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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 Brugmann1, 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, 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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THE LATIN LANGUAGE

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, ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ, 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, Θ (the th-sound of our 'ant-heap'), Φ (as in

1 Hübner's article in Müller's Hand- buch d. Klass. Alterthumswissensch., vol. i. pp. 492 sqq. 1886, gives a summary of what is known and a list of the authorities.
\textit{uphill \textprime}, \( \Psi \) (the symbol for the \( kh \)-sound of our \textquote{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 \textit{centum}), \( \Psi \) (later \( L \)) for 50, \( \Phi \) for 1000 (later \( M \), the initial of \textit{mille}), while the right-hand half of the symbol, viz. \( D \), was used for the half of 1000, \textit{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 \( t \)) (Ritschl, \textit{Opusc.} iv. 704 and 722; Mommsen in \textit{Hermes} xxii. 598). 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 \textit{sw}- (e.g. \( \phi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \alpha \delta \alpha \mu \omega \epsilon \), in the proper name Hecademus, on an inscription of Tanagra (Röhl, \textit{Inscr. Grac.} 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 \( \textit{FEFHAKED} \) (\textit{=fecit}) (C. I. L. xiv. 4123), in the earliest Etruscan inscriptions, e.g. \( \upsilon \lambda \chi \eta \varepsilon \nu \varsigma \) (the proper name \textit{Fulcinus}) (Fabr. \textit{Suppl.} iii. 306), and in the inscriptions of the Veneti, an Illyrian tribe of N.E. Italy (Pauli, \textit{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 \( \gamma \)), 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 (\textit{Annali dell' Inst.} 1880), we find \( \textit{FEKED} \) (or \( \textit{FEKED} \) corrected into \( \textit{FECED} \)), \( \textit{feci} \), \( \textit{PAKARI} \), \( \textit{COSMIS} \) (\( \textit{cômis} \)), \( \textit{VIRCO} \) (\( \textit{virgo} \)?) 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 250 and 250 B.C. according to Mommsen), with Ga. $f$: (Gai filius) (Edon, 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 possidere, &c., beside posedit, &c., for all the older inscriptions write the consonant single in such cases; of the latter, the Miliiarium Popillianum, 132 B.C. with paastores. 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 *siciliens*, 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*, a form likewise employed to denote the *y*-sound, and often also for initial *i* (Christiansen, *de Apicibus et I 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 *T*, just as we use Spanish *ñ* in loan words like ‘cañon,’ while for Greek *ζ* (formerly denoted by *s*-,*ss*-,*c*-,*sevrs*, 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 *vos*, &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 *fiel*, ‘fient,’ 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 puet, si innumerabiles unius et viginti formae litterarum, vel aureae vel quaelibet, aliquo coiciantur, posse ex iis excissus annales Enni, ut deinceps legi possint, effici; quod nescio an ne in uno quidem versu 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 (nostrarum 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 ḡh, a development of I.-Eur. sc-, 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 ἱδώμα, ἱδός), hr ḡh, (e.g. a 'his' prefixed to srth, 'stream,' is pronounced a rhod), I.-Eur. sc- when preceded by a vowel became f, e.g. a fiur, 'his sister' (I.-Eur. *esiyo sicesor), which points to a connexion between hr (ḡh), and the f-sound. It must never 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 Aberdonian dialect of Scotch, where the ḡh- or ḡh-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 potuisse quam psi non quoloquentes), was also written xs from early times (e.g. extrad 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. saxum on an epitaph of one of the Scipios, c. 130 B.C., i. 34; proxymes for proximus, exigit, lex 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.; exemplo Comm. Lud. Sace. 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 syllabic element of the x-sound. The guttural element is repeated in the spelling cs, e.g. vexor for vxor (a misspelling which has led to the corruption vxor in MSS. of Plautus, Class. Rev. v. 293), vexxt (C. I. L. v. 5735). (For examples in Virgil MSS., see Ribbeck, Ind. p. 391). We also find xc, e.g. ivxta (C. I. L. vi. 14614), and sx, e.g. vsxxt (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. vcsxt (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, coseladořicso, &c., can be fairly quoted as an instance of Old Latin z is doubtful, for the reading suggests O zeu (Greek Ζεύ) 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 ae-noine of the Dvemos inscription is too doubtful to quote; for the letters may read not only \( \text{dze noine} \), ‘on the ninth day,’ but also \( \text{dies noine} \), or even \( \text{Dvenoi ne} \). 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 \( \text{Papirius} \) to \( \text{Papirius} \); in the Digests (i. 2. 2. 36) Appius Claudius is mentioned as the author of the change: \( \text{R litteram inventit ut pro Valesii Valerii essent, et pro Fusiis Furii} \). 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: \( \text{z vero idecrio Appius Claudius detestatur, quod dentes mortui, dum exprimitur, imitatatur} \). In the Oscan 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. \( \text{eizazunc egnazum} \) (in Latin, \( \text{earum rerum} \), on the Bantia tablet, c. 130 B.C.). (On the question whether the z (Latin character) of Osc. \( \text{zicozo} \), ‘dicelius,’ represents the soft s-sound or the ts-sound of the letter written in the Oscan 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. \( \text{zeze} \), ‘sedens,’ see von Planta, Osk.-Umbr. Dial. p. 71.)

§ 6. The Guttural-symbols. A special symbol for the y-sound, made by adding a small stroke to the symbol C, is said by Plutarch (Quaest. Rom. 54 and 59; cf. Ter. Scaur. 7. 15 K.) to have been the invention of Sp. Carvilius Ruga c. 293 B.C., presumably because he was the first to write his name \( \text{Ruga} \) with the new symbol, as L. Papirius Crassus, dictator 339 B.C., was the first to conform the spelling of the family-name \( \text{Papirius} \) to the new pronunciation \( \text{Papirius} \). 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 \( \text{Kaes} \), and in a few words before the vowel a, e.g. \( \text{Kalendae} \), a common spelling on inscriptions (see C. I. L. i. Index, p. 583), \( \text{interkalaris, kapni, kalumnia} \). Terentius Seaurus, second cent. A. D. (p. 15 K.) tells us that the letter K was called \( \text{ka} \), while the name of C was \( \text{ce} \), and that these letters themselves had been before his time used to indicate the syllables represented by their names, e.g. \( \text{krus} \) (for \( \text{ka-rus} \)), \( \text{era} \) (for \( \text{cera} \)). Velius Longus, first cent. A. D., speaks of some sticklers for old usages in his own age, who in their corre-
spondence always spelt *Karissime* with *κ* not *η* (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 10. 23 K.; Serv. in Don. p. 422 K.; Donatus, p. 368 K. For spellings with *κα* 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 Gaius, Cn. for Gnaeus; just as an old five-stroked form of the symbol M seems to be the original of the abbreviation for the name *Mantius*, 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. *acertare* for *agitare* (Paul. Fest. 17. 30 Th.). The proper spelling of these obsolete words was occasionally a subject of discussion, e.g. whether *pacvnt* in the XII Tables, *vita pacvnt*, stood for *pagvnt* (cf. *pepgi, pango*), or for *pacvnt* (cf. *paciscor*). (Quint. i. 6. 10–11; Ter. Scaur. 7. 15 K.; cf. Fest. 330, 23 Th.) and probably the *μεταχειρισμος* of early *C* to *c* and *g* was almost as fruitful a source of error as that of *E* to *ε, η, ο*, of *O* to *o, ω, ω* in the Homeric text. Thus frico, not frigo, may be the proper form of the Old Latin verb, used by Accius *frigit seactus* (of a boar) *Trag.* 443 R., &c. (cf. Greek *φρίζω* for *φρικ-γι*); *tēcere* (cf. *tēkoma, προσδοκά*o) of Old Latin *degere*, ‘expectare’ (Paul. Fest. 51. 32 Th.). (On the use of *C* for the g-sound see also Mar. Victorin. p. 12 K. who quotes *Cubito, loco, aqua*; 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 *c*, especially in inscriptions of the time of the Gracchi, e.g. *Peqvnia, oqvfare, qvra* for a list of the instances, see Bersu, *Die Gutturnien*, 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 c-sound before *o*, and of *q* to the c-sound before *u*, is quite uncertain. (For Accius’ use of *gg* for *ng* in *agglvus*, &c., *gy* 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. X- 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. Gennaio for Gennajo (Lat. *Iunviarius*); others use *j* for *-ii*, e.g. *vije, vici* ‘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); *lārva*, for example, is a trisyllable in Plautus, never a disyllable. The minuscule forms *v* and *u* are developments of the *V*, of Capital, and the U of Uncial writing. The use of the tall I form on Inscriptions for the *g*-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 *-iaw*, *-uw*- is very doubtful. Sittl, in *Burs. Jahresber.* 1891, p. 250, quotes *abiicere* for *abyic* (?), *vesvvs* for *Vessue* (?); cf. Brambach, *Orth.* p. 94.
On the Monumentum Ancyranum we have iventvis (3. 5 M.), and in Virgil MSS. ivenis, fluidus, 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 ponit, 'Fotum,' 'Firgo,' quod et Aeoles fecerunt 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 Dvenos tablet may be a variety of this symbol in the later form *Dvenoi ne*, but it may also be *z*, *dze noine* or (most likely) a form of *i*.

(See above.)

Cicero wrote *ii* to express the sound of the second element of an *i*-diphthong before a vowel (see ch. ii. § 55). e.g. *aiio*, *Maia*, *Aitax* (Quint. i. 4. 11; Vel. Long. 7. 54 K.: et in plerisque Cicero videtur auditu emensus scriptionem, qui et *Aiiaecem* et *Maiaim* per duo i scribenda existimavit. He mentions also *Troia*, and with three *i’s*, *collset*. Cf. Prisc. i. 303 and i. 14 H., who ascribes the spelling *Pompeiiii* to Julius Caesar.


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 F 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 L.- *iy* and *y* in words like Osc. *heriadi* and *heriam*, see ch. iv. § 63.

§ 8. Double Consonant. Festus in his discussion of the word *solitaurilia* (p. 412 Th.), which he derives from *taurus*, in the sense of *sitymb*, and the Oscan sollo- (in Latin *lotus*), 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 I enuntiari non est mirum, quia nulla tune geminabatur littera in scribendo. quam consuetudinem Ennius mutavisse fertur, utpotest Graecus Graeco more usus). The Roman tradition, which ascribes this spelling reform to Ennius, as well as the doubling of the long vowel to Aceius, 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. *Hennaion* (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: Mumiæs
§ 8, 9.] THE ALPHABET.

Sabelio C. I. L. V. 1361. osa x. 3743. Marius Victorinus, fourth cent. A.D., states that it was often to be seen in old MSS. (sic et appare in multis adhuc veteribus ita scriptis libris (p. 8 K. Cf. Isidor. Orig. i. 26. 29).

§ 9. Signs for long vowels. No instance of oo for o is found on the extant Latin inscriptions, though we have voatum on an inscription in the Faliscan dialect, whose orthography was very like the Latin: *predol de senatui sententia voatum dedit*. For i 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 α had taken the same course as Latin ei, and expressed the same sound as original long i (Blass. Griech. 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. (aliu vero, quorum est item Lucilius, varie scriptitatverunt, si quidem in iis, quae produceantur, alia per i longam, alia per e et i notaverunt, velut differentia quadam separantes, ut cum diceremus 'viri,' si essent plures, per e et i scriberemus, si vero esset unus viri, per i notaremus, et Lucilius in nmino:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Iam puerei uenere; } & \text{e postremo facito atque i.} \\
& \text{ut puerei plures fiant. } \text{i si facis solum,} \\
& \text{pupilli, 'pueri,' 'Lucili,' hoc unius fiet; } \\
& \text{item} \\
& \text{hoc illi factum est uni; } \text{tenue hoc facies i:} \\
& \text{haec ille iecere; } \text{adde e ut pinguius fiat.)}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{meille hominum,' duo meillia, } & \text{item hoc E utroque opus; 'miles,'} \\
& \text{militiam'; tenues i, 'pilam,' qua ludimus, 'pilum,'} \\
& \text{quo pisunt, tenues. si plura haec feceris pila,} \\
& \text{que iacimus, addes e, 'peila;' ut plenius fiat.
\end{align*}
\]

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.):—

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{porro hoc 'filius Luci;'} \\
& \text{feecris i solum, ut 'Corneli,' 'Cornificique.'} \\
(2) & \text{mendaci 'Furike,' addes e cum dare, 'Furei,'} \\
& \text{iussersis (unless we read 'date, Furie,' and make the ei-form Voc. Plur.).}
\end{align*}
\]

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 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. r M.).
10 K.), after quoting the passage from Lucilius beginning ‘meille hominum,’
goes 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. I. 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 melius 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 Μακρείλλος,
Μαρκείλλος, Μαρκείλλος is the rule, and it is common till 50 B.C. But the ια is not
found in derivatives where the Greek accent does not fall on this vowel, e.g.
Μαρκιανος, Μαρκείλλεινος, &c. (Eckinger, p. 8).

In the first century A.D. the use of ιι for α seems to have been affected for
a time, for the spelling μαυλί occurs on wax tablets found at Pompeii
(Notizie degli Scavi, October, 1887), and ιι is often found for α of fourth decl.
nouns in Virgil MSS. (see Ribbeck, Ind. p. 449), e.g. metus, currus; also ιιιι
for ιιιι (cf. Probi Appendix, p. 202. 27 K.). In the Bamberg MS. of the elder
Pliny ιιιι is the regular spelling in the Gen. Sg. and (Nom. and) Acc. Pl. of
fourth decl. 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 Α, which, he points out, has the same quality when short
and when long (see ch. ii. § 1); hence α and α, he argues, should be written
in the same way, like Greek α and α (9. 4-7 M.):—

a primum longa, et breuis syllaba, nos tamem unum
hoc faciemus, et uno eodemque ut dicimus paeto
scribemus ‘pacem,’ ‘placide,’ ‘Tanum,’ ‘aridum,’ ‘acetum,’
(On vehemens for vemens, 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. ἀγγέλος, ἀγγαλή, 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 inquirunt, ‘ageps’ for anceps. (Varro ap. Prisc. i. p. 30 H.: ut Ion scribit, quinta vicevima 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 veratatem videere facile non est. Similiter ‘ageps,’ ‘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, aggere, &c.

§ 11. New Letters for Greek Sounds: Y, Z, CH, PH, TH, RH. Our name for y, viz. ‘wy,’ comes from the Latin name for the letter which was ‘ui’ (Mém. Soc. Ling. vi. 79). Greek υ is often represented by Latin ui, and vice versa, e.g. quinquei for κυνκοῖ, and Αὐλὸς for Αὐγιλα (ibid. viii. 188; Eckinger, p. 123). Before the introduction of the Greek letter, Latin n 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. sylla supposed to be the Greek ἕλη, lympha identified with Greek νυμφή, &c. (see ch. ii. § 28). Greek ς, if we are to believe the grammarians, was expressed in earlier times by d also (Prisc. i. p. 36: y et z in Graecis tantummodo ponuntur dictionibus, quanvis in multis veteres hace quoque mutasse inveniantur, et pro v u, pro ζ v e r o . . . s vel ss vel d possuisse, ut . . . ‘Saguntum,’ ‘massa’ pro Ζάκνυθος, μαδα, . . . ‘Sethus’ pro Ζήθος dicentes, et ‘Medentius’ pro Mezentius) (see ch. ii. § 120).

The earlier expression of Greek θ, ϕ, χ by t, p, c (e.g. adelpus, Metradati) on an inser. of 81 b c. (?), Not. Sacr. 1887, p. 110 remains in words like tus, Greek θος, Poeni for Φοινικῆς, colx, Greek χαλκ (cf. Quint. i. 5. 20 diu delinde servatum ne consonantibus (veteres) adspirarent, ut in ‘triumpis’). We find b for ϕ in Old Latin Bruges for Φρόγες, and in balloena for φάλλανω, 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. xlviii. 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. Daφne, C. I. L. vi. 686). But as early as 146 B.C. we find th, ph, ch in the dedicatory inscriptions1 of the Graecizing L. Mummius (C. I. L. i. 546 Corintho (?), 146 B.C.; i. 541 in Saturnians:

ACHAIA CAPTA CORINTO DELETO
ROMAM REDEDIT TRIMPHANS).

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 ἀντεμφανύ through Low Lat.) has come to be written with th, 'anthem.' For Greek initial ϒ, and for η, the older spelling was r, rr, e.g. Regium, Burrus (the invariable form of the name Πύθος in Eunnius, according to Cic. Orat. xlviii. 160). The use of rh for initial Ψ 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. Arkiia (for Ἀρχίας), Meelicikies (for Μελικίας Gen.), and so Pelignian Perseponas, 'Proserpinae,' Gen., but we have also Ose. thesaurei, 'in thesauro,' Loc., &c.

§ 12. Influence of Greek Orthography.—The use of y 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 lubi, ʏ 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 a 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

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 å and ã, if they differed at all in quality, did not differ so markedly as Latin ē and ē, ĩ and ĩ, û and û. 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 å, aa for ã), 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, plācite, &c., just as the Greeks write ἀ and ἄ in the same way, e.g. ἄρες and ἄρες (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. ĩ and ĭ; and so in the Romance languages Latin ĭ appears as close c, Latin ĭ as close i (e.g. Ital. misi for Lat. mīśi; Ital. beve for Lat. bibit). Latin å and ã, 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 sacrus 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, pacem 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 aurifer from aurum and facis, and in Early Latin in open syllables too, e.g. übègit, classical übìgit, from üb and ügo, an e retained in classical Latin before r, e.g. im péro from päro. 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. occìpo from ob and cùpio, testìmò-nium (C. I. L. i. 197, 3) from stem testì- (see iii. 18). Varieties in the spelling of foreign names like Sarìica and Servìca, Delmatìa and Dalmàtia prove nothing for Latin a. More important is the fact that jà-, jaj- seem to have tended to the pronunciation jè-, jej-, with open e. Thus Jànnàrius became Jènnàrius; jajùnuus is the Plautine form of the classical jejùnuus. Here the change of a to e was due to the influence of the palatal j (our y) preceding, just as the ù of jùnìpèrus was changed to i by the same palatal in Vulgar Latin jùnìpirus (Probi Appendix, 199. 8 K.) (Ital. gìnepro, Fr. genìèvre, Span. enebro). No such influence is at work in the mispronunciation stetìm for stàtim, a Roman cockneyism like London ‘keb’ for ‘cab’, mentioned by a grammarian of the fifth (?) century A.D. (Consentius, p. 392, 16 K.: per immutationem fiunt barbarismi sic: litterae, ut sìquis dìcat ‘bobìs’ pro vobìs, ‘peres’ pro pedes, ‘stetìm’ pro statìm, quod vitìum plebem Romanam quadam deliciosa novitatis affectione corrupit). 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. *nòtare, a by-form of nòtare, to swim, which ousted the a-form in Vulgar Latin about 100 B.C. In Plautus’ time and later vàcàre was pronounced like vocàre; the o-sound apparently having been produced by the influence of the labial v (our w) (cf. Kòdòpàtos, Kòdòpàtos for Quadàtòus on Gk. inscriptions), as e was by the palatal j (our y) in Jènnàrius. In one of Phaedrus’ fables (App. 21) a man
mistakes the caw of a crow for *ave! ave!* It is worth mentioning that Oscan ú, the representative of Ind.-Eur. O, Õ, 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. *τωφτο*), 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. 25o, l. 33 Th.); and Paulus gives *veia*, not *veio*, as the word for ‘cart’ (p. 56o, l. 17 Th.); though Lucilius, if Festus (p. 426, l. 7 Th.) quotes him accurately, makes ṥ the Latin equivalent of the Oscan Neut. Pl. suffix in *sollō* (Lat. *lota*),

*nasa quoque omnino dirimit non sollo 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. *cāpiēt*, 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 ē, 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 (w-0 w-0 w-0 w-0 w-0):

    a prima locum littera sic ab ore sumit:
    immunia rictu patulo tenere labra,
    linguamque nesse est ait pendulum reduci,
    ut nisus in illam valeat subire voeis,
    nec partibus ullis aliquos ferire dentes.

Marius Victorinus (fourth cent. A.D.) (p. 32 of Keil’s edition) compresses
the same description, in his usual way: a littera rictu patulo suspenso,
neque impressa dentibus lingua enuntiatur. It is still further compressed by
Martianus Capella (fourth or fifth cent. A.D.) (iii. 261, p. 63 of Eyssenhardt’s
edition in the Teubner series): A sub hiatu oris congruo solo spirito memo-
ramus.

§ 3. Interchange of a and e. Delmātia and Dalmātia: Vel. Longus, p. 73 K.
placet etiam Dalmatiam quoque, non 'Dalmatiam' pronuntiemus, quoniam
da mino maxima ejusdem provinciæ civitate tractum nomen existimatur.
On Inscriptions, we have sometimes a, e.g. Dalmat. (C. I. L. vi. 1607), some-
times e, e.g. Delmatia (C. I. L. iii. p. 280) (see Georges, Lex. Lat. Worft. s. v.),
Jī-, jē- for jā-, jaj-:—The Vulg. Lat. name of the month was Januarius (C. I. L. vi.
1708, of 311-314 A.D., and other inscriptions) [see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 185].
So in Greek inscr. 'tēvopaiów C. I. G. 9486 (Catana); 'tēvopaiów I. I. S. 62
(Syracuse)], which has developed into the Italian Gennaio (cf. Span. Enero),
with open e. Jājānus (with ē according to Ter. Maur. 343 K.), jējentaculum
supplanted the older jājānus, jējentaculum, the Plautine forms (A. L. L. 7. 528).
Jēnua, for jānua, is indicated by Sardinian enna, genna, and is sometimes
found in MSS. (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 185). Jājānus reappears in late
Latin (in the Ital. e.g. Luc. iii. 20), and in Span. ayunar, while the shortened
forms jēntacilum, jēntāre are found in MSS. along with the usual jēntacilum,
jēntāre (see Georges, Lex. Worft. s. v.); and jāntare is indicated by Old Span.
yantar, Port. yantar. On Vulg. Lat. jēcto for jācto (Ital. gettare, Fr. jeter), see
I. F. ii. Anz. p. 35; and for other examples of a-e, Georges, Lex. Worft. s. v.
Sorapis, serracum, Sērdica, 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.
§ 5. **Anomalies in Romance.** Accented Latin a sometimes shows o, sometimes e in Romance from a variety of causes. Thus Ital. chiovo, from Lat. **cīvēus**, shows o by influence of e; Ital. (dialectal) opre for apre, Fr. ouvrir, hardly point to Vulg. Lat. *opèrio* for *ôpèrio*, but are rather influenced by *cio(o)*ôpèrio, Fr. courvrir, Ital. coprire; Ital. monce from Lat. *mancus* is due to the synonym tronceo from Lat. *truncus*. Vulg. Lat. *grevīs* (Ital. grave and grave) may have adapted itself to *levīs*; *mēlum*, not *mētium*, the original of the Romance words for apple (Ital. melo, &c.), is to be the Greek form μῆλον, and is indicated by the pun in Petronius, chap. lvi. (p.37, 19 Bückh.) contumelia...contus eum malo (leg. melo). The appearance of e for o in the unaccented syllable, e.g. Vulg. Lat. *alecōr* (with stem *alecere*) for *ālēcēri*- (Ital. allegro, Span. alegre), *cērēsim*- (cēresium and cērazilium in Marc. Emp.) from *kēraisō* for *kērisin* (Greek kēradōs) in the Romance words for cherry (Ital. cīregio, &c.) is due to the same law which produced *consevrum* from *sacrum* (ch. iii). The mispronunciations fēligo Prob. 212. 4, *securatum* Mar. Vict. x. 6, are to be similarly explained. (On the variation of Italian ā with I.-Eur. ā in words like Lat. *pāva* (Osc. pate-) besides Gk. πέραννυμι, see ch. iv. § 6.)

§ 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. étē. (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. cireba, from Lat. *cērapat*) (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 ĝ (e.g. Ital. cielo, Span.
cielo, from Lat. caelum, exactly as Ital. criepa, Span. erieba, from
Lat. crēpat). Latin ĝ and i ĝ are merged in the same way in
Romance (Ital. fendo from Lat. findo, like vendo from Lat.
vendo; messo from Lat. missus, like mesa from Lat. mē[ō]sā; all
with close e), being distinguished only in the oldest Romance
dialect, viz. Sardinian (Sard. veru from Lat. vērus, but pira from
Lat. *pīra, pīrum, 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, ēra, loanwords of
the second to the fourth cent. A.D., are in Welsh ffydd, ewyr).
And so the probable history of the change of ĝ to i ĝ in unaccented
syllables (e.g. elīgo from lego), is that the open e first became
close e, and then passed into i ĝ. 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 ĝ substituted for e in the mispronunciations censured by the
grammarians, pinaria for penaria, pīdato for pedatu, decem 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 ĝ seems to have approached
the sound of i ĝ to judge from the frequent confusion of suffixes
like -eus and -ius, -eolus and -iolus. Before i ĝ, older eī, the ĝ-sound
was recognized as the correct pronunciation, or at least the correct
spelling, e.g. mīcis, mīis, contracted to mis; diī, diīs, contracted
to dī, dis; ii, iīs, contracted to iī, iis in Plautus, &c. The con-
trary tendency, to substitute ĝ for i ĝ 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.
matyām). Another dialectal change was to replace ĝ by i ĝ 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. eestint, Lat. exstant; keenstur, Lat. censor, censores), and not by the symbol of the long vowel. For Latin nevertheless the evidence points to ē- for ēr, -ē(n)s- for -ēns- having had the close sound; for évitat 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)sa (Ital. mesa, Welsh mwys, &c.) point to the ordinary ē-vowel. But Vulg. Latin Jēnnarius (for Jānnarius) 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 e 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 producitur vicinum est ad sonum i litterae, ut 'meta;' quando autem correptum, 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
velit dicere 'aequus' pro eo quod est equus, in pronuntiatione hoc fit (cf. Alcuin 295. 4 K.: 'aequitas,' 'aequus,' id est justus, ... per ae diphthongon scribenda sunt; 'aequus,' si animal significat, per simplicem e) (see § 41). Pompeius, in another passage (102. 4 K.), aseribes the comparison of the long z-sound to the i-sound to Terentianus Maurus: aliter longa, aliter brevis sonat. . . .

dicta its Terentianus 'quotienscumque e longam volumus proferri, vicina sit ad i litteram,' ipse sonus sie debet sonare, quomodo sonat i littera. quando dicis 'evitat,' vicina debet esse, sic pressa, sic angusta, ut vicina sit ad i litteram. quando vis dicere brevem e, simpliciter sonat. And 'Sergius' (in Don. 520. 27 K.) gives much the same account as Servius: vocales sunt quinque. hae non omnes varios habent sonos, sed tantum duae, e et o. nam quando e corruptum est, sic sonat, quasi diphthongus, 'aequus,' quando productum est, sic sonat, quasi i, ut 'demens.'

§ 8. i for unaccented e. 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 mali scribi, quamvis 'compressus' dicitur; et e contrario 'decem' audacius dixerim, quamvis inde 'decies' trahatur, quoniam, ut supra dixi, sono usitatiore 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 e in hiatus. The Appendix Probi censures vinia (198. 3 K.), cevia (198. 5), brutta (198. 6), coelia and coelarium (198. 6), lanceia (198. 8), solia (198. 10), calcius (198. 10), tinic (198. 19), ballius (198. 23), lintium (198. 31), pallarium (198. 9), fossiolius (198. 26). Artium (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 ὅρρα, ὃρα from the end of the first cent. a.d.; πειλον in the Edict of Diocletian, 301 a.d.; Ποτιλοι, Ποτωλοι. 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 1 placet . . . 'miis' per i, non 'meis' per e, ut Terentius:—

at enim istoe nihil est magis, Syre, miis nuptius aduersum.

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 Seipio Epitaphs (C. I. L. i. 38, of 130 B.C.). In the Lex Parietii Faciendo (C. I. L. i. 577), a copy of an inscription of 105 B.C., we find the Abl. Pl. abigienies, aeculnienies, distinguished in spelling from Acc. Pl. abiginea (K. Z. xxx. 500). Similarly dili, dis 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 'dii'; nam et deabus Cicero dixit: igitur deis ratio, dis consuetudo; and the same must hold of iti, its (iots, C. I. L. vi. 877, time of Augustus; iei, iei, but eos, &c., on the Regulations for the Ludi Saeulares of 17 B.C. (Monumenti Antiichi 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.vv.) By-

1 But the use of i may have been a mere usage of orthography to avoid the awkward collocation -ei-, which might be misread as the symbol for
forms in -ea and -ia are sometimes differentiated by the subtlety of grammarians, a practice very properly censured by Cornutus (ap. Cassiod. 150. 18 K.) : vineas per e quidam scribendas tradiderunt, si haec significarentur, quas in agris videmus; at contra per i, vinias, illas sub quibus latere miles solet, quod discrimen stultissimum est. nam neque aliunde vineae castrenses dictae sunt, quam quod vineis illis agrestibus similés sunt. (For other examples of -ea, -eus varying with -ia, -ius, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 424 ; Braband Orth. p. 133; and consult Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv. glarea, linea, janes, muscallaeus, virgineus, vitreus, gallinaeus, cavea, urcoitus, adorea, lancea, oreae, ostrea, pausa, labea, linteo, phaseolus, nauseo, copeoa, hordearius; and Braband, Hilfsbuchlein s. vv. balteus, soloe, linea, tratea.) They have been explained by that tendency to change i and e in hiatus into consonantal i (y), which turned liliun &c. into ‘lilyum,’ area &c. into ‘arya,’ so that -eus, -en, -ius, iun 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 vin-, the Umbr. vea- and via-; -eo for -io is common in inscr. of Etruria, Praeneste, &c. (Sittl, Lok. Versch. p. 10), e. g. Praenestine filioi (C. I. L. i. 54); the Praenestine form of ciconia is given by the MSS. of Plautus, Truc. 690, as conea not ‘conia’; ut Praenestinis conea est ciconia; in Plaut. Most. 48 the MSS. read aleato ‘on garlic.’ Charisius (70. 27 K.) censures the pronunciation of ‘ali diserti’ aleum, doleum, pileum; the Appendix Probi rejects aleum (198. 18 K.), pileum (198. 19), lanceo (197. 29), osteum (198. 5). [For other exx. see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv. alleun, arsen, aleo, douleum, folium, lanie, ostium, palteum, solenium, spolium; and Braband, Hilfsbuchlein s. vv. feriae, liliun, sobrius. Both spongia and sponga 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 é. 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 Aurilius (third cent.), Cornilius seem to represent that change of é to i before a syll. with i (y) in hiatus, which appears in filius, 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. filiciter), how many are dialectal (the equivalent of Lat. é is an i-sound in several of the Italian dialects, e. g. Osc. ligid ‘lege’ ch. iv. § 5), and how many are mere mistakes. In Greek inscr. i for Lat. è is late, probably dating from the time when Greek ë came to take the i-sound; but ἄφρασο (-αλνος) is found beside ἄφρασο in the second cent. (Eckinger, p. 24). The rare spelling decrevit for decrebit 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 imperator (for imperátor) on the same inscr. suggests that ei in decrevit may have been meant to indicate the close e-sound [cf. legitibus xiv. 2892 (Praeneste), pleib. (Eph. Epigr. i. 3)]. Délices and délorus are rightly explained by Velius Longus (73. 2 K.), who follows Varro: délerus is the proper form, derived from lira a furrow, while the form délorus is due to a fanciful connexion of the word with Gk. ἄνηρ.
PRONUNCIATION. VOWELS.

(On the comparative prevalence of the two spellings see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s. v., and cf. App. Probi 198. 19: delirius non 'delerus'; torpido beside torpido (Caper 166. 8 K.) is merely the substitution of a more familiar for a less familiar suffix (cf. graviado for graviado; see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s. v.), and the same is true of Vulg. Lat. *vénimun (Fr. venin), Bizacinus for Bizacinus (App. Probi, 198. 1), *périgamínun (Ital. pergaminio, Fr. parchemin), *pulícínun (Ital. pulcino, Fr. poussin) (-énus, -énun have been in fact supplanted by -inó- in Romance languages, e.g. Ital. Saracino, Messina, &c., Fr. serin, a canary, if from Síreën), *rácínus (Ital. racimolo, Fr. raisin), *regrádun (Ital. berbice, Fr. brebis), *matile (Ital. mantile), &c. (See also Georges, s. vv. críuména, sénimun, séricus; cf. App. Probi 199. 6: hermeneumata non 'erminomata'.)

§ 12. I for accented ĕ (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 329 sqq.). Bipennis for bıpennis, censured in App. Probi 199. 6 K. (cf. Quint. i. 4. 12), is due to confusion of pínna with penna (cf. Caper 166. 17 K.); carícum beside cárrectum (de Dub. Nom. v. 573. 2 K. Virgilius in bucolicis 'tu sub carecta latebas,' nune caricata), may follow the analogy of sálíctum, &c., but it is more likely that the true reading here is sacricea, Plur. of sacrícvm (Nonius 21. 24 M. ?), the original of Span. carrizo. On vígeo and vígeo, fítix and fítix, fíber and fíber, pína and penna, see ch. iv., § 11; and on bénécolus and bénécolus, bénificus and bénificus, &c., ch. iii. § 37. Scítá, scítá for schédá (see Georges, s. v.) seems to follow the analogy of scíndo; spíció, sícó, &c., of prospéció, prósico, &c. The use of ẽ for ɨ is discussed in § 17. Before ng every Latin ɨ became by a phonetic law of the language ɨ (see ch. iv. § 8), e.g. tingo, confringo, attingo; and other consonant-combinations may have influenced ẽ towards the close e-sound or the i-sound (see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s. vv. Vergilíus, vergiliac, Verгинíus, hermitum, segmentum, Vorserma, and cf. § 144); dignus has been explained as *deć-nus from décet, and spellings like frávniátum (Schuchardt, Vok. i. 354) may point to a modification of ẽ like that of ő (ch. iv. § 20) before nt.

§ 13. ā for ē. Before ce we find a for e in the mispronunciation novarea (for nóareca) mentioned in the Appendix Probi (198. 34 K.); but forms like ansvar (ib. 198. 22 and 23), passár (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 carlándae, the Vulg. Lat. form of ciéndae [in Greek always καλάνδα] (cf. Eckinger), Welsh calan, New Year’s Day, Mod. Gk. κάλαντα], may be a 1 Conj. Gerundive form. (Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 206 sqq., has collected a list of examples of doubtful validity.)

§ 14. I. The Romance languages show us that Latin ɨ, ɨ differed in quality, like Latin ē, ē. Latin ɨ, as we have seen, they merge in Latin ē, while Latin ɨ remains ɨ, e.g. Ital. beve, from Latin bilítt, misi from Latin mísí. This ɨ from Latin ɨ 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 ɨ 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 ì, 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 ì, viz. the ù of optimus older optimums, &c., which they style 'a sound between i and u.' The natural inference is that Latin ì and ù differed as Latin ë and ë, the short vowel being open, the long close, while ì before a labial, in words like optimus, had some sound like that of German ù in schützen, Hütte. This ù 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. ë is in the Oscan alphabet e, e.g. edum (Lat. ēdere, esse 'to eat'), estud (Lat. esto); ì is i, e.g. bivus (Lat. vīvi, Nom. Pl.). For ë and ì they have the same sign (except that for ë it is often written double to indicate length), a modification of this last, which we conventionally write ï, e.g. fīsnam, a temple, Acc. Sg. (cf. Lat. fēstus), pīd (Lat. quīd). In Greek characters the three signs are ε, ι, ι; in Latin characters e, i, i. Everything points to their e having been, like Latin ë, an open E-sound, their i the close I-sound of Latin ì, while like the Romance languages they have merged close e and open i in one sound ì. Whether the iu of Oscan ultīumam (Lat. ultīmam) indicates the Latin ù-sound is, with the scarcity of material at our disposal, uncertain (see ch. iv. § 23).

In rustic Latin, as we saw (§ 10), ì before a vowel was replaced by e, e.g. mateola for *mātiola, while in the ordinary language accented ë 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. audīt, 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
\(\varepsilon\) for \(\ddot{i}\) in *speca*, &c., is probably a development of the old diphthong \(\varepsilon\ddot{i}\). Similarly \(\varepsilon\), the old vowel of the open unaccented syllable, e.g. O. Lat. *âbégit* for *âbigit*, was retained in rustic Latin.

§ 15. Descriptions of the I-sound by Latin phoneticians. The phoneticians describe only the \(\dddot{i}\)-sound. Terent. Maur. (329. 119 K.) :-

\[\text{i porrigit iectum genuinos prope ad ipsos,}
\text{minimunque rendet supero tenus labello;}
\]


§ 16. by Grammarians. The \(\dddot{i}\)-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 *optimum* 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 (3.4.8) that some special sign is required for the sound between \(i\) and \(u\) in words like *optimum*, and similarly for the sound between \(e\) and \(i\) in words like *hēre* (older *hēri*), *sibi*, *quäsi* (older *sibe*, *quaśe*) [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 nesciocube*]: medius est guidam u et i litterae sonus; non enim ‘optimum’ dieimus aut ‘optimum’i, et in ‘here’ neque e plane neque i audiur. In another passage he tells us that the change in spelling, *optimus*, &c., from *optumus*, &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: iain ‘optimus maximus,’ ut mediam i litteram, quae veteribus u fuerat, accipereat, Gai primum Caesaris inscriptione traditum factum. ‘here’ nunc e littera terminamus; at veterum comicorum adhuc libris invenio ‘hēri ad me uenit,’ quod idem in epistulis Augusti, quas sua manu scriptis, aut emendavit, deprehendidur . . . ‘sibe’ et ‘quase’ scriptum in multorum libris est, sed an hoc voluerint auctores nesio; T. Livium ita his usum ex Pediano comperi, qui e ipse eum sequabant; hae nos i littera finimus. This example, *here* and *heri*, has given rise to some doubt; for we are accustomed to regard *herē* and *heri* as differing in quantity, like *rare* and *rari*, *Tiburē* and *Tiburī* (the -e being the Cons.-stem Locative suffix -i, the -i being the I-stem Abl. suffix -id, of one MS, *opimum* for *optumum*, 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 heri in Terence. Eun. 169 heri minas pro ambōbus uiginti dedi, often shortened by the peculiar metrical law of the comedians by which āē was scanned as āē, iāē as iāē, &c. (see ch. iii), as in the line, Hec. 329 heri nēmo voluit 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 i, which we see on old inscriptions in rendering the diphthong ei, e. g. poïrume for poīrumei, later plurīmi, 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 hominem; and we may be sure that in Quintilian’s time the word heri, 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 (have) 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 have (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 ‘exilis sonus’ of the Latin vowel i and, in some cases, of i, e. g. in 3 Sq. Pres. Ind. of verbs of the fourth conjugation, audīt, &c. (In Plautus and the oldest literature this i is long. audīt, the shortening having been effected by the influence of the final i, just as with us the vowel of ‘note’ is shorter than the vowel of ‘node.’ See ch. iii. § 49.) Ordinary i, as in 3 Sq. Pres. Ind. of the third conjugation, ponīt, &c., he calls the ‘latus sonus,’ while the i of optimus is ‘pinguis.’ Of this last sound he says that the spelling and pronunciation of u for i in optimus, manūbiae, &c., was regarded in his time as old-fashioned and countrified (49 K.): i vero littera interdum exilis est, interdum pinguis, ut in eo quod est ‘prodit’ ‘vincit’ ‘condit’ exilium volo sonare in eo vero quod significat prodiere 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, rusticānum, atque illis fere placuisse per u talia scribere et enuntiare, erraveret 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 aeque manet eadem quaeque superlatione sublata, ‘manubiae’ an ‘manibiae,’ ‘libido,’ an ‘libido’? nos vero, postquam exilias sermonis selectare coepit, usque i littera castigavimus illum pinguitudinem, non tamen ut plene i litteram enuntiaremus, et concedamus talia nomina per u scribere ipsis qui antiquorum voluntātes sequuntur, ne tamen sic enuntient, quo modo scribunt; and again (67 K.): varie etiam scriptitum est ‘manecipium’ ‘aupcupium’ ‘manubiae,’ siquidem C. Caeser per i scripsit, ut appareat ex titulis ipsius, at Augustus per u, ut testes sunt ejus inscriptiones. . . . relinquitur igitur electio, utrumque per antiquum sonum, qui est pinguissemus et u litteram occupabat, velit quis enuntiare, an per hunc, qui jam videtur eligantior, exilium, id est per i litteram, has proferat voces; and a little further on (68. 6 K.): mihi videtur nimis rusticana enuntiatio futura, si per u extulerimus. Ita tamen existimò enuntiandum, ut nec nimis i littera exilis

1 But the Comm. Lud. Saec. has optimus maximus.
sit, nec, u litteram si scripseris, enuntiationis sono nimiris plena. Here
his account of the 'sound between i and u' is perfectly clear. Optimum had
in old times been written and pronounced with a U-sound; but such
pronunciation was old fashioned and countriified 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 dis-
cusses 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 vinco), condit (from condoo), with that of the third person
singular of prodire, vincire, concdire. Keil supplies a sentence between the
words sonare and in eo, and reads: exilius volo sonare, si dico ab eo quod est
producere, vincere, condere; in eo vero quod significat prodire, &c. He refers
the 'pinguescit' to the sound of i, not to the i of optimum, &c., understanding
Velius Longus to distinguish i from i 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 'tenutare' and 'plenius facere' some two centuries earlier, in a passage
not less obscure (9. 14 M.):

'pilam' qua ludimus, 'pilum,'
quo pisunt, tenues, si plura haec feceris pila
quae facimus, adde e, 'peila,' ut plenius fiat;

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 vides quam tenuiter sonat. junge
illam ad aliam litteram, et vide quia non sic sonat, sed pinguisus sonat,
'vulnus,' 'vanus,' numquid sic sonat 'unus' quando u sola est? non, sed
tenuius sonat. 'vanus' quando dico pinguior sonus est. numquid diets
'u-a-nus'? ergo vides quia, si ponantur solae, tenuem sonum habent, si
jungantur ad alias litteras, pingues sonant. similiter et i sic patitur. 'itur,'
ecce tenuius sonat; si dicas 'Titius,' pinguius sonat, et perdit sonum suum,
et accept 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 mispronun-
ciations of Latin i (394. 11 K.): iotacismum dicunt vitium quod per i litteram
vel pinguius vel exilii protratalit fit. Galli pinguius hane utuntur, ut cum
dicunt 'ite,' non expresse ipsum proferentes, sed inter e et i pinguiorem
sonum nescioque ponentes. Graeci exilii hane proferunt, adeo expressioni
ejus tenui studentes, ut, si dicant 'jus,' aliquantulum de prior littera sic
proferant, ut videos disyllabum esse factum. Romanae linguae in hoc erit
moderatio, ut exilis ejus sonus sit, ubi ab ea verbum incipit, ut 'ite,' aut
pinguio, 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 here uses 'pinguis' and 'tenuis' or
'exilis' like Pompeius, not like Velius Longus, while he distinguishes long i
as 'plenior vel acutior,' short i in hominem as 'a sound between e and i.'
What he means by saying that in habui, tenui, i had the 'pinguis sonus,' must
be that the words were pronounced in his time 'habuyi,' 'tenuyi.' (Seelmann gives quite a different explanation.)

These three accounts of Latin ï, ï, taken in connexion with the evidence supplied by the Romance languages, where Latin ï has become a close E-sound, while Latin ï is invariably close I, give us the right to suppose that the usual Latin ï was different in quality from Latin ï, being an open I, like Engl. 'bit' or Germ. Kind. While ï 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 ï in such words as the 3 Sing. Pres. Ind. Act. of the fourth conjugation, prodït, audït, condït, where the ï, 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 ï came gradually to replace open ï 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 ï, ï, with ù, ù, were not distinguished like e, e, o, o; though Consentius a century later enlarges on this very distinction in the case of ï. It is more probable that these commentators, though they refer to some Latin instances (mēla, dēmens, ēquus), 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, η, o, ω); and, if this be so, it cannot but suggest the alarming suspicion that their phrase, 'ï is like the diphthong, ï like ï,' may really mean that Greek ë had the sound of a (as was the case in Attic Greek by the second cent. A. D.), ë of ï (the itacism of modern Greek. Blass ascribes the change of ë to ï to the fifth cent. A. D.).

To pass to the ù-sound of optimus, which in the Romance languages is merged in ordinary Latin ï. 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 ï, 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 ã (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 ã remained, e.g. cūbo. The passage which we now quote from Velius Longus extends the same sound to ï in accented syllables influenced by the labial sibilant ð, as in vir, virtus (75 K.): 'aurifex' melius per i sonat quam per u. at 'aucupare' [et aucupium] milii rursus melius videtur sonare per u quam per ï; et idem tamen 'aucipis' malo quam 'aucupis,' quia scio sermonem et decori servire et aurium voluptatim. unde fit ut saepe aliud scribamus, aliud enuntiems, sicut supra locutus sum de 'viro' et 'virtute,' ubi i scribitur et paene u enuntiatur. unde Ti. Claudius novam quandam litteram excgivavit similem ei notae quam pro aspiratione Graeci ponunt, per quam scriberentur eae voces, quae neque secundum exilitatem i litterae, neque secundum pingul-tudinem u litterae sonarent, ut in 'viro' et 'virtute,' neque rursus secundum latum litterae sonum enuntiaretur, ut in eo quod est legere, scribere. In the last words he seems to refer to ï of the third conjugation, legit, legimus, legitis, &c., the sound of which he calls 'latus' as opposed to the 'exilis sonus' of ï, and the 'pinguis sonus' of ï/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 by other grammarians to this i/u sound (see Seelmann, p. 205). Of these we need only quote two; one from Marius Victorinus (fourth cent.), who points out that this vowel is really the Greek υ (Latin y) (see § 28); and one from Priscian, who, like Velius Longus, gives this sound of Greek υ to accented ῤ influenced by a preceding υ. Mar. Victor. 19. 22 K. sunt qui inter u quoque et i litteras supputant deesse nobis vocem, sed pinguius quam i, exilii quam u. sed et pace eorum dixerim, non vident y litteram desiderari: sic enim ‘gylam,’ ‘myserum,’ ‘Syllam’ (MSS. syllabam), ‘proxy- mum’ dicebant 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 σίλα was spelt *silba* through a fanciful connexion with ῤή, and so *Sylla* for Syrula (cf. App. Probi 197. 26 crista non *crysta*); but it is difficult to explain *ylia* (for *gylia*) in the same way. All the Romance languages point to *gila* as the Vulgar Latin form (Ital. Span. gola, Fr. gueule). The *antiqii* 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 Acolici ponitur brevis, sequente d vel m vel r vel t vel x, sonum y Graeceae videtur habere, ut *video,* ‘virm,* ‘virtus,’ ‘vitiwm,’ ‘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: *vir non vyr,* virgo non *vyrgo,* virga non *vyrga,* so that the existence of this tendency to pronounce accented i as *u* after *e* can hardly be doubted. (The Latin name for υ, Greek υ, was ‘ui.’ See below.) But Greek υ does not represent Latin i in this position on Greek inscriptions. Other examples of accented i/u are *simus,* written for *simus* by some purists of the Augustan age (Mar. Victor. 9. 5 K. Messala, Brutus, Agrippa pro sumus *simus* scripserunt), and by Augustus himself (Suet. *Aug.* 87) (cf. C. I. L. ix. 3473. 14); *libet* and *libet;* *clupeus* and *dipeus* (see Georges, *Lex. Worff.* s. vv.); though two of these, *simus* and *libet,* might be explained as enclitic words and so wanting the accent, e. g. *amatisumus,* *libet-ire,* *quodlibet,* &c. (see iii. 12). (See also Georges, *Lex. Worff.* s. vv. *Bruttii, ciens* (earlier *ciens,* *inter, sigrupulius.* The Romance forms point to both *simus* (e. g. Fr. sommes) and *simus* (e. g. Ital. siamo from *semo, O. Roum. semo. *Supparum,* by with *siparum* (see Georges s. v.) seems to be an Ocean word (Varro, *L. L.* v. 131), and the mispronunciations ‘imiblicus’ (Prob. *App.* 198. 4 K.; cf. Ir. *imblui,* ‘seoiriscus’ (ib. 198. 32 K.), ‘arispex’ (Vel. Long. 73. 9 K.) have been variously explained.) (On the *u*-sound, see Parodi in *Studi Italiani,* i. 385.)

§ 17. *Interchange of i and e.* The misspellings on inscriptions testify abund- dantly to the close relation between i and e (close e), e. g. *karesmo* merentesmo (C. I. L. ii. 2997) (see Schuchardt, *Vok.* ii. pp. 1-67); but i is rarely written e except in Gaul and Britain, where e 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. *velia,* Varro, *R. R.* i. 2. 14). If so, the e is that dialectal e for
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I.-Eur. ei which is found in the Umbrian language, e.g. prevo- (Lat. prēcus, pričitus; Osc. privekuto), and in various parts of Italy. Deniūdis for dimiūdis (App. Prob. 198. 27 K.) is due to confusion of dē with dē- (dis) [cf. demelius, C. I. L. vii. 140; x. 3428, and in MSS. (see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. 71). Fr. demi]; Serena for Sërina (App. Prob. 199. 10) to confusion with sërenus (cf. Fr. serin, canary ?). On délirus and délirus, see eh. 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 ē for i of höninem, &c., as well as ē for i of spica, &c., and ē 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 Judicaria of 70 B. C. : quare Cotta noster, cujus tu illa lata, Sulpici, nonnunquam imitaris, ut iota litteram tollas et e plenissimum dieas, non mihi oratores antiquos, sed messores videtur imitari (de OraL. iii. 12. 46. Cf. iii. 11. 42; Brut. xxxvi. 137; lxiv. 259; and Quintilian xi. 2. 10).

The frequent occurrence on Greek inscriptions of ε for Lat. i (e.g. θεβης, λεντιον) may point to Greek ε having had (unlike Latin ē) the close E-sound (see Blass, Ausage der Griechischen, 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 ε for i is the usual spelling in ἐποιητῶν at all periods, while Kaueklos is replaced by Kaueklos after 50 B. C., Kaπεταλιον by Καπεταλιον in the first cent. A. D. ; Λεπέδος is the form of the Republican, Λεπίδος 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, libiscum, minus, ministe, sinu, sine, sinapi, vindico, comissor, solitus. 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. di) 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. dIes (C. I. L. vi. 7527) ; dIe (10239, also prIsvqam). (On prIs see § 143.)

§ 19. Anomalies in Romance. Ital. freddo, Fr. froid, from Lat. frigidus, point to *frīddus, from frīg(i) dus (cf. App. Probi 198. 3 K. frigida non frigida), where the i has been referred to the analogy of rigiudus (but see § 127); *giorem replaces girem in Celtic countries (Fr. loir, O. Prov. gles), but not elsewhere (Ital. ghiro); Vulg. Lat. *sūbilo, *sīfīlo, beside sībilo, *sīfīlo, to whistle (e.g. Ital. suflaire, subilare, sigilare, O. Fr. subler, sifler), have been explained by reference to suflare, or to sūbilo, the Etruscan word for a fluteplayer ; Greek i in χύρμα is treated like Latin i in Fr. chrême, Ital. cresma.

§ 20. O. Having discovered that Latin ē is open E, Latin ă close E, we are almost entitled to infer that Latin ă will be open O, Latin ò close O. 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 L.-Eur. Aspirate Mediae to voiced Spirants (\(\text{dh}\) to \(\text{d}\), the sound of our \(\text{th}\) in ‘this,’ &c.). They correspondingly moved the Tenues to unvoiced Spirants (\(\text{t}\) to \(\text{th}\) of ‘thin,’ &c.); and similarly the Mediae to Tenues (\(\text{d}\) to \(\text{t}\), &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 \(\text{o}\) as open O, Latin \(\text{o}\) (with which Latin \(\text{u}\) is merged) as close O. This open O is in many languages developed in open syllables to \(\text{no}\) (e.g. Ital. ruota, from Lat. \(\text{rūta}\)), as open E to \(\text{ie}\) (§ 6), while in Spanish \(\text{no}\) has further developed to \(\text{ne}\) (e.g. ruede), a change that reminds us of the substitution of \(\text{ve}\) for \(\text{ro}\) in Latin words like \(\text{verto}\), older \(\text{vorto}\). In Italian we have molle (with open O) for Latin \(\text{mollis}\), sole (with close O) for Latin \(\text{sōl}, \text{sōlem}\), the open O having the O-sound of German voll, Stock, the close that of German so, Fr. chaud. Our ‘short \(\text{o}\)’ 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 \(\text{o}\)’ in ‘so’ is a diphthong.

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

The O-sounds of the Oscan language offer the same analogy to the Latin, as the E-sounds (§ 6). The Oscan alphabet, being borrowed from the Etruscan, had originally no sign for Ơ, but only the sign for u. This u-sign was used for Ơ as well as for u, while for Ơ a modification of the sign was used, conventionally written by us ú. In Latin characters u expresses Oscan u, and Ơ Oscan ú, though in the final syllable before a labial u sometimes takes its place [e.g. Osc. estud, in Latin writing estud (Lat. estō, older estōd), Osc. pûd, in Latin writing pod (Lat. quûd), Osc. deikum, in Latin writing deicum (Lat. dicere, older deicere), and dolom, dolum (Lat. dōtum)]. In Greek characters Oscan u is ov, and sometimes Ơ, Oscan ú is o. This Oscan 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 tragicum sub oris antro
molita rotundis acuit sonum labellis.

This 'tragic tone in the mouth-cavern' of Ơ is perhaps more applicable to Greek ow, which was open Ơ (Blass, Aussprache des Griechischen², p. 26), than Latin Ơ, 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: ơ, ut e, geminum vocis sonum pro condicioe temporis promit ... igitur qui correptum enuntiat, nec magnō hiatus labra reserabit, et retrorsum actam linguam tenebit. longum autem productis labris, rictu tereti, lingua antro oris pendula sonum traeicum dabit. 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 Ơ became u in classical Latin, e.g. consulo (early consulo, C. I. L. i. 548, latter part of second century B. C.); pulcer (but Pòl[er], C. I. L. i. 552 of 131 B. C., cf. Prisc. i. 27. 12 H.); culpa (Old Lat. cópá 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, lunbus, 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. resendit); and in Italian we have close *o* in ponte, fronte, fonte, which corresponds with Priscian’s remark that *funtus, frondes, &c.*, were the older forms retained in Rustic Latin. (Prisc. i. 26. 35 H. multa praeterea vetustissimi etiam in principalibus mutabant syllabis; ‘gungrum’ pro gongrum, ‘cunchin’ pro conchin, ‘huminem’ pro hominem proferentes, ‘funtes’ pro fontes, unde Lucretius in libro . . . tertio:—

*atque ea nimium quaecumque Acherunte profundo,*

. . . quae tamen a junioribus repudiata sunt quasi rustico more dicta. Cf. Velius Longus p. 49. 15 K. unde in multis etiam nominibus variae sunt scripturae, ut fontes funtes, frondes frundes; and Charis. p. 130. 29 K.; sic ab Ennio est declinatum annalium libro vii; russelscunt 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 *rn* 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 *κόλπος* is *catharum*; Greek *τόρπος* was in Vulgar Latin *turnus* (so spelt in the MSS. of Symmachus. *Epq. v. 10*, e. g. Span. tornar, Ital. torno (with close *o*). The vowel of *tornus* has been referred to the close sound of Greek *o* (while *o* had the open sound) (K. Z. xxx. 336), and the *u* of *amurea* (Greek *ἀμώρφη*), and other Greek loanwords in Latin (cf. App. Probi 198. 22 botrunus 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 *ő* 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* (Non. 146 M. *obba*, peculi genus, quod nunc ubba dicitur).

In Greek inscriptions we have *Μουταρός* for Lat. *Montanus* (C. I. A. iii. 1138, of 174–8 A.D. p. 54. For other examples of *o*- *u* before consonant-groups in the accented syllable, see Georges, Lex. *Worj*. s.vv. *conchis, dupundius, formo(n)sus, Corsi, Volcae, proboscies, colostra, bulbus, furmus, fornix, fornax, Fulcivus, triumphus, cocheia*; and in the unaccented syllable, s.vv. *voksellia, bo(n)silla, promunturium*, also Brambach, *Hülfh*. s.vv. *furnus, fornica*. For classical *uv* we have O. Lat. *ov*- in *fluvius, eloctes* (see Georges s.vv.). *Curium* (for *corium*) on the Edict of Diocletian viii. 6 is a strange variety. The Appendix Probi censures *furmi* (197. 27 K.), *formunsus* (198. 9; *detundo* (199. 1), *purpuretinum marmar* (197. 19), as well as *torna* for *turna* (198. 4 and 23). We have *tundunt* on two rustic Calendars (C. I. L. i. p. 280) for class. *tundere*. Cf. Sard. *tundere*.

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

§ 24. *u* for *ő*. These two sounds are, as was mentioned above, merged in the Romance languages. In Late Latin inscriptions the expression of *ő* by *u*
is very common, e.g. patrunus for patrōnus. (Cf. App. Probi 197. 28 sobrius non 'suber.') Schuchardt, Vol. ii. p. 91 sqq., has collected a large number of instances from Inscriptions and MSS. (cf. fæcitud, C. I. L. i. 813). Forms like pūmilīum, pūmilīs belong to a somewhat different category; for the original sound here was ou (cf. pater pōumēlionom on an old Praenestine cista, Eph. Epigr. i. 20), and ē was a development of ou, in the same way that ē was of ei (see iv. 32). The same ē for ou seems to appear in the classical forms rubūstus, rubīgo, for which we have occasional byforms rubūstus, rubīgo (see Georges s. v., and cf. Probi Append. 199. 5 K. robigno non rubigo). (This use of ō and ā for earlier ou is discussed in ch. iv. § 41.) (Cf. nongentos non 'mungentos,' Bede 281. 26 K.)

§ 25. Other changes of ō and ē. Curtiūm, a mispronunciation of cortiūn (Dub. Nom. 575 7 K.), may follow the analogy of curtus; faenēris, &c., for faenōris, &c. (Vel. Long. 72 and 73 K.) are influenced by genēris and the like; praeśtōr and praeśtōrē (Curt. Valerian. ap. Cassiodor. 155. 23 K.; Alcuin 306. 12 K.; Bede 286. 19 K.) depend on præstōr and præstōrē; āstūn was in Vulg. Lat. āstūn (vatei Gen. is found in Marc. Emp. xxviii. 37) (Ital. uscio, O. Span. uzo, Fr. luiz); āum, an egg, was *ācūm (Ital. uovo, Span. huevo, O. Fr. uef); āvālium and āvālium are two different forms (Greek κοράλλων and κοράλλων); and the same must be said of opīlio and opīlio. (The note of Servius on Ecl. x. 19 venit et apilio, &c., implies these quantities: propter metrum ait 'upilio,'—nam opilio dicimus—et græco usus est schemate, sicut illi dicunt óvōma pro eo quod est óvīma, et ófrē pro eo quod est ófrē. Cf. Caper 112 K. upilio, nune opilio.)

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

Latin ū is little altered in Romance, except that in some countries it has taken a ū-sound, in France (lune, for Latin lūna), a Celtic country, and, perhaps by Greek influence, through the south-east coast of Italy. Italian ū, which seems to retain the sound of Latin ū, as Italian ē of Latin ē, 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 ū 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 ũ for ü, e.g. Bret. dir (Lat. dūrus), but this is probably due to the Celtic tendency to turn u-sounds into ū-sounds (see however K. Z. xxix. 46). Vulg. Lat. jinipirus (e.g. Ital. ginepro) for jūnīperus (Probi Append. 199.8 K.) shows the same influence of the palatal spirant j (our y) as Vulg. Lat. Jenuarius for Jānuarius (§ 1). But there is little reason to believe that Latin ũ had naturally a ū-sound. Plautus, Men. 654, compares the reiterated tu tu 'you! you!' to the hooting of an owl:—

Matrona. Tu tu istic inquam. Peniculas. Vin adferri noetuan,
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 ũ is hardly known in the Romance languages (K. Z. xxix. 46). The connexion between ũ and close O is seen in the numerous misspellings of o for ũ in plebeian inscriptions (Schuchardt, Vok. ii. 149, &c.). In unaccented syllables, as we have seen (§ 14), ũ tended to the ū-sound of optīmus, optīmus, 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 υ, which in older Latin was treated like Latin u, but afterwards was with more exactness spelt (and pronounced) with the Greek letter ι (y); though in ordinary usage we often find it, like the ū-sound of optīmus, represented by i. In Oscan ũ took after certain letters a yu-sound, e.g. tiurī (Lat. turrim), Diumpāis (Lat. lūmpis, lymphīs), as in the Boeotian dialect τυχή was τυνχα, or in English 'tune' is pronounced 'tyun;' but there is no trace of this sound in Latin 1 (see ch. iv. § 7).


hanc edere vocem quotiens paramus ore
nitamur ut u dicere, sic citetur ortus:
productius autem cœuntibus labellis
natura soni pressior altius meabat.

1 The confusion of Carthaginian miuulec (?) with Lat. mures in Plaut. Poen. 1009 is no evidence.
§ 28. Greek \( v \) in Latin. Ter. Scaurus says (vii. 25. 13 K.) \( y \) litteram supervacuum latino sermone putaverunt, quoniam pro illa u cederet, sed cum quaedam in nostrum sermonem graeca nomina admissa sint, in quibus evidenter 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 \( gyla \), &c., never gained acceptance (Caper vii. 105. 17 K. \( y \) litteram nulla vox nostra adsceicit. ideo insultabis 'gylam' dicentibus. Cf. Bede vii. 273. 33 K.; Ter. Scaur. vii. 22–23 K.; Vel. Longus vii. 81. 5–8 K.; Mar. Victorin. vi. 33. 11 K.), unless the word was mistaken for a Greek one, e.g. \( sgylcara \) referred to Greek \( θυλη \), \( lympha \) to Greek \( νυφη \) (Cf. crista non 'crysta, App. Probi 197. 26 K.). The new letter invented by the Emperor Claudius to express the \( u \)-sound of \( opthinus \), \( optimus \) is used for Greek \( v \) in words like \( Nymphius, Bathylus \) in the Fasti Antistates written in the reign of Claudius (C. I. L. I. 3, p. 247). But before the use of the Greek letter \( T \), the Greek vowel was written \( u \) (Cassiod. 153. 11 K. \( y \) littera antiqui non semper usi sunt, sed aliquando loco illius \( y \)ponebant: itaque in illorum quidem libris hanc scripturam observandam conseque, 'Suriam' 'Suraeusus' 'sumbola' 'sucophonatas,' at in nostris corrupti non debet; cf. ibid. 160. 16 K.); and the MSS. of Plautus indicate such spellings as \( Hilitaria \) for \( Illiria, \&c. \) Burus and Bruges were the forms used by Ennius for \( Pyrrhus \) and \( Phryges \) (Cicero, Orator xlviii. 160 ipsius antiqui declarant libri). That it was also pronounced like ordinary Latin \( u \) we see from the Romance forms of these earlier Greek loanwords which make no distinction (e.g. Lat. \( tumba \), for Greek \( τυμβος \), is in Ital. \( tumba, \) in Sard. \( tumba, \) in Fr. \( tombe \)), not to speak of Plautus' pun on \( Lydis \) and \( Uadis \) (Bacch. 129), and on \( chrysalus \) and \( cricasius \) (ib. 362). After the \( u \)-sound of \( opthinus \), \( optimus \) came to be spelt with \( i \), the same letter was in ordinary usage employed for Greek \( v \), e.g. \( ogrus \) (Greek \( κοκωρος \)), in Ital. \( ccero, \) being pronounced probably in the same way as the \( i \) of \( optimus \), which in Romance is not distinguishable from ordinary \( i \). \( Tondrus \) for \( Tynodurus \) on an old Praenestine cista (C. I. L. xiv. 4109) is perhaps to be explained by the \( u \)-sound of \( o \) before \( ad \) (ch. iv. § 20). Greek \( kv \) is often spelt \( qui, \) e.g. Vulg. \( quiatius \) for \( cyathus \) (see Schuch. Vol. ii. p. 273 sqq. for examples), as \( latin \) qui is often expressed by Greek \( κυ \); e.g. 'Aνιλια for \( Αξιλη \), \( Κυρεινος \) and \( Κυρεινος \) for \( Quirinus \) on Greek inscriptions (see Eckinger, p. 123). \( ο \) is found for Greek \( δ \) in \( goerus, coelephia, \) byforms of \( ϟγρος, ωλιφη, \) &c. (see Georges s. vv., and Schuch. ii. 278). Latin \( ù \) is in Greek inscriptions always expressed by \( o \) till the beginning of the Empire, when \( ov \) takes its place. We find \( v \) especially in the suffixes -\( ullus, -ulus, -urios, \) &c. (Eckinger, p. 58 sqq.) \( Sulta, Sylia \) for \( Sφρυδα \) (§ 16) is always \( Συλλας. \)

(For spellings of Greek \( v \) and the Latin \( ù \)-sound with \( y, u, i, \) see Schuchardt's examples from inscriptions and MSS., Vol. ii. p. 218 sqq., and consult Georges, Lex. Worlf. s. vv. \( cumbra, miuira, myrrtetum, myrtum, lympha, \)

\[ \text{1 Varro \textit{Men.} 50 B. makes the Gen. phaticus' arrepticus \text{Gl. Sangall.} 912; Plur. \text{lymphon. In} \text{Glossaries we have phaticus' \text{Ambr. B. 31 supr. nymphanticus for} \text{nymphaticus, e.g. 'nym-}} \]
murmilla, Thymania, Syrus, servyllum, and Brambach, Hülfsbüchlein s.vv. thynnus, syllaba, stilus. The Appendix Probi has: tymum 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 ū. The coincidence of Latin ū and ū in the Romance languages makes it natural that we should find o written for ū 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 Boconiana (C. I. L. xv. p. 386); and Greek στιραζ appears in late Latin as storax (Georges s.v.). [In addition to the large number of instances of o for ū collected by Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 149 &c., see Georges, Lex. Wort: s. vv. columna, urceolus, cunnus, luxurio, cercundus, and cf. App. Probi 198. 23 puella non 'poella'; 198. 12 cluaca non 'cloaca'; 197. 25 columna non 'colonna' (on the last example, see § 68 and ch. iii. § 33.)]

§ 30. ū for ú. 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 ū and by ū (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 bocula (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 ū and ū. Ciläber was in Vulg. Lat. colobar, the ū 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. culovria, Span. culebra, O. Fr. culuevre; cf. Append. Probi 199. 2 K. coluber non colobar: see colobar 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 sūor. Lūridus was *lūridus (Ital. lorde, Fr. lourd); pīmez shows *pilm-, in Ital. pomice, Span. pomez, Fr. ponce); nōptia was *nōptia (Ital. nozze, Fr. noces), explained by analogy of noce nupta (>). Úpilio and épilio, cūrātium and cūrātium were explained in § 25. Amūrgo and amūrgo are due to interchange of suffixes, not to transition of vowel-sound. (So grācido and grācido, § 10.)

A curious tendency to interchange u-i and i-i appears in Vulg. Lat. stāpila (seen in Ital. stoppia, O. Fr. estoble, Fr. étule, &c.), unless stop- and stap- are original byforms. (On mitulus and mytilus, see Brambach, Hülfsbüch. s.v., cf. Gk. μυτώλης and Μυτώλης, Lat. Útia and Greek Ίτών.)

§ 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 every day 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 aequis and equus tell the same story. Welsh praidd (Latin praedia, for *prae-heda or *prae-hula, fromprehendo, 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, au 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 au, 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; au, 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, au was reduced to ū (through eu?), e.g. défrüdo, from fraudo (see ch. iii. § 18) (cf. Ital. udire, from Lat. audire); ae, or rather the earlier ai, to ī (through ei?), e.g. dictīsum, from taedeo (ibid.); but in later Latin the reduction was seldom carried out (ch. iii. § 23). The interjection au, 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. banbari to bark.)

Ae 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 au in syllables before the accent, when the next syllable contained the vowel u, e.g. Augustus, 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.
Oi, a diphthong used in early times, had been reduced first to oe, then to a simple sound ū (through some ū-sound probably) before the classical period. What was the exact sound of the later diphthong oe, which we find in words like coelus (from co(m)-itus), 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 ū, e.g. goerus (beside γύρος), colophon (beside κόλυφος). 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, nimum 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 nē and ūter, with the accent on the nē, § 149), seu (so nen, cen, ch. x. § 16 and 11) (by reduction of si-ve, sei-ve, ch. x. § 4); while I.-Eur. eu was, like I.-Eur. ou, 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 hev (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 hui, 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 quī.

THE LATIN LANGUAGE.


§ 34. Ter. Maurus on au. Terentianus Maurus makes a distinction between Latin äu and æu, while Latin eu, he says, is like Greek έυ always ἐυ. ἐυ, as in 'aut age,' 'aut ubi,' 'Aurunci' of Virgil, he compares to Homer's αὐπροαυ (presumably ἀὑπροαυ) and φρατρ σοι for αὐράπ, in contrast to the (accented) ἐυ of aurum, auspices, Greek αὐπροαυ:

'aut age' inquit ille vates, saepe dixit 'aut ubi'
dixit 'Aurunci,' quod aeque barbarum est produere:
pes ubique lege constat, prima eum correpta sit,
consonans et una plenum non quaeat tempus dare

alphaeav inquit poeta sic et aurop corripit.

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 eu of aurum, a reduction which was similar to that seen in pretonic eu followed by a syllable with u, Aruncus like Agustus (cf. aυνεχεο, C. I. L. vi. 13416; Arunci in Virgil MSS., &c.; Ribbeck, Ind. p. 388.)

§ 35. au in Romance. Had au been an open O-sound in Vulg. Lat. it would have been merged in Latin æ, has ae as been merged in e. But that the o of Ital. pocc, Fr. chose, is a late development we see from the forms of the words, which would otherwise have been *poco, *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 Paulius, but not so pronounced), while after a long vowel double i was common, e.g. sìlla, sìlla, vittum (Diminutive of vimnum) (see § 127).

§ 36. u for accented au. The change of au to a in the (originally) unaccented syllable is in conformity with the rule in defrúdo, 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 frede, § 69), where there seems no reason for supposing the syllable to have been unaccented [Another instance of the confusion of au and a in this word is the spelling frastrua, often found in MSS. of Virgil (see Ribbeck, Index s.v.), which also exhibit frude for fraude in A. iv. 675, as the MSS. of Lucretius have frudem ii. 187, frudi vi. 186 (see Lachm. p. 851]). 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. cludo, and p. 750), which remains in the Italian cchildren. (For claudam, lane, 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. auréa, goldfish), because he wore two gold ear-rings [Festus 202. 13 Th. orata, genus piscis, appellatur a colore auri quod rusticì '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 plebian form Clodius, no doubt with the view of conciliating the mob. Cicero himself in his letters often uses the more homely forms with o, e.g. *loredam (Att. v. 20. 4), pollawum (Fam. xii. 12. 2; oricula (Quint. Fr. ii. 13. 4), like oricula, 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 ornamentum, ornatus, of auspicium with omen, of auribus with oculus (Barsian’s Jahresbericht, 1881, p. 33). So too Priscian (i. 52; p. 39 H.) says: (an) transit in o productam more antiquo, ut ‘lotus’ pro lautos, ‘plostrum’ pro plaustrum, ‘cotes’ pro cautes: sicut 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) auscelari dicebant antiqui pro oscelari] is found in Plautus, not merely in *aurichalcum (Greek ὀρίχαλκος), where it is due to confusion with aurum, but also in ausculatūr (Bach. 897, &c.). *Avula, or avilla as in the palimpsest) of Plautus became *alla, as Paulla, Paulla became *Polla. It is perhaps confined to derivatives of *os (see Georges s.vv. oreæ, oritium, osculum, osculor), which seems to have had two parallel stems in early Latin, *aus- and *os- (cf. jäeur and jōcūr); so this gives no evidence on the pronunciation of Lat. ophone. In the Lex Metalli Vipsacensis of the first cent. A. D. (Eph. Epigr. iii. p. 180) we have *aura for the Greek *σωφία, which the Romance languages show us to have been *soría in Vulgar Latin. Rustic or dialectal o for au is found in the name M. Lorni (= M. Laurentii), on a jar in the old Esquiline cemetery (c. 200 B. C.) (Ann. Inst. 1880, p. 260), while on plebian inscriptions we have such forms as *Oli (for *Avili) on the tombstone of a praeco (Eph. Epigr. iv. p. 297), Otior (C. I. L. xi. 1973), &c. In Greek inscriptions we have Πόλος from the time of Augustus, but always Παύλος (though often Παύλα and Πάλλα, like Lat. *Polla). (See Eckinger, p. 13.) In cauda (Lith. kūdas) the original vowel may be o, and the spelling au be due to the similarity of sound between o and au. (See K. Z. xxviii. 157 for this and other doubtful instances.) [For other examples of au-o, see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 301 sqq., and Georges, Lex. Worl. s.vv. caupo, auspicer (Diom. 383. 10 K. Claudius octavo Historiarum ‘Flacco ospicatur’), caulis, cauliculus, caurus, raudus [also rudus], pauese, laureum, plano, claudus, claustrum, sorix (cf. Mar. Vict. 26. 7 K. sorix vel saurix. C. G. L. v. 242. 33, codex.)] (See Diomedes, pp. 382–3 K., Probus Inst. 118–9 K.) Suetonius (Vesp. viii. 22) tells us an anecdote of the homely Vespanio: Mestrim Florum consularem, admonitus ab eo plaustra potius quam postra dicenda, postero die ‘Flaurus’ 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 *Ἀγούσταλος, Mitt. Inst. xiii. p. 236 n. 5; Eckinger, p. 12.) The Romance name of the month points to Vulg. Lat. Augustus, e. g. Ital. agosto, Span. agosto, Fr. août, and shows that the a was not merely a conventional symbol for o. *Asculto was the Vulg. Lat. form of ausculatus (cf. Caper 108. 6 ausculata non ‘asculata’), as we see from the Romance forms, e. g. Ital. ascultare, Span. ascuchar; *agurium of augurium (Rael. far agur, to consider, Ital. sciagurato, from *exaguratus, unlucky,
Span. jauro. Claudius often occurs for Claudius on inscriptions (e. g. C. I. L. ii. 4658, of 275 A. D.) (cf. Greek Φαστος, C. I. A. iii. 10, of 209–210 A. D.; Bull. viii. p. 247, of 17 A. D., from Eumenia). For similar spellings in Glossaries (e. g. ‘agustae’ sanctae; fastus for faustus, &c.), see Löwe, Prodr. p. 421. In MSS. of Virgil, &c., we find Arunci for Arurunci (Ribbeck, Ind. p. 388, cf. Aruncatio, 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. Φαουτιν, C. I. L. ix. 6229 and 6230; Φαουσίνες 6229 (the form Παςλας does not occur till the fourth or fifth cent. A. D.); also aoē, e. g. Παουλανια. C. I. G. 6665; Αουλον (2656 b add.) (see Eckinger, p. 13).

§ 40. ae for au. Ae is found now and then on inscriptions for au, e. g. maesο(λευν), C. I. L. i. Fast. min. ix of 1 A. D.; Paelinus, &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. proae), 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 fenisicia, the hay-harvest. The Romance forms point to σεπες, not saepes; σεπτον, not saepturn (e. g. Port. sebe, Span. seto) (Gröber, A. L. L. v. 465). From Varro’s remark that sœnæa (and saeptrum ?) represented the pronunciation of Greek σκηπτρον 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 sœna; em ut Graeci Accius scribit ‘sœna.’ In pluribus verbis a ante e alii ponunt, alii non, ut quod partim dicunt ‘sœptrum,’ partim ‘sœptrum,’ alii Plauti ‘Fæneratricem,’ alii ‘Fæneratricem;’ sic ‘faenisicia’ ae ‘fenisicia’). This spelling of the title of a play of Plautus, Fæneratric, for Fænæratric, the Usuress, agrees with another remark of Varro that fœnus, not fænus, was the pronunciation of Old Latin, used by Cato and others (Non. 54 M.; Varro lib. iii de sermone Latino: ‘fœnus autem dictum a felu, et quasi fetura quadam pecuniae.’ Nam et Catonem et ceteros antiquiores sine a littera ‘fenus’ pronuntiassse contendit, ut fetus et fecunditas). How thoroughly ae (through oe ?) became identified with the long sound of open e at a later time, we see from the remark of a fifth century grammarians, that σεπες, when the first syllable, through being accented, was unduly lengthened in pronunciation, became εœqus (Pompeius 285. 6 K. plurumque male pronuntiamus, et facimus vitium ut brevis syllaba longo tractu sonet . . . si (quils) velit dicere ‘æqueus’ pro eo quod est equus). (Cf. presendo, with shortening of præae before a vowel, as δημον of δη, and Marius Victorinus’ use of -æeus to express the disyllabic pronunciation of Gk. -ëus (67 K.).) Another grammarian of the same century gives a caution against the confusion of vaæ and ë (Agroecius 114. 21 K.), of quaeritur and quæritur (id. 116. 18 K.); while he speaks of the first syllable of
praemium, pretium, precor, as if they were distinguished in writing only, not in pronunciation (id. 115 K. praemium cum diphthongo seribendum; pretium, precor sine diphthongo. Veteres enim majoris rei sermones cum diphthongo, et quadam dignitate scribi voluerunt). Even in the fourth cent. Servius, in a note on Virgil, Aen. i. 344:

huic conjux Sycaeus erat, ditissimus agri Phoenicum, et magnò miserae dilectus amore,

thinks it necessary to point out that miseræ is the Adjective, not the Adverb misère. The ‘Orthographies’ of Bede and Alcuin (the latter served as a text-book for Carolingian scribes of MSS.) abound in similar distinctions (e.g. quærictur and quæritus, Alcuin 303. 16 K.; Bede 287, 8 K.; quaestus and questus, Alcuin 308. 17 K.; saepeit and seicit, 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 erumma for aerumna; Marius Victorinus (fourth cent.), p. 25 K. on the spelling cesaries]. Philargyrius, the Virgil Scholiast, on Ed. iii. 99, defends the ae of haedera (for hëdëra) by connecting the word with haervo (cf. Paul. Fest. 71. 2.6 Th. hedera dicta, quod haeret, sive quod edita petat, vel quia id, eui 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. Wortf. s. v. meles, nenia, gleba, maena, muæna, paëlex, fëles, eæra, ne (the Interjection), gaësum.]

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

§ 42. ai for ae. The old spelling ai 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 illis e novissima sonat, not to speak of Quintilian (first cent.) (1. 7. 18 ejus secundum nunc e litteram ponimus), that the second element, as pronounced, was e, not i. The change of the earlier ai to the classical form of the diphthong, ae, took place in the second cent. B. C. (e.g. adém, beside aiqum, tabelai, datoii, &c., on the S. C. Bache. of 186 B. C., C. I. L. i. 196). The spelling ai, found once or twice towards the end of the second cent. B. C., e.g. conqueisivi, Cucélius, Cucécius, may mark the transition (see ch. iv. § 29). In ain for aïsne, aïbat (disyll.) the diphthong must have had the sound of O. Lat. ai.

§ 43. Greek α. Before a consonant Greek α is always τ in Latin, e.g. Afrides. Before a vowel it is τ till the first cent. A. D., then i. Thus Alexandræa, Darius, &c., are the earlier spellings; Alexandria, Darius the later. (See Brambach, Hülfsbühlein, p. 4.) The τ, -τ was often shortened (cf. § 143). e.g. balνευ (Gk. βαλνεων) (cf. Prisc. k. p. 71 H. and p. 73 H. on Alphæus, Hectorius, &c.). The Greek diphthong which probably passed into the τ-sound about 100 B. C. is a common expression of Latin i, e.g. ἀντωνεῖος, but of Latin τ only in hiatus, e.g. ἀρτεῖον (for atrium), Ποπύλειος (for Publius) (see
§ 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 *cepit,* *coepita* and *incepta,* Alcuin *vii.* 299. 18 K.; *Bede vii.* 269. 14 K.; *foedus* (*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.v.* *cena,* *caenum* (*cf.* Span. *hiede*), *amoenus,* *fenus,* *maevo,* *poenae,* *proelium,* *caelebs,* *caedium,* *caecus,* *oboeditio,* *foeetus,* *fecundus,* *obscenus,* *pomeroium,* *femina,* *fetus,* &c.] Greek *ö* is in classical Latin *ö,* e.g. *melodia,* but earlier *oe,* e.g. *comoedus* (*cf.* Thraex and Thrax, Blass, p. 43.)

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

§ 46. Greek *ö.* Marius Victorinus *vi.* 66–67 K. consimili ratione quaeritur, Orpheus in metro, ut

non me carminibus vineat nec Thracius Orpheus, utrum trisyllabum an disyllabum sit, an idem nomen duplici enuntiacione promatur, aut sine a littera, ut Pcleus Penethus, aut cum a, ut its declinetur Orphaeus, ut Aristaeus, visum est tamen hoc posse discerni, ut illa sine a littera graece sit enuntiatio, haec latina, quae per diphthongon effertur. The proper spelling is *euhoe,* *Eukius,* *euhan,* *not evoe,* *Evius,* *even* (*see* Brambach, *Hülfsbüchlein s.v.*). For a corruption of Greek *ö* in vulgar pronunciation, see App. Probi 199. 6 hermeneumata non *‘erminomata.*' On an old mirror of Praeneste we have *Tasos* (*Tasei,* Gen.) *for* *Θαρεύ* (*Eph.* *Epigr.* i. 23).

§ 47. *ü* 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 oii utebantur, tantum ut ab illo ‘qui’ distinguereetur. *Ter. Scaur.* 28. 1 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*, *uos*, exactly like *pius* and *tuos* (ch. i. § 1). The only question is whether *j* and *v* were actual consonants (*y, w*) or half-vowels (*i, u*). 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 *w*-sound in *veni* (v. 395. 15 K. u quoque litteram aliqii pinguius ecefunt, 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, vomis, 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. *vostre, giurare, Lat. jūrāre*); 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*. But there is no evidence of this, unless we count as such the scansion *ūbicīo* 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. *swē*- became Latin *sō-, e.g. *soror* (through *sro- ?), but not I.-Eur. *wē-, e.g. vetus*, which may indicate that the *v* of *sve-* was more consonantal than ordinary *v.*
whereas in *ābicio* 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 *u* of *qu*, which Velius Longus tells us was more vocalic than the *v* of *valente, &c., in a following *v*, e.g. *cum* (earlier *quum*) for *quum*, *locuntur* (earlier *loquentur*) for *loquuntur* (cf. § 93). A similar unconsonantal character for *v* in early Latin has been inferred from the reduction of *i̇vi* to *i* in such Plautine forms as *oblïscor* for *oblïviscor*, *dînus* for *divînus*; 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*, *u*, 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 ‘oni,’ 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 *cătida* affected the vowels *i*, *u* when they preceded other vowels. The word *lärna* is a trisyllable in Plautus; it has become a dissyllable in classical Latin, just as *lär̩dum* of Plautus became *lär̩dum*. The only forms known to Plautus are *mîlus*, *rēlicus*, *grâtīs*, which in classical Latin are *mîlos*, *rēliquos* (by the middle of the first cent. A.D. *relicus*), *grâtis*. In the first cent. A.D. *tēnus* wavered between a dissyllable and a trisyllable (Caesellius ap. Cassiod. vii. 205 K.).

This reduction of the vowel *i* after *l*, *c* led, as we shall see (§§ 90, 94), to the assimilation of these consonants. *Titius* became *Tityus* and then something like *Titius* (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 *Maia, 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-ja 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 *maiorem* (*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 *v* (the digamma), but none for *y*, we cannot say. Possibly the reason is to be found in the more rapid development of the *v*-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 Benedictine copyists of MSS. (Keil, *Grammatici Latinii*, vol. vii).

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 *servus, vulgus*, the Aeolic digamma, goes on to speak of the consonantal (*pro consonantibus*) character of the vowels *i, u, e, g. iam but etiam, vos but tuos. Of conficit he says, *littera i sibi insidit, and so with u in vulgus, servus. 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 Aeolic digamma (cf. xii. 10. 29). The usual expression of the grammarians for 
 and v is (i, u) transeunt in consonantium potestatem’ (e.g. Mar. Victorin. vi. 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’ (vocalis), the first to use this term being Servius (fourth cent.) (iv. 422. 1 K.), e.g. Pompeius (fifth cent.) (v. 103 K. ‘vanus’ quando dicgo pinguior sonus est. nunquid dicis u a nus? ergo vides quia, si ponantur solae, tenuem sonum habent, si jungantur ad alias litteras, pingues sonant. similiter et i sic patitur. ‘itur,’ ecce 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 accipiendae: 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 caelebés should be written *celebres, the word being derived from caelum and vita, and meaning literally caelestium vitam ducens (!), 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 Quintilian quotes Belona for Íeténa (féléna) (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 Πωρός), Bruges (for Φρόγες) and balæna (for φαλάνα). The whole passage is taken from Verrius Flaccus, who used these same examples. In our MSS. of Quintilian there is the corruption Belona for balæna, 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 (w) as opposed to the labiodental spirant sound (v) (see below). Other barbarisms which he mentions as ‘in usu cotidie loquentium’ are so-lu-it for disyllabic solit, uam for ucum, 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’ augēra (Trag. 624 R.): pro certo arbitrârō sortis, òrâcula, aditus, àugura, 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 progeniüm 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. § 26), nor have the Plautine forms aín (always), aibat (occasional) (see ch. viii. § 35); pélùro, where the v of the preposition has been dropped, owing to the consonantal nature of the i, seems to be a later spelling than perico (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, diius in Plautus (see *Rhein. Mus.* xxxv. 627); and Plautus’ trisyllabic avonculus (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 cave (pronounced with ē, ch. iii. § 44) is seen from Cicero’s story (*Dir. ii.* 84) of the confusion of Cauneas (sc. *ficus vendo*) with cave ne eas, as well as from the spelling causis for cave sis in Juvenal ix. 120; of v in ave (pronounced with -e, Quint. i. 6. 21) from Phaedrus’ fable (App. 21) of the man who mistook the caw of a crow for this word (*fama* for *familia* on an inscr. of Ameria in Umbria, *C. I. L.* xi. 4488, may be a dialectal variety, like the Oscan famelo ‘familia’ of Bantia, *Zv.* l.l.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 *Diuliali* (Rossi 1118, of 568 a. d., Madius (Rossi 172), *Giove* (*I. E. N.* 695), Gianuario (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 -dia, -dia, -gio, -giao were pronounced like -yu, -yu, yo, &c. The occasional spelling with Lat. z, Greek ζ, e.g. Zanvario (*C. I. L.* x. 2466), ζουεςα (*I. I. S.* 826. 22, Naples), κοζς (Lat. co(n)jux, *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. regínumem, ajuta, pronounced ayuta, from Lat. adjútum) 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. Janvarius is Sicil. yennaru, Ital. gennaio, Fr. janvier. In loanwords in Welsh Latin j has the y-sound, e.g. Ionawr (Lat. *Jānuarius*), dydd Iau (Lat. dies *Jovis*). In Greek inscriptions, besides the usual ι, e.g. *Iouarios, Pousarios,* we have sometimes η and ει, e.g. *Houlios, Elouios, Gaios* and *Gaños* (see Eckinger, p. 80).

The barred d of the Pelignian dialect (Petiodu, uiddadu, Uibdu, added in the same inscription, Zvetaieff, *Inscr. Ital. Inf.* 13) expresses some sound into which consonantal i(y) and di in hiatus had developed (Lat. *Pettiediu,* *viando,* Vibidia, abiti) (*Rhein. Mus.* xlii. 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. idda 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 b-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 ov is the earliest spelling for Lat. v, and continues to be the usual spelling throughout the Imperial period, e.g. ἀφανῆς Mon. Apocryph. οὐσπασίανος (never θεσπ., οὔτεραπος and οὔτεραπος, &c. But we find β occasionally even in the first cent. A.D., the earliest examples being Φαβιος, Λεβιος (the usual spelling), Σιλβανος, Βαλεριος. This use of β may have been stimulated by the preference of a single to a double symbol. Λεβιος is more pleasing to the eye than Λεσιος; and in this way we may explain why Latin ov is more often oβ than oov. (It is often ov, e.g. Νους) (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 vulba in the Latin inscription, bowel in the Greek.) We sometimes find ov and β on the same inscription, e.g. Νερος and Νερμ (second cent.), Φασανος and Φάβιανος 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 intervocalic v in palimentum, &c., for παλιμεντον (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 convivium, convivio (where the m of con is changed to n) on the Lex Municipalis of Julius Caesar (C.I.L. i. 206), and still more from invitel, invitelis (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. compromissae i. 196, clear instances of u before an undoubted bilabial. The facts certainly point to con-, im- being the oldest spellings before v (and f, see § 64), e.g. comvivio (and contentionid) i. 196; convalem, confluent (but also confluent) i. 199; and the im viva of the Palimpsest of Plautus (Merc. 471), commutans (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 con before v, mentioned by Marcus 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 consonantis obtinet vceum, et anteposita vocali fit, ut aliue quae consonantes. quotiens igitur praepositionem sequetur vox cujus prima 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 'combitis,' 'comburur,' 'comfort,' 'confundat,' 'commemoret,' 'comminuit,' 'comparat,' 'compellit,' 'comvalescit,' 'convocat,' non 'conhibit,' 'conburur,' et similia. sic etiam praepositio juncta vocibus quae incipiunt a supradictis litteris n communicat in m, ut 'cohbitam,' 'imbitur,' 'imfert,' 'inflet,' 'immemor,' 'immitis,' 'impius,' 'impotentis.' The ordinary rule that con-, im- are used before p, b,
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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, comrocot, &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. cimodo, cimitor, &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 deontius effere- 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 v for Latin v-, e.g. Goth. wins, our ‘wine,’ ‘wall,’ ‘wick’ (Latin vimum, vallum, vieum). 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. guariare from Gothic warjan; guisa, our ‘-wise’), an indication that the initial v-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 v- 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 v. This v, 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. Danubius, the spelling of the classical period, later Danubius (see Georges, Lex. Worfs. s.v., and for other examples, s.vv. abellana, gabata, viductum, Suebi, sebun, Venovius, sevir). 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 consonant 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 vinemicos, 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 beneficium et veneficium hoc interest, quod beneficium bene facientem significat, veneficum autem veneni datorem esse demonstrat). Vitillum is the correct spelling, not bætillum (Nettleship, Contributions to Lat. Lexic, s.v.).

After v and l the same thing seems to have happened; cf. late Lat. albeus (Agrim. 82. 24.), arba (75. 19.), Vulg. Lat. corbus, curbus (Fr. corbeau, courbe, &c.). Pliny’s example of preconsonantal l is the word silva (§ 99); and the classical spelling of the Perfect of ferveo, where rv is followed by u is ferveu not ferveu (fervus) (cf. Georges, Lex. Worfs. s.vv. vulca, eruum, gitus; Probi App. 198. 7 alveus non ‘albeus.’ Albeus occurs often on inserr, e.g. C.I.L. x. 1.
§ 53. Intervocalic v dropped. Between vowels v seems to have retained a vocalic character much longer. It was dropped before u of the Nom. Sing., thus reius (older deiur-) became *deius, den's, Gnaevus became Gnaeus, &c. (ch. iv. § 70), but was usually restored from the other cases, e.g. rieus from rivo, &c., but Vulg. Lat. had rius, &c. (Ital. rio, Prov. rius, O.Fr. riu); between similar vowels it is very prone to disappear, e. g. i'i, sis, for sī vis, obscur, divus (Plaut.), just as in Mod. Tuscan between e-e, bee for beve; late spellings like novicius, for novicium, Nεo(m)bris 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.L. i. 277, viii. 9422, ao E. E. v. 777; cf. the remarks of grammarians like Probus, Inst. 113, 17 K. hoc ovum et non hoc 'cūm'; Probi App. 198 5. K. flavus non 'flau'; ib. 199. 2 K. rius non 'rius'; ib. 198. 8. K. fossil non 'failla'; ib. 199. 2 K. pavor non 'paur'; ib. 197. 28 avus non 'aus'; similarly on Greek inscriptions Νεομβριος is the usual form (as early as 73 n. c. in S. C. of Oropus); cf. Οξταίος (time of Augustus); 'Αιαρος (C.I.L. 4750); Ξενας, &c. (Eckinger, p. 92) (see also Georges, Lex. Worf. s. vv. longo, box, boa, Ribbeck, Index, p. 448 for spellings in Virgil MSS. like fluventa, bocum, fluvidus, fluventiam, ingruel, tenuvia).

§ 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. cardis Petron 46. 4) (Ital. morto, cardo; Span. muerto, cardo; Fr. mort, chardon from *cardo, *ōnis), just as -quae- became -cu- in the beginning of the first cent. A. d. e. g. eus, locutur, locutus (see § 93), but also when pretonic in words like Jūn(u)arius, Feb(r(u)arius, batt(u)ēre, cons(u)ēre, conti(u)ari (see Georges and Brambach s. vv. and for conti(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. gennajo, febrajo, battēre, cuire, &c.) (see ch. iii. § 15). In the App. Probi we have: 199. 12 Febrarius non 'Febrarius'; 197. 23 vacua non 'vaqua', vacui non 'vaqui' (cf. Feb(r)arius in various Latin inscriptions, such as C.I.L. ix. 3160; xiv. 58. 2795). Pītāta must have had in ordinary speech the trisyllabic pronunciation which Horace gives it (Epp. i. 1. 108 nisi cum pituita molesta est), and not the quadrisyllabic of Catullus (xxii. 17 mucusque et mala pituita nasi). For Aelius Stilo's derivation of the word was 'quia petit vitam' (sp. Quint. i. 6.
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37; and the Vulgar Latin form was *pēpita or *pipītā (Ital. pipita, Span. pepita, Fr. pépio; cf. Mid. Engl. pippie, Swiss pippis). On the other hand suātēs seems to have been a trisyllable in Vulg. Lat. (as in Sedulius, e.g. i. 274, and later poets), e.g. Ital. soave, O.Fr. so-çf, Prov. soûn. Servius (ad Aen. i. 357) tells us that many persons in his day considered suātēs to be a trisyllable.

§ 55. ai, ei before a vowel. Velius Longus says that Cicero wrote Maiāa, &c., because he thought these words should be written as they were pronounced (audītū emensūs scriptōnem); so cājīcit might be written coīcit to express the sound of the first syllable cī and the second and third syllables ictē (Vel. Long. vii. 54. 16 K.): in plerisque Cicero videtur audītū emensūs scriptōnem, qui et ‘Aiaacem’ et ‘Maiaam’ per duo i scribenda existimavit: quidam unum esse animadvertunt, siquidem potest et per unum i enuntiari, ut scriptum est. unde illud quod pressius et plenius sonet per duo i scribere eportere existimat, sic et ‘Troiam,’ et siquā talia sunt. unde cresēt ista geminatio, et incipit per tria i scribi ‘coīcit,’ ut prima syllaba sit coī, sequentes duae ictē... at qui Troiam et Maiam per unum i scribunt, negant onerandum pluribus litteris enuntiationem, cum sonus ipsae sufficiat. hanc enim naturam esse quandam litterarum, ut morentur enuntiacione sonum deteint, quod accidit et in eo quod dicimus ‘hoc est’ [pronounced ‘hoceest’ p. 54. 12], cum ipsa vastitas litterae in enuntiacione pinguescat. atque ipsa natura i litterae est ut interjecta vocalibus Latinis enuntiatur, dum et prior illum adsedet et sequens sibi vindicat. So Priscian (x. 1. 494) says that aiō was spelt aiō in former times, and is still pronounced ‘ayyo’ (i loco consonantis habet duplīcis). Our ordinary pronunciation Trior, eijus is wrong. The first vowel of the diphthong retained its natural quantity, ejero, Gaius, but ejus, aiō, major (see Arch. Glott. Ital. x.), as we see from Romance forms like Ital. peggio (with open e) for Latin pējor, and from the remark of Terentianus Maurus (p. 343 K.), that in Troia, Maiā, pejor, jejunium the vowel preceding j is short in each of these words, though the syllable is long. Similarly ejūlo, to utter the cry ei (Plaut. Aul. 796 ei mihi!... Cur eiulas? must have been pronounced eijulō. In unaccented syllables j, i seem to have been dropped after a short vowel in Latin, e.g. the Adj. suffix -eus for -eios (Rev. Filol. 1891 p. 18) (ch. v.). Spellings like aiō are sometimes found in MSS. of classical authors, e.g. aiō in the archetype of Hor. Epip. i. 15. 45 was written aīo, whence the corruption alio in several MSS (Class. Rev. v. 296); eius in the Ambrosian Palmipess of Plautus, Most. 981 &c.; piaculum (in the Vetus Codex piaculum) 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. a. 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 /, 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 /θ, χ, φ/ (t-h, k-h, p-h, as in 'an-heap,' 'ink-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 /k/ seems to have been even in the time of St. Augustine an unpardonable breach of manners. (On /rh, rrh/ for Greek /ρ-, -ρρ/—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), /praēbeo/ (prachībeo), /praēda/ (for */prae-heda/, *prachīda). By the first cent. /prendo/ and /nil/ had established themselves in pronunciation, also /deprendo/, through /reprehensus/ was heard as well as /reprensus/.

In the Umbrian language the length of a vowel was often indicated by writing it before and after an /h/, e. g.: /comohota/ (Lat. comōhōta); and it has been suggested that this usage may have been adopted in Latin in a few words like /vēhemen(s)/, just as the Oscan habit of doubling a vowel to express its length (e. g. /trīstāmentud/, Latin /testāmento/ abl.) was adopted by Accius (ch. i. § 9). /Vehemen(s)/, according to this theory, is derived from /vē/ and /mens/, like /vēsanus/ from /vē/ and /sanus/ (Etym. Lat. p. 113). We have /nahartis/ (C. I. L. xi. 4213, time of Augustus), as well as /nart(is)/ (ib. 4201, 240 A. D.), &c., in Latin inscriptions from the Umbrian territory, and Cicero (Orat. xlv. 153) speaks of the name /Āla/ (Ahala) as representing /Axilla/ (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 /stāl/ 'steel' (with /h/ for I.-Eur. /k/; cf. O. Pruss. stakla) which became /stāl/.
§ 57. Testimony of grammarians: Quint. i. 5. 19 quamquam per adspirationem, sive adicitur vitiose sive detrahitur, apud nos potest quaeri, an in scripto sit vitium, si h littera est, non nota. cujus quidem ratio mutata cum temporibus est saepius. parcellissime ea veteres usi etiam in vocalibus, eum 'aedos irosque' dicebant. diu deinde servatum, ne consonantibus adspireant, ut in 'Graccis' et 'triumpis.' erupit brevi tempore niumius usus, ut 'choronea chenturiones praeclones' adhuc quibusdam inscriptionibus maneant, qua de re Catulli nobile epigrama est. inde durat ad nos usque 'vehemens' et 'comprehendere' et 'mihi': nam 'mehe' quoque pro 'me' [leg. mi?] apud antiquos tragoeiarum praecipue 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 roborandisque, ut sonus earum esset viridior vegetioque; atque id videntur fecisse studio et exemplo linguae Atticae. satis notum est, Atticos ἵξθορ et ἰ pronom en multa itidem alia, contra morem gentium Graeciae ceterarum, inspirantis praeclones litterae dixisse. sic 'lachrumas,' sic 'sepulchrum,' sic 'ahenum,' sic 'vehemens,' sic 'incohare,' sic 'hulluri,' sic 'halucinari,' 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 additis, intendetur. Then he goes on to tell of a bookhunting friend of his who had bought for twenty gold 'sigillarii' a MS. of the second Aeneid, 'mirandae vetustatis,' which was reputed to have belonged to Virgil himself. In v. 469 telis et luce coruscus aena, the last word had been corrected to ahena, 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. 117. 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 fauces emicet quod ipsis
h littera, sive est nota, quae spiret anhelum.
quin hane etiam grammatici volunt vacare,
quia non adicet littoribus novum sonorem,
sed graecula quaedam scholicae nitela vocis
vocalibus apte sedet ante posta cunctis,
'hastas' 'hederas' cum loquor 'Hister' 'hospes' 'hujus.'

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

Rules for the use and omission of initial h are very frequent in the grammarians. Nigidius (first cent. n.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 faedu, hicrus 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 fariolus (Ter. Scaur. 11 K.) (with faedu, fordeum, and p. 13 fircus): Faliscan haba (id. 13 K.): fibra (= herba) (Nigidius ap. ‘Serv.’ ad Georg. i. 126): forda bos, a cow in calf, Forticidia (Paul. Fest. 59; 73 Th. folus, fostis, fostia (id. 59: horatus, good (id. 73): hamulum, a shrine (id. 73): fuma (= humus), Fannii (= Fannii) (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 ὑπός (Paul. Fest. 59: horreum from fur (id. 73): firmus from Greek ὕπος (id. 64). So Servius (ad Aen. vii. 695): Faliscos Halesus condidit. hi autem, inmutato h in f, Falisci dicti sunt, sicut febris dicitur quae ante ‘hebris’ diecibatur, Formiae quae ‘Hormiae’ fuerunt, ἀνὸν ἴππος: nam posteritas in multis 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 Faliscan 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: quis ‘fordeum’ ‘faedosque’ [diecibant], pro aspirazione 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. harrena dicitur quod haeret, et arena quod areat; gratius tamen cum aspirazione sonat. Velius Longus (vii. 68. 18, 19 K.) defends alica : cum ab alendo possit alica dici, et aliculum existiment dictam, quod alas nobis injecta contingat, and ortus: quod ibi herbae orientat. Charisius says of this word alica that Verrius Flaccus approved of the form without h, whereas a line of Lucilius ran: nemo est haliciarius posterior te (i. 96. 9 K.). Caper’s dictum is: alica non halica (vii. 107. 12 K.). Another doubtful case was the salutation āve. Quintilian (i. 6. 21) tells us that though the proper form was āve, the verb being aevère and not havère, yet no one, except a precision, thought of saying anything else than havè: multum enim litteratus, qui sine aspiratio et producta secunda syllaba salutarit (‘avère’ est enim), . . . recta est haec 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, havrio, exaurio, harundo, haruspeç, hebenus, hederæ, helluw, Henma, heia, indw, Hildæ, Adewi, alicia, alic, halucinor, Hadria, Halaesa, Halicarnassus, Hamilcar, Hammon, Hannibal, Hanno, elleborm, ercisco, ericuim, erus, Hadrumetum, haedus, hamus, hariolus, hibiscum, himnuleus, hircus, hostia, holus, holitor, onustus, uma, umerus, uclus, Hisier, Hirpin, onero, Ilerda, Illigria). Cf. Probi App. 199. 17 K. adhuc 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
Christian charity: si contra disciplinam grammaticam sine aspiratione primae syllabae 'ominem' dixerit, displiceat magis hominibus, quam si contra tua praeccepta hominem oderit, quem sit 'homo.'

§ 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. abenam, Comm. Lud. Saec. A.60, &c.), ehemens, iacohare (along with tachironae, sequndrum, belsvarai, halbucinavi, honera and homitus) as old-fashioned forms now obsolete. A fourth century grammarian, called Probus, says that traho 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 prendo, never prehendere, was the form in use, says that viho 'sine dubio aspiratur,' and speaks of vemens and ehemens, reprehensio, and reprehensio as optional (vii. 19. 14 K.) [cf. Velius Longus (second cent.), vii. 68. 15 K., who gives vemens and reprehensio as the usage of the 'elegantiiores,' prendo as universal, and Annaeus Cornutus (first cent.), the friend of Persius, who mentions prendo, vemens, nil as the pronunciation of his day (ap. Cassiodor. vii. 153. 7 K.) (see also Alcuin vii. 311. 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, incoho, vemens, Ahenobarbus, Dahae, Pirautes, coerces, cohen, proemnium, periodus. For Greek compounds with aspirate initial of second member following a consonant, see exedra, exodus, synodus, Panhormus, &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 flagitiâm hōminis formed really a single word (ch. iii. § 12), and the hiatus is to be compared to hiatus in compounds like circūlōst from circum ilō. 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 cônesto (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. Versch. p. 39.)

§ 60. Greek aspirates in Latin. The Greek aspirates lost their aspiration in loanwords used by the early writers, e.g. Plautus, as we gather from the MSS. (see the statistics given in Fleck. Jahrh. 1891, p. 658 n.), from puns like those on Chrysalus (Crusalus) and crucisalus, on Charinus (Carinus) and careo:— Pseud. 736, non Charinus nihi quidemst sed copia, on Thales and talentum Capt. 274, and from the statements of later grammarians (cf. the pun on exceleavarat 'eam aspiratione secundae syllabae' (robbed of one's money, χαλάκας), and exceleavarat, 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] adspirarent, ut in 'Græcis' et in 'triumpis.' There are not wanting in Plautus indications that the vulgar Greek pronunciation of χ as k-χχ (see Blass, p. 86) influenced some loanwords in popular use so as to lengthen (by position) the previous vowel. Acc.('h)erus, Acc('h)il(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-shackles 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 bráchium and brachium, &c.). The proverb 'āpinae tricæque,' used of trifles (Mart. xiv. 1. 7):

sunt apinae tricæque et siquid villius istis, has likewise been referred to S. Italy, where ἄφανα (Latinized apinae), 'the unseen realms,' was in popular story the name of an imaginary country of bliss, like Aristophanes' 'Cloud-cuckoo-land' (Ribbeck, Leipziguer Studien, 1887). The Vulg. Latin muttus, a word, from which Fr. mot is derived (müthus, Non. 9. 16 M.?) seems to be similarly Greek μῦθος (muttus for müthus), as tricæ for *tricæ; also strūppus 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 Strappearia; the Romance forms point to strūppus, a form found in this passage of Festus). Gk. φ was in early Latin transcription p, e.g. Pilippus on a denarius of the time of the Græchi (C.I.L. i. 354), though sometimes (like Gk. τ in Burrus, Ποππός) b, e.g. Brûges for Φρύγης, balaena for φάλαινα (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, Greich. Aussprache, p. 85, dates the change of Greek 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 scire 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 Fundanius (Quint. i. 4. 14). Φ is however, as is natural, the Greek transcription of Latin f (Eckinger, p. 97); e.g. Φονδανος 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 τις (Gk. θως), &c. (see ch. i. § 11). A curious interchange of s and th is occasionally seen in the Notae Tironianae, e.g. αγάθος, Apollonis 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 πολυχρος, Ter. Scaur. vii. 20. 4-8), and σφυνχρον (st and pulcher! Charis. i. 73 17; cf. C.I.L. i. 1007 heie est sepulcerum hau pulcerai feminae), larchrıma (to Gk. ἀρχριμα), &c., but to others which could hardly be so misunderstood, e.g. præcoho, lurcho. In the Orator xlviii. 160, Cicero tells us that he was forced in spite of his convictions to yield so far to popular usage as to pronounce pulcher, Cethgus, triumphus, Korthago, though he
still adhered to Orcivius, Mālo, Óto, Caepio, sēpulcrum, cōrōna, lacrīna: quin ego ipsa cum seirem ita majores locutos esse, ut nusquam nisi in vocali aspiratione uniformiter, loquebar sic, ut 'pulcro,' 'Cetegos,' 'triumpus,' 'Kartaginem' dicerem, aliquando idque sereo convicio aurium cum extorta mihi veritas esset, usum loquendi populo concessi, scientiam mihi reservavi. 'Oreivio' tamen et 'Matones,' 'Onones,' 'Caepiones,' 'sepulcra,' 'coronas,' 'lacrimas,' dicimus, quia per aurium judicium licet. Similarly Quintilian, in a passage already mentioned (i. 5. 20), says: diu deinde servatum, ne consonantibus [vetereis] adspirarent, ut in 'Gracces' et in 'triumpis.' erupit brevi tempore nimius usus, ut 'chororae,' 'chenturiones,' 'praechones,' adhuc quibusdam in inscriptionibus maneant. 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 Carthagio, Graecus, Ótho, Bocchus; unaspirated were ēlio, coelea, coeleēre (Vel. Long. l. c.). In the fourth cent. Orcus, Vulcanus, cōrōna, ancēra, sēpulcrum (Mar. Victorinus vi. 21. 20 K.; Serv. ad Georg. iii. 223), but for ancora cf. Serv. ad Aen. vi. 4); but Graecus (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 thūs (Gk. òthos), cōrōna (from Gk. κόφος, Etym. Lat. p. 23), with turbō, sēpulcrum, 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 cōrōna Festus (26 Th.), quoting probably from Verrius Placeus (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 Tracia, Trachia, Chardtago. For φθ we have pth in pthoibus in the Comm. Lud. Saeec. The use of rh for Gk. initial φ 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, arca, tropaeum, baccar, Cethegus, Graecus, murra, Orcus, Ótho, pulcher, Regium, rhombus, talasio, letum, simulacrum, charta, Bosphorus (Bosphorus not till third or fourth cent. A.D.), chlamys, chorda, clatri, cochea, concha, cothurnus, cyathus, lyrco, lumpy, schema, schola, sepulcrum, ræda, Raetia, Ramnes, Rhodope, Rhodus, rhās, Rīphaeus, rōmphaea, theātrum, Viriathus, triumphus, racana, cinēphes (κινηφής), trichīnum (Abl. Plur. trichītīmis, C. L. L. ix. 4971; xiv. 375. 17). On the spellings Calphurnius and Calphurnius, see Schuch. Vok. i. p. 18, and for the confusion of ph, p, f, see ibid. on the spelling phīdelis, and Georges on phaeodus, sīfo, sulfur Late Latin calculus (see L. L. L. vii. 443) is the precursor of the Romance forms of Gk. κάλπος (Ital. Span. golfo, &c.). In the Probi App. we have (199. 7 K.) strofa non 'stropa'; (199. 17) amfora non 'ampora'; (197. 19) porphyreicium marmor, non 'purpureticum marmor,' and perhaps (199. 8) zizifus [zizibus 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. κόλαφος is Ital. colpo, O.Fr. colp, Fr. coup; χαλῶς is Ital. calare; ὀθάλλος is Ital. tallo, Span. tallo, Fr. talle. [Cf. the cautions given in Prob. Appendix against stropa, ampora (see above).]
§ 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, vine, Italian ogni, Spanish señor, cañon (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 knif, 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 ἀγγελος, 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. *aggulums, aggens, aggula, aggērunt.* 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 σαμβοξ (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, intacco. There was however one sound of Latin \( m \) 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 \( -m \) elides its final syllable before an initial vowel or \( h \), just as though it ended with a vowel, has nothing like it in Greek. Quintilian (ix. 4. 40) tells us that final \( m \) 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 aliqua inter duas vocales velut nota est, ne ipsae coeant. Cato, he adds, wrote 'dicae' 'faciae' for \( \text{dicam, faciam} \) (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 librario rum insectari volunt inscientiam, suam confinentur. 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 \( M \), to express final \( m \) before an initial vowel: ut appareret exprimi non debere. Priscian (i. p. 29. 15 H.) says: \( m \) obscurum in extremitate dictionum sonat, ut 'templum'; apertum in principio, ut 'magnus'; mediocre in mediis, ut 'umbra.' What the exact sound of \( -m \) was, is not easy to determine. From Latin poetry we see that a word ending in \( -m \), 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,' \( \text{fin(em) onevat} \) and \( \text{fin(e) onevat} \) (see § 153). Final \( -m \) 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 \( h \). Before e.g. \( \text{honorat} \) the final syllable of \( \text{fine, finem} \) suffers 'elision' in exactly the same way as before \( \text{onevat} \). But are we to say that in \( \text{finem} \) the \( em \) became a nasal vowel, an \( e \) spoken 'through the nose;' or in stricter terms, spoken with the passage into the nose not covered by the uvula? In this case \( em \) 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 \( hem \) (expressing surprise, sorrow, indignation, &c., e.g. Ter. Aen. 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 nullw'fert). 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 etiamnunc), was pronounced (Vel. Longus vii. 78. 19 K. cum dico 'etiam nune,' 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, comprimit, continet seem quite on a level with etiam nunc (or etiamnunc?). In both these cases Latin m is treated like Greek ν in συγκάλω, συντείνω, συμβάλλω, and the spellings found on inscriptions ἔν κύκλῳ, ὑμ. Προτάσει, τῆν γνώαικα, τῷ βουλήν, which has led in the Rhodian dialect of the present day to a complete assimilation of the nasal to the consonant, e.g. τίχαρι (τήν 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 coniunctus, coniux, with the first i nasalized, and conventio were *coniunctio with the first u nasalized, it would explain why it is that, in spelling, the nasal is often omitted, coventionid (C. I. L. i. 196), coiungi (id. 1c64) (cf. Sweet Primer, p. 1c4).

Final n had not this weak sound. Priscian tells us (i. p. 30) n quoque plenior in primis sonat et in ultimis partibus syllabarum, ut 'nomen,' 'stamen': exilior in mediis ut 'amnis,' 'damnun.' 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 privatul (Lat. cum privato) and cum atrul; and in both languages a nasal is often omitted before a consonant in the middle of a word, e.g. Umbr. iveka and ivenga (Lat. juvenca), uzo- and onso- (Lat. humero-); Osc. aragetud (Lat. argento) and praeulent (Lat. praesenti): Umbr. apentu and ampentu (Lat. impendito); Osc. Δαπνως (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:

quin tú suspendis té? Nempe tu te dixeras,

has often been quoted as an instance of such a suppression of the nasal (nēpe) in ordinary speech. But the true scansion is nempee with the same syncope of final -ē as in tun and tune, ac (for *atl) and atque, 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. müp, ‘mouth’ (Germ. Mund), gös, ‘goose’ (Germ. Gans), fif, ‘five’ (Germ. fünf).

Another internal group that calls for notice is mn. In most Romance languages this has become nn, e.g. Ital. danno (Lat. damnunm), donna (Lat. domna and domina), colonna (Lat. columnna), but in French the n has yielded to the m, e.g. dame (Lat. damnunm and döm(i)na) (colonne is a bookword). That in the Latin pronunciation the n had here a weak sound seems to follow from Priscian’s remark (i. p. 30): n exilior in mediis [sonat] ut ‘amnis,’ ‘damnum’ (where the syllable begins with m, a-annis, da-mnnum, while in étiamnnunc the syllable begins with n), as well as from Quintilian’s many centuries earlier (i. 7. 28, 29): quid quae scribuntur aliter quam enuntiantur? . . . ‘columnam’ et ‘consules’ exempta n littera legimus. gn 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 Sardinian nn, e.g. linna. There is no evidence to show that the g in this position in Latin took the velar guttural sound 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. quïntus (Ital. quinto, with close i) (see § 144). nd shows a tendency to mn (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. respondet).

M, n are ‘liquids’ (βγρα) in Greek, because they readily combine (like λ, ρ) in one syllable with a preceding mute. But in Latin, though this was the case with l, r, it was not with n, n. Greek loanwords in Latin which presented this combination, tended to be pronounced with a parasitic vowel, e.g. Tēciumessa for Greek Tέκιμςά: 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 loanwords, this spelling was generally abandoned; though even in the literary language it persisted in some forms, such as mïna
§ 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 figitur usque sub palato,
quo spiritus aeneae coeat naris et oris.

Mar. Vict. vi. 34. 12, 13 K. m impressis invicem labis magitum quendam
intra oris specem attractis naribus dabat; n vero sub convexo palati lingua
inhaerente gemino naris et oris spiritu explicavit. Marianus Capella
(iii. 261), M labris imprimitur; N lingua dentibus appulsa collidit. Priscian
i. 29, 30 H. m obseruam in extremitate dictionum sonat ut ‘templum,’
apertura in principio ut ‘magnus,’ medio in mediis ut ‘umbra.’ . . . n quoque
plenior in primis sonat et in ultimis partibus syllabarum ut ‘nomen,’
14, 7), speaking of the Agma, says: si ea littera [n] esset, lingua palatum
tangeret. Ter. Scaurus 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 (l. c.), in Augustus’ time, speaks of the n in
words like anguis, inerpat, ingenius 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. 30) says it is a sound common to Greek and Latin,
written g in Greek, and by the poet Accius in Latin, e. g. agguliis, ageps (cf.
that this was the sound of the nasal before qu in nunquam, nunquam, quamquam.
quamquam, which is a sound between n and g, though, he says, it is usually
spoken of by grammarians as if it were the sound between m and n of Greek
σάμβυς. Spellings on late inscriptions like nuncqavm (C.I.L. v. 154) nuncqavm
(iv. 1837), nuncqavm (x. 8192) may indicate this pronunciation, though in
rncxi (viii. 8692), &c., cx may be merely the common symbol for X as in
vocor (ii. 3330), a spelling which has led to the corruption vocor 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 proprie exprimat, tam nobis deesse
quam Graecis: nam cum illi σάμβυς scribant, nec m exprimere nec n. sed
haec ambiguities in his fortasse vocabulis sit, ut in ‘Ampelo,’ ‘Lycambe,’
nam in nostris supra dictis non est. The word σάμβυς, apparently the stock
element 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 sab'b'kā (Daniel iii. 5), Greek σάμβυς]. [Is the word connected with
the Latin sambucus, elderwood, where we have a similar variety of spelling
between sambūcus and sābucus (sub-in Romance)? On Lat. labrusca, in Vulg. Lat.
lambrusca (a MS. reading in Virg. Ed. v. 7), 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 ποντίς, 'Olventi, Cret. ἀπόβατος, &c. This Greek sound was appealed to by Latin grammarians to explain varieties of spelling like correundem and correundem, quantus and quantus, where w 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 'between 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. 266), CECREB (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 mt and nt, nb and mb caused by the co-existence of etymological and phonetic spellings like contéro and contéro, ibitibus and imbitus. (The spelling sententiam is that of the Lex Julia Municipalis and may be due to some orthographical theory of Julius Caesar; for on the same inscription we have damdum, damdam, faciundei, tuemandam, tuemdam, quamda, quantum, tantae, tantam.) The spelling of these verbs compounded with the prepositions in, cum (com) is frequently discussed by the grammarians (see the passages collected by Seelmann, p. 279) (cf. jamdandum for jamdandum 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 (collior, coeo, cohortor, cohaeret, but also conest, and in the older spelling comanditum, &c.). Before v only on early inscriptions, e.g. coevnumis (C.I.L. i. 532), coevniitid (i. 196); before j also on later, e.g. coiico (C.I.L. ii. 1964, col. ii. 51), coner (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. Novebrius, n before Dentals and Gutturals, e.g. eudem, proxicia (Mon. Ancyr.) (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 105). Greek inscriptions treat the Latin nasals in the same way, e.g. Novebpo, Povovos, on the one hand; Novebpos, Povovos, on the other (Eckinger, pp. 109 sqq.). Occasionally a nasal is wrongly inserted in plebeian and late inscriptions, m before Labials, n before Dentals and Gutturals, e.g. sempem, singmifer. (Examples from inscriptions and MSS. are given by Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 113 sqq.) (Co may be an original byform of com in cogo, &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. immobitis), tanto (Lat. tautus); 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 lambrusca, 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 ‘barbarismus’ by Julian, Bishop of Toledo (end of seventh cent.) (Exc. 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 nf in Romance are compounds with the preposition or particle in, e. g. infans. These show n, except in Provençal, where n is dropped, e. g. effas, efmer, efnerh (Lat. infringere), efner, afra (Lat. infra), cofrds, 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 incidence 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 τάμ), the sound was that of a nasalized (*anānasika*) vowel; others teach the ‘intervention after the vowel of a distinct nasal element called the *anūsāra, or after-tone*’ (Whitney, Sanscrit Grammar², § 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. Romão, Lat. *Romānum*, mão, Lat. *mānum*, lān (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, *mano* (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 feraill, 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 fēramail, 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 feram illud cannot be explained by the Irish reduction of feraïmhil to feraí. A better parallel to the latter would be the reduction of *coventio, conventio* to *contio*. (But see ch. ix. § 22.) (On Port. tam with *m* sounded like nasal *n*, see Sweet Phil. Soc. xvi. 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. 36 K.) speaking of final -m says: vetustissimi tamen non semper eam subtrahebant, and quotes a hexameter of Ennius (A. 354 M.) ending with mitia militum octo (cf. Enn. A. 322 M. beginning dum quidem unus); 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. 309) and Plautus, with the older poets, Horace, with the classical poets, allow prosodical hiatus in the one case as much as in the other. Lucullus, for example, scans as a short syllable without eliding, quam (i. 32 M. irritata canes quam homo quam planius dictat. He is speaking of the letter r), exactly as he shortens quo (xxx. 24 M. quid seruas quò ciam, quid agam? quid id attinet ad te?). Horace's nimm ades 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. xlv. 152) from the same poet Scipio invictae (A. 345 M.). Nor was this a mere usage of poetry. The same thing is seen in compounds, such as cónest, cóire (the spelling with com probably was the older usage before a vowel. cf. comauditum, and comagnisatum, Paul. Fest. 46 Th.: comegit Gl. Plac. xiv. 39 G.; on cógo, see above), which have the first syllable short, like praecirc, praecent. The compound of circum and it is a trisyllabic circit; of antē and it a dissyllable, antēit. (On flagitiem-homīnīs in Plautus, see above, § 59.) But the disregard of -m in metre before an initial consonant except under the law of Breves V breviantes, like Plautus' almost invariable enīm)\(^1\) is unknown until late plebeian verse, e. g. unbrā(m) levem (along with tāles amici) on the epitaph of a praece (C. I. L. vi. 1951), moriēnt(em) viderent (vi. 7578), &c. Even in the careless hexameters of the dedicatory inscription of Mummius (i. 542; of 146 B. C.), which contain faciūs occupying the place of a dactyl, pacē need not represent pacem (as in i. 1290: paeœm petit), but may be the Abl. (as in Plaut. Rud. 698: tua pace):

\[\text{tua pace rogans te cogendeis dissolvents tu ut facilia faxseis.}\]

The dropping of final -m in vulgar pronunciation is attested by the remarks in Probi App. (198. 27) trielinium non 'trielinu'; (199. 14) passim non 'passi'... númeram non 'numquam'... prīdem 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: sient plerumque passim Ioquentur '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: cum dicitur 'illum ego 'et 'omnium optimum,' illum et omnium aequem 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.).
Before \( n \) the pronunciation alluded to by Velius Longus is found expressed in writing, in MSS. of Virgil (see Ribbeck, *Index*, p. 430); so 'etiamnunc' on the Herc. Papryi (Class. Rev. iv. 443).

Tanne for \( \text{tanne} \) is quoted by Festus (p. 542 Th.) from Afranius: \( \text{tanne} \) arcula tua plena est aranearum? Cf. Quint. viii. 3. 45 on the sound of \( \text{cum} \) 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 \( \text{im barin} \), \( \text{im flammanum} \), \( \text{im mare} \), \( \text{im pappibus} \)). So forsam and forstam in MSS. (see Ribbeck, *Ind.* p. 420, and Georges, *Lex. Wortf.*, 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 \( -\text{ans} \) and \( -\text{cis} \), also in \( -\text{ensis} \), e.g. Κλήμης, καστήρια. But Latin \( \text{census} \) and its derivatives usually retain \( n \), e.g. σέφυς, Κρησσαρός (*Mon. Anc.*), also the combination \( -\text{nst} \) (Eckinger, pp. 114, 115). [For the variation of \( s \) with \( ns \) in Latin spelling, see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s. vv. centies, decies, conjugia (modern Cosenza), \( \pi\nu\sigma, \text{mensis}, \text{mensor} \), &c. Cf. Probi App. 198. 9 anas non 'asa'; 198. 2 Capsessis 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. \( \text{thesaurus} \) for \( \text{thesaurus} \) [see Georges s.v. Other examples, e.g. \( \text{occansio} \) (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 'Hereulens' for ' Hercules' (197. 25 K.). Velius Longus (p. 79. 1 K. says that Cicero 'libenter dicebat foresia, Megalesia, hortesia, and Papirian (ap. Cassiod. 160. 14 K.) says that \( \text{tusus}, \text{tusus}, \text{praus} \) 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. \( \text{formus} \) (cf. Probi App. 198. 14 K. \( \text{formosus} \) non 'formunus'; Caper 95. 18 K.: *Ter. Scaur*. 21. 10 K.; we have \( \text{formosae} \), *C. L. 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 sine littera dictam Varro ait quod media poneretur; sed auctores cum \( n \) littera protulerunt, Vergilius saepe, &c. (cf. Varro *L. L. v*. 118). On *quotiens* (the better spelling) and on *vicestatus*, &c., see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s. vv., and Brambach, *Lat. Orth.* p. 269.

§ 67. nx. Of the spellings \( \text{conjux} \) and \( \text{conjunx} \) (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, \( \text{conjugis}, \text{conjui}, \&c. \) In actual pronunciation, he declares, the \( n \) is heard; for 'subtracta n littera, et difficilium enuntiaburit et asperius auribus accidet.' The comparison of other I.-Eur. languages, e.g. Greek \( \text{σύ-χυς} \), Sanscr. \( \text{sun-yu} \), 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 *jungo* (cf. *Ter. Scaur*. p. 20. 10 K.).

§ 68. mm. In the fifth cent. Pompeius (p. 283. 11 K.) mentions as a barbarism *colomma* (cf. the Diminutive *cötlmeltta*) for *columna*, which looks very like the pronunciation mentioned by Quintilian as normal in his day (columnam exempta n legimus). This *colum(n)a* seems to have become *koloma*, as *cölber* became *colober*, by assimilation of unaccented \( n \) to accented \( o \) (see ch. iii. § 33), whence *columna* (Probi App. 197. 25) with open accented \( o \), the origin of the Romance words for pillar, as *colobra* (open \( o \)) of the Romance words for snake.
But the analogy of *columen* may have had something to do with the pronunciation *column* n'a (cf. *sciemellum* and *scammum*). See Georges s. v. *Sollennis* is explained as a byform of *sollennis* (from *annus*, around, Osc. *annum*), 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*, *lamma.*) The insertion of *p* between *m* and *n* occurs in late plebeian spellings like *calumpum*, *damppum*, *sollernps* (see Schuchardt, *Vok.* i. p. 149, and Georges, s. v. *damnum*). On *mpt* see below. *Hiemps* (cf. *consunpsi*, &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.; Alcein 303. 8 K.

§ 69. gn. Spellings on inscriptions like *ingnominiae* (*C. I. L.* i. 206, 45 v. c.), *conyato* (x. 1220) seem to be mere etymological spellings like *inpepo*, &c. *Singnir*, 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 *subtem* and *sublegmen*, *exitmen*, and perhaps *exagmen* (*Clas. Rev.* 1891, p. 294) (see ch. iv. § 116). (For instances of the spelling of *gn*-, consult Georges and Brambach s. vv. *coniceo*, *conitor*, *divosco*, *cognosco*, *nactus*, *natus*, *narus*, *aprugmus*, and see Schuchardt, *Vok.* i. p. 115. On *coniitor*, &c., but *cognosco*, &c., see ch. iv. § 119.)

§ 70. nct. The suppression of the guttural in *quintus* is something like the dropping of *-g* of 'going' in the mispronunciation 'goin' to.' *Quinctus* is the spelling of the Republic, *Quintus* of the Empire, according to Brambach. So on Greek inscriptions of the beginning of the second cent. n. c. *Kypertos*, but also *Koerto* (Eckinger p. 122). For the byforms *sanctus* and *nactus* (see Brambach) we have a parallel in *sactus* (reflected in Welsh saith) beside *santus*, 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 Oscan and become *nn*; and similarly Latin *mb* is *mm*. In ordinary Italian, Latin *nd* has become *nn* (*n*) in the pretonic syllable, as is shown by *ne* for Lat. *inde*, manueare for Lat. *manducare*. 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 *nn*, see Schuchardt, *Vok.* i. p. 146, e. g. *Secumnum*, and consult Georges s. v. *grandio*). *Nt* competes with *mpt* in *lanterna* (better *laterna*) apparently from Greek *launthp*, and *tempto* (not *tento*), *Pomptinus* (not *Pontinus*), *petentenum*, &c. (see Georges and Brambach). Thus *vivuntas* and *vivuptus* are sometimes confused in MSS, through the intermediary form *volumptas* (Schuchardt, *Vok.* i. 5). But *emptum*, *redemptum*, *consumptum* are the established spellings, though Marius Victorinus (21. 12 K.) demands on etymological grounds *enunt*, *redemtum*, *consumtum*, as also *redemsi*, *consuensi*, &c. (ch. iv. § 76).

§ 72. Parasitic vowel in Greek loanwords. The Early Latin instances have been discussed by Ritsehl, *Opusc.* ii. 469 sqq., who on the strength of MSS. spelling, and the requirements of prosody, restored to Plautus such forms as *drichima*, *techina*, *Alcimenia*, *Alcimese*, *Cicinus*, *giminastum*, *Procina*. Marius
Victorinus (8. 6 K.) tells us that the form Tecnessa 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 nec Alemenam dicebant nec Tecnessam, sed 'Aleumenam'; inde 'Aleumoe' et 'Aleumenae' tragœdiae, donec Julius Caesar, qui Vopiscus et Stræculus dictus est, primus 'Tecnessam' inscripsit illam, et in seca prænuntiari jussit (cf. Prisc. i. p. 29 H. [u] saepe interponitur inter ei vel cm in Graecis nominibus, ut 'Ἡρακλῆς' 'Hercules,' 'Ασκληπιός 'Aesculapius,' et antiqui 'Ἀλκμήνη 'Alcumena,' 'Ἀλκμαῖον 'Alcumaion'). Similarly the Sardinian moufon was called in Latin mūismo (a name applied to a much-prized breed of diminutive horses; cf. Lucilius vi. 15 M. praedium emit, qui vendit equum musimonem), but in Gk. μουζαῖον (Strabo). (On the parasitic vowel between a mute and l in Latin words, like pērīc,w)lum, see ch. iii. § 13.) The difference of Greek and Latin in this respect is seen in the fact that Δεκμος is the earliest and most usual form of the name Décimus, older Decimus, on Gk. inscriptions, just as awkward combinations with l, e.g. Δυτῖκος, 'Αρβοουρέα, Μασθλος, Πατεράκο, Πολύεα (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-glide' (Sweet, Handb. p. 84), as in Germ. Knie pronounced 'knie'; cf. Fr. canif from Low Germ. knif. (For examples on inscriptions, e.g. Himmis, 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-glide,' what we roughly call h, after them. In Danish
every initial  is pronounced with this  following; and the same peculiarity in Irish-English is well known. That Latin ,  were not so pronounced we can infer from the fact that for the more exact expression of the Greek aspirates, ,  were brought into use in the last century of the Republic, which shows that  had not, at least at that period, the sound of (like ‘uphill,’ ‘anheap,’ ‘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 (aghõsa) and voiced (ghõsavant) consonants, and its dependence on the opening (vivâra) or closure (sañcâra) of the glottis. The Latin phoneticians talk of and of  as entirely different types of sounds, produced by different positions of the vocal organs. Seelmann professes to find in their descriptions evidence that  had a more energetic articulation than  and . This is certainly true of their account of  and ; 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 , Lat. . 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 , especially when preceding certain sounds; and that the same tendency is shown by Latin  to be weakened in the same position to , e.g. Vulgar Latin *gavia for cávea (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(e)dīctio; Lat. cōquīna, cocīna 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 fortis and lenes.

In native Latin words the tenues and mediae are not confused to any great extent. The same tendency that turned I.-Eur. l 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, ALIXENTROM; 1501, ALIXENTE(r) CASENTER(a), both inscriptions from Praeneste, and in Ital. Otranto for Greek ῥῷποῖς -ὁῦντος, Lat. Hydruntum). In very early times the single letter c (Greek γ) was used for the c-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 mediae. 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-up; 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. pūrus), bene (Lat. bēnē), tale (Lat. tālis), duro
(Lat. dūrus); 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. mică
(Lat. mīca), lăptucă (Lat. lactūca), muta (Lat. mūtāre), and
in Italian the reduction of the tenuis is of limited extent, e.g.
amico (Lat. āmīcus, Span. amigo), uopo (Lat. āpus, Span. huebos),
vite (Lat. vītis, Span. vide), fuoco (Lat. fōcus, Span. fuego), &c.,
though before a we have the media in migà (Lat. mīca), strada
(Lat. strata), lattuga (Lat. lactūca), &c., and when the vowel
following has the accent, e.g. siguro (Lat. sēcūrus), 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.
lācrīma, 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. sopra (Lat. sūpra), capra (Lat. cāpra), but cavriuolo
(Lat. capreolus), 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. tenue to a Lat. media, is the change of Gk. ι to Lat. g,
especially before the vowels a, o, u. Thus γυμνί for κάμμι, γόδίνει for κώδεις,
gūbernāre for κυβέρνατο, Σπίγωμεν for Σάκωμε, &c., have always, or usually,
g in Lat. (see Georges, Lex. Wort. s.vv.). The spelling-varies in conger and
gonger, gōrītus and corītus, cāmmārus and gammarus (see Georges). Ter. Scaurus
(xiv. 9, 10) says that some pronounced gaunāce, some caunace; so gamellus and
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cōmellus [cf. Probi App. 198. 9 calathus non 'galatus'; Gloss. ap. Mai, Cl. Auct. vi. 576 corax per c non per g; and see Georges and Brambach s.vv. Caiaeta (now Gaêta), Agerigentum, grabatum]. In the modern Milanese dialect, the French cabriolet has similarly become gabriolé. Before n, c became g in Latin (ch. iv. § 116), so that the spellings cygnius, Gniöus, Gniöus are only natural (see Georges and Brambach). Of the final -oa of āmurea (Gk. ἀμύρρη), Servius (ad G. i. 194) says that it was written with c, but pronounced with g. (A similar interchange of -oa, -ga, is seen in levua and levea, rcca, and rage, &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. xlviii. 160 Burrum semper Ennius, numquam Pyrrhum; ipsius antiqui declarant libri; cf. Quint. i. 4. 15, and Ter. Saur. 14 K., who adds Byrria as the equivalent of Gk. Πυρρός). The form burreus 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. burrem dieciant antiqui quod nune dieimius rufum; unde rustici 'burrum' appellant bucalum, quae rostrum habet rufum. modo pari robued cibo ac potionex ex prandio 'burrus' appellatur), who also mentions burrenica polio; lacte mixtum sapa, a rufo colore (p. 26. 19 Th.), and burrenicum; genus vasis (p. 26. 7). Quintilian (i. 5. 13) quotes Cicero's phrase Canopitarum exercitum with the remark, ipsi Canobon dicunt. (On Latin Câgôpûs, Gk. Κάναβος see Brambach s.v.) In Probi Append. (199. 5 K.) we have, planta non 'blasta.' Gk. βατάνον for βατάνον is quoted by Hesychius as belonging to the Sicilian dialect (πατάνα...ποτήρια. τινὲs δὲ διὰ τοῦ β βατάνα λέγουσιν, καὶ βατάνα τά λοσάδα. ὅ δὲ λέξις Σικελική). So carathiôn evêhdéa of Catull. xcviii: 4 are in Gk. καρπατιναι and καρπάτηνα. Old Lat. Tellis for Θεή (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 θεή, apud Enniun: Thelis illi mater, and R. R. iii. 9. 19 antiqui ut Thetim 'Thelim' dieciant, sic Medicam 'Melicam' vocabant) perhaps implies an intermediary form with ḍ for Gk. τ. The relation of cotonea, the origin of the Romance words for quince (Ital. cotogna, Fr. coing) to Gk. κυώνιa is not clear (cf. Maebob. vii. 6. 13 mala cydonia quae cotonia Cato vocat; Pliny, N. H. xv. 10). In Vulg. Lat. we find additional examples of ḍ for Gk. κ, such as *grupu (Ital. grotto), *garofultum (from καρυόψλλον), *goniús: not to mention *guttus for (Teutonic?) Guttus, and probably gamba. Of spellings on Gk. inscriptions may be instance casti on castigarum, sapaotarum (from servârum), *gâl on all on the Edict of Diocletian; also Gântios for Cantisus, and Kântios for Candidius (Eckinger, pp. 98. 100, 102). The same interchange of tenues and mediea is seen in Gk., e.g. τῆκα and τῆνων, especially in loanwords, e.g. τάπης, ταπις and δάπας, 'Ἀμπακάτως and Ἀμπακατώτης: in dialects we have, e.g. κλάγας-'γαλα, Κρηθε, 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 carðàsus, Gk. κάρπασος, crûtnâ, Gk. γροβία a bag, galbdonum, Gk. καλάνη, spéduea, Gk. σπήληγγα, not to mention incilega, Gk. ἱγγύθηξη. Cf. also libdes with Gk. λάταγες, ἰόδη with Gk. πλάχ. On citrus (also cedrus), and Gk. κίδρος, see ch. iv. § 113. Both Crevisio and Orisida occur on old Praenestine cistae for 'Chryseis' (C. I. L. xiv. 4109; i. 1501)].

§ 75. Confusion of mediae and tenues in Latin words. A large number of seeming instances are not due to any Latin, or even Italic, law of sound,
but are survivals of that interchange of media and tenuis, which shows itself occasionally in I.-Eur. roots, e. g. situs and sigo. 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 lapidi (Lat. lāpides\textsuperscript{2}), &c.; the Roman dialect affects grosta, gantela, &c., with g- for c-. Thus Quint. i. 5. 12 tells us that a certain Tinca of Placentia used \textquoteleft precula \textquoteleft for pergula (see K. Z. xxx. 345). Of the misspellings of this kind in inscriptions and MSS. (collected by Schuchardt, \textit{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. Sacedr. 462 K. quotes a lampoon, perhaps a Fescennine line sung by soldiers at his triumph, quém non pûdet ét rûbet, nén est hómő sed répio). The word, which should probably be read in Catull. xxxvii. 10 (see Sacedr. l. c.), is evidently connected with robus and 

\textit{rufus}, for Sacedors adds, ropio autem est minium aut piscis robus aut penis [cf. Ter. Scaur. 14 K. on the doubtful examples of \textit{Palatium} and \textit{Balatium} (by analogy of \textit{balo}); \textit{Pulbicola} and O. Lat. \textit{Popicola} (by analogy of \textit{pupillus}); \textit{propon} on early coins for \textit{probus}, C. I. L. i. 19; \textit{advocat} in the Carmen Arvale]. For t and d, probably not petiolus, \textit{\textquoteleft a little foot\textquoteright} (\textit{\textquoteleft q?}). Afranius ap. Non. 160. M. atque ádeo nolo núdo petioló esse plus \cite{MSS. es pus\textsuperscript{3}}, for this is better explained as \textit{peciolo}; (Ital. pieciuolo, 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 \textit{-cit-} and \textit{-cer-} in the proparoxytone syllable seem to have become \textit{-gil-}, \textit{-ger-}, e. g. *plagitum, *jäger, to judge from the Romance forms (see \textit{Arch. Glottol.} ix. 104). (Is \textit{digitus} a similar transformation of \textit{dicitus}? \textit{Dicitus} is censured in Probl. App. 198. 10, and occurs in MSS. See Schuchardt, \textit{Vok.} ii. 413; initial \textit{era}- may have become \textit{gra}, e. g. Ital. grasso, Span. graso, Fr. gras from Latin \textit{crassus}; Ital. grata, Span. grada from Lat. \textit{crātis} (Meyer Lübbe, \textit{Rom. Gram.} i. p. 353); Lat. \textit{gavia} for \textit{cavae} is reflected in Ital. gabbia, Span. gavia, Prov. gabilia; so *gonf"{a}re in Ital. gonfale, &c. [For other examples of \textit{g-c}, see Georges and Brambach s. vv. \textit{vicosinus, viceni, triceni, tricies, nongenti, cremia, neglego, graculus, gurgulo}, &c.; on the change of \textit{d} before \textit{r} to \textit{f}, e. g. \textit{atrox} for \textit{adrox} (cf. \textit{idiam}), see ch. iv. § 113, of \textit{c} before \textit{n} to \textit{g}, e. g. \textit{dignus}, see ch. iv. § 119; \textit{bibo} (I.-Eur. \textit{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 cun Trigetram dici Siciliam an \textit{\textquoteleft Triquedram\textquoteright}, meridiem an \textit{\textquoteleft medidiem\textquoteright} oporteat, quaeritur.]

\textsection 76. \textit{Mediae and Tenues at end of word.} Quintilian, who includes among the points of inferiority of Latin to Greek the use of \textit{b-}, \textit{-d} at the end of syllables (xii. 10. 32 quid quod syllabae nostrae in b litteram et d innituntur adeo aspere, ut plerique, non antiquissimorum quidem, sed tamen veterum, mollire temptaverint, non solum \textit{aversa} pro \textit{\textquoteleft adversis\textquoteright} dicendo, sed et in praepositione b litterae absansom et ipsam f [s ett,\textsuperscript{4} subiendo], mentions (i. 7. 5) with disapproval the practice of distinguishing \textit{ad}, the preposition, from \textit{at}, the conjunction. The right use of \textit{t} and \textit{-d} in words like \textit{dē} and \textit{dā}, \textit{sēd}, \textit{quit} (from \textit{queo}), and \textit{quid} (from \textit{quis}), \textit{quēt} and \textit{quīt}, &c., is a subject of frequent remark in the grammarians, e. g. Ter. Scaurus (12. 8 K) approves \textit{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 306. 8 K., and (on hand and hand) 303. 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 Schuchardt, *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 rogau, *C. I. L.* iv. 2388 (but on O. Lat. fered, &c., for freit, &c., see ch. viii. § 69), periu (for perereat) iv. 1173; also the loss of -t in the combination -nt, *fecean vi.* 325, just as -t is lost in the combination -ct, lac from lacte from older lacte, an I-stem. The proposition is spelt at in the Lex Col. Jul. Genetivae Urbanorum of 44 B.C., except when the next word begins with d-, 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 adtributionem, &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 dicis, ad templum, ad deos, &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 -d about the end of the third cent. B.C. (see § 137), though d remained till later in the monosyllables med, ted, while hand was retained before words beginning with vowels (Ritschl, *Opus.,* ii. 591, &c., v. 352) and the affection of -t by the spellings on plebanell and late inscriptions of verb-forms like reliquit, &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 volupe, the Neuter of an adj. *volupis;* but it is common in Oscan, e. g. op (Lat. ob), ip 'there.' (On the spellings optimo, obtineo, &c., see § 80.). On the other hand final y never appears in Latin, though we have e in ac (for alq[u][e], nec (for nq[k][e]), lac (for lac[e], ific for illi[e], &c.; but nec is written invariably in negotium, and usually in negotio (see Georges, s.v.). (Cf. ch. x. § 18.)

§ 77. Mediae and tenues in the Dialects. There is a good deal of interchange of mediae and tenues in Umbrian and Oscan (e. g. Osc. deketasiúi and degetasius), 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. Osc.-Umbr. Dial.* i. p. 547). In a Falisco-Latin inscr. (Zvet. I. I. 72) we have gondecord, gonlegium, 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. běne), 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, obšuco, &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. *rudh-ro, Greek ἐ-πυθός. 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 sīfīlus, beside genuine Latin sībīlus, 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 prefectos:
nam muta jubet portio comprimi 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;
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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 hiscerellumve meatum voeis exprimere nisis valet, nisi
voceis exitum dederint atque ora reserarint) dispari inter se oris officio
exprimuntur, nam prima exploso e medis labis sono, sequens compresso ore
velut introrsum attracto voeis itu explicatur; Martianus Capella iii. 261
B labris per spiritus impetus reclusis edicimus . . P labris spiritus [spiritu
Eys.] erumpit; we may add the remark of Terentius Scaurus vii. 14. 3 K.
b eum p et m consentit, quoniam origo earum non sine labore conjuncto ore
respondet.

80. bs, bt. Latin bs had the sound of Greek ψ (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 quærimus). The
spelling abe is defended on the strength of ab by Velius Longus (vii. 61 K.),
who also tells us that some authorities always spelt opœstit, abœrspsi, wœps, nœpsi,
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, Pelœpis, but plebs, plœbis, 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 ‘celeps’ : (199. 3) plebs non ‘pleps’ : (199. 11) labusus non ‘lapsus.’] That
obœnœit was pronounced opœnit, we are told by Quintilian (i. 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. Oscus, Opscus and Opicus, old forms of Oscus (as subscribo, subscripto
of subscribo), Fest. 212 and 234 Th. ; and see Georges, Lex. Wortf., s. v. campsi,
camps]. Curtius Valerianus (ap. Cassiod. 157 K.) says ps belong to the same,
bs to different syllables. In the Lex Col. Jul. Genetivae Urbanorum of 44 b. c.
op is used in opœsepure, optœmerare, optœreare, optœnere, but always ab, never ap-
for apsis follow the analogy of ab.

§ 81. ps, pt. In Romance the sounds of Latin pt and ps have been retained in
Romuanian, but in other languages have passed into tt, ss, e. g. Ital. sette (Lat.
septem), cassa (Lat. capsia), esso (Lat. ipsœ), medesimo (Vulg. Lat. *met ipœsimus,
O. Fr. medesme, Fr. même). Issa for ipœs 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 ipœs by a ‘legatus
consularis’ led to his being cashiered by Augustus as ‘rudis et indecutus.’ Cf.
sussitio for supersitio, subsidio ; and for some examples of ss for ps in MSS. and late
plebeian inscriptions, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 148 ; for tt, t for pt, ib. i. 143, and
see Georges s. v. scrattsa, septimus. The lap-dog, the subject of one of Martial’s
prettiest epigrams (i. 109) was called Issa (i.e. ipœsa 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 ipœs.

1 Plautus puns on opœcro and max secœo, Mil. 1406.

§ 83. b and dialectal f. *Alfius* was the dialectal, *Albius* the Latin form of the name. The two forms are found, for example, on Interamina inscriptions (*Albius, C. I. L. xi. 4240, Alfia, 4242*). So with other proper names like *Orbulius* and *orfilius*. *Sifilus*, a mispronunciation of *sibillus*, censured in the Appendix *Probi* (199. 3 K.; cf. Non. 531. 2), was a dialectal variety; similarly *serôfa* a sow has been connected with *serôbis*. In glosses we find *crefrare* with *cribrare*, *bufus* with *bâbo* (Löwe, *Prodr.* p. 421), and in modern Italian *sibilare* (cf. Fr. *sifler*) beside *sibilare* (Lat. *sibilare*), *tafano* (Lat. *tâbûnus*), &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 *glomus* and *globus* (cf. *Probi* App. 198. 8 *globus* non *‘glomus’*) are two different stems, *globus, -i* and *glomus, -eris* (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. *tû*), *d, e. g. dono* (Lat. *dôno*) are both pure dentals, differing like any other unvoiced and voiced mute. But there is on Italian soil a curious sound, a cacuminal *d*, exemplified by Sicilian *cavddu* (Lat. *câballus*), 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 *lêcruma* (older *dacruma*) (see ch. iv. § 111); through neglect of the front closure it passed into *r* in Old Latin in words like *arfusse* (later *adfuissete*) on the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus (*C. I. L*. i. 196, of 186 B.C.) before the bilabial spirants *f* and *v*
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(see ch. iv. § 112). A fifth (?) century grammarian speaks of the mispronunciation peres for pètes 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. àter, stem âтро- for *âdro (see ch. iv. § 113), a tendency seen in spellings like Alexanter, 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 e, 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 pèriclum (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, vètulus, for example, becoming vèclus (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 adlineo, pronounced attlineo, 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, càlida to calda, made ‘Tityus’ out of Titius, ‘hodye’ out of hòdie. 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 sìmia has become French singe (through *sìmya), Latin apium Fr. ache (*апуя), Lat. ràbies Fr. rage (*рабье), Lat. cambiare Fr. changer (*cambiyar). 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 pìtæa, *píatya. 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.:

at portio dentes quotiens suprema linguae
pulsaverit imos modiceque curva summos,
tunc $d$ sonitum perfect explicatque vocem;
t, qua superis dentibus intima est origo,
summa satis est ad sonitum ferire lingua.

Similarly Marius Victorinus speaks of the two sounds as having marked difference in their formation (vi. 33. 24 K.): $d$ autem et $t$, quibis, ut ita dixerim, vocis vicinitas quaedam est, linguae sublatae ac positione distinguintur. 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 appulsu linguae circa superiores dentes innascitur... T appulsu linguae dentibusque impulsionis extunditur [extruditur Eysst., extuditur MSS.].

§ 87. $d$ and $l$. In some Italian dialects $d$ in the Latin suffix *-dus* becomes $l$ if the stem ends in a labial. Thus Lat. *tēpōlo* is in the Neapolitan dialect *tēpōlo*. Some examples of $l$ for $d$ in MSS, and late inscriptions are collected by Schuchardt, *Vok.* 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. *dicere* and *ricere* (Lat. *dicere*), $da$ and $ra$ (Lat. *dat*). 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 $d$ has sometimes developed into $r$, e.g. soleares, sometimes been dropped e.g. *nada*. Final $d$ is weakly pronounced in Spanish, and often dropped; and the same is true of the Galician dialect of Portuguese, e.g. *bondá* (Lat.
§ 89. tl. Vecbus for vitulus, vidus for vitulus, capacium for capitiuim, were mispronunciations in vulgar speech (Probi App. p. 197. 20 and 198. 34 K.). Sillis the old form of lis (Quint. i. 4. 16) is spelled selis on inscriptions (e. g. C. I. L. x. 211 and 1249). Caper censors the use of scaturis for stlatus, a pirate ship, marculus for martulos, a priest of Mars (vii. 107. 1; 105. 21 K.). (For examples of et for it in MSS. and late inscriptions see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 160.)

§ 90. Assibilation of ty, dy. In the fourth cent. we have an indication that ti, di 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 positae sicut di-cuntur ita etiam sonandae sunt, ut ‘dies’ ‘tiaras’). The same grammarian, in a note on Virgil, Georg. ii. 126, remarks that the Greek word Medua must be pronounced in Greek fashion sine sibilo, that is to say without that consonantal y-sound which Latin medius, medua had in the time of Servius, that ‘pinguis sonus’ of i which the grammarians, as we saw before (§ 14), declared to be particularly alien to Greek pronunciation. In the early part of the fifth cent. Papirian (MS. ‘Papirius’) is more explicit. The letters ti before a vowel, in words like Tatius, etia, justitia, have, he says, a sound as if z (i. e. Greek ζ, which had at this time the soft or voiced s-sound) were inserted between them (ap. Cassiod. 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 ti is followed by a vowel, and not always even then, not, for example, in Genitives like atii nor when s precedes ti, e. g. justius, castius. In the same century Pompeius censures as a fault the very pronunciation allowed in the preceding century by Servius, whereby ti, di were pronounced as spelled. He lays down the rule (v. 286. 10 K.): quotienscumque 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 pronun-cie. He goes on to say that this pronunciation is not found with initial ti, di; nor with the combination ati; 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 ‘Titius,’ pinguis sonat [1] et perdit sonum suum et accepit sibilum. A grammarian of the fifth cent.?)}
Consentius (395. 3), describes the new sound of ti in ētiam 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 hōdie 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. Crescentsian(us) (Gruter, p. 127, vii. i, of 140 A. D.), and even in the case of accented ti, di; Isidore's statement about the pronunciation of hōdie (now oggi) is perhaps supported by ozx (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. § 62), 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 (Zr. 231) Bansa- (Lat. Bantia), zico- (Lat. diccula) (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. 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
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 \( u \) (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 \( u \) of quoniam, quidem is said to be ‘nec vocalis nec consonans’ (Donat. iv. 367. 16 K.). Priscian (seventh cent.) says the same of the \( u \) of sanguis, lingua (i. 37), so that Latin \( qu \), \( gu \) 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 \( e \) invariably reproduce it by \( \kappa \), in cases like ΚΗΝΣΟΝ for centum, ΚΡΗΣΚΗΝΣ for crescens; 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. civitatem), and similarly German Keller (Lat. cellarium), Kiste (Lat. cista); it is not till the seventh century that spellings like paeze 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, citra. \( G \) 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. *Octōbris*, and had assumed the sound in late Latin, to judge from spellings on inscriptions like *lathaca* in the Edict of Diocletian, *Otobris* (Rossi 288, of 380 A.D.) and *autor*.


Mar. Vict. vi. 33. 20 K. c etiam et g, ut supra scriptae, sono proximae oris molimine nisiuoque dissimilant. nam c reducta intorsum lingua hinc atque hinc molares ursens haerentem intra os sonum voeis excludit: g vim prioris pari linguæ habitu patalo suggestens leniens reddid . . . [g, k] quaron utrumque exprimi faucibus, alteram distento, alteram producto ictu manifestum est. Mart. Cap. iii. 261; G spiritus [facit] cum patalo . . . K fauces palato formatur . . . Q appilus patati 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 quiet.’ Pompeius (v. 104. 25 K.) calls the *u* 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. *kvaistur*, Umbr. *kvastretie* [Lat. *quaestrae*]). In Faliscan the *qu*-sound is written *cv* (*cu* or *cv*) e. g. *cuano*. Greek transcriptions have normally *κου*, e. g. Κουαδάρτος; but *κού* is the earliest expression of *gu*-, e. g. Κοῦκτος (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 *ce*, *ge*, relics from *reliquos* (in the time of Plautus *reliquos*, of four syllables, *lucntur*, *licntur*, *extingunt*. The grammarians of the first cent. A.D. were puzzled by the want of correspondence between Nom. Sing. *equus*, Nom. Pl. *equi*, and reconstituted the Nom. Sing. as *equus* (in the time of Trajan) (Vel. Long. 59. 3 K. auribus quidem sufficiebat ut equus per unum us scriberetur, ratio tamen duo exigit); *guu* in *extinguent*, &c., followed somewhat later. In the fifth cent. we find *co* definitely ousting *quō*, and *go*, *guō*, though *quō* seems to have been pronounced *cō* 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 with *guo* and which with *go*. The rule they usually follow is to write *-go* when the Perfect has *-xi*, *ungo*, *tingo* (see Bersu Die Gutturales).

(A Vulg. Lat. *læceus* for *lāqueus* is the original of Romance words for ‘nose’
like Ital. lacce, Fr. lacs; cf. Probi App. 197. 27 K. exequiae non ‘execiae’; Cassiod. 158. 15 K. on ‘reliciae’). 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 nune melius, quod ‘cui’ tribus quam posui litteras enotamus, in quo pueris nobis ad pingueum sane sonum qu et o i utebantur, tantum ut ab illo ‘qui’ distinguere tur. 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 i scribitur; si dividitur, ut sit cui ut huic, per e (ap. Cassiod. 149. 1 K.). So Ter. Scaurus (first cent.), 27. 18 K. quis quidem per ‘euis’ scribunt, quoniam supervacuam esse q litteram 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 aquam 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 *Januarius; aqua is scanned with the first syllable long by the Christian poets, and appears in Ita l as acqua (cf. Probi App. 198. 18 K. aqua non ‘acqua’). A sixth cent. grammarians ventures to give this quantity to the word in a line of Lucretius, vi. 868 quae calidum tactum atque vaporem, where, however, the MSS. read laticis. Lachmann proposed to read aquae 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 pāti, lōcī has a shortening influence on the following long syllable, so that the words may be occasionally scanned pātī, lōcī (see ch. iii. § 42), a short vowel before qu seems hardly to have had this shortening power, e.g. rarely (if ever) lōqui. So to the ear of Plautus qu almost made a preceding vowel long by position, unless we say that lōqui, &c., sounded to Plautus something like a trisyllable. At any rate qu can hardly have had merely the ‘rounded’ k-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. dēsēn (Lat. dēcem), bēnna (Lat. bēna). That Plautus (who by the way was an Umbrian) makes a play on the words Sōsia and sōcius, proves nothing (Amph. 383):

Āmpithruonis te ēsse aiebas Sōsiam.—Peeçăueram:
nam ‘Āmpithruonis sōcius’ dudum me ēsse volui dicere.
He makes a play on arcam and arcam in Bacch. 943: atque hic equos non in arcam verum in arcam faciet impetum.

At Cicero's time the spelling pulcher, Gracchi 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 (amico with hard c, amici with sibilant c). Varro (ap. Prisc. i. 39) quotes aegces (another spelling of aniceps) 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, Κώμων, &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. δεμ, δωναρίκι, &c.), and on Latin inscriptions an interchange of c, k, q (e.g. pult, C. I. L. x. 7173: sequet for quisquit, viii. 1981) (see Seelmann, pp. 342 sqq.). This interchange is not regulated by any principle. We do not find k used for ‘hard c,’ 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, xxxi. 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 chiesa) 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 Loguduru, 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. i. 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, munidissis, negatium, otiun, nuntius, Porcius, propitius, provincia, spatium, Sulpicius, induitas, infrilae, condicio, contio, convivium, dicio, fetialis, solacium, suspicio, uncia, &c. The earliest examples date from the second cent. A.D.) On Greek inscriptions Latin cl and ti are similarly confused, the earliest example being Ἀποκαίνας (Ἄθην. iv. p. 104) of 131 A.D. In a Pisidian inscription (Journ. Hell. Stud. iv. p. 26), of 225 A.D., with Mapanavos, the σ (written C) is no doubt merely a confusion with the Latin letter c.

G before e, 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 ‘calcosties,’ for calcostygis, though this may be a case of that spirant pronunciation of Greek γ, like Tarentine δλος for δλγος, Boeotian ιω for ιγω. In the Romance languages it is treated exactly like Latin j (y), e.g. Ital. genero, Span. yerno (Lat. giner), like Ital. giace, Span. yace (Lat. jace). 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 g is found also before other vowels in late inscriptions and MSS., e. g. 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 g when pretonic is dropped, e. g. Ital. reale from Lat. regalia. So g in this position may have become a spirant (like g of German Tage), just as intervocalic b 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. cotanna, coturnix, setius (?), vettonica, pittacium, brattea, salapitta, rireta. So nictio, to 'give tongue,' of a dog who has picked up the scent, is spelled nittio in the lemma of Festus (p. 188. 1. 16 Th.), where he quotes the spirited line of Ennius, Ann. 374 M.:

nare sagaci

Sensit; voce sua nictit ululatque ibi acuta.

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 net, which became nt by loss of the guttural, see § 70. So mulcta became multa (Georges s. v.)

gm or at least Greek γμ seem to have tended, like lm, to the sound wm. In Vulg. Lat. sigma was *sauma (Prov. sauma, Fr. somme), Isid. Orig. xx. 16. 5 sigma quae corrupte vulgo 'sauma' dicitur (s. l. salma; cf. Span. salma, Ital. salma and soma). Cf. Probi App. 198. 11 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 dinguia, &c., of d with r in arduisse for adfuisse, &c., and, as we may now add, of r with l in words like caerulenus for *caelulenus, not to mention occasional occurrences of the dental nasal for r or l, like Vulgar Latin menetris for mērētrix, cunellum 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, sīla, albūs; (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, lupus, and especially (2) when it ends one syllable and begins the next, e.g. il-lē, 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. rallis), pelle (Lat. pellis), but after a consonant l has become an iy-sound, now reduced to i (the half-vowel), e.g. chiaro (Lat. clārus), pieno (Lat. plēnis), 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. ai tro in the Florentine dialect. All this points to l in clārus, &c., and l in alter, &c., having been pronounced with what phoneticians call an 'off-glide' and an 'on-glide' clārus, alter, 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 non multum abest hoc cacosyntheton 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 praestigiae for praestrigiae, incerėbi for increbrui, and in spellings on inscriptions like proprius for prōprimus. Before \( s, r \) was assimilated, e.g. rüssus, rüsus for rūrsus, as we see from Plautus’ pun on Persa and pessum (Pers. 740 Persa me pessum dedit). It was assimilated too before \( l \), e.g. perlıcio, pronounced, and often spelled, pellıcio. Metathesis of \( r \) (and \( l \)) was as common in bad Latin as in bad English, as interpētor (\( \text{?} \) interpētōr) for interpretōr, coacla for cloāca testify, and other mispronunciations censured by the grammarians. Dr became \( tr \) in Latin, e.g. atrox (cf. ĕdiuım) (ch. iv. § 113). Neither \( r \) nor \( l \) remained unaffected by the palatalizing influence of \( y \), that later sound of \( i \) in words like Žiunūrins, 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)args), a process exemplified in earlier times by the form peıuro for periūro, while \( ly \) has become the \( l \) mouillé, 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.)

§ 97. Phonetic descriptions of \( l \). Ter. Maur. vi. 332. 230–234 K.:

adversa palati supera premendo parte
obstantque sono quem eit 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;
Mar. Cap. iii. 261 1 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 \( \dagger \) vocis palatum linguae fastigio
fragorem tremulis ietibus reddit; Mart. Cap. iii. 261 R spiritum lingua crisi-
pante corraditur. 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 \( l \)
diecunt aut \( s \), nec minus quod capra per diminutionem capella dicitur et frater
fratellus.
§ 99. The grammarians on the pronunciation of $l$. The earliest account (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* 'lectum'. 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 *align*, vel m ut in *pulmone*. vel p ut in *scalpro* (2) *exilis*: ubicumque ab ea verbum incipit, ut in *lepore* 'lana' *lupo*, vel ubi in eodem verbo et prior syllaba in haec 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, he says, pronounce *ille mihi dixit* 'subtilius as if *ille* had only one $l$; others pronounce *ille meum comitatus est iter,* or *illum ego per flammam eripui* *pinguis*, 'ut aliquid illic sonit etiam consonantis ammiscere videuntur.' 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 pronounced like Italian viglia. Diomede (i. 458; 3 K.) remarks on the fault of pronouncing $l$ in *lācem* or *alnam* 'nimium plene.' Servius in Don. iv. 445. 12–13 K. calls it a *labdaciismus* (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 dies *lex*, *non lex*, vitiosa sunt per labdaciismum. item in gemino $l$, si volueris pinguius sonare, si dicamus *Metellus* 'Catullus,' in his etiam agnoscinus gentium vitia; labdaciismis scatent Afri, raro est ut aliquid dicat $l$; per geminum $l$ sic locuntur Romani, omnes Latinī sic locuntur: *Catullus* 'Catullus.' 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. *navis*), 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 'whi, lich' (Paul's *Grundr.* i. p. 86o). The fact that $e$ could become $e$ before $l$, but not before $l$, 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, æcre, vēpres* (also *crura*), beside *vōluptas, mel, lēna.*

§ 101. Interchange of $r$ and $l$. On the confusion of *flāgro* and *frāgro*, and the misspelling of both as *frago*, 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
employment of the suffixes -tis and -ris, that -tis should be used when the stem contained an r, -ris when it contained an l, e.g. angūrāle, mūlāre (ap. Charis. 135. 13; cf. Prisc. i. p. 142 H.). So too the I.-Eur. suffix -flo-, Latin -clo-, became -cro- after a stem with l, e.g. lacvarum, fulcrum, simulacrum. 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. viautre), and peligrino (C.I.L. iii. 4222, &c.), from which come the Romance words, Ital. peligrino, Fr. pélérin, our ‘pilgrim,’ &c.; in the mispronunciations telebra (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. meletrix, Non. 202. 13; 318. 6); in spellings on Greek inscriptions like βαρβαλλεια, βαρβάλλος, beside βαρβάλλεια and βαρβάλλος, Φεβάλλαιος, Μαλκουριανος, &c. (see Eckinger, p. 107); in Romance forms like Ital. albero (from Lat. arbor), reclutare (our ‘recruit’), Mercoledi (from Mercirii dies), urlare (from ubilare), which show that the same process is going on in modern, as in ancient, times on Italian soil. The town Cagriari in Sardinia was in Latin called Carales plur. or Caralis sing.; but we find byforms Caralis and Carariris. From Crustumeria, or Crustuminus, we have the adjective-forms Crustúminus and Chustúminus (Greek Κροστομεια and Κλουστομιεια, Eckinger, p. 107).

§ 102. Parasitic Vowel with l, r. The sounds l, r were called ‘liquidae’ by Latin phoneticians, λ, μ, ρ, ῥ (γραι by Greek), because they united easily with a preceding consonant. Cf. Mar. Vict. vi. 20 eaedem autem ‘liquidae’ dicuntur, quando haec solae [he includes m, n] inter consonantem et vocalem immissae non asperum sonum faciunt, ut ‘clamor’ ‘Tmolus’ ‘Cnosus’ [MSS. consil] ‘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 pō-clum, which is formed with the I.-Eur. suffix -flo-(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 cōlīda to cala, Titius to Titius, porcūlus (from the stem porco- with the suffix -flo-) to porculus, and so resounded 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, *patrem (Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. i. p. 251); and the same is indicated perhaps by Varro’s derivation of Gracchus, 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 Terèbuni for Trèbón -(Eph. Epigr. i. 116), though a good many of these may be dialectal. For this parasitic vowel was a marked feature of the Ocean language, and its kindred dialects, e.g. Ocean aragetud (Lat. argento Abl.), Pelignian Alafis (Lat. Albius). Bede cannot be right in explaining spondaic hexameters, like

illī 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
grammarians. He says (p. 250. 11 K.), after instanceing some spondeic hexameters ending with *argenti, incrementa* (!), *respergebat, interfectae, intercepto,* neque enim in quinta regione versus heroicis spondeum ponere moris erat, sed ita tamen versus hujus modi scandere voluisse reor, ut addita in sono vocali, quam non seribeant, dactylius putius quam spondeus existeret, verbi gratia, *‘intercepto’ ‘incementa’ ‘interfectae’ ‘respergebat’ et per synalipham ‘derivant.’ quod ideo magis r littera quam ceterae consonantiae patitur, quia quae durius naturaliter sonat durior efficitur, cum ab alis consonantisbus excititur; atque ideo sonus ei vocalis apponitur, cujus temperamento ejus levigetur aspersitas; and 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 *pātī, āgī* to be scanned long, though (see ch. iii. § 42) such a syllable is not so short as the first syllable of *pātī, āgī,* &c., for it cannot exercise a shortening influence (by the law of Breves Breviantes) on the following syllable. Plautus scans *pātī, āgī,* but only *pātī, āgī.* In the same way he always scans *vehiculum* (the invariable form), *cubiculum* (though this last word is an exception to the rule in being usually quabisyllabic, cubiculum), and never *vehīdum, cubicīdun.* 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, tārat, fibras, tricīlini*; 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 *tricīlini* (Inc. 145 M.), for example, reminds us of the form used by Varro, *tricīlinium* (R. R. iii. 13. 2. So the MSS.), and the forms found on inscriptions trichilinis (C.I.L. ix. 4971; xiv. 375, 17, &c.), should perhaps be replaced by the quabisyllabic form. In the time of Servius the accent rested on the second syllable of *manīplīus,* so that the word was regarded in ordinary conversation, either as being almost a quabisyllabic, or as having a penult equivalent to a long syllable (Serv. ad *Aen.* xi. 463 maniplis: *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 *tenēbrāe,* &c. (see ch. iii. § 11), is no doubt to be justified 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 *pātī, fibrum* 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 fabbro), just as a consonant was doubled in later Latin before consonantal *u* (v) in *aqua* (Ital. acqua), and before consonantal *i* (y), the development of *i,* in Ital. occhio (Vulg. Lat. oc(u)mus), &c. It is quite possible that the shifting of the accent to the second syllable of words like *tenēbrāe,* may have had the effect of strengthening the sound of the mute. The doubling of the consonant in the
§ 108. AVOIDANCE OF TWO R'S. (See A. L. L. iv. 1 sqq.) The changes of r to l in Vulg. Lat. pétérimum, &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 gnátririo for gnárior (not before Augustine), ferócior, for *ferior, mágis vérus beside verior, mágis mírís múñís (Plaut. Mil. 539) for miriorúbus múñís, décentior for déciórior in Quintilian and Tacitus, sanctior for sácior, all exhibit the same tendency. Pompeius (283. 13 K.) mentions mánor as a mispronunciation of marmor; and the form Mamers, Mamertini beside Marmar of the Carmen Saliare, also Fabaris, the Latin name of the Sabine river Farfars, perhaps show the same dropping of r in the reduplication-syllable. So too the form porriga was preferred to *pröriga. On praestigiae, from praestringo, to dazzle, crêbresco and its compounds (ribésco, is like pitésco, from a stem without r), see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v. On inscriptions, de proprio (Ital. proprio and proprio) for de próprio occurs (Not. Scav. 1890, p. 170), propiedad (C. I. L. xix. 2827 of 19 A. D.), &c. (see Schuchhardt, i. p. 21, for other instances). Vulg. Lat. *trono, to thunder, for tônó

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 γλ, θλ, &c. than the Romans, e.g. Λεγάτος, Βραχητία (Lat. Vigilantia), and the syncopated forms of -ulus (as in péroclus, &c.) are usual in the instances quoted by Eckinger (p. 75), Αρβονάκλα, Μασθος, Παστελός, Πούρακλα, 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 calida, &c.), including with them some whose vowel in the classical spelling is not original but parasitic: speculum, maschus, rodus, viclus (for vitulus), vernadus, articulus, lactus, jugulus, alculus, tabula, stabulum, tribula, capilo, capiulum. He also mentions mascel, figel, which may be South Italian, for the Oscan equivalent of famulus was bindel (Paul. Fest. 62. 1 Th.). The early date of the parasitic vowel with l is seen in the old Latin form piücelom, quoted by Mar. Vict. p. 12 K., and vocolom, 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. 749,

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

(For the parasitic vowel in Greek loanwords with m, n preceded by a consonant, see § 154.) Calicata, from calc, lime (Paul. Fest. 33. 8 Th. calicata aedifícia, calce polita; ib. 41. 21 calicatis, calce politis; ib. 53. 16 decalicitum, calce litum; Gl. Cyrill. kóvio, 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 decalaticis, de calce altatis), is not a case of parasitic vowel between l and a following consonant (like Gk. Καλιπόρνος), (Dittenb. Syl. 249 of 138 B.C.), and (on the edict of Diocletian καλικας. It merely retains the Greek loanword χάλκη in its disyllable form, instead of syncopating it to its usual form in Latin, calc. (For examples of the parasitic vowel in misspellings on inscriptions, see Seelmann, p. 251.)
(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 crastrum and pristris, in MSS. of Virgil (see Ribbeck's Index) and aplastrum (aplastre) for Greek ἀπλαστρόν: crétarias (Caper. 113). 13 K. etarlia tabernae, quae nunc 'cretariae' non recte dicuntur) by false analogy (see Schuchardt, i. 21 for other examples; and cf. Fr. trésor from Lat. thésaurus, beside Ital. tesoro; Span. estrella from Lat. stélla beside Ital. stella and (dialect) strella. In Italian we find the same tendency; e.g. Federico, Certosa (Fr. Chartreuse), arato (Lat. ārātrum), frate (Lat. frätrem), deretano (Vulg. Lat. *deretranus from retro'), &c.; gomitollo, a ball of thread, from Lat. glōnum, 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 rusum et retosum. Cf. Probi App. 198. 29 persica non 'peessica' (a peach). [For other examples, see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s.vv. controversia (and other compounds of -versus, e.g. prova'), Marspiler, Sassinia, Thysagates, assa, &c.]

In the Sententia Minuciorum of 117 B.C. (C. I.L. i. 199) we have controversius, controversias, suso varsum, sursumvarsum, and sursumvarsum, dorsum and dorsum side by side. Since double consonants are usually written single on this inscription (posidebunt, possevlt, &c., beside possiderent) controversius probably represents the pronunciation controversiis. (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. meretrix non 'menetris') may have been influenced by mēnēre or Greek μίνω (cf. Non. 423. 11 M. menetrices a manendo dictae sunt). Nor is cancer a clear case of 'Dissimilation' for *cancer (Greek καπε-iros), seeing that a nasal in the reduplication-syllable is not unknown in other L.-Eur. languages, e.g. Greek γογ-γόλλω, τον-θορίω, O. Ind. cañ-curryate, cf. gin-grire.

In the Gaelic language n when following c, g becomes r, such a word as cnu, a nut, being pronounced cnu (with nasal u). Some see this change in gróma, a land-measuring instrument, which they consider to be the Greek γράμων. 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 eh. iv. § 80).

§ 106. 1-n. Nuscitiosus, 'qui plus videret vesperi quam meridie' (Fest. 180. 21 Th.), and nusciosus, 'qui plus wespre videi' (Lōwe, Prodrorum, p. 17), are byforms of lucitiosus and lusciosus, which may be due to the analogy of nos. Leptis, 'filla fratis' (ib. p. 340) seems to be a byform of neptis. The Diminutive of colus, a spindle, was in Vulg. Lat. *conuc(u)la (Ital. conochia, Fr. que nouille). A more certain example of n for l is the mispronunciation censured in Probi App. 197. 24 K. cultellum non 'cuntellum' (see below) (see also Seelmann, p. 327; Schuchardt, Fok. 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 véknēnum, Bologna from Bōmōnīa, Palestrina from Praenoset, Praenosetio, calonaco and canonico (cf. Ital. gonfalone, a banner, Fr. gondalon, Span. confalon, O. Fr. gonfanon, Prov. gonfanons from O. H. Germ. grand-fano).

§ 107. 1 before consonant. For the n-affection of l before a consonant, see some instances collected by Schuchardt, Fok. ii. p. 493 sqq., e.g. calculus for calculus in MSS. (cf. Georges). In the Edict of Diocletian (301 A.D.) we have
§ 104–111.] PRONUNCIATION. LIQUIDS.

καννουλατορι for calcitlātorī. The letters L and I are so similar that spellings like sāter (le Blant. I. 9. i.) may be nothing but a graver's error. On the other hand the Umbrian form of the Latin Volsiēnus was certainly Volsienus; 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 Volsiēnus and the son's Volsiēno.

In Probi Appendix 197. 24 K. the mispronunciation cuntellum for cultellum is mentioned. This treatment of i 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. r1. Velius Longus 65. 11 K. per vero praeposito omnisbus integra praeponit, nisi cum incidit in litteram, adfinem consonantern, quam elegantioris sermonis viri geminare malunt quam r litteram exprimere, ut cum 'pellabor' malunt diecere quam perlabor. nec aliter apud Lucilium legitur in praeposito per,

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

'pellicere' malunt quam perliceere, unde et apud Virgilium non aliter legimus 'pellaces Ulixi' (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. Worlf. s. v.) The only example of r1 in the Indices of the Corpus is pertegere (vol. i).

§ 109. r before consonants. R is sometimes dropped before a consonant on Greek inscr., e.g. Keor (Lat. Quart.) (C. I. G. add. 43151), Ἀρακελος (Brit. Mus. ii. 341, from Cos); and in Latin plebian inscr., we have misspellings like Fotunata (C. I. L. vi. 2386) for Fortunatae (sometimes Fort-, i.e. Fort- with close a, see § 145). [Cf. the rude Faliscan inscr. Zvetaiyf. Inschr. Ital. Inf. 63 with Maci Acacelini (as Votilia for Votilia) for the usual Marci Acacelini of no 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 'Trasumennom' pro Tarsumennno, multi auctores; i. 5. 12 duo in uno nomine faciebat barbarismos Tinga Placentinus, si reprehendant Hortensio credimus, 'preculam' pro pergula dicens. Examples from Plautus are Phrygio, Aul. 508, corcolarii, Aul. 521. Consentius (392. 23 K.) censures perhum for prehum, reliquum for reliquum, interpretor for interpreter, coacla for cloaca, displicina (a schoolboy's joke surely) for disciplina: Diomedes (452. 30 K.), eriquiae for reliquiae, erigio for religio (and tontpister for tantisper); Julian, in Don, v. p. 324. 18 K. intreppella for interpella; Probi Appendix has (199. 12 K.) glatri [leg. clatri?] non 'craci.' This late Latin craci (cf. Probi App. 195. 23 K.) comes from *crutli as veclus (ib. 197. 20) from *velius for velutus. Clastrum for crastium is found on inscriptions of the Empire (e.g. clastrum et ulsum, Not. Scav. 1877, p. 246 of second cent. A. D., cf. κλαντροπλακοΰ, Athen. xiv. p. 647 c, d). Columnus is the adjective from coruloe. (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. cāpra), which reminds us of the statement of Paul. Fest. that the old Latin word for capra was crepa (33. 36 Th. caprae dietae, quod omne virgultum carpant, sive a crepitu erumur. Unde et 'crepas' eae prisci dixerunt. The Luperci, who wore goatskins and ran about striking people with goatskin thongs, were called crepi, ib. 39. 34 K. crepos, id est lupereos, dicebant a crepitupellicularum, quem faciunt verberantes); so interprete for interpreto (should we read interpretor in Consentius 392. 23 K.?); and preta for petra is used in various parts of Italy; formento is Lat. frumentum, farneticus Lat. phrēnēticos, &c., &c. For l we have padule, a marsh (Lat. pāludem); falliva beside favilla, fiaba, a fable, for Lat. fabula, fabūla. Paduan requilia for reliquia (should we read requiūnum in Consentius 392. 23 K.?) is in Venetian leriquia (cf. leriquia 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, Vok. i. p. 29 on Prancatius for Pancatius, padules for paludes (cf. Ital. padule), and Seelmann, p. 330 on Procobera for Porcobera, &c.; and for examples in Latin byforms, see Georges, Lex. Worfi. s. vv. pristis, crocodilus, Trasumenum, trapezita, and Wolfflin, A. L. L. viii. 279 on acerco and aressco.] The Latin Pūserpina (C.I.L. i. 57 prosēnai dat. case) for Greek peρeσφινη (Pelignian Persēpina gen. case) may be due to the analogy of prēserpo; but Vulg. Lat. *alenare for āνέθαλε (Ital. alenare, Fr. haleiner), *plopus for poplūs, pūpolus, poplar-tree (Ital. pioppo, Roman. plop, Catal. clop) are clear cases of metathesis of l.

§ 112. fy. For mispellings on late inscriptions and in MSS. like fius for filius, see Schuchardt, 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 *lyglium.


§ 114. F. The Latin phoneticians 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:

imūn superis dentibus adprimens labellum
spirāmine leni (Terentianus Maurus, second cent. A. D.).
The spiramen lene was more a feature of the normal /-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. /faba/), humo (Lat. /fūmus/), but fraga (Lat. /frāgum/, *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 highly probable that Latin /f/ was at some time bilabial, as it is to this day in Spanish, where /v/ (b) 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. /arfuis/ 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 /Fundānius/. 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 efflansa est : quae, etiam cum vocalem proximo accipit, quass aquadammodo, utique quotiens aliquam consonantem fragit, ut in hoc ipso ‘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 sonabis, modo quae locata prima est ;

Marius Victorin. 34. 9 K. f litteram imum labium superis imprimites dentibus, reflexa ad palati fastigium linguæ, leni spiramine proferemus; Mart. Cap. iii. 261 F dentes [facieunt] 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 libris est pronuntinda 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 aspirate 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. 28 K.) : et hoc seire debemus quod f littera tum seribitur, 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. stroфа, 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).

§ 116. mf. Mar. Victorinus (18. 14 K.) : item consonantes inter se [invicem sibi succedunt], sed proprie sunt cognatae, quae simili figuratione oris dicuntur, ut est b, f, [s], m, p, quibus Cicero adicit v, non eam quae accipitur pro vocali, sed eam quae consonantis obtinet vicem, et anteposita vocali fit ut aliae quoque consonantes. quotiens igitur praepositionem sequetur vox cujus prima syllaba incipit a supradictis litteris, id est b, f, [s], m, p, v, quae vox conjuncta praepositioni significationem ejus confundat, vos quoque praepositionis litteram mutate, ut est ‘combitis’ ‘comburit’ ‘comfurbit’ ‘comfundit’ ‘commemorat’ ‘communuit’ ‘comparat’ ‘compellit’ ‘comvalescit’ ‘comvoeat’ non ‘conbitis’ ‘conburit’ ‘confurbit’ et similia. sic etiam praeposito juncta vocibus quae inipiunt a supradictis litteris n commutat in m, ut ‘imbibit’ ‘imbuat’ ‘imfert’ ‘imfict’ ‘immemor’ ‘immittis’ ‘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 e vel q sequentibus in n mutat m : ‘anfractus’ ‘anceius’ ‘anquiro’). But the spelling with m before f (and e) was undoubtedly an old usage, of which such MS. spellings as comferro, Poen. 1048, confregossus, Men. 597 in the Plautus Palimpsest, in flamman, Aen. xii. 214, conferti, Aen. iv. 116 in Virgil MSS. may be relics. On the other hand since
§ 116-117. PRONUNCIATION. 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, urbea, &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. si, Fr. si, Span. si for Lat. si; Ital. sudare, Fr. suer, Span. sudare 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. resalir 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. ζύραγος for σμάραγος, Ζυρά for Σμύρα), which explains why Oscaa voiced s, which corresponds to Umbrian and Latin r, is in those inscriptions which are written in Latin characters, expressed by z, e.g. eiazc (Umbr. erak), eiazunc egmazum (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. formösus earlier formonsus, causa earlier caussa, üsus earlier ussus (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. sponsae, 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 causa 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 istatun (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 stehent (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 merx; 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. ascelia is the Late-Latin form of axilla. In Italian we have $ss$ [as in ancient Pelignian, e.g. usnr (Lat. usuress)], and
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, crees for Latin crēx, but s before a consonant, e.g. estron (Lat. extrānēns), 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 levls et unum eiet auribus susurrum.

Mar. Vict. vi. 34. 16 K. dehinc duae supremae, s et x, jure jungentur. nam vicino inter se sonore attracto sibilant rictu, ita tamen, si prioris ictus pone dentes excitatus ad medium lenis agitetur. Mart. Cap. iii. 261 S sibilum facit dentibus verberatīs. . . X quicquid ātque S formavit exsilabit. Cledonius, v. 28. 1 K. s . . . sibilus magis est quam consonans.

§ 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. Falisan 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 mēnis) [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 (Lat. spo(n)sare), 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. 522). 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)sa), chose (Lat. causa) with voiced s, like O.Fr. ruede (Lat. rūdē, Span. ruede), 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 *spōn(s)are*), precisely as any Latin unvoiced mute becomes voiced in this position; e.g. *muere* (Latin *muēre*), *pagare* (Lat. *pācare*). So does any s which by Syncope, &c. has come to stand before a voiced consonant, e.g. *sdegno* (Vulg. Lat. *disigno*), 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* Mercur. 925, *solve sonam* Truc. 954), and, if we are to believe the grammarians, *d*, e.g. *Medentius* for *Mezentius.* [But *Septimium* a mispronunciation of *Septizionium,* a building at Rome (Probi App. 197. 23), seems to be a popular etymology from *doumum.*] (Prisc. i. 49 y et z in graecis tantummodo ponuntur dictionibus, quanvis in multitatis veteres haec quoque mutasse inveniantur, et pro *v u*, pro ζ vero . . . . *s* vel *ss* vel *d* posuisse, ut . . . *Saguntum,* "massa" pro Ζάκκυθος, μᾶζα . . . . *Sethus* pro Ζῆθος 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 ὄζος (Germ. Ast), ἕζω (Lat. *sido* for *sido*), Ἀθήνας (Athanas-ds) 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 *pedyōs*), ζάλπουσος (for δίάλπουσος); and at this period came the transference of the Greek alphabet to Italy, with the result that in the Italian alphabets, Umbrian, Oscan, &c., the *z*-symbol had the sound of *dz* or *ts*. In course of time *dz* came round to the sound of *zd*, so that πεζός and *ζω* have 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. 10. 28; ef. 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. *saplitus*, Petron. 37, for *ζάλπουσος*), 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 *σζ* 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: ‘seiant z litteram per sd scribi ab isi 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 exenture hane
litteram, inveniet duplicem non esse, si modo illam aure sincerei re ex- 
ploraverit . . . et plane liquid supervenerit, me dicente sonum hujus litterae, 
invenies eundem tenorem, a quo coeperit. The interchange of \( dy \) and \( z \) on 
late inscriptions, e.g. baptidita, Rossi i. 805, of 459 a. d., and in spellings like 
\( zabulus \) for \( \tilde{d}i\tilde{a}b\tilde{u}lus \) (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) implies merely that the spirant 
\( y \)-sound which \( dy \) had come to take in Latin (§ 51, cf. \( M\)ädia for \( M\)ai) 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, viii. 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 \( ts \); 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 \( *\)Clau\( z\)us. 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. 26; Z vero idcirco 
Appius Claudius detestatur, quod dentes mortui, dum exprimitur, imitatur), 
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 \( s \) (voiced \( s \) to \( r \), 
exemplified in the new spelling of Papirius as \( \tilde{P}\)äpi\( r\)ius, 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 Fäsius, &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 Vök. 
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. istidium, estudium, sometimes \( hi \)-, \( he \)-, e.g. histrudius 
(often misread in MSS. as hisstudius), rarely \( y \), \( ae \), and is often confused with 
the prepositions \( in \), \( ex \). Thus iscribere, escribere may represent either 
scribere or 
inscribere or escribere. In late Latin where \( ab \) is used before an initial vowel, 
\( ã \) before an initial consonant, we find \( ab \) normally before an initial \( sp \)-, \( sc \)-, 
\( st \)-, 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 splorator for explorator (Cagnat, Ann. 
Epigr. 1889, no. 55), Spania for Hispania (see Schuchardt’s list, Vök. 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. 
ze\( ëf \) ‘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 'doubllets,' 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 *ilocua*, *ireddere*, *imerito* (misread in MSS. as *immerto*), &c. (see the list of examples in Schuchardt, *Vok.* ii. pp. 360 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, *minimicus*, nemico, and so on. Whether the same Procopio is the explanation of the mispronunciation *rabbo* for *arrabó*, 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 lucri,

Ut Praenestinis 'coneа' 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. *scurrus*) from *esca* (Orig. xii. 6, 30 *escarus dictus eo, quod escap solus ruminare perhibetur*), and *iscurra* (i.e. *scurrre*), somewhat comically, from the same word (ib. x. 152 [under *I not E*] iscurra vocatur, quia causa escaque quempiam consuetetur; cf. ib. xx. 4, 9 *discus antea 'iscus' vocabatur a specie scuti*. He warns his readers against the mispronunciations *yspissa*, *yscena*, *ystimulus*, (4, 509, App. 3, 40. *Ar. spissa*, *scena*, *stimulus et cetera similia y carent*). Similar warnings are given in the Glosses ap. Mai, *G. Amel.* against *iscena*, *iscandulum*, *iscapha*, *iscritura* (vi. 580), and directions to write 'per solam s' *seeda* (vii. 578 b), *stimulus*, *spissa*, and *splendor* (vi. 581). (Theophilus non 'izoifus,' Probi App. 198. 1, should perhaps read 'T. non zioflus,' and in 199. 10, *stabilitus* non 'istabilitus,' 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. *seol*, Bret. skol (Lat. *se(h)ola*). 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
Pronunciation. S, X, Z.

Form, e.g. ysgub, a sheaf. That Procop 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 ἀποθήκα, and Ital. morchia, Span. morcha from Vulg. Lat. *murca for ἀμουρκα, both Greek words. (On ste for istē, see ch. vii. § 17.)

A further result of the confusion of a word like scribo with a compound, exscribo, inscribo, was that some words beginning with se-, sq-, 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 pictus (Schuchardt, l.c., mentions a few doubtful examples; but includes cases where the s- was original, e.g. O. Lat. strītus, later strīvus. 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 Prismu for Lat. Prima), cônis (on the very ancient Dvenos inscription cosnis), dānus older dummus (cf. Dusmus). So tra(n)us became tra- before j, d, and optionally before m, p, according to Velius Longus, 66. 9 K., e.g. transstit, but trāgēcit, trāvēcit transmēsit or trāmēsit, transposit or trāaposuit. Spellings on late plebeian inscriptions and in MSS., such as prebeteri for prestbyteri (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. biasmare. Catal. blasmar, Prov. blasmarius) from Vulg. Lat. *blas(i)mare for blasphēmare, 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. volūptātem, 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, Ulizes, sescenti, Equallae, Xerxes, Sestus, &c. Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 351, and i. 133, gives some instances of es- for ex- before e, i, p in late Latin inscriptions and in MSS. (Of Placidus' Glossary, 67. 18 G. exspes, sine spe . . . 'espēs' vero sine x nihil est), and of ss-, s- for -x-, e.g. vissit for vicxit, Alexander for Alexander. Vixsit for vicxit 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 [ves sillo (A. L. L. viii. 589.) On mers for merx (mer(c)x), like pars for par(t)c) in MSS. of Plautus, see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. p. 656. Caper 98. 10 K. allows both calis and calx: calis dicendum, 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, trìes, pîpes, lîcûles. All these are forms censured in the Appendix Probi (197. 28 K.; 198. 29; 199. 4. 5); and on inscriptions we have mîlex, mîlîx, prensacr, &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 obstetrîx was made equtetrîs (Probi App. 198. 34 K., cf. 198. 28 meretrîx non ‘menetris’); and on inscriptions we have conîvs and corvs (Greek kozôyc, C. I. L. x. 719), sbornatrîs, &c. (see Seelmann, p. 353). The felatrîs (iv. 1388 and 2292) on inscriptions of Pompeii reminds us of -s, -ss for x, cs, on Oscean inscriptions of the same town, e. g. meddiss (for *meddíès Nom. Pl.) Zv. I. I. I. 140 (cf. Osc. Santia for Ævîtae).

§ 126. Final s. (See Havet on ‘l’IS 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. 16): quin etiam quod jam subrusticum videtur, olim autem politius, eorum verborum, quorum eaedem erant postremae duae litterae, quae sunt in ‘optimus,’ postremam litteram detræbant, nisi vocalis insequebatur; ita non erat ea offensio in versibus, quam nune fugiunt poetae novi; ita enim loquebamus:

qui est omnibus’ princeps,
non ‘omnibus princeps,’ et
uita illa dignu’ 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 susciperetur, quod reprehendit Luranius, Messala defendit. nam neque Lucilium putat uti eadem ultima, cum dicit ‘Aserninus fuit’ et ‘dignus locoque,’ et Cicero in Oratore plurès 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 bucea 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
(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 vālīs, 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 distinc-
tion 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 milia older millia, causa older cassa, 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, cāsus, glōssa, missi, millia of an earlier time were
reduced to causa, cāsus, glōsa, misi, 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-ssa, and make it no longer than a single consonant causa,
while in millia the similarity of the articulation of ĩ and l was the
reason why the vowel organs passed so quickly over the inter-
vening l-position back to the ĩ-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 consonantum sonus percutiet aures, Mar. Victorinus vi. 9–10 K.; who quotes *sub-batis, acc-cies, ef-fert, ef-fugit, fal-lit, gal-lus, macel-lum, nu-lus, pal-lium* Pal-las, an-num, Cin-nam, ap-paratum, lap-pam, Ar-runtium, bar-rum, cur-rit, fer-rum, as-siduum, Cas-sium, fe-s-sum, At-tius, Vel-tius, and adds: nam ut color oculorum judicio, saper palati, odor narium decidetur, ita sonus aurium arbitrio subjectus est. Similarly Papirian (ap. Cassiodor. vii. 162. 10 K.) says: *sono internoscemus,* quoting ac-cedo, at-tuli, as-sidius, ap-pareo, an-nuo, at-tigo. So Vel. Longus vii. 61–62 K.: ac-cipio, ac-currere, 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 incepit, Consentius, v. 394. 35 K., who quotes *il-le, At-tio.* Similarly Priscian, i. p. 45. 5 of *il-le,* p. 46. 8 of *Sab-burra, sub-bata, gib-bus, gib-berosus, gib-ber, ob-ba,* ... *sub-bibo,* p. 47. 5 of *bacca* (MSS. *baca*), *buc-ca, soc-cus, ec-gus, quic-quam,* p. 47. 9 of *abad-dir, abad-dier, ad-do,* *red-do, red-duco* ('quod etiam reducir dicitur'), p. 48. 5 of *of-ficio, suf-ficio,* *af-fectus,* *ef-ficio,* *dif-ficilis,* *dif-fundo,* p. 49. 29 of *lip-pus, ap-pareil,* p. 50. 25 of *mit-te,* *Cat-ta,* *at-tinet.* Velius Longus' remarks on the pronunciation of *reduco* and *reddo* 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 *causa*ae, *casus,* *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), *iussi* was spelt with a single *s.* Velius Longus (vii. 79. 20 K.) censures the proposal of Nisus (first cent. A. D.) to write *comere,* *consuere,* and his argument 'quia juxta productam vocalem geminata consonantes progresit non soleat,' and declares positively that *geminari consonantess productis vocalibus junctas usus ostendit,' quoting
as examples e\*rass\*, s\*ltuss\*, abiss\*, calass\*. He inclines however to the spelling pa\*l\*um on the ground that pa\*l\*um ‘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 dos\*sum (for do\*r\*sum), with ra\*sum, retr\*\*is\*um; and in another passage (72. 11 K.) he approves of the spelling and pronunciation acc\*i\*\*d\*\*tor. Annaeus Cornelius (ap. Cassiodor. 149. 12-15 K.), speaking apparently of the old spelling ca\*\*s\*sa, says: in qua enuntiatio 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. plur-sus, l\*l\*sus. The spelling ca\*\*s\*sa he makes etymological (due to ca\*\*issa), not phonetic: apparent ‘ca\*\*saum’ geminatum s non recipere, quoniam neque in fine praecedentis alterum potest poni, neque a gemino sequens incipere. The remarks of Velius Longus (72. 19. K. s vero geminata voces sonum exasperat), and of Marius Victorinus (viii. 5 6 K. iidem [sc. antiqui] voces quae pressiore sono eduntur, ‘a\*e\*us,’ ‘ca\*\*s\*a,’ ‘f\*\*\*us,’ ‘odio\*s\*us,’ per duo s scriebant ‘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 *\*mile\*less) we shall see below (§ 133). Elsewhere Terentius Scaurus defends the spelling pa\*l\*um on etymological grounds, comparing pul\*\*ym, pus\*\*il\*\*um (20. 15 K.); and Annaeus Cornelius (first cent. A.D., ap. Cassiodor. 149. 19 K.) speaks of some grammarians who wrote mallo (the older spelling, as we shall see) for m\*l\*lo, because they connected the word with Greek μαλλος. Another reason apparently alleged for this spelling m\*l\*lo, no\*l\*lo, was the analogy of the Infinitive m\*l\*le, no\*l\*le, 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 velit hoc interest quod, &c.) (cf. vel\*l\*\*int, C.I.L. v. 2090; vii. 80; nolle\*\*s, 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 so\*\*l\*\*n\*\*is by referring the word to σιλε\*\*ω. 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 ca\*\*si (though from c\*\*\*si\*, jussi (though the spelling juss\*\*s occurs on old inscriptions (see C.I.L. i'). Index p. 583), and cf. juss\*\*s (along with Ann\*\*\*i\*s\*s), vi. 77), us\*\*s (though from ido; cf. A.I.L. ii. 607), had a long vowel in the Imperial age. (C\*\*si, us\*\*s, according to Priscian, i. p. 466. 6, 7 H.) The use of l 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 n. c. we have promiss\*\*serit, remiss\*\*serit, repromiss\*\*serit, and on other inscriptions ca\*\*s\*sa, acc\*\*s\*\*ass\*\*s, miss\*\*s, pa\*\*l\*\*um, mill\*\*\*ia, mill\*\*\*arium (see the Index to C.I.L. vol. i', pp. 601-2); on the Comm. Lud. Sae\*\*c. both ca\*\*s\*sa and ca\*\*s\*sa, but always qu\*\*e\*\*s\*\*o; on the Mon. Anc. mill\*\*\*ia, claus\*\*\*um and claus\*\*\*sum, ca\*\*s\*sa, ca\*\*s\*sa, occasio.
Paulus is the usual form even on later inscriptions, also Pollio and Polio (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv.; cf. Folla 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 aulta and olla (see Georges); crioso (with ð, cf. crìspus) became crìso (ib.); glossa and glossema became glosa, glossema (Löwe, Prodromus, pp. i sqq.); nassiterna is the old spelling of this old word, like nassum (later násus) (see Georges). Thus abessio (from caedo), and abessio (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 l, s, 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 (adesus, ambessus, exessus, obsessus, perrussus, semessus, i.e. adessus, &c.), video (provissa, &c.; also the verb incissa), audeo (aussa), and other verbs in -do, -deo; haereo (haessit) and haario (haussere, hausseral); mitto (missis, missere); we have -ns- and -ss- for later -ns-, -s- in compressa and compressa, emenssi, &c., lapidossa, undossi, &c.; similarly causa, incusso, &c.; and in foreign words cassia (Gk. κάσσια, a misspelling of κασία), Crinissa (A. v. 38), gessa (A. vii. 662), Passiphae, Rheussu; though some of these last may be a wrong spelling (e.g. gessa should be gaesa, for O. I. gae, O. H. Germ. gaizon- point to gaeso-, with g for L.-Eur. gh-, cf. Sanscr. hēsās). And in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus we have essum, essurire, essulatun, essissus (Most. 826); ussus, ussura, incusses, ussio, usisse, dimissero, causso, ussus (laboriosi, odiossa, negotiosssam, radiossus); also nassum, ussa, and even wesse (perhaps rightly, for *séd-se(d)'), Merc. 249, Stich. 365, and nos, Stich. 536; and in Greek words paussam, Allissinarche, and (perversely) basissilic, Poen. 577 (cf. bassim, C.I.L. i. 1381). For l 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. quissilus), anheltus and anhelius, tellum, tellum, along with some of doubtful origin, collum, a strainer, G. ii. 242 (probably first *caevilum, then caulum or callum, then collum, like Paulus, Paulus, Pollio and Polio), ialy, A. vi. 180, mallum, G. iii. 69 and A. iv. 108, pauludim, millia, opitlo; as well as -ella, -ellus in loquella, querella (the normal spelling), Philomella, fassellus. (On all Dat., atim Adv., see ch. vii.) And in the Plautus Palimpsest, aulla, a jar (later aula and olla), millia, paulum (see Ribbeck's Index, and the Index to Studemund's Apograph of the Codex Ambrosianus). In the Palatine MSS. of Plautus we have also nolla (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 millia, &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.). Millia, milites are the normal spellings on inscriptions, beside mille, villa, from the reign of Tiberius; but in earlier inscriptions (excepting in very early ones where no consonant is written double) we have l. In the Monumentum Ancyranum, that valuable evidence of the orthography of the Augustan age, we have millia, milliens. (On stillicidium from stilla, Diminutive of *stira, stira, 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 ystwyl, Epiphany. So mille, villum, stella, villum
(Dim. of eimiun), tralla, corolla (Dim. of corona), allus (from unus), nullus, &c.
(Priscian i. p. 109. 21 H. attests villum, and allus; and on inscr. we have alla
C.I.L. ii. 1473 ; allii, vi. 10230 ; villum, x. 4787 ; villan, ix. 348, &c.). But
in a group of words, as before remarked, we have li in the older, l in the Imperial
spelling, viz. words where there has been what is called 'compensatory
lengthening,' e.g. qualis for *quas-lus (cf. quasillus), velum for vex-lum (cf.
rexillum). 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 Latini
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 auxilla
(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 li in paulum, mille, &c., of s for ss in causa, fissus, &c., and,
as we shall see, of m for mm in a similar case of 'compensatory lengthening,'
dunus from *dus-mus. Anhelus, if for *anhenslus from stem *an-anulo-, must
have had long e. Thus liquella for *loques-la, querville 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, villo are
attacked by the grammarians of the Empire, along with milla, causa, fissus,
&c., and represent with these the older fashion of spelling and pronunciation.
Diomedes (p. 386. 13 K.) blames those 'qui guminant l litteram et enuntiant'
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' edem elemento guminato?) 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) mure before r, e.g. frattre (C. I. L. viii. 111), suppre
and supprenus in Virgil MSS. (Ribbeck, Ind.); (2) before consonantal n (w),
e.g. tenmis in Virgil MSS., strenmior in MSS. of Lucil. xvi. 19 M. (cf. Probi App.
198. 18 K. aqua non 'acqua'); (3) s before mute, e.g. disscente (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, battuo. 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. mila, Eph. Epigr. iv. no. 557 (Consuetius warns
against mispronunciations like mille, vila, 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, comunis, but also in other cases, such as Diminutives, e.g.
sacellus (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 sfilla (from offa), membilla (from mamma)
(cf. Ital. vanello), but certainly in prepositional compounds. Thus ommitto
from ob and mitto has become omittit (Priscian i. p. 46. r8 H. omitto dicimus pro "ommitto"); in reddāce the preposition was changed, perhaps by the analogy of other compounds, to re, but not in redde, where it is accented (unless the true explanation here is that redde represents *re-dido* 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 voca incipit; nec tamen semper, siquidem "reddere" dicimus geminata d. . . . unde adnotanda imperitia eorum qui sic "redducere" geminata d littera volunt enuntiare, quasi "reddere," tamquam necesse sit totiens eam duplicem esse, quotiens sequens voca ab eadem littera incipitur.) 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 accepit? (see ch. iii. § 34). How far the weakness incident to the first syllable of accepit 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 cōrūptum 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 Lucr. vi. 1135 an ecaelum nobis ultro natura cōrumpum Deferat, a reading confirmed by Isidore, Nat. Rer. 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. amitto. It is not always easy to draw a hard and fast line between these two practices. A scansion like Plautus' quid amittis suggests that the second word was pronounced rather ammittis (cf. ammissam in Virgil MSS., Ribbeck, Ind.) than ammitis; 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 ammittis could then hardly be on precisely the same footing as a vowel long by nature. Adm-, though written amm- was not written ām-. (Amentum, beside ammentum and admentum, is probably non-existent. See Nettleship, Contributions s.v.) Again, Gellius says of the preposition com, compounded with ino, and uceto (ii. 17. 8) coligatos et conexus producte dicitur. (Com before w- is always con- in the best spelling, e.g. cōnubium, but not before gn, e.g. cognatus, unless gn has previously become n, e.g. cōnitor.) The late spelling aportus (see Georges) may be due to the analogy of oportet; but on Greek inscriptions we often have o, instead of the usual a, in compounds with com, the assimilated m being sometimes omitted, e.g. Κωμοδός, sometimes expressed, e.g. χαρακτορ (Eckinger pp. 51-2). It is therefore an open question how far these late spellings, such as corigia in the Edict of Diocletian, indicate a real reduction of the double consonant to a single, corigia, 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 jussit, ille, 395. 13 K. s litteram Graeci exiliter eferunt adeo, ut cum dicunt 'jussit,' per unum s dicere existimes; 394. 25 K. ubi enim [Graeci] dicunt '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 t, but not

---

1 In Martial ii. 6a puer Hyllae has assonance with puerile.
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115 often sound as (see Bieber). Similarly in Latin inscriptions we find Greek

chess, clissa, etc., misspelled in this particular, e.g. C.I.L. 179, &c. So Probus, App. (199 K.)

179, &c. in Latin, Vulg. (198. 12) "tunica" (198. 11) "tunica". "In each case the quality

of which was the same, whether short or long. On a Republican inscription

(C.I.L. 118) we have dossion, and in the Philippians of Plautus tessero.

The Plautian form of the name Aegea is "Hattico." In other words we have

a like confusion, e.g. "Britannia" and (later) "Britannia." See Vulgate, St. Paul, 2 Tim. 5.

19 The etymology, or wrong association, of the word 'Aegea' is generally believed to be

responsible for the later spellings "Attico," "Attico," etc., which see Brancaccio, An Nuovo,

190). An error in the spelling of "Aegea" in Latin is generally given of the form "Aegea," "Attico," etc.,

and the established spelling, "Attico," etc., is generally held to be the result of a mistake, e.g. "Britannia" and (later) "Britannia." So Probus, App. (199 K.)

190). An error in the spelling of "Aegea" in Latin is generally given of the form "Aegea," "Attico," etc.,

and the established spelling, "Attico," etc., is generally held to be the result of a mistake, e.g. "Britannia" and (later) "Britannia." So Probus, App. (199 K.)
we have seen, in prepositional compounds, like admitter, to which we may add
stipendium for stipendiun (stipendiorum, C. I. L. vi. 2496, 2787, 2795; stipendiorum
3069, of 221 A.D. point to i in vulgar pronunciation), *triae (see § 60) for
*trize[k]ae (cf. Ital. treecare, beside Neapolitan tricare). It appears to be
consistently carried out in a group of words, cuppa (cf. Sanscr, kappas) and
*trippa, stéipa and stépfa (Greek στέφην and στέφηπη), micies and micics, papa
(cf. pypae, C. I. L. x. 4315; pēpy, pēpia, vi. 6021) and puppa, gütus and gütus,
mütus (Greek μούθος, see Class. Rec. v. 10) and mütus, *bütis (Greek boeíts) and
*bütis (cf. Ital. botte, bottiglia). The forms with short vowel and double consonant seem to be those of late Latin and Romance (e.g. coppa, Ulp. Dig.
xxxiii. 6, 3 § 1 and xxxiii. 7, 8 M.; Augustine, Conf. ix. 8. 18; Not. Tir. 156:
poppa, Acron, in Hor. S. i. 5. 65; Ital. coppa, Span. copa, &c., while cuppa is re-
flected 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 muter (L-Eur.
*mätet), with long vowel and single consonant has become n modern German
mütter.] Stréna seems in the same way to have become stréna at the end of the
Republican period; for stréna is indicated by Span. estrena, &c., stréna
by Ital. strenna (with open e), Fr. étrenne, though the byform streana (see
Georges) may indicate confusion with strénasus, later stremnasus (see above). In
Italian the same thing is very common, e.g. venni for véni, leggi for légi,
tratto for brtó; and this may be the explanation of the puzzling form tutto
for Latin totus (see Körtig, Lat.-Roman. Wörterb. s.v.; and cf. Consent. 392. r K.
'tottum' pro toto, 'cottidie' pro cotidie), as of Latin Jupiter (the usual spelling,
see Georges) for *Jupiter' (ch. vi. § 32). Sté nas however retains this form in
Vulgar Latin, and similarly braca; while both classical and Vulgar Latin show
báca (see Georges, and cf. Ital. bag-ola, Fr. baie), which, if the ordinary derivation be correct (see Etyma Latina s. v.), should be bacca for *bat-ca. Latin cecus
seems to have been in Vulg. Latin *écus, to judge from Ital. cia, 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, proll.
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 Oscan 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. dekkiarim
(cf. Lat. decem), before an r, e.g. alttret (Lat. alteri), and similarly ss before t,
e.g. kvaisstur (Lat. successor), which remind us of Latin misspellings like aqua,
fratre, dissente; in the Umbrian inscriptions a double consonant is never
found in those written in the native alphabet, and very seldom (sometimes
perversely, e.g. ennem, cf. Lat. eam; avvei, cf. Lat. avis) in those written in
Latin characters.

\footnote{Juppiter, quippe (ch. ix. § 7), ipsippe (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. *béca* (see above) instead of *bucca*, *damna* (but in the proper name, Dàma; see Georges) instead of *dàma*. This implies that a sharp line was drawn in Latin between the single and double consonant\(^1\) (e.g. *mitus* and *mittus*), 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, *Häßlbüchlein s.v.* *laminia* and *lamina* (syncopeated *launa*), *vācillo* and *raccillo*, *mēmitilla* rarely *mammilla*, *buccella* and *bicella*, *disicio* and *disicio* (cf. *porricio*), *cōtidie* and *cottidie* (see *Etyma Latina* s.v.), *mutonio* and *muttonium*, *mutio* and *muttio*, and *glutto* and *gluto*, *margio* and *margiso*, *mantio* and *mantissa*, *favisae* and *fassiae*, *fazar* and *fassar*, *comissor* and *comis*, *Masinissa* and *Massinissa*, *phassolus* and *passeolus*, *Tissaphernes* and *Tissaphernes*, *Porsenna* and *Porsēna* [cf. Pompeius, p. 284 K., who also censures (a supposition?) *Catullina*], *medix* and *medix* (Oscan meddis Nom., *medikeis*, Gen.), *Apuleius* and *Appuleius* (but *Apulia* better than *App*—), *Marcomanni* and (later) *Marcomanni*. (*Pīnus* and *pennus* may be different words. See *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1887, p. 214.) The double consonant is declared by them to be the better spelling of *braccium* (with cch for χ of Gk. *βράχυν*; see § 60), *littera* [cf. Romance, e.g. Fr. lettre, and Welsh llythr. In the *Lex Repet.* (C. I. L. i. 198) of 193–122 B.C., once *litteras*, but the spelling of a single for a double consonant is usual on this inscription, and *ei* is used for *i* in *seine*], *fultīs*, *caccabas*, *cāleus*, *trālleum*, *cuppes*, *cupēdo* (for *cōp-*), *lōlīgo* (Fritsche, *ad Hor.* S. i. 4. 109), *fello* (for *fe-vo*), *hellvor*, *sollers*, *sollemnis*, *solicito*, *pappare* (Plaut. *Epid.* Goetz. pref. p. xxx), *cippus*, *lippus*, *cēperro* (see *Nettleship in Class. Rev.* 1892, p. 168). *Messa* (cf. *Hispalīs* with *ll* on C. I. L. i. 39), *Sallustius*, *baritus*, *Arruns*, *Arrētium* (now *Arenzo*), *āllicē, Alecto, Alliae*, *Sardiniapallus*, *baldaena* (Gk. *φαλλός*—rather than *φαλ-*), *ballista*, *Sallettini*, *cinimas*, *petōritum*, *Trādismanus*, *Appeninus* (and *Ap*-), *nummus*, *immo*, *bisechum*; the single of *ballatio*, *lītus* (so Vulg. Lat., e.g. *Ital. lito* and *lido*), *bucina*, *aticnor*, *besalis*, *belua*, *sārio*, *muriola* (cf. Paul. *Fest.* 125. 13 Th. *murrina*, *genus potionis*, quae *Graecia dictur nectar*. *Hane mulieres vocabant muriolam*, *Ermias*, *Apulia, Sufes, lápete, Larisa, sarīsa, Gnosus, Parasus, talasio, pedisequus, ilico*; the double consonant appears to be the older spelling, the single the later in *manteillum* (Plaut.) and *mānteō, stillo* and *stitio*, *pīlēus* (so, for example, in MSS. of *Martial*; see Friedländer’s edition, i. p. 117), and *pīleus* (*pīl-*, in Romance, K. Z. xxxiii. 308), *marmupium* and *marsupium*, *Marpessos* and *Marpēsios*, and possibly the legal *parret* and *pāret* (*Fest.* 292. 25 Th., *parret*, quod est in formulī, debuit et *producta priore syllaba pronuntiari et non gemino r scribi, ut fieret *paret*; quod est inventur, ut *comparet, apparet*). The spelling *pāricida* for *parricida* belongs to a period before the doubling of

---

\(^1\) Plautus, however, puns on *mittis* and *mitis* in Mil. 1424, when the soldier is getting a thrashing:
consonants was practised. Of Greek loanwords we have O. Lat. eroderra (Gk. κρυπτή), perhaps gramosus (from Gk. γλώμη) in Caecil. Comm. 268 R. (but gramae Plaut. Curc. 318, Büch. Rh. Mus. xxxv. 72), grobattus (Gk. κράβατος), &c. A. L. L. viii. 367. \( ^1 \) (See also Ellis Catullus p. 336 on Varus and Varro.)

§ 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 Ἕλλην, Ἕλλην). Double consonants have replaced Latin single consonants before \( y \), e. g. occhio (Lat. oc(u)lmus, vendemmia (Lat. vindōnia); before the \( w \)-sound of Latin āqua (Ital. acqua); before \( r \), e. g. fabbro (Lat. faber). (Compare the doubling of a consonant in these positions in Oscan orthography, and similar misspellings in late Latin inscriptions.) Doubling is very common under the accent of a paroxytone word, e. g. femmina (Lat. fēmina), legittimo (Lat. legittimus), and on the first syllable, when it has a secondary accent, e. g. pellegrino, tollerare (cf. late Latin suppelicōlus, see Georges). Forms like alledola (Lat. alauda), commedia (Lat. cōmedea) seem to be due to the analogy of words compounded with prepositions, like Latin allūdo, commōdus (cf. Osc. Appullunelis 'Apollinis?).

§ 132. Double consonant (not \( l \), \( s \)) after long vowel. We know that the \( e \) of fres̄sus, for fres̄sus, later fres̄sus, was long; but we cannot tell whether the true explanation of the change from dum̄med̄um to dú̄med̄um (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 (\( ùm \)) for consonant length (\( ùmm \)), like ùmissam for ammonissam (in MSS. of Virgil. A. ii. 741), as the \(-amm\)-of flam̄men, a blast, in Virg. MSS. (see Ribbeck) seems to represent the usual -\( ùm\)-of fla-men. A spelling like ráp̄es for ráp̄es in Virgil. MSS. (see Ribbeck) suggests rather the alternation of cupid̄a with cupid̄a, pû̄pa with pû̄pa (see above); and the quantity of the vowel before the double consonant of lамӣmina (see Georges), vacīmmia (see Ribbeck, Index) is quite uncertain. Clear cases of a long vowel before \( n \) are mercenarius (the correct spelling, according to Brambach, Hübfschöhl, s. v., later mercenarius), tinn̄ire (for tīn̄ire, Sard. tinn̄ire), and perhaps hinn̄uleus (also inm̄uleus, inm̄uleus, see Georges) (cf. Agroecius 115. 14 K. hinn̄uleus, ut i acutum sit, quia nomen a sono vocis accepit), and Vinn̄us (also Vin̄ius; see C. I. L. vi. 28978 sqq. Long \( i \) is indicated for Vinn̄ia, 28986) ; but before other double consonants they are difficult to establish. nārem on the carefully written inscription of the Emperor Claudius (48 a. d.) at Lyons (Allmer et Dissard vol. i. p. 70\( ^{a} \); Boissieu p. 136) may be due to the analogy of gn̄r̄us, nār̄us, which made the spelling naro (proposed by Varro, if we are to believe Papirian

---

\( ^1 \) Sometimes the interchange of single and double consonant is I-Eur. In pet-names we often find a double consonant: e. g. Gk. ἀκώ beside O. Ind. akā; Lat. mamm̄as atque tūt̄as (ch. v. § 81) beside Gk. ἀττά, O. Ind. attā; Lat. Acca Larentia, Gk. Ἀκκῶ (a name of Demeter), O. Ind. akā; Gk. Ἠσω, &c. The double consonant of Εγγίως, Seppius, &c. has been so explained, though others refer it to a dialectal doubling before \( y \) like Osc. Vitelliiū.
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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. varus 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 **t** to **t** after a diphthong is the late form author (censured, with autoritas, in Probi Appendix 198. 30 K., and found on late inscriptions, e.g. C. I. L. viii. 1423; cf. xii. 2038, of 491 a.d.), where the **t** represents **t** for original ct (see § 95). Ital. freddo, Fr. froid point to *friddus, from frigidus, a vulgar form of frigida* (Probi App. 198. 3 frigida non 'frigida'); O. Span. frido to *friddus or *friddus.

§ 133. Final double consonant. A final double consonant was not allowed in Latin orthography, but was written single, e.g. miles for *miless, from *mille-s. 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 'milex'; 198. 29 aries non 'ariex'; 199. 4-5 poples non 'poplex,' locuples non 'loenplex'), forms which are found on inscriptions (e.g. miler, C. 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 (Aud. 528), while in Ennius, Lucilius, &c., its last syllable is short (Ann. 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. xlv. p. 236) from *ters, *tris (Greek τρύς), as a long syllable (Bacch. 1127), as he scans es (2 SG. Pres. Ind. of mens), probes, &c. like *ess, *prodess (contrast cór, Lucil. xv. 9 M.; probés, id. inc. 128). A relief of this usage remains in the scansion of hoc for *hoce from *hod-(c) 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 paren' says: ergo scribendum per duo c, 'hoc-crat alma paren,' aut constiendum quaedam alter scribi, alter enuntiari; Pompeius (119. 13): item c littera aliquando pro duabus consonantibus est... ut... 'hoc erat alma paren': 'hoc,' collide e, ut sit pro duabus consonantibus. in illo alio exemplo brevis est, 'solus hic inflexit sensus': 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 *hoce (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, proless, &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, reliquit, &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 ἡλιθε. 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 τὴν πόλιν, ἔγδικης, &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 *tepus), tal lihati (Lat. is-tud lingit), tan nahiati (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. hab せる but はう はべる, 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 dicēr for dicas, feciāe for factam (see § 61). The tendency of final -m, -n to adapt themselves to a following consonant-initial, is seen in spellings on inscriptions, like in belānum, C.I.L. iv. 2410, imbello, iii. 4835. in 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 praedo, im alta in the Plautus Palimpsest (see Ind. to Studemund’s Apograph.). Caper (106. 17 K.) says: in Siciliam dicendum, non ‘is Siciliam,’ kara ʔə n, non kara ʔə s, quia nunquam sine n pronuntiatur (leg. insia . . non ‘is’?). We have etiamnunc in the Herculanean papyri (Class. Rev. iv. 443), and etiamnunc, jandandum, &c. in MSS. of Virgil (see Ribbeck), spellings which agree with the statement of Velius Longus (17. 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 ʕ- (Or. xlv. 154; Fam. ix. 22; cf. Quint. viii. 3. 45; 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., audiendoς, audiendoς, audiendoς, audiendoς, &c., a spelling recommended by Mar. Victorinus (22. 14 K.), and found in MSS., e.g. in Virgil MSS. acerbist, locustas, ventumst, amantemst, cupidost, suprost, &c. (see Ribbeck’s Index, p. 419), in the Plautus Palimpsest copiast, aegrost, homost, olimost, palamost, melios, &c., and similarly with es, iratas, dignas, ituras (generally printed by editors irata’s, &c.; once (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 ludit, ‘si(c) custodit’
for *sic custodit*: item litteram e quidam in quibusdam dictionibus non latine ecferunt, sed ita erasure, ut non discernas, quid dicant: ut puta situs dicat *sic ludit*, ita hoc locuitur, ut putes eum in secunda parte orationis cludere dixisse, non ludere; et item si contra dicat illud, contrarium putabis. alii contra ita subtiliter hoc ecferunt, ut eum duo e habeant, quasi uno e utrumque explicant, ut dicent multi *sic custodit*. [ Cf. his remarks (394. 7 K.) on the pronunciation *dixeram millis* for *dixeram illis.*]

§ 136. Latin *Doublets.* By pretonic Syncope (see ch. iii. § 13) ac (for *ate*), nec, nee, seu, replaced atque, neque, nere, sive before a word beginning with a consonant. In Dramatic poetry the final *e* is always suppressed, in similar circumstances, of *nempe*, and often of *unde, inde, quique, ille*, and perhaps *iste*. Similarly proin, dein seem to have developed from *proinde, deinde*, when a consonantal initial followed. Final -*a*, after it had been dropped after a long vowel in the pronunciation of most words, remained in monosyllables like *hauad, med, ted; hauad* being the form used before a vowel, *hau* before a consonant (Caper. 96. 4 K. *hau dolo* [leg. haud uolo?] per d recte scribitur, etenim d inter duas vocales esse debet. *quod si consonans sequitur, d addi non debet, ut *haugeo*; *Mar. Vict. 15. 21 K.* So in Plautus, Ritschel Opusc. ii. 591 n. and v. 352); the same probably being true of *med, ted*. (On qui(e), quandoc and quandoque, see ch. x. § 15, ch. ix. § 10.) Preposition *doublets* *a, ab, abs; e, ex, etc.*, 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*, see Georges, Lex. Wortf., 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*, ess, &c. (see ch. viii. § 2); but almost the only trace (a doubtful one) of spelling with -*ss* is *nosc in* the Ambrosian Palimpsest in *Stich. 536*; though Velius Longus (54. 6 K.), commenting on Virgil’s *hoc erat, alma parens,* half proposes to write *hocrat*: ergo scribendum per duo e, *hocrat alma parens*” aut confitendum quadem aliter scribi, aliter enuntiari (cf. Pompeius 119. 13 K.; Prisc. ii. p. 6. 1 H. So *hoccine for hocce-ne, hoccad-ne*, Prisc. i. p. 592. 22 H.). *Mol for *mell, *mell*, cor (for *carr, *cerd*, ter (for terr, cf. terr-uncius, *ter, *fers, *fers* are short in Ovid, &c., though long (neither *mol nor mol* 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 *miles, praegmax* (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, sententia, extrad, facultem, &c.), though it is not found in the decree of Aemilius Paulus Macedonicus of 189 n. c. (ib. ii. 5041, in turri Lascentana, ea 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 *hauad* 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 *nec*); before consonants it would probably be first assimilated, e.g. *hauad ilga, pronounced hauadligo, like alligo, hauad scio, pronounced hausscio* like a(s)*scisco*, 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 Seelmann’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. Masc. and Nom. Acc. Sg. Neut. On the older Scipio epitaphs it is usually dropped, e.g. oto (Acc. Sg.), duo(n)ora (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 militia militiae octo, as he begins another with Scipio invictus. (Cf. circum(m)ire, septu(m)ennis, septu(m)-aginta, but septu(mus), &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 (394. 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. 1. p. 602). That both io and -i represent the same sound -i(s) (ch. vi. § 2) is quite possible. (Cf. Cornelio on one Scipio epitaphi, C. I. L. i. 31, c. 250 B.C., Corneli 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 Pisaurum, e.g. matron(a)’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 vas’ argentēs; and some have thought that it is occasionally elided before an initial vowel in Plautus, e.g. com(i)s incommodus, Baeh. 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) existimus of Plaut. Pers. 353 may easily be a mistake for plure, which Charisius tell us was used in O. Lat., and so on. Whether aequānimitas implies a pronunciation aequ(us) animus is doubtful; it seems rather to come from the Compound (ch. v. § 80) aequ-animus (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. succinct, curtus), but to have lost the final consonant of -um (Zeitschr. Roman. Philologie, xvii. 559).

Final -t is often written -d on late inscriptions, e.g. reliquid, 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. ratia, ama (see Index to C. I. L. iv.).
Final -nt loses the dental, and is written -n, or -m, on late inscriptions, e.g. fecerun (see the Indices to the Corpus), though, no doubt, the -t was heard before an initial vowel, like the -t of Fr. vient en 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. quem), &c.; -l in a monosyllable like mel, Fr. miel, Span. miel, Ital. miele; -r in the monosyllable cor, Fr. cure, 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. demuncia, 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. nois, 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. cantus, legit, 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. dic), 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 bennidu (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 bēnē), ovvero for o vero (Lat. aut vērō), dimmi for di mi (Lat. dic mihi), checcosa for chè cosa (Lat. quid causa), where the double consonant is due to the final having assimilated itself to the following initial, as Latin à arose from a collocation like ab-bōnis, *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, -t of words closely joined to a following word beginning with a consonant suffers the same change as t 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-cni-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-luir, 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 pōte-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-NI-VS-HE-DY-PIVS, 11682 VI-XIT-AN-NIS, as well as by contractions, where the initial letters of the syllables are used, like MG (*magnus*), OMB (*omnibus*), PP (*propter*); though on inscriptions we often find *s* taken with the preceding syllable in words like CAE-LES-TI (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 *abs-tēmius*, *oblīvisco*; but such remarks only show that the natural pronunciation of these words was *ab-stēmius*, *oblīvisco*, 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: quotienscumque quaerimus, quae consonantes in scribendo sibi cohaerent vel cui syllabae impetuntur, utrum prior an sequenti, similitudo aliorum nominum hunc solvit errorem. ut puta ‘aspice’ ... intelligimus ... *s* et *p* ... consonantes sequenti tantummodo dare nos debere, eo quod invenitur sermo qui a dubaus ists consonantibus inchoetur, ut ‘spicea.’ similiter ‘amnis’... dehemus *m* et *n* sequenti syllabae dare in scribendo, quoniam invenitur sermo qui ab his consonantibus inchoetur, ut
"Mnestheus," 'attulit': non possessum duo t sequenti syllabae dare, quia nulius sermo inventur, qui a duabus t consonantibus inchoetur, et hoc in ceteris consonantibus observabimus. plane seire debemus, conexionis quod dico consonantium non eas quae latinis syllabis congruunt, sed etiam quae graecis, excepta selicit ea syllaba quae constat de b et d, quae in latinum sermonem nunquam ita transit, ut cohaeret, ut est ββδλλαα, quando enim scribimus 'abditur,' non possimus a in una syllaba ponere et b et d in sequenti. He thus testifies to a-spite, a-mnis, at-latit, ab-ditur. Similarly Caesellius (ap. Cassiod. vii. 205. 1 K.) to pote-stas, no-ster, ca-pto, plo-strum, lu-strant, capi-strum, cla-strum, va-strum, campe-stre, a-stla (for astula), pes-tum (for pestulum), car-po, dor-sum, Por-cius, Pa-ris, tu-tus, so-vo, nor-va, vol-ro, lar-ca, pul-vis, te-mu-is, but disyllabic ten-vis, be-la-a and be-l-a, ma-lu-a and ma-l-a ; Terentianus Maurus (vi. 351, v. 879 K.) to o-mnis, a-mnis, and (v. 904 K.) ma-gna, di-gna, a-gna, si-gna, pu-gna (v. 911 K.), fa-xo, a-xis, ne-xus, u-xor, no-xia ; Marius Victorinus (vi. 29. 20 K.) to o-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-ja-stas; Dositheus (vii. 385. 5 K.) to a-gmna, ma-gna ; Priscian (i. p. 42 H.) to a-bdomen, My-gnomides, Ab-o-dlas, A-dlas, Ae-tna, i-pse, nu-psi, scri-psi, scri-plurn, dra-chna, a-gwen, vi-criz, se-x-strum, thus admitting, unlike Servius, be into the list of pronounceable combinations, and (p. 50 H.) pe-seua, tu-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-spec, abs-temius (quia ex abstinentia temeti composita vox est) ; by Caesellius (ap. Cassiodor. vii. 206. 1 K.), ob-livisor, and (205. 18 K.), di-spicio, abs-latit, trans-latit, abs-condit ; by Alcuin (vii. 306. 4 K.), ob-stipo, ob-snu, ob-strea, obs-oevit (cf. Cassiodor. vii. 206. 19 K.). Priscian similarly says (i. p. 45 H.) si antecedens syllaba terminat in consonantem, necesse est etiam sequentem a consonante incepere, 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 Planite 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 gubernatunt, cavilatior, voluntatis, where the consonant group is divided between two syllables neither more nor less readily than in words like egisti, venisti, 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. bellus is Ital. bello with open E, Lat. stella 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 amat, ënet, ëbil, ëlor (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 Saturian, 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 havis, 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 Fidenae, 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 Fidenam. Scansions like Italía (an imitation of a Greek prosodical usage) are mere metrical licences, and prove nothing about actual pronunciation (‘Italiam’ . . . extra carmen non deprendas. 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—

\[ \dddot{x}, \dddot{x}, \dddot{x} \parallel \dddot{x}, \ddot{x} \]

dabunt malum Metelli Nauscio poëtae,

B-type (less usual)—

\[ x, x, x, x, x \]

prim(a) incidit Céreris Prosèrpinæ pœber,

a variety of the second hemistich of the A-type being \[ x, x, x, x \] adloéctus sümni, and of the B-type \[ x, x, x, x \] fasuisse urum. (See Amer. Journ. Phil. vol. xiv.)

2 The passages quoted from the grammarians by Seelmann, p. 75, are not conclusive; e.g. Ter. Scaurus' distinction of facilius 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 quantitative verse of the Augustan poets. Grammarians often censure mispronunciations due to the overmastering of quantity by accent, e.g. Cères (Mar. Sacerd. 451. 13 K.), *πίς* (Consent. 392. 18 K.), *πίπερ* and *ὀρατορ* (ib. 392. 3, 11 quod vitium Afrorum speciale est); they frequently caution against the confusion of *equivus* (with accented short open *e*) and *aequus* (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. *idōrum* 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’ (position, 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 dicis ‘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. adhuc non est nec longa nec brevis; plus tamen habet a brevi, minus quidem habet a longa. add de ad ‘et’ s, etiam fit longa. quare? e brevis unum tempus habet, t dimidium tempus habet, s dimidium tempus habet: ece duo tempora sunt, free-runt 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 *calesço* (with *ē*) and *modestus* (with *ē*), 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 *quīs incēdit?* but not *quīs instītīt? quīs infīrītū?* (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 *ā*) 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 et liquida 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 i) 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 pōplus; and makes the suffix tlo- (ch. v. § 25) one syllable, with preceding vowel scanned short, in vēhīclum, though (normally) two syllables in cūbīcūlum. 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. ālucris (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. \( \text{fabro-} \)), febbre (Lat. \( \text{fëbris} \)), and Ital. oechio from Lat. \( \text{oëculus} \) (Vulg. Lat. oculus, *occlus?)), suggests a similar account of the Imperial Latin pronunciation of \( \text{manipulus} \). 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 'staeccato' pronunciation; that is to say, *fabro- was pronounced with linking of the two syllables fa- and bro-, 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 \( \text{factum}, \text{omnis} \) (but cf. § 139), he makes the scientific explanation of the scansion of the first syllable as long (similarly with \( \text{fac tumulum}, \&c. \)) and by the tendency to attach an \( s \) in a group like \( \text{st}, \text{sc}, \text{sp} \) to the preceding syllable (seen in misspellings like disscente, § 139), he explains the scansion \( \text{esto}, \text{nescio}, \&c. \), with first syllable long. On the other hand, when a word ended in a vowel and the next began with \( \text{st}, \text{sc}, \text{sp} \), the 'legato' pronunciation did not equally assert itself, so that Lucretius allows a scansion like \( \text{liberà sponte} \) (v. 79) and the like, though Virgil does not \(^1\). The Italian pronunciation of festa, pescare, aspro, \&c., lengthens the \( s \), similarly the \( l \) in alto, the \( r \) in morte, the \( n \) 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 \( \text{pium} \) the \( i \) was originally long (cf. Osc. Puhlóí ‘Pio’ Dat. Sg.), and the scansion \( \text{pia} \) (MSS. \( \text{du} \), \( \text{dia} \)) has been ascribed to Ennius in his Epic (ap. Cic. Rep. i. 41. 64):

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

\(^1\) In \( \text{A. xi. 308—} \)

\[
\text{spem siquam adsceitis Aetolum}
\]
\[
\text{habuistis in armis}
\]

\[
\text{ponite. spes sibi quisque, \&c.,}
\]

\[
\text{a pause in the sentence intervenes}
\]

\[
\text{between the two words.}
\]
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though Plautus in his homelier dramatic poetry recognizes only *prae*. The shortening of the *i* 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 *prae* and *heudo* assuming the form *prē-heudo* (and even *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 *Chius* (Adj.) (Poen. 699; *Cure. 78*); whereas *uīnus* was not in vogue at Quintilian’s time (extra carmen non deprendas, sed nec in carmine vitia ducenda sunt, Quint. i. 5. 18), and Servius (ad Virg. *A. i. 451*) says that *audīt*, and not *audīt*, *lenīt* and not *lenīt*, was the ordinary pronunciation, the forms with the short penult being a usage of poetry. Here the retention of long *i* in Servius’ pronunciation may be ascribed to the presence of the forms with *r*, *audīvit*, *lenīvit*, and similarly we find in Ter. *Phorm. 573 audīveras*. The *fū* of Ennius, e.g. *Ann. 431 M.*:

> 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 *fīeri. fīverem*. (On Ennius’ *adnūīt* Perf. &c. see ch. viii. § 50; we have *ffveīt*, *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. *tū amas*, *Enn. Scipio inuicte* (cf. *Ennī imaginis*), Virg. *quī amant*, &c, was a native Latin usage and not an imitation of Greek versification ¹. 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 *ā*, e.g. *terrā*, and the later shortening of final -ō, e.g. *ponō* in Imperial Latin (ch. iii. § 45).

¹ It seems to be the rule in Saturnian metre (*Amer. Journ. Phil. xiv. 310*).
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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 \( \text{PRI\textsc{vs}q\textsc{v}am} \) (C. I. L. vi. 10239); and in the Romance languages the \( i \) of \( \text{dies} \) is represented by the usual representative of Latin \( i \), e.g. Ital. \( \text{di} \), Prov. \( \text{dia} \), Fr. \( \text{di} \), Span. \( \text{dia} \). 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 \( \ddot{i} \), in other words, had the close and not the open sound (§ 14). This is certainly the explanation of Romance \( *\text{pio} \), with close \( i \) (Ital. \( \text{pio} \), &c.), and of the \( \text{Pi\textsc{v}s} \) of inscriptions, e.g. C. I. L. vi. 1058, for we have seen reason to believe that a long \( \ddot{i} \) shortened in Latin retained the quality of long \( i \), \( \text{aud\textsc{t}} \), &c., of the classical and later period being pronounced with the close, not the open \( i \)-sound (§ 14). But the \( i \) of \( \text{dies} \) 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 \( \text{dies} \), \( \text{pins} \) on inscriptions are given in Christiansen, \textit{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 \( \text{in\textsc{c}el\textsc{u}ct\textsc{a}bil\textsc{e}} \) 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 \( \text{ct} \), but we cannot tell from a line like—

\[
\text{venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus,}
\]

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, \textit{Hülfsbüchlein}\(^2\), 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 i, 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 ō on the analogy of calēscō, nitēscō, stūpēscō and other Inceptives, as well as of the noun quiēs (cf. quiēscō C. I. L. vi. 25531), though he adds that a friend of his, an educated man, invariably pronounced the word with short e, quiēsco. In another passage (ix. 6) he recommends the pronunciation āctīto, against a common pronunciation of his time, āctīto, which was defended by the analogy of the short vowel of the simple verb āgo. 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).
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E.g. *illéxi*, and for no others, e.g. *dōxi*, nor yet when he makes the *a* of *mansi* 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 *ā, ē, ō, ē*, 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 *ı*-sound of Latin *u*, as opposed to the *aj*-sound of Greek *v*. Greek *ε* and *η*, 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 *hæsternus*, unlike *hēri*, had a long vowel, if we had not been informed of the fact by a Latin grammarian (Mar. Victorin. vi. 15. 15 K. *'hesternum' producte 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 *vōnuptem*, 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, of another 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 *illéx*, 'alluring,' and *illēx*, 'lawless.' We pronounce both *illéx*!
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 beginning 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 mutis, quibus in verbis eae primae litterae sunt, quae in ‘sapiente’ atque ‘felice,’ producte dicitur, in ceteris omnibus breviter. itemque ‘cōmosuit’ ‘cōnsuet’ ‘cōncrepuit’ ‘cōnfecit’: 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. kīyañt, &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, insōnīlis as opposed to fōns, fōnīlis (iv. 6. 12 and 28. 26 K.: cf. Prisc. vii. 39). Inscriptions, too, show the apex in words like clėmēns (C. I. L. ii. 4550), prōcédēns (vi. 1527 ñ 28), and a host of other examples with us (see a list of them in Christiansen, De apīcibus, &c. p. 41); while Greek inscriptions have -ṇs, e.g. ἰπρονής (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 tēndo, 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 The spellings t(h)ensaurus for ἔνθαι, Scapensula for Σκαπήνθαν or Σκαπτηγόραν, Chersonenses for Χερούνθανος (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 censured in Probi App. 198. 21 K., occansio for occasio (see § 66). Long open E was written as (§ 41).
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(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 novi-ens, and by the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. teso (Lat. tē(n)sus), and Celtic and Teutonic loanwords, e.g. Welsh dwys (Lat. dē(n)sus), O.H.G. isila (Lat. 禋(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. Vict. 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, cóncedo, 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. 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 có(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 1 of Inferi (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 inv-, inf- being shortened by the influence
of a preceding short syllable (see § 142). In Umbro-Oscan we
see lengthening of a vowel before ns, nf in Osc. keenzstur,
'censor,' (with long open E, § 6), Umbr. aanfehtaf, 'infectas.'

The remark of Priscian (ii. 63), that the terminations -gnum,
-gna, -gnum are always preceded by a long vowel, has been
extended by Marx and others into a rule that the combination
-gn- always lengthened a preceding vowel. Of Priscian's
examples (régnum, slāgnunm, benignus, malígnum, abígnum, prívelgnum,
Paélígnum), abígnum, régnum, slāgnunm had probably
originally a long vowel (cf. abíes, rëgem, stârê); prívelgnum
gets a certain amount of confirmation from the spelling prívelgno
on a soldier's epitaph (C. I. L. vi. 3541); but benignus, malígnum 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, 'dis-
dain'; possibly 'bookwords,' A. L. L. viii. 324), point to Vulg.
Lat. dígnun; but the word has the tall I in C. I. L. vi. 6314
dígne, and elsewhere. They point also to sículum (cf. sículum),
(Ital. segno, Span. seña, &c.); but on inscriptions we have
sículum (C. I. L. vi. 10234, a carefully written inscription of
153 A.D., and elsewhere), sIgnificabo (vi. 16664). The gram-
marian Diomedes (fourth cent.), speaking of the rhythmic
arrangement of some of Cicero's clauses (i. 470. 9 K.), seems
to speak of díguitas 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 díguitas. Welsh swyn, a charm,
Old Irish sén, blessing, sénaim, to bless, to sain, Old High Ger-
man ségan, 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 segnum, with close e, a develop-
ment of an earlier signum, not signum (cf. § 14). The Romance
forms indicate, too, a short vowel in lignum, pígnum, pugnus, and
show us that if the lengthening of a vowel before gn 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, ē became i (ch. iv § 8)]. The spelling *ligmen(tum) on an African inscription (C. I. L. vii. 1344) is not evidence enough for a lengthening of the vowel before gu; nor is the exact relation clear between sublegmen and sublēmen, 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, āctum, lēctor (from a third-conjugation 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, addēctō, xiv. 376 (second cent. A.D.), &c., āctis (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 (t from č)), recte1 (xii. 2494, beginning of first cent. A.D.), lēctor (vi. 5205), and the like (see Christiansen, p. 47, and cf. ληκτος, προτηκτο[pos] 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, rēxī, tēxi (Prisc. ix. 28, who adds illēxi 2), rēxīt (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(ino) (vi. 2080, the Acts of the Arval Brotherhood, c. 120 A.D.) is not sufficient

---

1 So that there was complete assonance between rex and rectē in the children's verse:
rex eris, si récte facies; si non facies, nón eris,
alluded to by Hor. (Epp. i. 1. 59) rex
eris aiunt Si recte facies.

2 Plautus puns on illectus, 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 -ngeo. Gellius
(ix. 6) attests ūncus beside ūngo; and on inscriptions we have
sejunctum (C. I. L. vi. 1527 e 38, b. c. 8–2), &c., defunctus (v. 1326),
&c., conjunctivit (xii. 4333, time of Antonines), extinctos (vi. 25617,
A.D. 10), cinclus (x. 4104) (see Christiansen, pp. 44 sqq.). Here
the spelling sāncus (cf. Ose. saahátum, Umbr. sahata), frequent
on inscriptions, seems to show that the lengthening occurs
before original nc (sacer 1), as well as before ne from original ng;
but the few instances of non-verbal forms, viz. conjuncta (vi. 6592,
6593), the numeral quīncus, frequent on inscriptions (Christian-
sen, p. 46) (cf. quīnque, quīnī), are again insufficient evidence to
separate the lengthening from the ordinary lengthening of the
Latin Perfect. The absence of the nasal in nactus (beside
nactus, fuctus (but fīntus Ter. Enn. 104), plebeian defunctus
(ii. 4173), and sactissimae (vi. 15511; v. 6580) (cf. Welsh saith
beside sant, § 70), is explained in ch. viii. § 10. In quīncus it is the
guttural that disappears. All the Romance forms point to quīntus
(cf. Greek Kouvētòs and Kouvtoς, though the earliest forms are
Kolvētòs and Kolvtoς: see Eckinger, pp. 122 sqq.), but declare
for the short vowel in pūntus, ūnctus, činclus, čīntus, čīnxi, fińxi.

In the absence of express testimony, such as we have for us,
nf, 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 ū, e.g. unguis for *onguis (ch. iv. § 20).

145. r with consonant. Spellings on inscriptions like Fōrtun(a), Fōuntuata
(C. I. L. vi. 7527) (cf. Fortunato vi. 2236) suggest that the o, which was certainly
originally short (Lat. ör for L-Eur. ē, 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- (sācrēs, Plautus), point-
the fact that beside sācro-, we have ing to a root sā- beside sāc-.
language; for the Romance languages testify abundantly to short vowels in words like *porcus, cornu, certus, &c.* Marius Sacerdos (vi. 451. 5 K.) quotes *pěrmix* as a barbarism; and Pompeius (v. 126. 5) censure the mispronunciation *örma.* So that the initial o* of *örmo, if long, as attested by inscriptions, [e.g. *örnau(l) C. I. L. x. 6104 (time of Augustus), *örnare xii. 4333 (time of Antonines); for other instances on inscriptions, see Christiansen, p. 53], and by Celtic loanwords (e.g. Welsh addurn, ‘ornament,’ addurmo, ‘to ornament,’ Lat. *adōrno) must have been originally long and cannot owe its length to the influence of the following *rn.* (Similarly *fōrna, *ōrdo, *ōrea.*) But it is more likely that the o was not really long, but merely had the quality of long Latin a in other words was close o. Plautus seems to scan *örn- after a short syllable; though the instances are so few as to leave a slight doubt (Trin. 840 might possibly be *novo cum *ōrnatu, *Aen. 721 eo *ōrnatus). There are not wanting indications that r with a nasal tended to modify the quality of a vowel, e.g. *formus and *fornus, *formica and *fornica, *turinus (Greek *θρ בעצם), 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, *Ital. Gram.* § 54). How far this may explain the discrepancy between the *firmus of inscriptions, Christiansen, p. 53, and the Vulg. *firmus, postulated by Romance forms like Ital. *fermo, and the Welsh loanword *fêrfr, it is difficult to say. *Arcem* with short a expressly attested by Audacis exc. p. 328. 8 K., originally the neuter of the adjective *örnum, e.g. Plaut. *Truc. 149* non aruos hic sed pascuus ager est, appears with long a in an inscription of Tiberius’ time (*ἀρχαί, 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 Dom. 426. 11 and 36 K. Prisc. *Acc. 521. 15, Audacis exc. 328. 6, is proved by *inermis, for *ā is not weakened to e (ch. iii.); *ārx Pomp. 130. 7 is proved by *coercio.)

§ 146. s with consonant. The short vowel before sp, sc, st, &c., attested by the Romance languages for words like *vēspēr, piscēs, cristŭs, 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 *pāstōr, *piscēs, *trēstis, *jāstus, &c. (see Christiansen, pp. 54 sqq.) must have been originally long. Diomedes (p. 431, 31; 432, 16) attests *fēstūstria, *ōspēr; Quintilian (ix. 4. 85) *agēstis, Audax (359. 15 K.) *campēstis, &c. *Hēstērmus (Mar. Victorin. vi. 15. 15 K.) beside hērī is puzzling; also the discrepancy between *crīstum of C. I. L. i. 1199 and Vulg. Lat. *crīsūs indicated by the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. *croста. Festus (86. 8 Th.) distinguishes *lūstrā, 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 *cōmm-?) (for *coventio, and so originally *cōntio, or perhaps *cōntio); French nonce, annoncer points to a Latin form *nāntius (for *noventius, and so originally *nāntius, Mar. Victorin. vi. 12. 18 K.); Romance words for ‘eleven,’ like Span. once, Fr. onze, point to a Vulg. Lat. *indecim (properly *indecim, from *ūnum and *decem) (*sīnciput is usually explained as *sēm(i)-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); *onguis seems to be for *ongus (ch. iv. § 20). The remark of a late grammarian (Anon. Bern. Suppl. 111 H.), that *hirundo, arundo have *u, is a mistake based on a misunderstanding of Priscian i. p. 123. 7 H.

§ 148. 1 with consonant. Vulg. Lat. remilœcum (Ital. rimorchio, Span. remolque, Fr. remorque), properly remilœcum (from Greek ῥεμιλεία) 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 uis, miswritten in the Archetype vis, as in v. 83, and then changed by scribes to avis: ultra, not ulla, 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 cûnum, valt beside võlo, &c. (see ch. iv. § 20).

The shortening of a long vowel before certain single final consonants, -r, -l, &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. sumumito 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. coelus for co-itus (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 lárua (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. coercē (a dissyllable) Pacuv., cóneslæ for cohoneslæ) Accius, whether it be that these contracted forms are a relic of the earlier accentuation of the first syllable of every word, cóere, and the uncontracted the result of the shifting of the accent, có-ére, 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 coercē is a 're-composition' like 刬- nước beside older enico (with weakening of unaccented vowel), or adcurro beside accurro (with assimilation of consonants) (see ch. iv. § 159). Synizesis went hand in hand with Synecope [lárua became larva at the same time that laridum became lardum (see ch. iii.)], and asserted itself more and more under the Empire; e.g. quetus (*quyetus) for quiētus is a common spelling on late inscriptions (cf. Ital. cheto, Span.
quedo, 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, *bracyum (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 nentiquam, &c., which is scanned with the first syllable short (or should we pronounce nyüliquam, nyullus, nyusquam?), while neüter, 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 Paeuvius, Trag. 47 R.:

gradere atque atrocem coerce confidéntiam
(cf. l. 345); and in Plautus deartuere (Capt. 640, 672), deausclaro (MüI. 884); deoscelari (Cas. 136, 453, 454, 467) are quadrisyllables. But dehortari (four syllables) stands in contrast to hortari in Poen. 674—

neque vos hortari neque dehortari decet.

(Ennius, Ann. 401 has the same verb in Tmesis: de me hortatur.) The phrase coemptionalis sener, 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 Priamo nostro si est quis emptor, coémpitionalém 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 cüm corona clárüm conestat caput. (MSS. conestat, constat.)

Of the compounds of hibeo, débeo always has the contracted form in Plautus; cohíbeo may in all cases scan as cíbeo, and prohibebo as próbeo; præbebo is sometimes spelt praehíbeo 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. In Terence we find only prëndo and reprendo, not prëhendo (unless possibly Andr. 353), nor reprehendo (from praec and *hendo). (For other instances, see Klotz, Albröm. Metrik, p. 139.)

In the classical literature the full forms of these verbs are generally restored [but e.g. coëgo from *co-agó, coëgito from *co-agito (Ch. viii. § 31), débeo, praebeo, &c.], though Derivative words often retain the shorter form, e.g. cípula from *co-apúla, from ãpere, to fasten; praedta for *praec-heda (cf. prehendo); praënum from *praec-em (cf. extimum from exëmno), &c. (see ch. v. § 4).

Coepi Perf., with its O.Lat. Present coepio, comes from an old verb ãpere (cf. ápisor) meaning ‘to fasten’ (Paul. Fest. 14. 2. Th. comprehendere antiqui vínco ‘apere’ diceant), derivatives of which are aptus, aptare, as well as cípa just mentioned. In the Perfect we should expect císpi like císpi from cígo (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
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

§ 151. Synizesis in Late and Vulgar Latin. For a list of spellings from late inscriptions and from MSS. like quesco (for quiesco), Febrarius (Ital. Febbrajo, Span. Febro, &c.), see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 444 sqq., and cf. Georges, Lex. Worff, s. v. *virid(ī)rium, sesquī(ā)line, vaccī(t)efacio, ventī(ō)sum, sem′(i)erinis, sem(ī)ustus, sem(ī)uncia, vīt(e)arium, ab(e)arium. All these show suppression of ā (ā'ë) before an accented vowel, long by nature or by position. Similarly Lat. *co-amb-uro is became Ital. quatto, Prov. quoit, Span. cacho, through Vulg. Lat. *quattus (from *excatitu), Lat. coāgerum, Ital. quaglio, Span. cuajo, 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., injurjatum, Lucilius ii. 9 M., malvisti, id. Inc. fr. ix M., genua, tenvia, arjela (with the first syllables of these three words scanned long by position) (see Luc. Müller, De Re Metrica, pp. 249 sqq.). (On ‘sceyo’ or ‘scelo,’ see Charisius, p. 16. 9 K.)

§ 152. Other examples of vowel-contraction. Nil from nikil (always monosyllabic in Plautus); mēno from *ne-hemo; dissyllabic deīnde, prōinde (according to the grammarians these were accent on the first syllable; see next chapter, and cf. the Plautine scansion pērīnde, Stich. 520); cōnumbro for *co-amv-uro; bīnum for *bi-kīnum, ‘of two winters’ (cf. Engl. ‘twinter,’ meaning a two-year old beast) from bīnum; cōpia and O. Lat. cōpi- Adj. for *co-oπia, *co-oπis- (cf. in-oπi-); antelac (see § 58 for other examples of the loss of intervocalic h with contraction). The loss of intervocalic u, y led to contraction in words like dītor for dīcitōr, dīnum a form of dīnynus, stō for *stāyō (Umbr. stahu, ch. viii. § 2) (but e and o do not coalesce in wūme, pleo, &c., nor a and accented ä in ãhēnas); on these see ch. iv. §§ 66 and 70. So did the loss of intervocalic m in cōgo for *cōmūgo, &c., (unless co 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. 2, p. 275.) (On the merging of i in a following i, u in a following u, 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; xliv. § 152; Quint. ix. 4. 33; xi. 3. 33–34; Seneca, Epp. 40 [cf. Cicero’s story of Crassus mistaking Cauneas (sc. fieus vendo) for cave ne eas; Div. ii. 40]. Marius Sacerdos (448. 6 K.) says that in reading a line like Virgil’s monstrum horrendum, &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 praecepiti stantem, &c. In the Saturnian Poetry a final syllable ending in -m seems to have been not elided but left in
§§ 151–154. PRONUNCIATION. PARASITIC VOWELS.

prosodical hiatus (see § 65), like the -um of circum in the compounds circīum(ago), circīum(eo), or of sublatum, &c., in the forms sublatuīri, &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 militūm 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. prē-hendō, illūs, and so in the older poets frequently, occasionally in Augustan poetry, e.g. quī amant, Virg., Esquili(naē) alītes, 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 cupidamus 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 fluumium atque algidam.

et ibidem:

quam numquam uobis Grai atque barbāri;

at Ennius semel:

Scipio inuicite;

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, fromSansc. 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{μνᾶ} took in Latin the form \textit{mina}, just as in French the Low German knif became canif; similarly we find in Plautus \textit{tēchīna} (e.g. \textit{Poen.} \textit{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{Alcūmeo}, \textit{Alcūmēna} (so on an old Praenestine mirror, \textit{C.I.L.} xiv. 4102), \textit{Tēcūmessā}, 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{Τηκυμεσσα}, 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{vēhīculum}, ‘that by which one is carried’ (in Plautus always \textit{vēhīculum}), \textit{cībīculum}, ‘the place where one lies down.’ In Plautus the \textit{-clo-} form is the more usual, especially after a long vowel; e.g. \textit{pērīculum} 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{c} 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{-bulum}, it is normal; he uses both \textit{pōplus} and \textit{pōplus} (the latter only at the end of a line) (cf. \textit{pīlumnoe poploes}, 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{pocolum} 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 Romanoi}.) At a later time the spelling \textit{-cul-} established itself so firmly in the language that it became impossible to discriminate an original \textit{co-lo, e.g. cor-cu-lum} (formed with the diminutive suffixes \textit{ko-} and \textit{lo-}, ch. v.), 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, teremenniú for ‘*terminia’ (Lat. termini), with liquid preceding; and with liquid following, patereí (Lat. pātri), Sadiriis (Lat. Satrius), in Pelignian sacaracirix (Lat. sācrātrices), pristafalacirix (Lat. praestāblātrices), and so on. The inserted vowel takes the quality of the vowel in the syllable containing the liquid, e.g. aragetud for *ar-getud, patereí for *pa-trei (so Lat. stāblum for *sta-blum, stāblis for *sta-blis). The long preceding syllable is the reason of its absence in Osc. maatreis (Lat. mātris) (cf. O. H. G. hlūtres beside fōgales and Plautus’ preference of perīclum, &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. crābro, 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 discīpulus 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 Gracchus, ‘a gerendo’ (Lib. Gramm. p. 184, Wilm.), suggests a pronunciation like Grāchus.
CHAPTER III.

ACCENTUATION 1.

§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.
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‘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 ‘charakteřistical.’

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 quīritāre, balsimo from Latin balsāmum). 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. ámbigo, &c., but Greek áνάγω, &c.), the Syncope of syllables following the accent (e.g. oblúrgo from oblúrgo, caldus from cáltus), 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 loanwords, especially in the language of the less educated Romans. Greek Σοφία (with short i) became Sóφia, a stress-accent replacing the pitch-accent with the result of lengthening the accented vowel; Greek éδωλων became ódōnum. 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 magolnia 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 *ünō-decem, is seen working in the Early Literary time in words like objurigo (Plaut.), objurgo (Plaut. 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 vivīdis 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), banter his friend on his enthusiasm for so trivial a subject (te istam tam tenuem θεωπλαυ tam valde admiratum esse gaudeo . . . sed quaeo quid ex ista acuta et gravi refertur ad τέλος ?), 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 *προσωπία* 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,
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. Ῥώμα but Ῥώμαι. The quantity of the final syl-

lable 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 Ῥώμα to differ

from that of Ῥώμαι. Other circumflex words are, according to

the grammarians, long monosyllables like rēs, ἱλίς, ἡμῖς, and final

long syllables of words whose last vowel has been dropped by

Apocope or Syncope, e.g. illīc from *illīc, 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 amó (Latin amāvit,

Vulg. Lat. *amāvit) 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 amó or our ‘Oh!’ when used sarcastically, or

a stress-‘circumflex,’ formed by two impulses of the voice, some-

thing 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 ‘tānto’), tempo (pronounce ‘tēmpo’), while the

different treatment of a Latin penultimate from a Latin ante-

penultimate vowel in words like popolo (Lat. pōpulus), uopo

(Lat. ēpus), suggest the possibility of a Latin Rōma, &c. as

distinct from Rōmus, &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, Rōmæ is doubt-

ful), 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 ‘vitio carens vocis artificiosa pronunciatio’ (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 enuntietur aliqua in eo syllaba necesse est summum illud vocis fastigium possideat). His imitator, Martianus Capella (fourth and fifth cent. A.D.) (iii. p. 65. 19 Eys.), prettily describes accentuation as ‘anima vocis et seminarium musices,’ adding, quod omnis modulatio ex fastigiis vocum gravitateque componitur; and Nigidius, a contemporary of Varro (ap. Gell. xiii. 26. 1-3 H.), describes the accentuation Vóleri by the words summo tono est prima, deinde gradatim descendent (cf. Audac. 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 use the illustration of the accentted syllable of the word optímus being on the only syllable heard at a distance, finge tibi quasi vocem clamantis ad longe aliquem positum, ut puta finge tibi aliquem illo loco contra stare et clamare ad ipsum. cum coeperis clamare, naturalis ratio exigit ut unam syllabam plus dicas a reliquis illius verbi; et quam videris plus sonare a ceteris, ipsa habet accentum. ‘optímus,’ 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 árma from the circumflex of Müsa, acutus dicitur accentus quotiens cursus syllabam proferimus, ut ‘árma’; circumflexus vero, quotiens tractim, ut ‘Músa’ (cf. Pompeius, 126. 4 K. non possimus dicere ‘árma,’ non possimus dicere ‘Músa’; Cledonius, p. 31. 30 K. ‘árma’ excusso sono dicendum est, while ‘Rómá’ is pronounced tractim). Similarly Priscian (i. p. 7. 11 H.) speaks of three different sounds of ã, with the acute, the grave, and the circumflex accent, as in hámis, hámorum, hámus, or árae, árarum, ára,
and Vitruvius, in a passage borrowed apparently from Aristoxenus, says of the words sol, lux, flos, vox, nee unde incipit nee ubi desinit [sc. vox] intelligitur, sed quod [v. l. nee 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, Épiros, unlike the Latinized form Epirus: sane 'Epiros' greace 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 Calypsdnem, 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 Φίλιππος, 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. Ancôra (Greek ἀγκόρα), with o instead of ν, is not a certain example, and still less the hypothetical cumíla (Greek κομίλη, not κονίλα) 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. *bilirum* (Greek βούτυρον), *blindsemus* (Greek βλάσφημος), *údo-

*um* (Greek είδωλον), *órénum* (Greek ορήμος beside ἐρήμος), *selínum* (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 'abýssus' (ἀβύσσος): paenultima positione longa sed acuitur antepaenultima. So *abýssus* Paulinus of Nola (19. 651; 35. 338); 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 *Tpetr̄o* (Greek τόπτρον), and had earned for them the epithet of the 'overweening' Romans (ὅθεν ὑπερηφανεῖτος ἐκλήθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν). I have heard a Frenchman ascribe the English mispronunciation of words like 'Français' 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, —, though sometimes in emphatic utterance the word is pronounced with
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§§ 4, 5. a lengthening of final vowel and a slight rise of the voice on the second, the unaccented, syllable, \textipa{mānō}. 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 syllables of the word ‘jamais!’ is often very considerable, especially in excited utterance, \textipa{ja-mais!} or \textipa{ja-mais!} (see Storm in Phon. 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. pitā, Greek πατήρ, 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 preceding vowel bore the accent in the Indo-European, but became voiced when that vowel did not. The Indo-European verb *wértō, to turn or become (Sansk. vārtāmi, Lat. vērō), is in Goth, vaírpa (our ‘worth’ in ‘Woe worth the day!’) with the unvoiced-spirant sound (our /θ/ in ‘thin’); while Gothic fadar (Engl. ‘father’) had the voiced-spirant sound of our /ð/ 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. mūs, our ‘mouse’ from Indo-Eur. *mūs (Sansk. mūṣ, Gk. μῦς, Lat. mūs), where the immediately preceding vowel had the accent, voiced in Goth. áiza-, our ‘ore’ from Indo-Eur. *áyos (Sansk. áyas, Lat. aës), 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 τωῆς, Lith. rankūs), acute in Nom. Sg. of the same stems (Greek τωῆς, Lith. rankā from *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. infringo from in and frango; concído from cum and caedo; triennium from tri- (tres) and annus; which point unmistakably to an earlier *concaido, *triánnium, &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 facílius, muliérem (ᐢ് Vive), 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, sapientia became sapiéntia, tempestatibus became tempestátibus, 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 sapientia, tempestátibus 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 sapientia would be more accurately written sāpiēntia. 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; sapientia would become sāpiēntia, tēmpestātibus would become tēmpestātibus. Dimidius, unless it takes its -mi- by analogy of dimidiatu, &c. (which is unlikely), must have been accentuated on the first syllable about 250 B.C., for the change of unaccented ē to ē 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 Planta, 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 ō) became ā when they preceded the syllable which bore the I.-Eur. accent, e.g. magnus from *meg-nōs, Gk. μεγάς). 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 Planta, 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, with three accents in the first hemistich and two in the second (see ch. ii. § 141),

   e.g. dābunt málum Metélli || Naéuio poetæ.

For a five-syllabled word always counts for two accents in Saturnian verse, e.g. mágna sāpiēntia || multāsque uirtūtes,
e.g. dédet Tēmpestātibus || aide mēretod,
e.g. ònerāriae onūstae || stābant in ùstris;

and a four-syllabled word (at any rate of the forms – several and – pl) does the same at the beginning of the line,
e.g. immolābat ùream || uictīam pūlchram,
e.g. sūpérbiter contēmpτīm || cōnterit legiones,
e.g. Cōrnēlius Lūcius || Scipio Barbatus.

A Latin secondary accent in long words such as armātāra is indicated by the Romance forms, which treat the vowel of the first syllable in the same way
as they treat accented a. Italian Fiorentino 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. décóres, décóres. 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-syllabed words, like fácilis, beginning with three short syllables. These were at the time of Plautus accented on the fourth syllable from the end, fácilis, &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 Cēthēgūs, 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 Catullus, with a naturally short vowel in the paenultima, takes the acute accent instead of the circumflex, Catullus, with the grave on the antepaenultima, as before, Catullus.

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, nix, 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), nostrá(tis).

A compound word, or word-group, like réspúlica, júsjúran- dum, málésanuus, intéreálócë, has only one accent, respúlica, mále-sánus, intere álóci, &c., though, if resolved into two independent words, each takes its separate accent, réisque públíca, mále sánus, inte rea lóci. Thus Argílétum, which the etymological fancy of the Romans explained as Ar gi 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, Argílétum. (On these word-groups, see below, § 12.)

The secondary accent, which, as we have seen (§ 7), must have existed in longer words like árbérétum, témprérátus, intémé-rátus, existémátus, is ignored by the Roman grammarians, unless we are so to understand the media prosodia, mentioned by Varro, in imitation of the μέση προσφοία 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. pérègrínus), scellerato (Lat. scélérátus), 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): difficilior apud Graecos observatio est [sc. legis sermonis], quia plura illis loquendi genera, quas διάλεκτος vocant et quod alias vitiosum, interim alias rectum est; apud nos vero brevissima ratio. Namque in omni voce acuta intra numerum trium syllabarum contineatur, sive eae sunt in verbo solae, sive ultimae, et in is aut proxima extremae, aut ab ea tertia. Trium porro de quibus loquor, media longa aut acuta aut flexa erit, eodem loco brevis utique gravem 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, ideaeque 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 *sól*, *dós*, *Catilílus*, *Céthegus* (Sergius, De Acc. p. 483. 11 K.) *indoctissímus* (Pomp. 127. 15 K.), *Caélius*, *Sallustiús*, *Cariddiús*, *Caecíro*, *Galénus*, *Galéni*, *Camílli* (Mart. Cap. iii. p. 65. 22 Eyss.), *Románus*, *Hispéánum* (‘Priscian,’ De Acc. p. 520. 17 K.), *áb*, *mel*, *fél*, *ár*, *pars*, *píx*, *níc*, *fíx*, *láx*, *spéś*, *fús*, *sól*, *móns*, *mó̄s*, *fóns*, *líss* (Diom. 431. 15 K.), *míx*, *rís* (Don. 371. 8 K.), *néc*, *nác* (Serv. in Don. 426. 27 K.), *rós* (Serg. De Acc. 524. 21 K.), *aés*, *él*, *qué* (Pomp. 128. 15 K.), *dúes*, *citús*, *datúr*, *árat*, *pónitus*, *cóhors*, *lítina*, *Rómam* (Diom. 431. 18 K.), *hórâ*, *léges*, *salús*, *hómò* (Dosithéus 378. 1 K.), *míta*, *Créta*, *népos*, *bónus*, *málus* (Don. 371. 17 K.), *marínus*, *Críspínum*, *amícuc*, *Sabínum*, *Quírinus*, *lectíca*, *Metéllus*, *Marcellús*, *látérbae*, *tínebrae*, *Fidénae*, *Athénæ*, *Thébae*, *Cúmae*, *tablæae*, *fénstraæ*, *Sérignus*, *Málius*, *áscia*, *fásica*, *Július*, *Cláudíus*, *Románi*, *legíti*, *practóres*, *praedóines* (Diom. 431. 23 K.), &c.

Of compound words and word-groups with one accent (like our ‘son-in-law,’ ‘man-of-war,’ ‘pockethándkerchief,’) we have examples such as *maledínum*, *interestíci* (Don. 371. 22 K.; Diom. 433. 30 K.; Pomp. 130. 18 K.; Cledoniús 33. 12 K.). *Argileum* (Prisc. ii. p. 113. 10 H.; but with all three accents, Mart. Cap. iii. p. 68. 15 Eyss.), *propedíum* [Don. ad Ter. Ad. v. 5. 7 (888)], *respublica*, *juávarandum* (Prisc. i. p. 177. 10 H.; i. p. 180. 12 H.), *jurisperitus*, *legílatór*, *praefecuterbírbis* and praefecuterbíri, *tribunusplebis*, *tribunusplebí*, *mentocapús*, *orbísterrerae*, *orbísterreraum*, *paterfamilias*, *paterfamilíaram*, *armípotens*, *armírumpotens*, *magistermílííum*, *ascredítis*, *acácalís*, *aresponsís*, *abactás* (Prisc. i. p. 183. 5 H.), *iustúsmodi*, *hujusmodi*, *vejusmodi* (Prisc. i. p. 440. 2 H.). Of *hujusçemodi*, &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. 11 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 -as, Gen. -atis, indicating the country of one's birth, e.g. cujáś, nostráś, Arpínás, with prímás, optimás (Caper ap. Prisc. i. p. 128. 23 H.). These words, which in Early Latin (e.g. Plautus) have the full form cujáśis, nostráśis, when at a later time they became contracted, retained their old accentuation; and so nostráś, 'a countryman of ours,' was distinguished by its accent from nostras, Acc. Pl. Fem. of the Possessive Pronoun (Priscian i. p. 454. 11 K.).

(2) Some Verbal Forms; addic, addúc, &c., fumát (for fumácit), audiít (for audícit), 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 audiít and not audíit, leáit and not leníıt, 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 ëit 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. amó, Latin amácit, Ital. dormí, Latin dor-mécit) points to Vulgar Latin forms in accented -aut, -it (cf. -aut on graffiti of Pompeii, C. J. L. iv. 1391, 2048).

(3) Words ending in -e (the Enclitic -e), whose last syllable is long by nature or by position, e.g. addúc, posthúc, ante-húc, istic, ilíc, istic, ilíc, istic, ilíc, istic, istic, ilíc (Caper ap. Prisc. i. p. 130. 2 H.). Vulgar Latin accentuation of the final vowel of ilíc, ilíc, &c. is indicated by the Romance adverbs, e.g. Ital. li, là, Span. allí, allú.

(4) Words ending in -n (the Enclitic -né), whose last syllable is long by nature or by position, e.g. tantón, Pyrrhın (Servius ad Aen. x. 668, &c.). This rule cannot however have been absolute, for forms like vidén ut in Old Latin Poetry, and even in Augustan poets (Virg. Aen. vi. 779; Tib. ii. i. 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.) tells us that vidéns was the usage of his time (ad Aen. vi. 779 vidéns ut geminae stant vertice crista] 'don' naturaliter longa est, brevem eam posuit, secutus Enniium: et adeo ejus est inmutata natura, ut jam ubique brevis inveniatur), and Plautus seems, when -que, -né is elided, to let the metrical ietas fall normally on the syllable which would have the accent in the absence of the particle, e.g. próspéré(o), surripítasqü(o) (Amer. Journ. Phil. xiv. 315).

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 Váleri Voc. from Valéri Gen., but adds
that in his own time such an accentuation as Vāleri Voc. would sound very strange: siquis nunc Valerium appellans in casu vocandi secundum id praecptum 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 (Audaces exc. 361. 11 K. that papae and attēt (also ehem, MSS. hochem?) were accentted 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 ἐγεῖρε appears in Plautus’ dramas with the last syllable lengthened (cf. the MSS. spelling eucae), and the phrase eucae-eucae always has the metrical ietus eucae-eucae.

Greek words, as was mentioned before (§ 3), when they were used by a Latin author with their Greek form and declension, retained also their Greek accent, e.g. Epīros in Virg. Geor. 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 -ērem, -ērum, e.g. muliērem, filiōrem, the accent in Vulgar Latin was shifted from the i to the e and o, muliērem, filiōrem. The precept of an unknown grammarian (Aeneid. Helv. p. ciii. K.) sanctions this usage (mulierem in antepenultimo nemo dobet acuere, sed in penultimo potius), and in Christian poets of the third and fourth centuries we find scansions like insuper et Salomen, eadem muliēre creatus, Drac. Satisf. 161; cf. Ital. figliulo, Span. hijuelo, Fr. filleul. Nouns in -ēs, Gen. -ētis followed a somewhat different course. Their Nominative became -ēs, and this form was extended to the other cases, e.g. paretes (C. I. L. vi. 3714), Acc. Sg. *paretem is attested by the Latin loanword in Welsh, parwyd, and by the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. parete (with close e), Span. paré, Fr. paré, while *muliārem is the original of Ital. migliere (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. *tenebrae 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 cont.) (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. recipit is indicated by Ital. riceve, Fr. reçoit; renigat 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. consacro, 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*, *quadraginta*, &c. (see Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. Rom. Sprach.* i. p. 494). *Triginta* is one of the barbarisms 'qua in usu cotidie loquentium animadvertere possumus,' 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 *quadraginta* (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 accentuated (cf. Greek ἄνηπ ὁ is and ἱς ἄνηό;). Other enclitics were the copula *qρε* (Greek τε, Lat. quæ), the personal pronouns (unless specially emphasized), &c.

We can determine with a fair amount of accuracy the accentuation 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. Plant. Trin. 21 [rogat] ut liceat possidere hanc nomen fabulam,

where ut and hanc, 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 Piscesos 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. Priscian (i.p. 183 H.) objects similarly to a statement of Hellenizing grammarians, that quis, the indefinite pronoun, in siquis, unamquis, &c., is an enclitic like τις in εἰς, and prefers to call siquis 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 nē, 'verily,' ne, prohibitive, ne 'lest'; ádeo, the verb, and adéo, the adverb; ut, 'how,' ut, 'in order that'; ergo, 'therefore,' ergó, '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 (I.Eur. *qūē, O. Ind. ca, Gk. τι, all unaccented), vi [I. Eur. *vi, O. Ind. vā (unaccented), Gk. *φε in ἤ-έ from *ν-φέ], 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-
verse the words often have their final vowel, and some appear also in the forms *ae (for *atb), 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 (amati's), amatust, amatust est for amatus es, amata est, amatus est (cf. centuriam, &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 est, 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 é would have taken another form, such as Ital. *iera, Span. *yera (cf. Ital. niega, Lat. nègat). It need hardly be said that the extent to which these words, and indeed all 'Sentence-Enelities,' 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 *amatum 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 enclitic, e.g. Ital. mi, ti; Fr. me, te; (b) the accented, e.g. Ital. me, ti; Fr. moi, toi. Similarly a Vulgar-Latin possessive *mus, *mum, *ma, beside the regular meus, meum, mea, 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 ἐνυ and ἐνυ ἐμ, ὅκ ἐκαίνων, apud nos autem pronomina eadem et disceratam 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, úd me, inter se, unless the pronoun is emphatic (or elided), just as in Greek we have πῶς με, πῶς σέ, &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)um pàrem, (il)la māter, &c. as the origin of the definite article in all the Romance languages, while ille pater seems to have been pronounced sometimes il(l)e pater, e. g. Ital. il padre, Span. el padre, Prov. el paire, sometimes il(l)e pater, e. g. Fr. le père. Similarly (il)stél, indicated by Ital. stasera. "this evening," is actually found in old MSS. (see Neue, Formenlehre 3 ii. pp. 402 sq.; on stél in the Italian, see Georges, Lex. Wörf., s. v.), and ilstél 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. ilīlis est qualis Cicero fuit, but qualis fuit Cicero! The grammarians often distinguish between the accentuation of quis, quālis, quantus, quōt, quōtus, cujus, übi, 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,
quiō, quōitus, cum suos servant accentus. Infinitum est interrogativorum contrarium, ut quis, qualis, quantus, quoit, quōitus, cum in lectione gravi accentu pronunciantur, cf. ll. p. 127, 2 H. Partit. p. 501. 14 H. So for qui interrog. and rel. ib. ii. p. 9. 20 H.; cujuus, interrog. and rel. ib. ii. p. 179. 3 H.; quo, ubi, unde, qua, ib. ii. p. 132. 3 H.; ii. p. 83. 11 H. ‘qua’ quando relativum est gravatur; quando, Charis. p. 111. 27 H.; 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. τοῖς interrog., τοὺς rel.), and say that ‘they take the acute accent on the last syllable’; and Charisius (p. 111. 27 H.) gives an actual Latin example of this accentuation of the last syllable in the sentence quandō tot stragis acervos 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 stragís acervós, &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-téstem, 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) Testēm quem duum te adducturum dixeras, the accentuation would presumably be by the same reasoning testēm-queen; and this presumption seems to be confirmed by the versification of the dramatists.

(6) Propositions, while adverbs, are accented. Thus we should say si pra hôbitat, but supra moénia est; ânte vénit, but ante Cæsarem vénit. This distinction is often inculcated by the grammarians; e. g. Palaemon (first cent. A. D.) (ap. Charis. p. 189. 10 K. = Diom. p. 407. 19 K.) insists on the different accentuation of infra, supra, extra, intra, ultra, citra, circa, juxta, contra, subitus, coronam, ante, post, prope, usque, super, when adverbs, and when prepositions; cf. Charis. p. 231. 24 K.; Audax, p. 353. 22 K.; Probus, Inst. p. 149. 27 K.; Mart. Cap. iii. 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, inêp), 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. 11 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 circumœstite, circumœlitio). 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 ‘ânte portas’). This suggests that in collocations like in via, per dólum, 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 obriam, sûdîlo (sè, sinê dolo), comminus, dënîo (dë növo), admûdum, âfîtîm (but cf. Gell. vi. 7), as well as by the versification of the dramatists, which also points to in-rem,
ACCENTUATION OF SENTENCE.

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. Priscian ii. p. 27. 4 H. cum praestore ponuntur, monosyllabae acuto, disyllabae paenultimo acuto proferuntur); but remained unaccented in phrases like virtutem propter imperatoris or justitia in legum, where the preposition is followed by a genitive dependent on the noun (Censorinus ap. Prisc. ii. p. 23. 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 omnius syllabis, postpositae acuuntur in principio. He refers expressly to igitur, quænam, saltem, so that he would have us pronounce, e.g. igitur Cicero vénit, but vénit igitur Cicero. That the monosyllabic conjunctions et, sēt, 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, coctēm-dabo, missum-facit, cave-fícias. In Plautus volo-scire is always scanned volō-scire, never volō-scire; and the metrical ictus in his verses of phrases like factēm-volo, facto-volo, missūm-facē, cave-páris, cave-fāxīs supports our rule. Cicero's story about Crassus at his departure for Parthia mistaking the cry of a fig-seller, Caunēs! Caunēas! (sc. fēcūs vendō) for càre nē eās (Div. ii. 40. 84) seems to show that in ordinary talk this verbal phrase was treated as a word-complex with a single accent cave(n)e-ē(e)as. Similarly a verbal phrase like ópērm-dāre, fidēm-dāre, dōnō-dāre would probably have ordinarly 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: fidēm-dāns, operān-dat, operām-dābām, dōnō-data. The reduction of other unemphatic verbs to mere members of a compound word is indicated by the traditional way of writing quōdēt, quamēris, quantumēris, and the like. Sīs, 'if you please,' from sī vis (cf. sūtis, Plur.), is an enclitic appendage of the imperative, e.g. próprē-sis as much as dūm in excūtī-dūm, aspici-dūm. (Plautus gives to these phrases the ictus proper-sis, excūtē-dūm, aspiciē-dūm, &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 mōdus, rōs were so used in Latin we see from the traditional spelling quēmōdō? quārī? So dies in propēdēm (Don. ad Ter. Ad. 888), quotidie, postridie. Gellius (x. 24) says that in the time of Cicero and the earlier period, the phrase diequitōr or diequipinti was in vogue, 'pro adverbio copulare dictum, secunda in eo syllaba correta,' 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

át ego te pendéntem fodiam sūmūlis trigintā dies,
where the last two words seem to make a compound noun, like our ‘fortnight,’ ‘twelvemonth.’ Locus too might be subordinated in a phrase like interea loci (Don. ad Ter. Evan. 255), ubi loci, &c. The versification of the early dramatists, and the compound words in Romance suggest as similar word-groups phrases like vac-e-mih, vac-unmerv-e-mih, bene-rém-gér, male-rém-gér (with metrical itus normally on these accented syllables in Plautus), ad-illam-hóram (Ital. allora, Fr. alors), ad-mentem-habère (Prov. amenteaver, O. Fr. amentevoir), axis-stréthio (Fr. autruche, Span. avestruz), acis-tiérda (Ital. ottarda, Fr. outarde, Port. abetarda), foris-fidére (O. Ital. forfare, Fr. forfaire), male-hábitus (O. Sp. malate, 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 philosóphus, apstal, Latin apóstólus. And in countries under Celtic influence, such as France or the northern parts of Italy (e.g. in the Romagna dmeng for dominica, 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 n and m was not syncopeated, because the consonant-group nm was difficult to pronounce, e.g. anima not *amna. But in the Romance languages syncope has been pushed a stage further, e.g. Prov. anma, alma, arma, Old Fr. anme, alme, arme, Fr. âme, Span. alma, Sicil. arma, Ital. alma (in poetry), the unmanageable group nm being often changed to rm, just as original nm in Latin *can-men from câno, *gen-men from géno, 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). Frigidus appears in all the
Romance languages in a syncopated shape (Ital. freddo, Fr. froid, &c.) (ch. ii. § 132). *Vīridis, too, was in Vulg. Lat. vīridis (Ital. verde, Span. verde, Fr. vert), and calīdus appears early as calīdus. 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 porrīgo by the analogy of the perfect porrexi; and the analogy of other adjectives in -īdus where this termination was preceded by some uncombinable consonant, e.g. frigidus, may account for the existence of unsyncopated adjectives like calīdus; for the consonants in calīdus, l and d, are of a kind that would be easily combined. A Nom. Sing. like hortus, if syncopated to *hortis, *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. examinis, unanimis from ōnīmus (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 ě, ē, or the reduced (posttonic) form of original ā, ĕ (§ 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 -vī-, preceded by a consonant, followed laws of its own. It appears in the posttonic syllable as ēr, e.g. pāternus for *patri-nus. Similarly -vī- appears in the posttonic syllable as ĕl (ōl) in facultas, &c. (see ch. iv. § 13). The syllable -vī- 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 *v even in a syllable long by position, e.g. 
aunculus (Plautus), the ordinary conversational form of ae\nunculus (cf. aunculus, C. I. L. viii. 3936, ix. 998); or rather the semivocalic 
w has dropped out between the two vowels. Similarly ditior 
for divitior, deorsum (dissyllabic deorsum in Plaut.) for devorsum, 
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 aridere, aridorem, for example, we say 
that the syncope of \ of *aridere, *aridorem is due to the new 
accent on the penult; *aridere, *aridorem, but it might possibly 
be referred to the influence of the old accent on the first syllable, 
*aridere, *aridorem. Words like artēna (Greek ἀρτήνα), perstrōma 
(Greek περστρόμα) 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 \ before an initial consonant, 
e.g. nempe, proinde, deinde, which before a consonant often took 
the forms *nem (so scanned by Plautus and Terence, ch. x. § 7), 
proin, dein, as atque, unde 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 frigidaria (Lucil. viii. 12 M.) beside frigidus, 
calidarius beside calidus, portōrium beside portitor, portūdiale beside 
póstēri, altrīnsēcus beside āltēri. The weakening effect on an 
unaccented syllable of a following accent is shown by Plautine 
scansions like senectūtem, volūntātem, pōtēstātem, perstrōma, where 
an additional weakening element is supplied by the short syllable
preceding. These scissions must reflect the pronunciation of these words in ordinary conversation. Similarly calē-fācere became calē-fācere and cal-fācere, and ministērium passed into ministērium or mistērium (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 -vi- of avidus, 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. sī audēs (Plaut.), if you please, in the classical period sōdes].

Arid- of āridus becomes ard- in ardēre, bndōrem, and by their analogy sometimes appears in the simple adjective (ardus, Lucil. xxvii. 40 M.). Similarly act- for aevīt- in aētās may have come into use first in the lengthened cases aētātis, aētāti, aētātem, or in derivatives like actērnus, though here the syncopated form of the trisyllable established itself in ordinary usage, unlike ardus. Forms like calēdrius 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, πεπλεφων), 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. jūrgo (in Plautus still jūrigo), usūrpo for *usūrpo, -ās for (Plautine) -ātis in nostrās, Arpāndās, 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. bālinēum [so Plaut. and Ter., and balineator, Rud., 527 (A.)], a spelling which did not yield for some time to later balneum [balinearium, 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. (Eph. Epigr. iii. p. 166), ópitumus [the spelling opivtma 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 opivtmo, 'optimum']. These words, as we saw above (§ 5), had in the time of Plautus and Terence the accent on the first syllable, bålínëüm producing balineum, *ópitumus optumus. Similarly ópificëina, ópificëina (Plaut. Mil. 886), produced officina, puëritia (with the ictus puëritia in all the instances, not many, of its occurrence in the early dramatists) produced the puërtia of Horace [C. i. 36. 8 actae non alio rege puertiae; Charisius (fourth century a.d.) still recognized puëritia as the correct form, 266. 7 K.]. But forms like caldus, viridë, dominus belong to colloquial or to Vulgar Latin, and were not as a rule established in the language till the later Empire, though valde, older válide, Plaut. Pseud. 364, and a few other words, were current at a much earlier time. The same wave of syncope that reduced viridë, dömëns, &c., to dissyllabic form attacked n, i in hiatus (cf. ch. ii. § 48). As early as the latter half of the first century a.d. tënüs varied between a dissyllable and a trisyllable (Caesellius ap. Cassiod. vii. 205. 16 K.); cardus (for cardunos) (ch. ii. § 54), mortus (for mortunos), &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. *platya, Lat. plûtëa, &c. (see ch. ii. § 48).

Forms like saeclum 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 e and the l 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 -cilus, -cilum 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 velhculum, 'that by which one is carried'; poculum, 'that out of which one drinks'; bibculum, 'the place where one lies down'; periculum from *perior, perilus, experior: oraculum from orare. To the second, diminutives like corculum, uxorcula, sucula. 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 velhclum, with that monosyllabic form of the suffix which we find invariably when by dissimilation the cl is changed into cr, e.g. ambulaclum, '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 -c-stems, e.g. porcu-lus, celoc-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-cu-lum, *porclus from porcu-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 mae tuo stat periculo;

and it is only at the end of a line that the phrase nullum stat 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 *saece(um), &c. to their original form *saeclum, but also words like *porculus to *porclum, e.g. Ital. cerchio, (Lat. circe(um)), teschio (Lat. test(um)), spillo (Lat. spinn(um)).

(Cf. oculus, C.I.L. x. 7756, &c., crustulum, xi. 3303, of 18 A.D., Proclaeas, xv. 1157, of 123 A.D., Vitalus, viii. 9432, &c., Λευκλος, &c. on Greek inscriptions, Eckinger, pp. 73–5, Masclus (Gk. Μαρκλος, &c.); so in Probi App. 197. 20–22 K. speculum non *speclum, masculus non *masclus, vetulus non *veclus, vitulus non *victlus, vernaculum non *vernacclus, articulus non *articlus, bacculus non *baclus, angulus non *anglus, jugulus non *juglus, and 198. 18 oculus non *culus, 198. 23 tabula non *tabla, 198. 27 stabulum non *stablum, 198. 34 capitulum non *capiclum, 199. 9 tribula non *tribla, 199. 14 vapulo non *vaplo (MS. baplo); and see George's Lex. Wortf. s.vv. coaff(n)lo, aedic(u)la, assec(u)la, inb(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, pect(u)lus, 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)lus, vet(u)lus, vernac(u)lus, Asc(u)lum, Vist(u)la, &c.; cf. Schuch. Vok. ii. 402 sqq.). Fr. roule, &c. from unsyncopated *völla points to a re-formed diminutive; so in Roumanian, e.g. teule or tiule (Lat. tégula) (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 archii (‘qui exccubabant in aere,’ Paul. Fest. 19. 10 Th.) for archi-cubbii, where the proximity of two almost identical syllables či and ču has caused or facilitated the dropping of the former. [Similarly semmodius and semmodius, débilíturare for *debilitáäre, fastitium for *fastitidium, údolatria for údodía-, limitrophus for limitotro-,
Restitútus for Restitutús (A. L. L. viii. 368), &c., as in Greek ἀμ(φι)-
φορεύς, ἣ(φο)φορία, λει(πο)πυρία, &c.].

And a large number of words, like dixem (beside dixissem),
audissem (beside audīvissem), audi-trix (beside auditor), gi-gno (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 cs-rem; but see ch. viii. § 3), or, if there is, it took place in the I.-Eur. period, e.g. I.-Eur. *gī-gnō (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 audivisse (ch. viii. § 3), like sis for sī vīs.

§ 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 Dēcimīus), C. I. L. i. 1133, Gminia (for Gēminia), Eph. Epigr. i. 72, Diespra (for Diēs-prītor), C. I. L. i. 1500; Prtonio (for Prėtonio), 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 cīonia, ‘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 payment,’ ‘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 cīonia (line 690):

‘ar’ facio luceri,
ut Praenestinis ‘conea est cīonia.

(Cf. misisia for Ital. amicitia in the modern Parmese dialect; Ital. nemico for Lat. intīmīcus, &c.) The omitted vowel is e or i, once a (Mgōnia, C. I. L. i. 118) (besides Acenemeno for Agānemno, on an old Praenestine cista, Eph. Epigr. i. 19), and the omission is easily explained by the influence of the accent in words like Dīasp(ī)tri(y), 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(ē)minia (cf. Cem(i)na, C. I. L. i. 99). But an accented vowel is omitted in Trittia (for Tertia), Eph. i. 108, Pol(i)dia, Eph. i. 95, and even a long accented vowel in Atīia (for Atīlia), 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 era was written for cāra, kra for kara (cāra). His example for d is almost exactly our first example of the Praenestine contraction, viz. Deimnus for Dēcimus. These words of Terentius Scaurus suggest that spellings like Alōsi for Albēsi, Albensi on an inscription of Alba Fucentia, a town not far removed from the Praenestine district (Zvetatieff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. 46), lubi 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.
§ 15. Syncope under the Old Accent Law. (1) The preposition ambigu-
(Gk. ἀμπύριος) loses its second syllable in compounds like ἀνεκτος, ‘a servant,’ for
*ἀμβι-ολός (Gk. ἀμπυρόλος, Sanscr. abhi-caras), an old Latin word from
which came ancivare, ‘to serve’ (Paul. Fest. 15. 7 Th.) and ancilla; ancipes
(Plaut. Rudi. 1158), later aniceps (from ambi- and cāpitu; am-plector, &c.
The same shortening may have caused that confusion of the old preposition in-do
(endo) (ch. ix. § 27) with the preposition in (en) (ind(o)gredior, &c. becoming by
syncope identical with ingredior) which led to the disuse of in-do and the
adoption of in in its place. Thus inaudito (Plaut.) was completely ousted by
inaudito in the time of Terence, and in the classical period compounds with
indo are only found as archaisms in poets, e.g. inādīpūrārū Juv.

(2) The second syllable of the first member of a compound is syncopated in
hostes for *hosti-pes, princeps for *primi-cepis (cf. primit-genius, an epithet of the
goddess Fortuna, unsyncopated because m and g do not easily combine); forceps
for forma-cepis (from formus, ‘hot,’ connected with Gk. θέρμος. Paul. Fest. 59. 18
gives us this etymology, forecipes dientur, quod his forma, id est calida,
capiuntur; cf. Vel. Long. 71. 15 K.); quindicem from quīnqūēd et dēcem; undecem
from ānus and dēcem; universus is a re-formation from an older syncopated
form which we find on the Decree of the Senate against the Bacchalian
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 pivos V
oinuorsei uire atque mulieres sacra ne quisquam fecisse uelit) (this may be
a mistake for *oinuorsei, like sursuorsum on the Sentent. Minuc. 1. 15); vindemia
for *vin-demia; Marpor (C. I. L. 1. 1076) for Marcī-por, &c.

(3) The first syllable of a verb compounded with a preposition is suppressed in
pergo for *per-rigo (cf. pervexi, pervectum); porgo, the old form of porrīgo, *por-rigo (cf.
Fest. 274. 15 Th. antiqui etiam ‘porgam’ dixerunt pro porrigam), 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 poena porgite dextra), appears now
and then in the Silver Age poets (Val. Flacc. ii. 656; Stat. Theb. viii. 755, &c.),
but the classical form is porrīgo; surgo for surrīgo, *surrī-go; a deponent perf.
participle sortus for *surculus, formed on the analogy of the syncopated pres. ind.,
was often used by Livius Andronicus (Paul. Fest. 423. 1 Th.); beside surrīpī
(classical surripui) we have the syncopated form surripui in Plautus (e.g. Capt.
750), and even a perf. part. pass. formed after its type, surripus (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 surpuerat mihi); pono for *pō-sina (the preposition is pō-
a byform of *dēpō, idō), postus, depostus, compostus, very common for pō-situs, &c.;
like postus is prae-stū, earlier prae-stū (Cassiod. 157. 22 K.), ready, at hand, for
*prae-stūt; cette for *cetūte, *cē-dāte, where the particle cē, ‘here,’ ‘hither,’ is
prefix ed to the verb, as in Oscan ce-brnust, ‘huc venerit’ (Zvetaljeff, Inscr. Ital.
Inf. 237. 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 cons-acro out of consecro, ad-sum out of assum
(ch. iv. § 160) restored por-rigo, surrīpui, &c. The older forms might remain
undisturbed in derivatives whose connexion with the verb was unnoticed,
e.g. refīrica faba (refīrica, 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 refīrīgo, ‘to roast,’ ‘parch’); aprīcus, Aprilīs may be similar
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traces of an *ap(-e)rio (cf. *ap-é-rio), unless the syncope in all three words was pre-tonic syncope under the Paenultima Law of Accentuation, ref(e)rico, ap(e)ricus, *Ap(e)rius. 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. Coerce, for example, is dissyllabic in Pacuvius (Trag. 47 R.),

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

(4) The first syllable of a reduplicated perfect of a compound verb is dropped in reppuéri, rettāli, rectiāli, &c., where the double consonant seems to preserve a trace of the syncope (see ch. viii. § 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 arcubii for arcì-cibìi, above § 13); and it is natural to suppose that the perfects without reduplication, like ex-servi O. Lat. scididó, con-curri (and con-cucurri, older *con-cucurri), &c., originated in this way (ch. viii. § 44), just as in modern Greek βάζω has become βάζω in compounds like διαβάζω, ἵμβάζω, &c. Another syncope verb-form is conu(e) (2 Plur. Imperat. of cóno), 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. vīnīte) having been restored through the influence of forms where the consonants were not adapted for combination (e.g. sistīte), or where the syllable in question did not immediately follow the (early) accent (e.g. cócinītēs), as well as from the analogy of other conjugations, e.g. amā-te, monē-te, audī-te. In Umbrian and Oscan these imperatives are syncopeat, e.g. Umbr. sistu (Lat. sistō), Osc. actual (Lat. āgito). The same is true of derivative adjectives, e.g. in -idus, hūmidus, frigidus, cūlidus, sólidus, rígidus, úrīdus, &c. (but nūdus for *norīdus from a root noge-, Sanser. nag-nas, our ‘naked,’ is syncopeat; on údus see below), in -icus, e.g. únicus, cīcicus, médicus, but the nouns Plancus, turnus, ‘a glutton’ (from tūra, ‘the mouth of a sack,’ according to Paul. Fest. 86. 23 Th. lura, os culle, vel etiam utris; unde lurones capacis gulae homines), junco, &c. are syncopeat (see below on rūncus). Similarly vīcīdus is saved from syncope by the influence of other adjectives in -idus, while the noun vīta for *vītā (Lith. gyvata) is not. The Umbrian adj. in -co, tōco- (Latin públicus) from tōta, *tōta-, ‘the community,’ ‘people,’ shows the contraction which Latin adjectives of this formation escape (cf. Osc. toutico-).

(5) Diminutives in -lo, on the other hand, extended the syncope from dissyllabic to other forms, e.g. ulla from *ūnus, vīlum from *vīnum, Ter. Adelph. 786, and from their analogy, cōrīlla for *cornūla, perīlla for *persīnula, amnīlla from amnī(h)ora (Greek ἀμφόρα, Acc. of ἀμφορεῖς), &c.

(6) Greek words borrowed at an early period probably owe their syncope to the early accent, e.g. Hērīlēs (Greek Ἡρακλῆς), Politēs (the early form of Polītās), Plaut. Bacc. 894 (Greek Πολυδήσης), calc (Greek χάλις, with ȧ); cf. Prænestine Acmenes (above, § 14).

(7) Other examples are alter from ätler; postu-lo from *posci-tulō; ulna from *ultina (Greek ἀλήσις); original -iu becomes -ī in Latin, e.g. colīs from *colīnis (Lith. kāñnas, Greek κολεψώρ); propēr from *prōpī-tūr.

(8) For the syllable -ri-, examples are: sīcorūs from *sācrū-dōs, *sācrī-dōs,
from sacer and root dō, ‘to give’; ácerebus for *dérī-dho-, with the same termination (belonging to root dēh, ‘to make’) which becomes -dus when not preceded by r, e.g. frigidus, calidus (see ch. iv. § 114); sócetum for *sacēr-lum, *sacēr-lum, sacēr-lum, &c. Nouns like áger (Greek ἄγρος), cáper (Greek κάρπος), 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, hortī, hortō, hortum, &c., and of other Nominatives, whose final syllable did not immediately follow the (early) accent, like áninus, iūnumus. In the Italian dialects we find this -er- in similar positions, e.g. Osc. Aderla- from *Abrola- (Lat. Atella), Abella- probably from *Abrola- (Lat. *Apella), Umbr. ager, paier, ‘propitious,’ from pācriī, often spelt -r-, e.g. Sabine Atrna- (Lat. Aternus), Osc. Tantrnaüüm (Gen. Pl.) (ch. iv. § 92). In Latin we seem to have -er- for -ri, in the accented syllable too, e.g. ter (Greek τής), in Plautus (e.g. Bacch. 1127) scanned as a long syllable, and so pronounced terr (cf. terruncius, the right spelling; see Bücheler in Rhein. Mus. x1vi. 236), from *ters. The substitution of or for rī would then be due rather to metathesis (cf. N. It. fardor, &c., for fredor, &c., Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gramm. i. p. 291, and see above, ch. ii. § 111). Ter would however be unaccented in phrases like ter-mille (cf. terdecies written as one word on Mon. Anc. i. 29). On ter, see ch. vi. § 61, on er for rī ch. iv. § 13.

(g) For the syllable -ri, e.g. automo for áxi-timō (Greek ἀξίω for ὄξη-ω); claudio *clācio-do, from clācis; cūria for *cóivici (cf. Volsian coverhui, Zv. Inscr. Ital. Inf. 47); gaudeo for *gāviddeo, part. gāvidus (Greek γαῦτεων for γὰῦτεω); naufragus for *nāvē-frāgus1; nīper, cf. adj. naperum Acc. Sg., Plaut. Capt. 718 recēns captum hominem naperum nocuium, for *nēvē-perus from nēcūs and pēro; praeco for *prē-vēco from prae and vēco; praedes, earlier praexides (praexides Plur., praeex Sing. on the Lex Agraria of Sp. Thorius, i11 B.C., C. I. L. i. 200, but only praedes on the older Lex Repetundarum, 123–2 B.C., i. 198), from prae and vas, perhaps suffered syncope after the new accent law, as did ūdus (as early as Lucil. inc. 172 M.), in Plautus only ūdus; ravēus for rāvīcus from rāvīs, ‘hoarseness’; vitā for *civīta (see above); aueps for *āvē-eps; Opiter, a name given to a child ‘who had a grandfather for a father,’ eujus pater avo vivo mortuus est (Paul. Fest. 207, 15 Th.), Plur. Opiteres (Loewe, Prodr. p. 396), seems to be colloquial Latin for *Avpater for *āvē-pater from āvus and pater. The form māvōlo is found (with mālo) in Plautus, but in the classical period only mālo.

The syllable -ri, -r- is syncopated, even when long by ‘position,’ in auspex for *āvē-spect; nāntius, older nōcentius [the older form occurs in a prophecy of the famous Marcius, published 213 B.C. (ap. Fest. 164. 26 Th.)] quamvis noventium duonum negumate, ‘quamvis bonum nonium negate’]; mundānae for *nōvē-dīnae from nōven and don a system of dies (Sanser. dinam, O. Slav. dini). And -r- 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 lavābrum for lábrum among other instances of Old Latin forms such as hactenus for háctēns, hocedie for hōdē, sēmol for sīmūl); látrina for lávātrina, the old word for a bath, supplanted by the Greek loan-words bai(s)neum (βαῖανεῦον) (cf. Non. 212. 7 M. látrina...est lavatrina, quod nunc balneum dicitur), as balneum itself was succeeded by lavātārum: dīnum was early contracted to dīnum (Leo in Rhein. Mus. xxxviii. 2), e.g. rēdinai and
res deina on an old inscription (C. I. L. xi. 4766), so obliscor for obluciscor in the early dramatists (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), and in universal usage, sis, 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. ālūrā, citrā, infrā, suprā, extrā, contrā on the one hand, and ultīrīor, citīrīor, infīrīor, sūpērīor, extīrīor 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 syncopam passa sunt, ut 'supra' pro 'supera,' et 'infra' pro 'infera,' et 'extra' pro 'extera,' nam antiqui trisyl- laba ea proferebant, ut Cicero in Arato:

Tovrus Draco serpit supteraque retorquens Sæc,
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 ee vero plus supera parens, and on another inscription, with the same indication of date (cf. Ritschl, P. L. M. p. 46) (-ee- for ē in secedes) we have infera, i. 1166 quae infera scripta sunt, but on the earlier S. C. de Bacch. (i. 156 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 arbitrium, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., and cf. magister- C. I. L. i. 73, ma[gi]steratus, Eph. Epigr. ii. 298; on dextéra and dextra, see Brambach, Lat. Orth.; on sinistra for sinistra (e. g. Ter. Eur. 835), on Tībēris and Tībris, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., and for other examples of syncopated byforms, s. vv. sol(ī)duis, Vir(i)domarus, frig(ī)dus, ful(ī)ca, Teness (Gk.) and Tempsa (Lat.) ; but audac-ter, later audāc-ter, prēvi-gnus beside prēvi-genus (cf. Paul. Fest. 225. 2 Th. 'œnigenos' 'unigenitos'), ὑγ-μen beside ὑγι-μen, &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. tontico- with Umbr. totico-, 'publicus,' Osc. minstro- with Lat. ministro-, Osc. Vezkū- with Lat. Vetusco-.

§ 16. Syncope of Final Syllable. In Oscan and Umbrian, as in Gothic, ǣ, ǣ, i, but not ë (?), in a final syllable are syncopated, e. g. Osc. hūrz, Lat. hortus, Bālīns, Lat. Balīnum, tūrtiks for *tonticos from touta-, 'community,' 'people,' Umbr. emps, Lat. emptus, piahaz, Lat. piātus, all with syncope of -īs; Osc. médeg for *med-ūk-ēs Nom. Pl. of medītuk, the title of the Oscan chief magistrate, censtur for *censtor-ēs, Lat. censōrēs, with syncope of -ēs of Nom. Pl. (see ch. vi. § 40). Umbr. pacer for *pāc-rī-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. āger for *ag-ro-s, in-līger for *en-līg-ro-s, ācer for ac-rī-s, vīlīcīr, &c., but perhaps in no others. Quattuor might be for *quētūr-ēs, Masc. (Doric Gk. rētōpe, Sanscr. catvāras), but may
also be the Neuter form (Sanscr. catvàri) (see ch. vi. § 63). The contraction of -atis to -as in the Nom. Sg. of adjectives or nouns denoting the place of one's birth, e. g. Arpínas, *Casìlas (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 patientia,

seems intended to mimic an Oscan *Campans for Campánus, like Osc. Bantins for Bantinus. Like Arpínatis, later Arpínas, are Samnitís, later Samnís, Laurentís, later Laurentis, Tiburtís, later Tiburs, &c. (Prisc. i. p. 134 H.). Nominatives Sg. of i-stems like sors (in Plaut. Cas. 380 sortis), quietes (if an I-stem like O. Pers. ſiyátiš, Av. šyšitiš) may have dropped i in their final syllable, not by syncope, but by analogy of consonant-stems; cf. nube used by Liv. Andr. for nubës (Serv. ad Aen. x. 636), plebes and plebës (for other examples, see Ritschl. Opusc. ii. 652). Or these may be instances of parallel stem-formations, like penüs, peno-, penos- of pénus, Gen. penús, penum, Gen. peni, penus, Gen. penóris. So viólen and víoletus, fluens and fluentum, &c., epulonus (Paul. Fest. 55, 15 Th. ‘epolones’ diecebant antiqui, quo nune epulones dicimus), and ópulo, centurionus and centúrius, curíus, decurionus and cüríus, decúrius (Paul. Fest. 34. 36 Th. ‘centurionus’ antea, qui nune centurio, et ‘curious’ et ‘decurious’ diecebantur), infaus, once used by Accius (Trag. 189 R. infans facinus) in the sense of infandus. Compounds like in-dex, iūs(d)-dex, vin-dex differ from causi-dicvs, iuri-dicus, fáti-dicus in being formed directly from the weak verb-stem dic-, like Sanscr. a-diš-. So conjux (cf. Sanscr. sayuj-, Gk. a(γ)ες besides bijāgi and bijāgus, bijae, &c. So for(m)iceps, au-ceps, prin-ceps beside urbi-cópus (Plaut.), hosti-capas (Paul. Fest. 73. 10 Th. ‘hosticapas’ hostium captor); opis-fex, arti-fex, carnt-fex beside múni-ficus, magni-ficus; rém-ex beside pród-igus. Man-suetés (Acc. manสueum and manสueum) beside man-suetus, in-quito beside in-quitus are like Gk. ἀθέης and ἀορός, ἀθέης and ἀορός. Praceps, aniceps from praec-, ambici- and córii, in Plautus praecipecs (Rud. 671), ancípecs (Rud. 1158) (cf. procapax, Paul. Fest. 281. 22 Th. ‘procapis’ progenies, quae ab uno capite procedit; and concepit (?) of the XII Tables ap. Fest. 556. 27 Th. tignum iunctum aedibus uneaue et concepit ne soluito) were afterwards assimilated to compounds of cópio, e.g. prin-ceps (cf. Prisc. i. p. 280. 15 H. antiqui tamen ‘anceips’ et ‘praeceips’ et ‘bicéps’ proferabant in nominativo ... idem tamen vetustissimi etiam ‘praecepis’ genetivum ... secundum analogiam nominativi protulerunt). Old Latin Pollácès (Plaut. Bacch. 894, cf. Gk. πολλάκες) was shortened to Polláx, probably by analogy of láx, Gen. làcís. Priscian (i. p. 282. 12 H.) tells us that the old forms of concors, discur, &c. were concórides, discórides (cf. i. 354. 13 H.) (cf. late Lat. orbes, e. g. Ven. Fort. ix. 3. 14; orbis non ‘orbs’ Probl 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 hiárus (Gk. ἡλίας), one of those loanwords from Greek to express subtileness 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, hiáris (ch. v. § 34); foris was perhaps originally forstus (Paul. Fest. 73. 9 Th. ‘forstum’ pro bono dicebant), though as early as the XII Tables we find forstes for loyal allies, (ap. Fest. 524. 15 Th., in XII caustium est, ut idem juris esset ‘Sanatibus’ quod
§ 17. ACCENTUATION. SYNCOPE.

'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; sīcro- and steri- are parallel stems in O. Latin (sīcres 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 di Mānes. In the Carmen Salinæ occurred the phrase Cerus mānus, explained by Paul. Fest. 87. 29 Th. as creator bonus, and at Lanuvium the old word mānis was in use even in the time of Macrobius (fourth cent. A.D.) (Macr. i. 3. 13 nam et Lanuinī 'māne' pro bono dierunt; sicut 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 ἄραθν as a good omen when a light was brought into the room, dici principium 'māne,' quod tum manat dies ab oriente, nisi potius quod bonum antiqui diebant 'manum,' ad eujusmodi religionem Graeci quoque, cum luimen affertur, solent dicere φῶς ἄραθν (see ch. vi. § 38). The O-stem hortus became in the compound *co-horto- an I-stem *co-hortis, which (like sors, &c. above) changed its Nom. Sg. to co-hors. Even the Perf. Part. Pass. sānātus appears in the form sanatī- 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 defecisset 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 damnātō-, of an I-stem damnati-, which has taken a cons.-stem Nom. Sg. damnas, like aesas, tempestas.

10-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 'vatiō' diebant; so Verres and Verrius. In Vulg. Lat. -ius (-us) became -is in actuaris, abstemis, sobris, caerulis, consanguinis, &c. (Lowe, Prodr. p. 420), thus repeating the early confusion between -io- and -i- in the declension of names like Cæcilius, Acc. Cæcili, Cæcilius, Acc. Cæcillum (see ch. vi. § 3). But none of these is 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 Lūcius and puer (stem pīĕro-), 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, -ös, -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, Vol. 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. fict for ficit.)

§ 17. Syncope under the Pænultima Accent Law. (1) Pretonic. Compounds of fācie like călie-facio, which shortened their e by the law of Brevis Brevians (see below), took the further step of suppressing the vowel altogether before
the accent of the next syllable, cal-facere, cal-factus. Quintillian (i. 6. 21) tells us that in his time the full form cal-facere was never used in ordinary talk. *Olefacere, not *olefacer, is the regular form. Ritschl proposed to help the metre occasionally in Plautus by reading beneficium, malficium for bonificium, malficium, benfacta, malfacta (e.g. Trin. 185) for benefacta, malfacta 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 maldictum (see Ritschl, opusc. ii. 716). So firmly established was the syncope of compounds of facio like ofacare that even *arefacio, whose ē 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, figlina beside discipulus, figulus, and on later inscriptions vetranus (cf. C. I. L. iii. Ind. p. 1159 for *vetranus, &c. (on Greek inscriptions almost always oeperavos or bentavos). 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 ietus scena) had a byword secona; and another obsolete term seculna, discussed by Gell. xx. 11, a synonym of *sequester, was explained by a grammarian, who compiled a sort of 'Slang Dictionary' (Lavinius 'De Verbis Sordidis') as a contraction of *seculna. Vulg. Lat. mat(i)tinus (Ital. mattino, &c.) may be explained either as a case of the suppression of one of two similar neighbouring syllables, like Res(t)itus above (§ 13, p. 176) or of pretonic syncope, such as is seen in Ital. cervello (Lat. cervellum), vergogna (Lat. vireundua), bonta (Lat. bontāt), gridare (Lat. quiriteare), dritto (Lat. directus), &c. Procope is common in Italian, owing to the frequency of final vowels, e.g. vescovo (Lat. episcopus), nemico (Lat. inimicus), cagneio (Lat. occasio-), &c. Synizesis of the pretonic short vowel is seen in Vulg. Lat. qu(i)etus, *dyurnus (Ital. giorno); coacrus became *quattus (Ital. quatto), &c. (cf. Georges, Lex. Worff. on Num(i)torius, Lug(u)iunum).

(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 *barica from the Egyptian bōris (Prop. iii. ii. 44) (see Rhein. Mus. xlii. 589). Another is lamna (Hor. C. ii. 2. 2 inimice lamnae), in Vulg. Lat. lamna (Arnob. ii. 41), the older form of which was mamnā (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 obīrigo, by Terence's time always obīrargo, nouns or adjectives in -ālis denoting the country of one's birth, &c., e.g. infimatis (Stick. 493). The same shortening tendency attacked u, i in hiatus, e.g. lārva is a trisyllable in Plautus, a dissyllable later, so grātīs, later grātēs, while it has left traces of itself in spellings on old inscriptions like iuvra (for jugrca) on the Lex Agraria of Sp. Thorius, iii. b. c. (C. I. L. i. 200. 14. 25), not to mention others which may be dialectal, such as proseppai (Dative) on a very old mirror of Cosa (C. I. L. i. 57. -ai, not -ais, is what is written; see Rhein. Mus. xlii. 486), and cedere for caedere on an early inscription of Spoletium in Umbria (C. I. L. xi. 4766). Arānus for arīdus appears occasionally, e.g. Plaut. Aul. 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. 8. 21-
§ 18. CHANGE OF UNACCENTED VOCALS. 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 in 'but.'
We notice too a difference in this respect between Italian pro-
nunciation 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

x. 1781), which also contains uela (2, 18) for acida (but aridus, Plaut. Rud.
574, 726, 764, &c.; so Raude for Ravide, Catull. xi. 1; aspers for aspersis, Virg.
Aen. ii. 379 (cf. aspritido, aspritubam, asprido, and other derivatives, as well as
Ital. aspro), aspiter, Sueius ap. Non. 513 M. Syncope after a short accented
syllable is seen in soldus, used even in the Lex Municipalis of Julius Caesar,
45 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 206. 114, 115), and admitted by Horace into his Satires (S. ii. 5,
65 metuentis reddere souldum, and S. i. 2. 113), in possum for pôdê-sum (ch. viii.
§ 97), and in ferme, for fêrime, Superl. of fêrê, if the corruption fert me of the
Palatine MSS. in Plaut. Trin. 319 be evidence of the spelling fêrime in Plautus'
time. Plautus has never the form culmen, which appears to be a form proper
of the oblique cases, so that the declension was: Nom. colêmen, Gen. col(um)ninis
(cf. Georges, Lex. Wortf. on later(ulumus, and possibly fer(ulum). In Vulgar Latin
we have slave-names like Marpor (C. I. L. i. 1076), Naepori (Dat. Sg.) (i. 1539 e),
of which full forms like Quindipor, Marcipor, Gaipor, are given by Festus (340.
17 Th.), mattus for mâtîtus, 'drunk' (Petron.), virîdis (cf. Probi App. 199. 9 viridis
non 'virdis'); on vir(i)desco, vir(i)darium, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv.; dictus
for dîgitus (see Georges); fridam for frîgadom on an inscription of Pompeii
(C. I. L. iv. 1291) (cf. Probi App. 198. 3 K. calida non 'calda'; frigida non
'frîga'; infringido for infringido, Oribas. fragm. Bern. iv. 34. p. 1. 6 and 10 Hag.);
cf. frîgador (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv.); calida is read in Cato, R. R. vi. 1 and 75.
Varro, R. R. i. 13, &c., and the proper name Cald(üs) is found on coins as early as 109 B. C.
(C. I. L. i. 382); on donnus for domînus, see Georges s.v., and
of the proper name Domnus, Domna, Gk. Δωρος (C. I. G. i. 6505, end of second
cent. A. D.), and Vulg.-Lat. nitid(üs), horr(û)ds, rîg(û)ds, col(û)phus, &c. are
indicated by the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. netto, ordo (but with close initial o), reddo, colpo, &c.
(For a list of syncopated forms in late inscriptions and MSS., see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 394 sqq.)
unaccented vowel has become ı. 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. remīgis, jūrīgo (Plaut.), later jūrīgo. Under the influence of a following labial consonant or l it assumes a u- or ù-sound (see ch. ii. § 16), e.g. occēpo, in-cēpio, 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 clīnis, òpus (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 ā (through *ei), au becoming ā (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, oclūdo. 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-caīda- (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 *armatura, &c. shows
the same treatment as the vowel of the syllable with the main
accent (cf. Ital. Fiorentino from *Florentinus, like fiore from
flōrem, but Firenze from Floréntia). 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. *prōnicare might become provōcare, though the noun praeco
(for *prae-vice) was left unchanged; ēnico might become e-neco;
consecro, con-sacre. 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 ēnico in
Plautus, &c., in spite of the old practice of separating the pre-
position from its verb by tnesis, ob vos sacro, for obsecro vos, sub
vos placio, for supplicio 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, fulguris, &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-capas (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 jefaked Numasoi*, 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 *i*, the modification of a short vowel in an ordinary short unaccented syllable was *e* (Gk. ε); while the older representative of *ü*, the modification of an unaccented short vowel before a labial or *l*, was *o* (Gk. ο). *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 *ε*. Thus on old Praenestine jeweleases, &c. we find spellings like *Belolai* (C. I. L. i. 44) for *Bellulae*, Salutes (i. 49) for Sālūtis, *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 *abigit*, 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*, oppedeis 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, *proieciat* (for *projicito*) on the Titulus Lucerinus (Eph. Epigr. ii. 298); while the spelling *inieciatis*, Plaut. *Truc.* 298 has led to the corruption *illeciatis* in the Ambrosian Palimpsest (so in Lucretius MSS. *traiecére*, iii. 513. For other examples, see Lachmann ad Lucr. ii. 951); *o* was similarly retained after *i*, *e*, e.g. *fitiolus*, *Pāteoli*, lit. ‘little wells,’ and after vocalic or consonantal *u* (*u*, *w*), e.g. *paruolus*. (See ch. iv. § 70.)

The *iē* of compounds of *jacio*, &c. became *ē*, e.g. *conicio*, through loss of accent (ch. iv. § 51), and similarly *uē* of compounds of *quatio*, &c. became *ū*, e.g. *concūtio*. 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 (surrupptum Plaut.), but always insulto, insulsus, inculo (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  görüşound (ch. ii. § 16), written at first v, later i. The spelling of MSS. of Plautus, testimonium, &c. became in time testimonium, &c. In Superlatives i for earlier u 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 maximum, 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 confirgo, 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. τέγγω), 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 pocolum (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, ãgilis, fàcilis, where i follows in the next syllable, is in O. Lat. e, e.g. famelai (C.I.L. i. 166), on Greek inscriptions Καυκελω, &c.

An o which had escaped the reduction to e became at the end of the third cent. B.C. u, e.g. òpus, earlier opos (ib. i. 52), Lucius, earlier Luciom (ib. i. 32) (cf. ch. iv. § 17); industrius (older endostro-, if we may believe Paul. Fest. 75. 28 Th.); -unt in 3 Pl. for older -ont, e.g. praeadoopont of Carm. Sal. (Fest. 244. 13 Th. MS. -oti-) in the sense of praeeptant. A u became ì, i, e.g. sàtura, satira.

The weakening of the diphthong ai (later ae) to i was frequently abandoned in the late Republican and Imperial time, a number of forms which exhibit this weakening, e.g. consiptum, obsiptum, from saepio, 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), ı sank further to ı, e.g. Bovianum for Bovianum (Oscan Búvaianúd Abl.), Mārius (cf. Oscan Maraiio-). Similarly unaccented au in hiatus sank to u in elu, eluācrum (Cato) from lāvēre (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 balineum (βαλανείον), trūtina (τρυψάνη), ŭlentum (τάλαντον), phūlerae (φάλαρα), &c., but not in plūtanus (πλάτανος), barbarus (βάρβαρος), &c. Vulgar Latin cītera (κιβάρα), Probi App. 197. 26 K., Ital. cētera and cētra, but Span. guitarra from cītāra (κιβάρα) (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 ơ of ancōra (ἀγκώρα) and the e of plūcenta (πλακοίντα, Acc. Sg.), for example, may have arisen in this way, just as πρόβυρα became protulum (Löwe, Prodr. p. 376) by the analogy of diminutives, or Περσε-φόνη, Prōserpīna (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 Mīnerva through loss of accent in the first syllable or by analogy of mīnor is uncertain. But the pretonic change of au to u in Ital. udire (Lat. audīre), uccello (Vulg. Lat. *auccellus from āvis), 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
is seen in mispronunciations like tonotru (Probi Append. 198. 32 K.), preventing reduction in ãlãcer, hãbãtem, &c.

A long vowel in an unaccented syllable was not shortened (except in the final syllable, see §§ 40–50 infr.) until a late period, when the length of all long syllables had been reduced to something not far removed from a short syllable (see ch. ii. § 141).

But a syllable long by position, when preceded by a short syllable and followed immediately by the accented syllable, was so reduced as to be often scanned as a short syllable by the early dramatists, e.g. volãptatem, senãclutem (Plaut. Ter.).

In Oscan and Umbrian, though syncope is of frequent occurrence, the quality of an unsyncopated unaccented vowel is retained in the spelling. The name, for instance, of the Latin poet, Propertius, who was a native of Umbria, is in Umbrian form Propartio-, not Propicio- (Vois. Ner. Propartio on an Umbrian inscription, C.I.L. xi. 5389, would be in Latin Vols. Propertii, Neroniis f.; cf. xi. 5518 sqq.).

§ 19. Other Examples. I. Syllables long by position. Anteclassical exercerent from sario, Ter. Heaut. 143 (e in all the MSS.; cf. Paul. Fest. 57. 12 Th. exercerent: sarioent); ommentans, from manto, Frequentative of mittis, quoted by Fest. (218. 14 Th.) from Livius Andronicus (cf. Gl. Plac. ommentat: expectat, &c.); inpetrum: inpetratum (Paul. Fest. 77. 3 Th.); inermat: armis spolliat (id. 78. 28 Th.); indicex: inductor, ab inliciendo (id. 80. 29 Th., with quotation of Plaut. Asin. 221) from O. Lat. liece (id. 83. 36 Th., lacit: induct in fraudem. Inde est ‘allieere’ et ‘inecessere”; inde ‘lactat,’ ‘illectat,’ ‘oblecat,’ ‘delectat.’ Cf. 83. 14 Th. lacit: decipeciendo induct. ‘Lax’ etenim frus est); proceretia (id. 282. 6 Th.), apparently from castra, seems to be the word equated with Gk. πολάρχεα in the ‘Philoxenus’ and ‘Cyrillus’ Glossaries; compuctus is in Plautus the Participle of the compound of piciscor, comp extrus (ch. ii. § 144) of compingo. We have e before a labial with a consonant in insepsit, the old ‘Perf. Subj.’ of incipio (Paul. Fest. 76. 23 Th.); peremne dicitur auspicari, qui amnem, aut aquam, quae ex sacro oritur, auspicato transit (Fest. 316. 32 Th.); indepate: 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: átisavres; proceptat: sape praecepit Carm. Sal. (Fest. 244. 10 Th.); inbrae aves: qua in auguris aliena fieri prohibent (id. 78. 7 Th.). But enrubro: inhembenti (id. 54. 7 Th.). Cf. the questionable spellings in the ‘Philoxenus’ Glossary, enuber, enubra, enubrum (for enub-?). On the Falisco-Latin inscription of the Faliscan ‘collegium cocorum’ 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 aciptum acetaei agedai.

Classical examples are génetriz beside genitus; obettrix beside stator, constitutio; (but préditriz, &c., influenced by préditor); fulgitudrum (all these Neuters in -trum
and Femis. in -tra have e, except a few with a, e.g. verērum, mulētra, arētrum. But tontrum: see A. L. L. i. 111; id-ent-ideum from ante; expers from pars; pīrennĭs from annus, and imberbis from barba, with the usual I-stem of Compound Adjectives; incēstus from castus; forergus from formus, 'warm;' and otopio; consperco from *pīco-sec (cf. pāciscor). So in Reduplicated Perfects, e.g. peperci from parco; fajellī from fulto. And in Final Syllables like miles for *mĭles, *mĭli-tŭs (in Plaut. the last syllable of such words is long by position, ch. ii. § 137); cornicen for *cornicēns, *cornu-con-s. An original o becomes e(i) in triginta for *trigenta (Gk. τρίακοντα) (on i for e before nt, cf. ch. ii. § 147),ulle from unaccented olle (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-sternari (cf. Gk. πτέρωμα, O. H. G. stormen); an original i perhaps in O. Lat. magister Quint. i. 4. 17). Other examples of the variation of weakened and unweakened forms are: comparco and comparparo, contracto and contracto, aspergo and aspargo, amando and amendo, disperso better than disperso, bipartitus and bipartitis, quinquapartitus and quinquapartitis, retracto better than retracto, conspergo and conspargo, ciliandrum and calidendrum, attræcto and attracito (so perhaps Sarapla and Sarapla), on which see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. vv.; cf. abarctul Paul. Fest. i. 11. 36. abarct id. 19. 26 Th. On Greek inscriptions we have παραφ, μακαφ, βηβαλλαρος, ουτραρος, &c., from the end of the first cent. a. D.; see Eckinger; praes-fiscini is usually derived from fuscium, but neither existero 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 legerîpa (e. g. Pers. 68, corrupted to lege rampam), cf. vicervādix, Cato, R. R. xxxiii. 3), though at a later time the usual 'Composition-Vowel' 'i' was used, e. g. pinnirapus, Juvenal (see Rev. Phil. 1892, p. 199); from para come aequiperu, impera, pauper, but ὄπι-parus; jumiperus (and junipurus) (see Brambach, Lat. Orth. p. 142), derived by Verrius Flaccus from jāvēnis and pîrus (Serv. ad Ex. vii. 53); scer, soceri may be the direct development of *swēkuros, Gk. ἐκπός, Skt. śvaśuras, but see § 15, K. Z. xxxii. 564); cēneris, cēneri, but cinus, ciniscelus (cf. Georges, Lex. Worf. s. vv. Silerus, mataris, Samivrannis, and for plebeian spellings like Caeserem, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 195, ii. 214). [The late spelling facinerous is capable of being explained, like temperi Adv. beside temporl Dat., by the variation of the suffix -os- and -es- in the Declension of the Neuter stems (ch. v. § 71); cf. pigneru for pignora (see Georges)].

§ 21. (2) in -r or Labial. Anteclassical: consoluerunt and cosolutor on the S. C. de Bacchanalibus of 186 b. c. (C. I. L. i. 196. But consulueri e. 185 beside consultu i. 186 on two old inscriptions of Venusia); the MSS. of Plautus show exsolatum, Merc. 593 (B), exsolatum, Most. 597 (A), &c. (see Brix ad Trin. 535); consol on two inscriptions of 211 b. c. (i. 530–r) on another of 200 b. c. (Not. Scav. 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); exsoles is the Old Latin form (Cornutus ap. Cassiod. p. 152. 7 K.); Caesellius ap. eund. p. 204. 2 K.), while Velius Longus says, 'consol' scribēbatur per o, cum legeretur per u (p. 49. 14 K.).; incolomis is the spelling of the best MSS. (B, C) in Plaut. Truc. 168 (cf. colommas C. I. L. i. 1307). O remains in the classical period in vinolentus (perhaps by analogy of vīnī lentus), somnolentus, and sanguinolentus. For the Superlative suffix we have the oldest spelling ơ in the proper name Maxamo in an inscription in the Faliscan dialect (Zv. I. I. L. 60 Maxomo Iuneo he cupat, 'Maximus Junius hic
cubat") (cf. Gk. Δεσόμος C.I.A. iii. 61. A (3) 18, end of first cent. A. D. (?); maximus, &c., as was said above (§ 18), is the usual spelling on inscriptions till the time of Julius Caesar, though maximus, &c. is occasionally found much earlier. The spelling of Plautus has u in words like magnusse, Pseud. 702 (A.); pullyfugis, Most. 826 (A.); sociufrada, Pseud. 362 (A.); sacrufoem, Pseud. 327 (both A, the Ambrosian Palimpsest, and the Palatine family of MSS.); carnufex, &c. (see Index to Studemund's Apograph of A, p. 522). So Oinumana for Uninamama, an Amazon, on an old Praenestine cista (C.I.L. i. 1501); testumnonum on the Lex Bantia of 133–118 B.C. (i. 197); Cornufica on an inscription (i. 1087), which Ritschl dates 'not long after Caesar' (cf. Gk. Κορυφοκεῖος, e.g. C.I.G. 6948), tubulustrium (Varro), but acedificandum 158 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 565 and Eph. Epigr. viii. 460), opiparam on the old Falisco-Latin inscription with acipitem (Zv. I. I. 72), vadimonium and aedicifex on the Lex Agraria of 111 b.c. (C.I.L. i. 200); testnonum on the Lex Repetundarum of 121 B.C. (i. 198), &c. Monufastus is the anteclass., manifestus the classical spelling (Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v.). [For other examples see Georges s.vv. Hadrumetum, quadrupes, septu(m)ennis, septu(m)aginta, crassypes (Gk. Κρασσόογης, Bull. vi. p. 280, of the Republican period), manupretium, marihunus, incohemis, coluber, marusappium, monumentum, coruupeta, sacrufex, existetano, lauruma muculentum, recevero, ustulo, accupenser, sternulatum, ituubus, sesscypex, victuma, pontufex]. The influence of a following syllable with i (especially in hiatus) is shown in familia (O. Lat. familia, § 18) beside famulus; subrimii haedi, from rumus, mamma (Paul. Fest. 369. 8 Th.) beside subrmari (Fest. 442. 32 Th.); monicicipes beside manucipium on the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 200); manibiex, Eph. Epigr. i. p. 215 (but manubies, ib. viii. 476, on a Capua inscription c. 135 B.C.); suripias 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 surrupi, surruisses seem to be the Plautine forms (also surruphus); we have recipit on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 180 b.c. (C.I.L. i. 33), acippio and concilium on i. 197 of 133–118 B.C., accipto, conciliatum, conciliaboleis on i. 198 of 123–122 B.C.; accipiant on i. 199 of 117 B.C.; only the i-form is quoted of inipitus: impicatius vel inretitus (Gl. Plac.), from root ap- (cf. optas). [For insipiet: inpetum facite (Paul. Fest. 78. 5 Th.), see below]. In Gk. inscriptions Σεπτυμος is very rare; we find almost always Σεπτυμος. (See also Georges on Lanuvium).

Classical: u remains in contubernalium (but adtibernalis, Paul. Fest. 9. 9 Th.) from taberna; nuncupo, 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) (trebibus on an old inscription in the British Museum, Eph. Epigr. ii. 299); disipuo is the anteclassical, dissipu the classical spelling (Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v.); so victuma 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. 12. 14 K. ut apparat ex libris antiquis foederum et legum, qui etiamsi frequenti transcriptione aliquid mutarunt, tamen retinent antiquitatem... pro ‘piaculum’ ibi ‘piacolom’), is on a law of 56 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 603), piacul- (piachum on the Spoletium inscription, xi. 4766), but the ancient o
remains in Plautine spellings like
aemolos, Acc. Pl., Fœn. 196 (A.); epolones diecebant antiqui quos nunc epulones dicimus (Paul. Fest. 55. 15 Th.); agonum: pastorale baculum, quo pecudes aguntur (Paul. Fest. 21. 37 Th.); Tuscolana, C. I. L. i. 1200; tabolam on S. C. Bacch. of 186 b. c. (i. 196); taboles, popolum (beside popul(o)) on Lex Bantina of 133–118 b. c. (i. 197); singolos, taboleis (and tabula), concilableis on the Lex Repetundare of 123–122 b. c. (i. 198); singolos (but vinculeis) on the Sententia Minuciorum of 117 b. c. (i. 199); tabolam, singolos 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, tricontabule(is), viz. iii i b. c.; angolaria (but operculea), 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 Δεντολος (first cent. b. c.), Δεντολος (c. 140 b. c.), Δεντολος (first cent. a. d.), but usually Δεντολος (cf. ch. ii. § 102); the Gk. loanword drachma is in the earlier writers draco(γ)uma; for spellings like vigulum, vigilu, vigilia, titulus, sidelo, sepulcrit, see Georges.)

§ 22. in other short syllables. Anteclassical: accedo (for accedo) is preserved by the MSS. in Enn. Trag. 77. 206 R.; Lucr. ii. 1025, v. 609 and elsewhere (see Ribbeck, Prolegom. Verg. p. 416); so timetum in Naev. Com. 35 R.; acetare diecebant, quod nunc dicimus agere (Paul. Fest. 17. 30 Th.). Similarly e is retained without weakening in spellings of the oldest MSS. of Plautus like deternet, Pers. 505, contemnem, Stich. 214, contemnem 623, &c. (so the corruption ad te alienet, Pers. 497, points to alienet not attinet); in the MSS. of Poem. 266 proseda (cf. Paul. Fest. 282. 16 Th. prosedas meretrices Plautus appellat), optenuei on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 150 b. c. (C. I. L. i. 38); conregione in the augur's formula (Varro, L. vii. 8; Paul. 46. 24 Th.); promemoravit, pronemet, Carm. Sal. (Fest. 244. 12 Th.); cf. mereto(a) on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 215 b. c. (C. I. L. i. 32) (but merito a i. 190, 'early part of the sixth cent. a. u. 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 Paenultima Law, e. g. aiidiles Nom. Sg. on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 250 b. c. (i. 31); Fabrecio (i. 106); Tempestatubus on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 215 b. c. (i. 32); Leporesse for Liparesse (Gk. Δισαρα), (quoted probably from Ennius by Paul. Fest. 87. 6 Th.), and Greek inscriptions often retain the older orthography, e. g. κομετον (usually), Καυμελος (till c. 50 b. c., then Καυμελος), Καπεταλος (usually, Καπι- not till first cent. a. d.), Απεδος (in Rep., but Απεδος in Empire), Δομετος and Δομειτος. But the weakening to i is old, as is seen from dimidius, which must have changed to eto i at a time when the accent rested on the first syllable; confice on an old Praenestine cista of third cent. b. c. (Mil. Arch. 1890, p. 303); subigit and opsis on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 200 b. c. (i. 30); hablarent oppidum, possidere on the Decree of L. Aemilius Paulus, 189 b. c. (ii. 5041); obstinet, diecebant antiqui, quod nunc est ostendit, ut in veteribus carminibus, &c. (Fest. 228. 6 Th.); prosperes, prospece, Carm. Sal. (Fest. 244. 13 Th.); etnico is the old spelling, later eneco (Georges, Lex. Worff. s. v.); proscio, quod praesocatum projicitur (Paul. Fest. 282. 13 Th., cf. proscio, Gl. Philox.); eisicas from ex and seco, Plaut. Rud. 122; obigetan antiqui diesciant pro ante agiat (Fest. 214. 2 Th.); iurigo, later iurgio (cf. iurgium); gallecinium from cano, by analogy of which was formed conticinium (cf. Gl. Plac. p. 58. 24 G. conticiuo; tempore nociis post galli cantum quando cecininit et conticuit) (see Goetz, præf. in Plaut. Asin. xxv). Classical: Jupiter from pater; sistite (cf. Gk. ἱστατε); compitum, explained by Varro, 'ubi viae competunt' (L. L. 6. 25) (cf. propitius); dimico from maco
(cf. maeco); of the rare weakening of o we have examples in Compounds like hōniciōda, armiger, &c. for the Composition-Vowel, which is o in other languages, is i in Latin (see ch. v. § 83); incubitus beside inculta? Of i, examples are cornicen (Gk. κορνικάριος, κορνοκάριος and κορνικάριος); supercōlīnum (cf. Gk. κόλα, Plur.); both inclusus (incluto in all the MSS. of Plaut. Pers. 251) and includus are attested spellings; (cf. arbitro, not arbitrō, in the MSS. of Lucretius, v. 941 and 965). For other examples of e-i, see Georges, Lex. Wortf., s. vv. eligo, compitum, tremebundus, caeremonia, feniscium, cervesia, ploxeum, subsicīvus, quatensus, internecio, protinus, seexa, querimōnium, intellegentia, nagelgo, intimo, also for late and plebeian spellings like segitis, patena, tredecem, decim. (On late adjecentia see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 193.) The change of e to i in syllables long by position is claimed for praeciscīnia gēnīsta, &c. (on these see ch. ii. § 12), certainly with right in infringo, &c. (see ch. iv. § 11), before a consonant-group like ng (so tingo for *tengo, Gk. τίγγα). Assimilation saves the vowel in segetem, teretemi, &c.

§ 23. (3) Diphthongs, ai, ae. Anteclassical: distisum et pertisum diebant, quod nunc 'distaeum' et 'pertaesum' (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 facietor videare, et scire plus quam caeteri 'Pertisum' hominem, non pertaesum, dices.

Lucilius was right, for compounds with intensive per are Separable Compounds like bene-facio, sat-ago (see below); pertaesum is the spelling on the Claudius tablet at Lyons; consipitus 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 consipita, undique uenor (Enn. Trag. 254 R.); adipserippe et prassipere diebant antiqui, siquē nos quoque modo dicimus abaequo 'iniquum,' ab quaerendo 'inquirere' (Paul. Fest. 16. 9 Th.); obsipiam, quoted from Caecilius by Diomedes (p. 383. 10 K. quod vulgo obsepio 'dicimus' dicimus veteres 'obsipio' dixerunt. Caecilius, &c.) (Com. 65 R.); praecidaneam poream diebant, quam immolare erant soliti antequam novam frugem praeciderent (Paul. Fest. 273. 5 Th.). (Gellius, iv. 6 discusses this word and its cognate sucidaneae, which, he says, was sometimes mispronounced in his time sucidaneae: succidaneae nominatae, litterae i scilicet tractim pronuntiata; audio enim quosdam em litteram in hae voce corripere); occisit is quoted from the Laws of Neum by Festus (194. 21 Th.); so detādo in XII Tab., incederetis on S. C. Bacch. of 186 n. c. (C.I.L. i. 196. 27). But exquaire is quoted by Priscian (i. p. 38 H.) from Plant. 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 defecatum, Most. 158 are the likely spellings); conquaeri, conquaesuiri, exaestvumavit occur on the Lex Repettundarum of 123-122 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 198), while on the Edictum Popilianum of 323 B. C. (i. 551) we have the curious spelling conquaesivi (cf. i. 547, an inscription of 141 or 116 B. 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. oposaephum on the Lex Col. Jul. Urbanorum of 44 B. C. (Eph. Epigr. ii. p. 105); lapiadimnis on the Lex Metalli Vipascensii of the first cent. A.D. (Eph. Epigr. iii. p. 166); we have usually fabri subediani on inscriptions (C. I. L. x. 6699. 5; vi. 9559. 8, &c.), or Subediani (vi. 9558. 7; viii. 10523. 5) (of which last, Subediani on ii. 2211. 7, seems to be a misspelling). The weakened forms are used in the classical period in the compounds of quaero, in existine (cf. Mar. Victor.
p. 22. 6 K. quid enim facietis in his quae, velit is nilitis, et scribenda sunt et legenda ut scripta sunt, ut exempli gratia 'existimó' non 'exaestimó'), in fastitium for *fasti-tidium* (§ 13; p. 176), &c.

*au*; *afflicere* 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); *accuso*, *incuso*, &c. from *causa* are classical forms. The *ā* of the compounds of *claudio* was in time adopted in the simple verb too, *cludo* by analogy of *recludo*, &c. (of Ital. *chiudo*) (see Seelmann in Gotth. Gel. Anz. Aug. 15, 1890) (cf. *sed frudo* § 64, beside *sed fraude* § 69, on the Lex Repetundarum, C. I. L. i. 198). The *ō* of *exploado*, &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, apud veteres plodo; then after quoting the form *plerent* from Cicero, he adds, secundum eas consuetudinem qua 'au' 'syllaba cum o' littera commercium habet, ut cum dicimus 'claustria' et 'clostra', item 'caudam' et 'codam' et similia), just as *oe* (older *oi*) and *ā* are by-forms, e.g. *commūnis*, *immūnis*, *cominin* in S. C. Bach, (C. I. L. i. 196), *immoenis* (Plaut.). *Oboedio* from *audio* is difficult to explain. (See also Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v. *dissaeptum*, *exquirō*, *existimō*, and Brambach, Orth. on *pertaeus*, *lapicidin*.)

§ 24. (4) Diphthongs in *Hiatus*. (On these see also ch. iv.) The *u*-diphthong is retained in *āb-avus*, *āt-avus*, *trīt-avus* (O. Lat. *strīt-avus*) but becomes *ū* in *ēd* beside *lavo*, *erum* (erum) from *ere* (Gk. *ἐπιθνός*), *ēmīo* for *de novo*, &c. The Greek *Achina* of became Lat. *Achnī* (through *Acheiv-*); Gk. *Achn* (*ov*, *olivo*), older *oleivo*, which became when *-om* was weakened to *-on* *olei* (*v*) *um* Nom., *olei* Gen. &c. (see ch. ii. § 53), whence *oleum* (for *ey* before a vowel loses *y*, e.g. *go, *I go,* for *eyō, ch. iv. § 63), and *olivum*, *olei* and *olivi*, &c. (like *dei* (*v*) *us*, *deivi*, when *dēs* and *divus*, *dei* and *divi*, ch. iv. § 70); Gk. *ʾromea*, a Thracian claymore, became *rumpia* (Enn. Ann. xiv. fr. 8 M.; Liv. xxxi. 39. 11). In *clocca* for *clavca*, the *v* has been dropped, as usual, before the accented vowel (ch. ii. § 53), while *nūvus* and *nucus* are different formations (ch. v. § 7).

§ 25. (5) *Je* and *ve*. On *ī*, *ā* as a weak or unaccented form of *yē*, we in Indo-European see ch. iv. § 51. Whether the *ī* of *ābicio*, &c. should be explained as an similar Latin weakening, or as a modification of *-ī*, is an open question. The *ū* of *concitō* may also be compared with the use of Greek *ωυ* for Lat. *-quī* (especially unaccented), e.g. Greek *ʾAνυα* for Lat. *Aquila*, Greek *Kordemos* for Lat. *Quirīnus*, see ch. ii. § 28. Cf. *ancumelitudes* 'unclean,' (Paul. Fest. 8. 29 Th.), and inquinare; *biega* is the reduction of *bi-juga* (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v. *bijuga*), *quadriga* of *quadri-juga*; *ābicio* 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-ginta* with *ei* for unaccented *o* (cf. Greek *πακόννα* are rare, e.g. *vītānus* from *L.-Eur.* *wetos* (Greek *ῖρος*, 'a year') and similar derivative TO-stems from Neuter S-stems, *fērundus* and similar Gerundial DO-stems from third Conjugation Verbs, *vītānus* and the like formations [that *fēnestus*, *fērendus*, *fērentarius* (cf. Osc. *Herenat-*, the *Ocan Venus*), &c. show a weakening of *ō* to *ē*, and not rather a system *fenes*-*, fērend-*, *fērent-* cannot be proved; cf. ch. viii. §§ 89, 94, and see above, § 20; cf. *lupibus* (-os) and *fenumbris* (-os)]. Similarly in final syllables long by position we have *-unt* in 3 Pl. of Verbs for O. Lat. *-ont*, e.g. *negatīont* (Liv. Andron.), *osentīont* (Scipio Epitaph) (ch. viii. § 73). The change of *o* to *u*
in unaccented syllables is further discussed in ch. iv. § 20. Dupondius (and dupondii; see Georges, Lex. Worf. s.v.), promontarium, are not good examples, for before n, nt we find even accented o becoming a u-sound, e.g. O. Lat. fruntes, Acheruntum (ch. ii. § 22). For examples of the change in syllables not long by position, see Georges, Lex. Worf. s.v. formidobosum, adolescentes, lenures, fulguria, bajulus, lautuniae, and cf. Brambach, Orth. on the misspellings polarum, annulum, Aequiculi and Georges on substes, eburn Gen., rigura Plur., vindentus, sanguinulentus, somnulentus, trideun. But aralum (Greek κορ-) and carastum (Greek κορ-) are not examples, nor mamphur (leg. manfar) the 'thong' round a turner's wheel (Paul. Fest. 101. 1 Th.) (see Meyer-Lübke, Comm. Schweizer-Sünder, p. 24), and O. Lat. colina is a doubtful form. Examples of u-i are inclitus, later inclitus, defruteum and detrueitum (see Georges), arbitum and arbitum (Lucr.), sátara 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 eipit Corsica Aleriaque urbe); tessera (τίσσορα); Agrigentum (Ἀγρίγεντα Λεξ.), now Girgenti; Tarentum (Ṭārānta Λεξ.), now Taranto or Taranto; Alizexontum (Ἀλίζεξοντος) on a Praenestine cista of third cent. B.C. (i. 59), and on another (i. 1501) Alizent(e') (Ἀλίζεντος), Casuen(a) (Κασοῦναρα); Aleteta (Ἀλεταντύττα); Hecula, O. Lat. Hecula (Quint. i. 4. 16) (Ἐκάθη); 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. Worf. s.v.); Camerina and Camerina (Καμέρωνα), στόυπα (καμάλη) (see Meyer, Rom. Gram. i. pp. 32, 36); machina (μηχανή, μαχανά); Catina (Κατάνη); scutula (σκυτάλη); stranguulo (στραγγαλάω).

b. catapula (καταπλήττω); scopolus (σκόπελος); tarpsisita Plaut. (τραπεζής); pharetra (φαρέτρα); Acheruns Plaut. (Ἀχέρουν); enecilis (Löwe, Prodr. p. 376) (ἐγχελύς).

c. dopsilis (δαψίλης); cypresus (κυπάρισσος).

d. amargia (ἀμάργγια); cothurnus (κόθυρνος); episula (ἐπιστόλη); also epistolā (see Georges, Lex. Worf. s.v.); panula (φανώλης); tribula (τρίβολος); Patrocles (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. Avernum, popularly connected with ὄρνος, and late Lat. averta (Greek ἀβρή) admit of other explanations. (See Solmsen, Stud. Lat. Lat. Gesch. p. 23). On the spelling numisma (Gk. νομίσμα) see Keller ad Hor. Epig. ii. 1. 234, and on late Lat. cabalus for diabolus, Georges, Lex. Worf. s.v.

e. arytanae; but artaena (artena) in Lucilius (ἀρτάναια); incitega (ἐγγοθήνη). (Paul. Fest. 76. 3 Th. incitega: machinula, in qua constituebatur in convivio vini amphora, de qua subinde deferrentur vina); mettea, 'minecement' (Varro, L. L. v. 112 (ματένη). (The word appears in a curious military term maddoeburulues, used by Vegetius for a leaden bullet, or a soldier armed with these, apparently for ματτανο-πάρβολος, lit. 'minecement-scattering.' See A. L. L. v. 135); serpillum, (if from Greek σπυρόλος), with s by analogy of serpo.

f. au, av. Achit (Ἀχιτό); olivum and olvem (ἐλαιον); olive and oile (ἐλαια); Centurum, Centaurnum (Gl. Plac. p. 54. 7 G.) (Κένταυρον).

Parasitic Vowel. Ηρελθή is on Praenestine cistae and mirrors Hercle . . . (C.I.L. xiv. 4105); Herole (Ἅρκελος) (C.I.L. i. 1500), Herculee Acc. (i. 56), and on old Praenestine inscriptions (xiv. 289-2) Herculet Dat. On a Roman inscription of 217 B.C. (i. 1503) Herculei Dat. So Hercolei (i. 1175), Hercoloi (i. 815), but Herculis Gen. on an inscr. of 146 B.C. (i. 541), classical Hercules,
mehercle (cf. Prisc. i. p. 27. 13 H. Romanorum vetustissimi in multis dictionibus loco ejus (u) o posuisse inveniuntur . . . . Hercolem 'pro ' Herculum'); 'Aσκληπιὸς is Aisoloapi Dat. on an old inscr. (Ann. Epigr. 1890, no. 85, but Aisclapi, Eph. Epigr. i. 5), classical Aesculapius; 'Άλκηφη is in Plautus Alcmena; on techna, &c., musimo, see ch. ii. § 72.

§ 28. (8) Vowel unchanged. i. in Latin words. Anticlassical: incontassit and excantassit of XII Tab. (ap. Plin. xxviii. 18), but 'occentassint' antiqui diec-bant, quod nunc concivem fecerint (Fest. 196. 12 Th.); ancassu, dicta sunt ab antiquis vasa, quae caelata appellamus (Paul. Fest. 15. 10 Th.), but Prisc. i. p. 29. 20 H. cites as instances of am-, 'anfractus,' 'anclusus,' 'anquiro,' and Varro, L.L. vii. 43 explains 'anceilia': quod ea arma ab utraque parte, ut Thraeum, incisa; perfacul antiqui, et per se 'facul' diec-bant, 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): perfaculis (beside difficultis), being what are called 'Separable' Compounds, cf. per pol saepe peccus, Plaut. Cas. 370, per ōpus est, Ter. Andr. 265 (so that Lucilius was right in his objection to partimism, see above); procapis progenies: quae ab uno capite procedit (Paul. Fest. 281. 22 Th.); concapit tignum XII Tab. (ap. Fest. 556. 27 Th. tignum inuentum aedibus sineaue et concapit ne soluto); resparsum vinum (Paul. Fest. 353. 6 Th.); concapit, comprehenderit (C. G. L. v. 182. 22). oecumene (3 Pl. Pft.) is quoted from Sallust's Histories by Priscian, i. p. 529. 5 K.

Classical: rēdarguo, but 'redarguo,' was used by Scipio Africanus Minor (Fest. 372. 7 Th. redarguisses per e litteram Scipio Africanus Pauli filius dicitur enuntiasse, ut idem etiam 'pertism'); ālacris, but Vulg. Lat. aecer (so in a glossary in MS. Vind. 482) (Ital. allegro, &c.); augurātus, augur were formerly 'augeratus,' 'auger' according to Priscian, i. p. 27. 17 H.; impetus, but 'inipite,' impetum facie (Paul. Fest. 78. 5 Th., apparently a corruption for 'impete,' impetum fac(e), 'compitum'; undeceim, duodecim weaken the e of the final syllable but not of the paenultima; īncola, but O. Lat 'inquilinus' (ch. vi. § 10); inaequalis, but 'iniquus,' &c. U remains in ītūlī (see ch. viii. § 39), πειδεμου, contumax, &c. (See also Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv. instauro, con-quaestor, comparo, sepelio, &c.)

§ 29. ii. in Greek loanwords: amygda (ἀμυγδάλη) (but Vulg. amicădula, Probi Appendix 198. 26 K.), artem oct. Lucil. (ἀρτήριον); astraba, the title of a play ascribed to Plautus (ἀστράβης); ballaena or balena, Plaut. &c. (φάλανα); balanus, Plaut. &c. (βάλανος); barathrum, Plaut. &c. (βάραθρον); calamus, Plaut. &c. (κάλαμος), apparently Vulg. Lat. *calmus (Ital. calmo and calam, Fr. chaume); cantharus, Plaut. &c. (κάνθαρος); cinaedus, Plaut. &c. (κίναιδος); cottaibus, Plaut. &c. (κότταβος); cymbalum, Lucr. &c. (κύμβαλον); daedalus, Enn. &c. (δαίδαλος); drapeta, Plaut. (δραπήτης); gauzacum, Varro (καυνάκης); gauzace, Lucil. &c. (γαυνάσης, γαυνάσας); Hecladu, Plaut. &c. (Εκλήνη); hilarius, Plaut. &c. (λαρός), later hilaris (λαρός); Hilaria, Plaut., later Myria (Μιλυρία); lapathus, Lucil. (λαπάθος); machaera, Plaut. &c. (μάχαρα); malaxis, Naev., Plaut. &c. (μαλάκος); margarita, Varro, &c. (μαργαρίτης); metalum, Varro, &c. (μετάλλον); muren, Plaut. &c. (μύρων); narcissus (νάρκις); obrusta, 'touchstone,' Cic. (ὀβρυστής, ὀβρυστόν); onager (ὁνάγος); palaestra, Plaut. &c. (παλαίστρα); petasus, Plaut. &c. (πητάσως); phalanga, Varro, &c.; pittacium (πιττάκιον); pithuna, Varro, &c. (πιθύνη); raphanus, Cato, &c. (ῥάφανος); sessamum, Plaut. (σήσαμον), but sessuna, Plaut.
ACCENTUATION. VOWEL-WEAKENING.

Poen. 326, sesimn (see Georges s. v.); stomachus, stomacher, Ter. &c. (στόμαχος); Tartarus, Tartarvus, Enn. &c. (τάρταρος), sometimes mispronounced 'Tarterus' (Consont. 392. 17 K.); thalamus (θαλάμος); thesaurus, (θ)εσσαυρος, Plaut. &c. (θησαυρός); trapezum, Accius, &c. (τρόπαιον); tympanum, Plaut. &c. (τύμπανον); tyrranus, Plaut. &c. (τύραννος); paedagogus, &c. (παιδαγόγος).

§ 30. (9) Long vowels. None of the examples adduced to prove that long unaccented vowels were sometimes changed are conclusive: delēro from lūro, 'a furrow,' root leis- (O. Sl. leha, Lith. lūsė, 'a garden-bed,' O. H. G. wagon-leisa, &c.), is the correct form, while delēro, as Varro (ap. Vel. Long. 73. 2 K.) pointed out, is due to confusion with Greek λήφρον. Delētio (so spelt in all the MSS. apparently of Plaut. Stich. 457), beside delenio, subtilis (but probētum, &c.), suspicio, conciētum, all with i in the following syllable, show the change to which even accented e 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 occedamus. For not only does Placidus' Glossary of Plautus (p. 89. 4 G.) give occedere: occurrere vel obviām cedere, but the MSS. (the Palatine family) of Plautus read in the passage referred to by Festus, viz. Ps.-Stic. 250, Accedamus hac obviam, where the corruption accedamus points to an original occedamus. Consiva, an epithet of the goddess Ops (Fest. 210. 26 Th., Varro, L. L. vi. 21) has been connected with consīo, consēvi. The examples of unaccented e are numerous, such as the compounds of cēdō, rēpō, cēdo, crēdo, crētēs, spēro, irrētio 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. Jēnarius, &c., see ch. ii. § 3) the examples usually adduced are anhelēs (cf. hālō), and subēt (cf. tālōs). But anhelēs (spelt anelēs in MSS. of Virgil; see Ribbeck's Index) has probably come from *an-ēnēlōs, the a of hālō, from *an-sēle (root an augmented by ə), having been changed to e while its quantity was still short. The word subtēl quoted by Priscian (i. p. 147. 9 H.) as an instance of -ēt, and explained as τὸ κολὼν τοῦ πόδος (what does he mean by hostis hostilis, subtēl subtēlis, i. p. 131. 21 H. ?) may similarly be due to a change of the short vowel in the original form *sub-tax-tēs (cf. taxīllus) (or from taxīlus ?). None of the Compounds of dēmō, fēmā, fētus, dērās, pārēo, pāko, pāvēs, rēdō, vādō, gāvēs, gāvēs, lābor, mānō, nātūs, gāvēs, &c. ever change the vowel. Prefestus is a compound of festus (cf. fērīae for fēsīae), not of fastus, fās (cf. nefastus). Nor do ā, ē change; witness the Compounds of pīlōro, dōno, fēsīs, &c. Praestōlōr and præstīlōr come, the one from præsto, the other from præstā (§ 15. 3). Pejēro and ējēro (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. reini; dēmōrat, Ital. dimora (with close o), Fr. demeuro. The vowel of the simple verb usually appears unchanged in the Compound, e. g. redōdēlt, Ital. rendiede, O. Fr. rendiūt. 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 adluo, adiliguer, adlibabor as the forms in use at his time, though Assimilation was the custom with other verbs, e. g. alligo (see eh. iv. § 159). The same grammarian, in another passage, while he approves of the pronunciation commendō, adds that the popular pronunciation was commandō (73. 10 K. quamvis ‘commendō’ 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’ faciat per s et e, non per s et a, sic et castus facit ‘incestum’ non ‘inceastum’; 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 perpetu, depecisci, &c., while the analogy of the simple verb is seen in spellings on Imperial inscriptions like consacravit (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.) prōtinus the Adverb of time, from protemus the local Adverb. The i of the Oblique Cases of levir, *laevir, ‘brother-in-law’ (cf. Greek ξαφής, 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 gentirix, for gentrix (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 *plico (Gk. πλίκω) to plico. (For other ex. of ‘Re-composition,’ see Seelmann, Ausspr. p. 60, and Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv. dispando, infacetus, proacanto, infrario, peremo, indennis beside inenniss; see also above, § 28).

§ 32. (11) Pretonic. Miniscitur 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-aēde esse, in-tēmpīl ire, &c. Caper (p. 93. 3 K.) corrects the mispronunciation pinaria colla for ‘penaria,’ and (p. 106. 4 K.) pulenta for ‘polenta,’ and (p. 100. 23 K.), pidato for ‘pedatu’ in the phrase ‘primo pedatu’; Probi Append. 198. 5 K. sinatus (C. I. L. i. 206. l. 135; viii. 10525, &c.). We may similarly explain the n of Ulixes, from 'Ολύσσεως, the ‘Aeolic’ form of Οὔσσεως (Quint. i. 4. 16, who also quotes the spelling Pulixena for Polyxena); cf. Τουβωμος on a Gk. inscription of Syracuse, I. I. S. 125; Bouλουμωμ on a Cyzicus inscription of the Republican period, Mith. vi. 124. (See also Georges, Lex. Wortf. for the spellings rutundus, bulliga, cinimum, Sigambri, Lundānium, &c.). In Italian the influence of the following labial is shown in somiglia (Lat. *simulat), domanda (Lat. demandat), dovere (Lat. debere), of a following r in smeraldò (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 aequātis has become uguale; cronaca (Lat. chronica) owes its penultimate a to Assimilation. The same tendency is seen in Vulgar Latin *aramen for aerāmen (Span. arambre, Port. arame, Prov. aram, &c.), *salcaticus for siletaticus (Fr. sauvage, our ‘savage,’ Span. salvaje), &c., and in classical Latin in Perfekts like memordit, peposci, ecuerri, of which the older forms were memordi, peposci, ecuerri (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 syllables of Perfekts like papāgi, 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-die-i (see ch. viii. § 22) from *die-seo]. (On the Assimilation of Syllables in Latin, see ch. iv. § 163.) Mispronunciations of this kind censured in the Appendix Probi (197–9 K.) are: tokonemn, tonotru, passar, ansar, parentalia, buttumen, and on late inscriptions we have misspellings like monomentum (C. I. L. vi. 2888, 11131, 24481, xiv. 416 and 523 and 864; Bull. Comm. Rom. 1889, p. 137, 1887, p. 43), odtomo (C. I. L. ii. 4291) (cf. oppodium 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. 7906), pataris (vi. 2063, 12, the Act. Arval. of 81 A.D.), careares (vi. 2065, 2066, 2067, the Act. Arval. of 87–90 A.D.), cubuc(i)tarius (C. I. L. vi. 6262, 8766), figitinae (xv. præf. p. 8). See also Georges, Lex. Wortf. on the spellings lucuna, lucusta, tiebiris, Berenice, carear, passar [e.g. Itala (Ash.) Lex. xi. 5, (Taur.) Math. x. 29 and 31, (Cantabr.) Luc. xi. 150], Ptolomanis, Dabolü, tugurium, and cf. Romance forms like Span. pajaro, Ital. passaretta (from Vulg. Lat. passar). The opposite tendency, viz. Dissimilation, 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 lacus has been referred the a of Vulg. Lat. *lacusta (Roum. łacústā), while forms like Prov. langosta, O. Fr. langeste point to an original l'angusta (illa 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 vistrello Caserta sportiglione, Pisa pilistrello, Parma pâlpâstrel, &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 cæsim, putā, feriunt, legiunt, 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 vulôptatis, vulôptatem, vulôptarius, &c. are common scansion in the early dramatists, and vulôntialis, juxôntutis, gubôrurare and gubôruror, egôstatis, venôstatis, supôléctilis come next in order of frequency. The normal scansion 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, miserium (Ital. mestiero, Fr. métiér, Chaucer's 'misterie,' ed. Morris, iii. 348); and this form seems to occur as early as Plautus, Pseud. 772:

paruis magnisque miserius praefulcior,

where the MSS. offer miserius. 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 operemperem, phrases which may be considered as word-groups in-occulto, tib(i) OPEREMPEREM, and so fall under the same category as the polysyllables voluptatia, 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. *am-mitto* for *om-mitto, ommitto; re-cido, re-latus, re-duco, earlier reccido, relatus, redudo, 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 ex-, qui(a) in- show the same shortening as in the final syllable of iambic words. Similarly in Greek and other loanwords a syllable long by position may be shortened when the preceding short syllable has the accent, as in Plautus always Philippus (Φιλιππος) in the sense of a 'Philip,' a gold coin, and in the Christian poets abysus (ἀβυσσος) (Paul. Nol. 19. 651; 35. 228; Cypr. Gall. Gen. 268 P.). In Vulgar and Late Latin we have syllables long by nature shortened in this way, e.g. erēmus (ἐρημος) in the Christian poets (e.g. Prud. Psych. 372; Cath. v. 89), whence the Romance forms, Ital. eremo and eremo, O. Fr. erme, Span. yermo, &c.; merēlatur, a mispronunciation censured by Consentius 393. 23 K. (also ἐρώταρ 392. 11 K.); vercandus in the Christian poets (e.g. Fort. vii. 6. 10) (cf. vercandus C. I. L. x. 1870), whence the Romance syncopated forms of ver(e)candia, 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. xxxi. 198; xxii. 1). In Ter. Phorm. 902 an verebamini, some MSS. have an vereveni; and Clitomestra or Clitudemestra (Κλτωμέστρα, a better spelling than Κλωτωμέστρα), in Livius Andronicus, Trag. 11 R., may be a case of false analogy, like aurichalum (ἀουρίχαλος), which is in Plautus aurichalum, 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). Anōtra (Ἀνότρα), 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. co.); and we know from Cicero (Or. xlviii. § 159) that the t, o were long in these cases. calfacio, &c. (in Quintilian's time apparently calfaccio, i. 6. 21), are really separable compounds, calce facio (cf. facit ārē, Lucr. vi. 962), so that the e is properly regarded as a final vowel; and the same is true of diēquinte (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 t, 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, dic, 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
calcarius, 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. emps (Lat. emptus), is difficult to establish with certainty for Latin, since videns beside violentus, mansuetus beside mansuétus, rémex beside pródigo, &c., may be instances of parallel stem-formations like pénus, peno-, penos-, of penus, Gen. penús, penum, Gen. peni, penus, Gen. penoris; and even stronger examples, such as Arpīnas, older Arpínātis, praeeeps, older praeeipes, 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 quiqip(e), nemyp(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' . . . apud Plautum) (for Terence’s use of -ne, -n, see Dziatko ad Phorm. 210 Anh.); while he employs the forms hisce, ilisce, &c. before an initial vowel, hi, illi, before an initial consonant (Studemund in Fleckeisen’s Jahrh. 1876, p. 73). Parallel forms like atque, and ac for *ate, 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 mágiis 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 doubles. The syncopated form of the I.-Eur. preposition *ápó (Greek ἀπό, Sanscr. ápa) has become universal in Latin, e.g. ap-ério, ab-dúco (cf. sub, Greek ὑπό), almost the only trace of the final vowel being po-situs, pénos for *po-s(t)no; I.-Eur. *pérí (Greek πέρι, Sanscr. pári) is Lat. per- in perma-gnus, persacepe, &c.; I.-Eur. *éti (Greek éri, Sanscr. áti) is Lat. et (Umbr. et); I.-Eur. *épi (Greek ἐμ-οθέω) is Lat. ob (Oscan opération); I.-Eur. *ambhí (Greek ἀμφύ) is Lat. amb-ustus, an-ciusus, whether the Syncope of these words took place in the Latin period (ab from *ape, earlier *apo), or at a much more remote period (cf. Goth. af, English ‘off,’ ‘off’). Neu, seu, seu, which are not used in Latin poets before a vowel, are cases of Syncope in the Latin period o sivé &c.; also quin (see ch. x. § 16) for qui-ne [cf. Ter. Andr. 334, if nī]:

efficite qui detūr tibi;
égō id agam mihi qui ne detur);

sin for si-ne; quot, tot (cf. tūt-dem, Sanscr. kāti, tātī). (On fer and vel, see ch. viii.)
§ 58, and on *em, originally *eme, the Imper. of *ema, ‘to take,’ ch. x. § 19). As late as the time of Terence we find *abduce used before a vowel, *abduc before a consonant, while *face 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 imperatives *aligned *, *duc *, *fac *, in word-groups, i.e. in close connection with a following word, the syncopeated ‘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. Capcr 208. 10 K. *bibre* non ‘*biber*’); and a plausible etymology of *instar*, 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.’ (Wölflin in A. L. L. ii. 58.) *Bustar or bostar* glossed by βουστάσασ in the ‘Cyrillus’ and ‘Philoxenus’ Glossaries, may be for *s-tare, as instar for instare*. We find -al, -ar for -a, -are, -are in trisyllabic or longer Nouns like *animal*, but from sedile, &c. we do not find *sedil, &c.*, nor from *âle, &c. ul*, though *subtel* (τὸ κοιλὸν τοῦ ποδίς, Prisc. i. p. 147. 11 H.) is said to stand for *subâlæ, Neut.* of *âlæ* from *âlus*. *Sirempe*, an old legal word, found in the phrase *sirempe lex esto, ‘let the same law apply,’* e.g. Plaut. *Amph.* prol. 73:

*sirempe* 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 siremps lex esto), and other early laws. *Lacte*, the Plautine form (though *lac* is the reading of the MSS. in *Amph.* 601, perhaps a corruption of *laed*) is *laet* in Varro, L. L. v. 104 (*laete* Cato ap. Char. 102. 9 K.), and in classical Latin *lac* (cf. Charisius, 102. 4 K. lactis nominativum alií volunt lac, alií lact, alií *lact* ‘e’ postrema). *Vidâp, pleasurably,* seems to be for *voluta*, Adverbial Neut. of an Adj. *volutis*; and Ritschl (*Opusc.* ii. 450) would analyze the *voluptas* of Plautus, Mil. 277, &c. into *voluta 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 *facile*, e.g. Lucilius vi. 3 M. nobilitate facul propellere iuquos, and *difficul* for *dificil* (see Nonius, p. 111. 21 M.; Paul. Fest. 61. 32 Th.; Fest. 266. 20 Th. ‘perfacul’ antiqui et per se facile diebant, quod nume facile dieiium). The O. Lat. Adverb *poste* (e.g. Enn. A. 244 M. poste recumbite, nestraque pectora pullite tonsis) is in classical Latin *post*; *ante* does not appear without the final -e in Latin, but we have in Oscan *püst*, *post*, Umbrian *post*.

The suppression of a final short vowel was a common feature of Oscan and Umbrian, e.g. Oscan *nea*, Umbrian *ne* (Lat. *neque*), &c. (See also ch. x. §§ 9 and 12, on *ut* and *uto-nam*, *dünec* and *dônique*, and cf. Georges, *Lex Wortf.* s. v. *altar(e)*, *animal(e)*, *autumnal(e)*, *boletar(e)*, *cervical(e)*, *cochlear(e)*, *laquear(e)*, *palveinar(e)*, *virginal(e)*, *lucir, specular, toral, torcular, vestigial*, &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 ē, unless diverted by a following labial to ō. It is probable that short final vowels took the same course, and were one and all changed to ē. This ē might be dropped (§ 36) or retained, but did not become ō, as unaccented ē in the middle of a word did (§ 18), so that ē is preeminently the final vowel of the Latin language. A final ē becomes ē in māre for *mari, ānēmāle (later animal) for *animali, &c., while in the middle of the word it remains, e.g. maria, animalia. Similarly final -ē, when, by the addition of a particle, it ceases to be a final vowel, becomes ō, e.g. lēnīficēus beside bene, quippini beside quippe, sicēne beside sic(e), hocēce beside hoc-ce from *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 ei, class. ē, for posttonic ai in inceido (S. C. Bacch.), class. incēdo from O. Lat. caido, class. caedo, so we find final ei, class. ē representing I.-Eur. ai (or āi? ch. viii. § 66) in the 1 Sing. of the Perfect Active, &c., e.g. ītūd-ē (older -ei). And while an example of the weakening of oi to ei, ē in the posttonic syllable is difficult to find (§ 18), it is regular when final, e.g. foideratēi (S. C. Bacch.), class. foederati, from an original ending -oi. On the treatment of the final long diphthongs -āi, -ēi, &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 -ā in terrā, arvā, &c., but did not pass into another vowel, such as ē. The shortening of long final vowels is discussed below (§ 40).

§ 38. Change of final short vowel to ē. An example of ē- for an original -ō is the ending of the 2 Sg. Imperat. Pass. and Depon., e.g. sequēsē for *sequēsō (Gk. συνάω, ch. viii. § 77), of -ēr for -ār, perhaps sat from an older *satu-ē (cf. satu-ē) (but see ch. ix. § 4). An ē which has escaped this weakening (e.g. enē, on which see ch. ix. § 27) became -ū (as in the posttonic syllable, § 26), e.g. indōā. (On noemū, a byform of noenum, see ch. x. § 18).

§ 39. Alternation of final e with internal i. Other examples are istic, istic from istic, ille, increased by -ce ; isticēne, isticēne, further increased by -ne ; hicēne, huncēne, huncēne ; tuin, for tuin with ne, is the spelling of the MSS. in Plaut. Mil. 290 ; undique from unde, undidēm from indē; antē is antī- in compounds like antici-
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pare, antistes, antistita, antigerio (O. Lat. for valde), and antisto (a better spelling than antasto: see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.); facilin for facile with ne, servirin for servir with ne, is the spelling of the MSS. in Plaut. Mon. 928 and 795; benictus, benificus, malicivus, malificus (beside benecolus, malecolus, &c., a spelling much discussed by the grammarians, e.g. Vel. Long. 76-77 K.; Alcuin 298. 14 K.; Probus, 119. 2 K. See Brambach, Lat. Orth. and Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv.) (For additional examples see Ritschl, Open. 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. plius (cf. Oscan piilio-), balneum (βαλανείον), diremo, prehendo (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 h, so that scansions like Plautus, Aul. 463 méi honoris, Asin. 706 dé hórdeo (cf. class. méhóde), Ennius, Ann. 45 M. Scipió inuicté, 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 -ū 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 sollo 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 scansions like cantō, except on the theory that they are imitations of the Greek -ω of ποίω, &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, maxumē, manū and other Ablatives (earlier datād, &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 tenes, amas, moras (for the statistics, see Leppermann, De correetione, &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 bacchanāl (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 (Prise. i. 23. 13; 366. 21 H.).

iii. Final syllable long by position. In Plautus legūnt, dixerūnt
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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 -mg to -n is with us.

§ 41. Final long vowel in Hiatus. In Greek poetry (dactylic, anapaestic, &c.) besides the shortening of final diphthongs like au, oi before an initial vowel (a scansion due to the consonantal character of i, ãvðpa µoi ènverε being pronounced ãvðпа µοιείνενε, G. Meyer, Grie3. Gram. § 154), we sometimes find shortening of final å, ø, ð 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, µi 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. quæcum? (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 dei; (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 operā ebur, obsequi animo. In Anapaestic Metres also with (5) Cretic words, and in other cases. (For a list of examples, see Klotz, Altröm. Metrik, p. 119. They include not merely instances of dissimilar vowels, but also of similar, e.g. i-i in èri imāgīne, Pseud. 1202). Terence, and apparently Lucilius, restrict it to the first of these cases; but Virgil has not only examples like qui amant (Ec. viii. 108), but also like vās vāsē inquit (Ec. iii. 79), and sub IIō alto (A. v. 261). 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 ēám, 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. de hördeo, Asin. 706, which might be written de-hördeo like dehōtari, Poem. 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 anaepastic 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, tibī, sībī, modū, cīlī, &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. volō-scire, abi-rus, cavē-dicas, while the examples of nouns are mostly confined to adverbial forms, e. g. domī-restat, domō-prodit, or subordinate words like homō (see statistics in Leppermann, De correctione, 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 legiūnt, dixerō (Hor. S. i. 4. 104) but not dixerūnt. That this shortening was not a mere metrical licence, but reflected the actual pronunciation, we see from Quintilian’s remark (i. 6. 21) that havē, 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 mistaking a fígurál’s cry, Cœnus (sc. fícus vendo), for cæve ne eæs. 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 rogān for rogās in Pers. v. 134?) Plautus in his dialogue modes 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 Pelliō, dixerō, mentīō, &c.; commodō Catull. x. 26 is probably Neut. Plur. (see Owen ad loc.). (On the operation of the Breves Breviantes Law in Plautus, see Journ. Phil. xxii. 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 Brevians, e. g. not pātrī like pātī, nor even a short vowel preceding qu, except under particular circumstances. But in classical poetry we find putrivēctā, liquēfactum, &c.

§ 43. Shortening of final -ā. We have -ā in Greek words in the early poets (Enn. A. 567 M. agoeā longa repletur is very uncertain; cf. Gk. ἀγουά), just as we have in later poetry, e. g. Stat. Theb. vi. 515 Nemaā (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 aquis pinnis obnixa volatā, a lengthening of a short syllable before the penthemimeral Caesura, like the lengthenings before the hephthemerimal in A. 85 M. sic expectabat populās atque ora tenebant, Virg. A. iii. 464 dona dehine auro graviā sectoqse 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 édepol uix fuit cópiā | adeunā atque impetrāndī (at the end of the first hemistich of an Iambic Septenarius, like -ūs in Truc. 149 non árnuos hic sed pascuās | ager èst : si aratīones); Plaut. Rud. 1086 TR. Ét crepundātā (ἀ), GR. Quid, si ea sunt aürea? TR. Quid istūc tua? (at change of speaker,
like -ē of Voc. Sg., I-Eur. -ē, in Pers. 482 TO. Quid agis? DO. Credo. TO. Unde agis te, Dōrātē. DO. Credō tibi. Or they are cases of wrong scansion, e.g. Trin. 251 nox datur: ductur familia tota (where the metre is Anapaestic with familia, not Cretica with fāmilīa), Mil. 1314 Quīd sīs? Quīn tu iūbes eceferrī òmnia quae isti dedi [where we should scan òmniā quae istī, not òmniā qu(a)eī, istī], or of wrong reading, e.g. Asin. 762 Ne epistula quidem ālla sit in āedibus (where we might insert usquam before ālla, as in Rud. 529, and scan epistula, not epistulā). A few apparent instances of -ā in Plautus have not yet been explained, viz. Bacch. 1128; Epid. 498; Men. 974 a. (For a list of examples in Plautus, see C. F. Müller, Plant. 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, su-prā (exstrād, su-prād on S. C. Bacch. of 186 b. c., C. I. L. i. 196), so that Early Latin contrā, frustrā (e.g. Plaut. Rud. 1255 ne tu frustrā sīs, 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. venustissumā, Poen. 1177, gratiā, Stich. 327, rusticā, 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 plantāto, plantāte, while for nouns like mensa the length of the final -α would not be impressed on the memory by other cases like mensae, mensam, &c. The -ā of Numerals like quadragintā, &c. is not scanned as a short syllable till late times, e.g. C. I. L. vii. 28474 (= Meyer, Anth. 1326) quadragintā per annos; vi. 29426 (= Mey. 1389) septēagintā, when Abl. -ā is similarly treated, e.g. C. I. L. xiv. 3723 hic situs Amphiōn ereptus primā juventa (see ch. ii. § 141).

§ 44. Shortening of final -ē. Final -ē 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 hāve, not avē, was the universal pronunciation of his time (multum enim litteratus, qui sine aspiratione et producta secunda syllaba salutarīt—'avere' est enim—et 'calefacere' dixerit potius quam quod dicimus, et 'conservavisse,' his adiect 'facere' et 'dice' et similia. recta est haec via: quis negat? sed adjacent et mollar 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 calēfacio, frigēfacio is in all Latin poetry scanned short only when the first syllable is short, calēfacio (but never *frigēfacio), which in Quintilian's time was apparently pronounced calēfacio (Quint. i. 6. 21 quoted above; for this spelling see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). Cato's arēfaciō, so spelt in MSS. of the Res Rustica 69; 125; 157. 12, seems to follow the analogy of calēfaciō. These Compounds were Separable Compounds (cf. fact are for arēfacta, Lucr. 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 catē, madē, &c., is in the Compounds catē-fācio, madē-fācio (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. patēficit ; Catull. lxiv. 360 tepēfaciet beside tepēfascit of lxviii. 29 (see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. p. 618). A short vowel before a mute and liquid (and to some extent before qu) (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, liquefāint. Similarly in the compound of dies and quintus, &c. the e of the second syllable, properly regarded as a final -ē, was shortened in the Republican forms diēquinte, &c. (Gell. x. 24. 1 'die quarto' et 'die quinto'... ab eruditis nune quoque dici audio, et qui aliter dicit pro rudi atque indeo despicitur. Sed Marci Tullii actas ac supra eam non, opinor, ita dixerunt; 'diequinte' enim et 'diequinti' pro adverbio copulate dicitum est, secunda in eo syllaba corrupta. Divus etiam Augustus, linguae Latinae non nescius, munditiarumque patris sui in sermonibus sectator, in epistulis plurifariam significatone ista dierum non aliter usus est.) Final -ē in the Abl. of the fifth Declension is treated by Plautus exactly as final -ō 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. āūē, ēāūē. This shortening was not extended to Ablatives with long penult. So with Adverbs in -ē (originally -ēd, e. g. factūmēd on S. C. Bacch. of 186 n. c., C. I. L. i. 196). Plautus scans prōē, mēxāmē, though an instance of the shortening of this -ē 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 -ē, that is to say, only under the influence of a Brevis Brevians, e. g. vēō, which normally has this scansion when joined closely as an auxiliar verb with an infinitive, vēō-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), vōō (Catull. vi. 16), dālō (Catull. xiii. 11), vēbī (Hor. S. i. r. 104), and even of cretic words like Pollio (Hor. S. i. 10, 42, 85; and even in the Odes, ii. 1. 14), mentō (Hor. S. i. 4. 93), dīcērō (Hor. S. i. 4. 104), gnōmōō (Hor. S. i. 9. 43). The shortening of final -ō, like that of final -ē, and unlike that of final -ē, 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, Sulmō, Nasō, &c.; and even Cicero uses Vētō, if his epigram is rightly quoted by Quint. (viii. 6. 73) fundum Vētō vocat, quem possit mitttere 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 (1 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 eura videndum est quod veteres omnia vel verba vel nomina quae o littera finiuntur, item adverbia vel conjunctiones producta extrema syllaba proferabant, adeo ut Vergilius quoque idem servaverit, in aliis autem refugerit vetustatis horrorem, et carmen
contra morem veterum levigaverit ... paulatim autem usus invertit, ut in
sermone nostro 'scribo' 'dico' et item talibus, ubi o non solum correpita
ponitur, sed etiam ridiculis sit qui eam producereit ... sane monosyllaba fere
quae suaque sunt verba προτόρυα o littera finita tam versus quam etiam prosa
similiter productam habent: necessse non corripit, ut 'sto' 'do.' quibus si
conferatur 'dico' 'curro' 'disco' item producta o littera, dijudicari poterit
quam sit aliiu absurdum, alii et per euphoniam gratum; cf. p. 63. 17 K.
nullum autem nomen o producta finitur nisi peregrinum, velut 'Ino'
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 vigilando of Juv.
iii. 232, &c. on the ground that it is part of a verb: 'nos in 'do' ultimus
terminatione, quae similis est dativo vel ablative nominis, nisi quod verbum
hoc 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 abī, redī, and Perfects like
dēdī; while in nouns we have donī (very frequent), erī, vivī, senī, &c., with the
Ablatives avī sinistra, Pseud. 762, parī fortuna, Bacch. 1108 (cf. Ter. lex 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 paenuitima ending
in -ū, the examples are not frequent. Terence has always diū, never diū, but
Plautus has diū (or dju?) 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. -i. In Plautus
we have still the long quantity, e. g. Aul. 413 apertitur Bacchanāl: adest, but
in Classical poetry -iā, e. g. trībānāl, Ovid (cf. Mar. Victorinus de Finalibus
p. 231. 11 K.). Subtel (apparently for *subtelē, Neut. of *subtelis, a Compound of
sub and tāhus) (but see § 50), is quoted as an instance of -iā by Priscian, i.
p. 147. 11 H., and explained as τὸ σῶλον τὸν πόδος.

-m. Whether the different treatment of -m after o of the Gen. Plur. and o of
the Acc. Sg. Masc. and Nom. Acc. Sg. Neut. of O-stems on the earliest
inscriptions (e. g. C. I. L. i. 16 Susanna probam, 'Suessanorum probam') is a
proof that a long vowel was at the end of the third cent. B.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 nēs (ch. ii. § 34). Osc. paam 'quam'
Acc. Sg. Fem., Umbr. praataram Gen. Pl. Fem. (with s the equivalent of Lat. o)
indicate a retention of the long quantity in Umbro-Oscan.

-r. (1) Nouns like calcar(e). 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 sūrōr, maevor, mīnor, major, have the long quantity invariably in Plautus, unless in cases of shortening by the Brevis Brevians Law, e. g. sorōr, Poen. 364; amōr, Cist. i. 1. 69, and probably always patīr. Iambic nouns often retain the old Nominative ending -os, e. g. odo, Pseud. 841; honos, Trin. 697. Ennius in his Annals has -ör. Whether he ever (A. 455 M. südör) uses -ör is doubtful; but Lucilius has normally -ūr (e. g. strīdōr, inc. 90 M.), and the two probable examples of -sr in Lucilius, (dōtōr v. 55 M.; pūdōr xxx. 70 M.) are perhaps metrical lengthenings before the chief Caesurae, like Virgil's lābōr (6. iii. 118), domītōr (A. xii. 550), &c.

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

(3) Verbs like mōrōr, šōr Ind., morer, utar Subj., in Plautus always have a long final, unless shortened by the Brevis Brevians Law, e. g. Rul. 1448 nil morōr ullum lucrum; Aul. 232 utār; Bacch. 153 nil mōrōr. By Lucilius' time it is invariably short, e. g. fruniscōr xviii. 3 M.; oblīnār xxx. 25 M. In the Comedies of Terence the evidence is defective (e. g. sēpūrā, Andr. 819). In Tibullus, i. 10. 13 trāhōr is of course a case of metrical shortening before the penthemimeral Caesura. Oscan patīr 'pater,' keenztur '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. cūbāt, Amph. 290; timēt, Amph. 295; vēnīt, Aul. 226; arāt, Asin. 874; solēt, Merc. 696; alt, 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 crissavīt 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. stētīt, Phorm. prol. 9; augētāt, Adelph. prol. 25, &c. beside audīrēt, Adelph. 453. On a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B.C. written in elegiac metre (C. I. L. i. 38) we have nōbitāvīt, though the spelling -ēt in the Perfect is found much later (e. g. probāvīt beside coerūvīt, in C. I. L. i. 600, of 62 B.C.) (see ch. viii. § 70). Ovid repeatedly lengthens the -ēt of interīt, abīt, redīt, &c. and of petīt (see Munro ad Lucr. iii. 1042). On atētāt 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. Mil. 325 sunt manīs; Aul. 187 hadēs; and the same is true of the plays of Terence (e. g. bonīs, Eun. 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 -t, -r (see the statistics in Leppermann, De correptione ... apud Plautum, and in Boemer, De correptione ... Terentiana).

Horace's paulūs aptaque remiss (A. P. 65) is a unique scansion in Augustan poetry (cf. vidēn, rogōn § 42). Ennius has in his Annals (l. 102 M.) virgīnēs (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 dixerâ, but not e. g. dixerâunt. Ennius' virgînes in Ann. 102 M.:

uirgînes nam sibi quísque domi Romanus habet sas,

shows shortening of a final syllable long both by nature (ñs 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 dissyllables in the dialogue metres (e. g. Nil pótiét (?) suprá, Ter.; ex Graecís bónis Latinas fecit nón bonas, Ter.), in the case of trisyllables, &c. only (as a rule) in Anapaestic and other lyric metres (e. g. vénérânt húc, Plaut.; odio énicâs míseram, Plaut.; qui hic liberâs virgînes mércatûr, Plaut.).

Final syllables which had originally a double consonant are long in Plautus, e. g. milès for *miles, Aul. 528 milés imprânsus âstât, aes censêt dari, though they may, of course, be shortened by the influence of a Brevis Brevians, e. g. potês, Stich. 325. But after Plautus' time they appear to be short syllables. Ennius has not only équês (Ann. 484. 249 M.), but also milês (Ann. 277); Terence has always adês, potês; Lucilius has milés (xi. 8 M.), prődês (inc. 128 M.); Lucretius (iii. 721) écôs, and so on. But final -s for -ss never fails before an initial consonant to make 'position' in Early Latin versification as original -s for usual fails; milês vult could not end an Iambic Senarius like occidîstis 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. miles imprânsus, miles pransus (see below § 51, on hoc(c)).

§ 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. candôr, majôr, fundôr, calcôr, tribûnâl, but not in the monosyllables fûr, sôl, 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:

hûius côr, huiûs studiûm, huius sáuium, mastígia,

the pronunciation of his time having probably been cord huıus, cord ardêt, when the next word began with a vowel, but cor calet (like cor(ă)cŭlum, 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 *tērs (I.-Eur. *tris, ch. vi. § 61), is a long syllable before an initial vowel in Plautus, Bacch. 1127 (a bacchiac line):

rerin tēr 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 *höradeum, ch. iv. § 158), established itself before initial vowels too. Hoc Neut. for hoc (*hōd-ce, ch. vii. § 16; cf. hocci-ne) retained its antevocalic 'doublet' form in classical poetry, e.g. Virg. (A. ii. 664):

hoc erat, alma pārens, &c., 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-c-erat' alma pārens, 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-quipādem, and (in the older poetry only) of tū, tē, mē, &c. before quīdem (e.g. tāquipādem, 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 paroxytone 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, *noenum 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. *circu(m)*it (a trisyllable); (cf. *sublatuiri* for *sublatum iri*, 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 *noen*, see ch. x. § 18), *nihil* for *ni-hile*, Neut. of I-stem (cf. *imbellis* and *imbellus*, *sultel* from *sub-tèle*, Neut. of an I-stem compound of *tâlus (?), and see § 49). But *vênire* 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. cavalo, 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, Ä.

§ 1. Ä. I.-Eur. ä is Latin ā. Thus in the declension of A-stems we have Latin famílias (the old genitive preserved in legal language, pāter familias), terrā (later terrāi, terrae), praedā (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. motē, 'wife,' O. Eng. mōdor, O. H. Germ. muter, 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 indā-gēna, ġēn-us : tel-, ‘to carry,’ Lat. lātus for *tlātus, P. P. P. of tollo; stel- (O. Slav. stelja, ‘I spread’), Lat. lātus, wide, earlier stlātus, stlēta, sc. nāvis, whence the adj. stlētarīrus, or with -āt- for earlier -āt- (ch. ii. § 127), stlattā, stlētarīrus (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. stlāta: πειρατικοῦ σκάφους εἶδος: Juv. vii. 134 stlattaria purpura); ster-(Lat. strā- unus, strā-men; ġer-, ‘to rub,’ ‘wear away,’ ‘make old’ (Gk. ἔρω), Lat. grā-num; keld-, ‘to strike’ (Lat. per-cello), Lat. clādes; kert-, ‘to bind,’ ‘weave together’ (O. Ind. crštāti, ‘he binds,’ krṇātāti, ‘he spins’), Lat. crātes; ker-
(Gk. κέρας, 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. i. §§ 253, 306), so that, for example, Lat. grānum would represent I.-Eur. *gīnō-, while Goth. kaurn, Eng. corn, represent I.-Eur. *gīnō- (cf. Lat. rād-īx, I.-Eur. *wīd-, but Goth. vaurts, Eng. wort, I.-Eur, *wīd-): (2) due to the fusion of an e-sound with an a-sound in a grade of a dissyllabic root of the form ġena-, &c., so that e.g. Lat. gnātus would come from ġena-, the root ġen- with the addition of an a-sound, while Gk. (Att. and Dor.) -γνητός would come from ġene-, the root ġen- 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. *keras- (Greek κέρας-): (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. gārvus would show a root formed from ġn-, the weak grade of the root ġen-,' to know,' by the addition of the suffix ā, as gnōtus, gnōsco would show a root similarly formed from ġn- by the addition of the suffix ō; Lat. lātus, 'carried,' for *tlātus, will thus be like Dor. Gk. ἄ-τλα-ν from root tel-, 'to carry,' ἄ-ττα-ν from root pet-, 'to fly.'

Latin ā is often ā lengthened by ‘compensation’ (§ 162), e.g. quālus for *quaes-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-hēnslo, with change of ā to ē before the vowel became lengthened by 'compensation' (ch. iv. § 162). The older spelling was with û (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 ν an ā developed from an ō, just as in cāvus we have ū for ū (§ 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. Acs. 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. mittat, and Pass. mittar was shortened in the second cent. B.C.; -al (older -āle) was also shortened (see ch. iii. § 49).

In Umbro-Ocean I.-Eur. ā was likewise retained (von Planta, i. p. 77), e.g. Osc. mæatreis, Umbr. matrer 'matris'; Osc. fratrūm 'fratrum,' Umbr. frater 'fratres.' But final -ā became an O-sound, written in Ocean ú (in Lat. alph. o, in Gk. alph. )o), in Umbr. ú (in Lat. alph. o) and a, e.g. Osc. motto, Umbr. mutu and muta, multa ('a fine'), Osc. vīú 'via.' It is scanned (in the Neut. Pl. of an O-stem) as a short syllable by Lucilius (sollō, Lucil. insc. 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. fērānum, fērātis, &c.; I.-Eur. noun-suffix -āt- (e.g. O. Ind. dēvātāt-, 'divinity,' Dor. Gk. ἱερατ-, Lat. miētāt-, vijaatāt-; I.-Eur. adjective-suffix -āko [e.g. Ir. buadhach, 'victorious' (from buaid, 'victory'); cf. Boudicca, wrongly called by us Boadicea), Gaulish Teuto-bodiācē, Bēn-ācē, Lith. sēdōkās, 'sweetish,' O. Sl. novakuī; cf. Gk. νεῖατι, Lat. mārīcē, verācē; (2) in individual words: I.-Eur. *brātās-, 'brother' (O. Ind. brātār, Gk. φίδερομ, the member of a φίδερθ, O. Ir. brāthir, W. brawd, Goth. brōjar, O. Eng. brōjor, Lith. broter-āl-s), Lat. frāter; I.-Eur. *bhāgo-, 'beech-tree' (Dor. Gk. φάγος, O. Engl. bōc-ṭrēw, 'beech tree,' bōc, 'a book,' lit. the runes scratched on a piece of beech-wood), Lat. fāgus; I.-Eur. *swādo-, 'sweet' (O. Ind. svādā-, Dor. Gk. ὑπό, O. Sax. svōtī), Lat. suēdis for *suādes; similarly Lat. clāvīs (Dor. Gk. κλᾶτις, nīceem Acc. (O. Ind. nāv-am, Hom. Gk. νῆς(♮)-α, O. Ir. nau), fāri, fēna,fāuna (Dor. Gk. φα-μί, O. Sl. ba-jati, 'to converse'), vāles (O. Ir. faith, the | being due to 'Infection,' that is, to the influence of an ā, which was suppressed in pronunciation in a following syllable, from stem fāti-, I.-Eur. *wātī-).

§ 3. Ā. I.-Eur. ā is Latin ā. Thus I.-Eur. *āgo, 'I drive' (O. Ind. ājāmi, Gk. ἄγω, Ir. again, O. Isl. aka inf.), is in Latin āgo; its derivative, I.-Eur. *āgres, 'a field' (O. Ind. ājra-s, Gk. ἄγρα, Gothis. akrs, Engl. acre), is in Latin āger, stem āgro-.

I.-Eur. ā varies with ā, and similarly Latin ā with a, 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.
στατός), with ἀ for the weak grade of ᾧ. Latin ā (probably Eur. ā) is also the vowel of a weak grade of ō, e.g. in a root like ὀ-, ‘to give’ (Gk. ὀ-νος, ὀ-πος), Latin ὀ-τος beside ὀ-νομ. Like Lat. ὀ-τος from root ὀ- is Lat. σα-τος from root σ-, ‘to sow’; and this ā seems to be an Eur. ā, a weak grade of ē, e.g. in root καδ- (Gr. κεκαδεῖ κεκαδοῦτο, Lat. cedo). 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 ᾱ by Brugmann), appears in Latin as ā, stātus, dātus, sātus, but in O. Ind. we have ē in sthitās, ē-di-ta 3 Sg. Aor., -dītās P. P. P. of dhā- (I.-Eur. dhē-), ‘to place.’ The same O. Ind. ē is seen in words like I.-Eur. *pater-, O. Ind. pitār-, where in the other languages we have ā, Gk. πατηρ, O. Ir. athir, Goth. fadar, O. Engl. fader, 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. πέτανμε); and in Latin we have a few instances of ā, where other languages, or kindred Latin forms, offer ē, frango fragilis (Goth. brikan, Engl. break), flagro (Gk. φλέγω), gradus (Goth. grips), aper (O. Engl. eofor, 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. *kαπρο- (Gk. κάπρος) and I.-Eur. *επρο; 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. patensins, Umb. abro-), depending, it may be, on the pronunciation of Latin or Italic a (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 ē. This ē became, perhaps about the end of the third century b.c., ē in syllables not long by position (except when it preceded r), and before ng;
while this \( o \) became \( u \) or the \( ü \)-sound, which in most cases passed into \( ĺ \) at the close of the Republican period. Thus the compound of \( ab \) and \( cadō \) became \( accēdō \) (so spelt by Ennius), then \( accēdō \); from \( in \) and \( arma \) we have the compound \( inermis \); from \( sub \) and \( rapio \) first \( *surropio \) probably, then \( surrūpio \) (Plaut.), then \( surrūpio \); from \( ex \) and \( frango, effringo \) (see ch. iii. § 18). Final Latin \( Ą \) probably became \( ė \), and might be dropped (see ch. iii. § 37).

In Umbro-Oscan I.-Eur. ė remains, as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. ager, 'a field,' Osc. actud 'agito' third Sg. Imperat., also I.-Eur. a, e.g. Osc. paterē 'patri,' Umbr. Iupater 'Juppiter' (von Planta, i. p. 75).

§ 4. I.-Eur. ė. The I.-Eur. preposition \( *āpō \) (O. Ind. āpa, Gk. ἄπα, Goth. aft, Germ. ab, Engl. of) is Latin \( āp- \) of \( ap-ērio, \) usually written \( āb, \) with suppression of the final vowel; but the form \( pō- \) of \( po-situs, \) from \( pōnō \) for \( *pō-\text{šino}, \) shows suppression of the initial vowel; \( *ādā \) (O. Ir. ad, Goth. at, Engl. at) is Latin \( ādā \). The I.-Eur. pronoun \( *ālyo, \) 'other' [Gk. ἄλλος, O. Ir. aile, Gaul. Allo-broges, 'those of another country' (Schol. Juven. viii. 234), (as opposed to *Combroges, 'native,' whence Welsh Cymry), W. aili, Goth. aļjis, Engl. el-se] is Latin \( ālius \). Similarly \( mādeo \) (Gk. μαδᾶω); \( sālio \) (Gk. ἄλλομαι); \( sālix \) (Ir. sail, a C-stem, Bret. haleg-en, O. H. Germ. salahā, O. Engl. seall, Engl. sallow) (but see §§ 92–94); \( dācrīna, \) later \( lacruma \) and \( lacrīna \) (Gk. λάκων, O. Ir. dēr, W. dagr, Goth. tagr, O. Engl. tear, Germ. Zähre); \( ango, angor, angustus \) (O. Ind. āghas, 'need,' Gk. ἀγγχα, Ir. t-achtaim, W. t-agu, Lith. aṅkstas, 'narrow,' O. Sl. ązūkū, Goth. aggvus, Germ. enge); \( arceo \) (Gk. ἀρχέω, Arm. argel, 'hindrance'); \( mācer, \) 'thin' (Gk. μακρός, long, Av. masah-, 'size,' O. H. Germ. magar, 'thin'); \( albus \) (Gk. ἀλβος, white leprosy); \( ānimus, āнима, \) 'soul' (O. Ir. anim, amman Gen., 'soul,' Gk. ἄνεμος, wind, from root \( an- \), 'to breathe'); \( āno \) (O. Ir. canim, W. canu, Goth. hanu, 'a cock,' Engl. hen); \( ālo \) (Ir. alaim, W. alu, Goth. ala, 'I grow up,' Gk. ἀνάλοσ, insatiate); \( āqua \) (Goth. ahva); \( scūbo \) (Gk. σκάσω, Lith. skabū, 'I cut,' Goth. skabā, 'I shave,' O. Engl. scave, Engl. shave); \( āro \) (Arm. araur, 'a plough,' Gk. ἀρῶ, O. Ir. arathar, 'a plough,' W. ar, 'tilth,' Lith. ariu, 'I plough,' O. Sl. orjā, Goth. arja, Engl. to ear); \( sal- \) (Arm. aa, Gk. αλς, O. Ir. salann, W. halen, O. Sl. soli, Goth. salt, Engl. salt).

I.-Eur. ė or ē (see § 51).

ā—ē (see § 55) e. g. atrox and odium, aecer-bus and ocris.

ā—ē (see § 61) e. g. aser blood (Gk. ἀπα), sacena a priest's knife (cf. seco).

É, Ė.

§ 5. E. I.-Eur. Ė is Latin ē. Thus the optative-suffix, I.-Eur. -jē- (-iyē-) (O. Ind. syās, siyās, Gk. εῖς for *εῖς) is -iē- of O. Lat. siēs. From the root plē-, 'to fill' (O. Ind. prā-tā- Part., 'full,' Arm. li, Gk. πλή-πης, O. Ir. lin, 'number,' O. Isl. fleire, 'more') comes Latin plē-nus, im-plē-bus, plērī-que, O. Lat. ex-plē-nunt; from
se-, 'to throw, throw seed' (Gk. ἱμη for *τι-ση-μυ, ἰ-μα for *σε-μη, O. Ir. sīl, 'seed,' W. hil, Goth. mana-ṣēps, 'mankind,' Engl. seed, Lith. séju, 'I sow,' O. Sl. sējə, sē-mę, '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 pśe- (O. Ind. psā-, 'to devour,' Gk. ψηφυ, 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 pśe- 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 ġnā- (Lat. gnā-tus) from ġen- or ġn-ā (§ 1). Occasionally ē became ī in Latin through the influence of an i-(y) followed by a vowel in the next syllable, e.g. filius for *fēlius. Latin ē is often ī, lengthened by 'compensation,' e.g. ānhēlus for *an-ēnsto from *an-ānsto- (cf. halo), written in the older orthography (in Virgil MSS.) anhelius, 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 from prehendo, trēs from *treyēs (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. εἰνυ for *ε(ά)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 i (the symbol also of I.-Eur. i, § 13), í (Lat. alph. i), e.g. ligatūis 'legatis,' liquēd 'lege'; in Umbr. e, sometimes i, e.g. plēner 'plenis,' habētu and habētū '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-rā-, 'suckling,' dhā-tri, 'nurse,' Arm. diem, 'I suck,
Gk. ὑδαῖος (ὑδαί-) ὑδαί-νεος, ὑδαί-ὐμέν, ὑδαῖ-η, O. Ir. dith, ‘he sucked,’ dinu, Pres.-Part., ‘a lamb,’ Goth. daddja, ‘I suckle,’ O. H. Germ. ūaw, Lith. ᵉ-ūė, ‘a leech,’ pirm-dėlė, ‘young mother,’ O. Sl. dė-te, ‘infant’), Latin fi-ē-miña, fiēlo (vulgar form of fiēlo, fi-teus for *fielius; I.-Eur. nē-, ‘to sew, spin’ (Gk. νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νῆ, νenance). Similarly Lat. ōs (O. Ind. rā-s, ‘property’); Lat. nē-vēs (O. Ir. fīr, Gwir, Goth. tuz-vērjan, ‘to doubt,’ O. Sl. vēra, ‘belief’); Lat. rē-rē (Goth. rēdan, ‘to advise,’ O. Eng. ērdan, Engl. rede, Germ. rathen); Lat. spēs (Lith. spēti, ‘to have leisure,’ O. Sl. spēti, ‘to advance,’ Goth. spēdīza, ‘later,’ Germ. spät). This I.-Eur. ō is often a ‘doublet’ of ē (see §47); rē-, for example, of Lat. ōs, O. Ind. rā-s, is a byform of rē-, rē- (O. Ind. rā-dās Gen., and some refer the fi- of Lat. filius to an I.-Eur. dīs, a grade of a root dēhī, dāhī, ‘to suckle.’ That the Romans of Plautus’ day regarded filius as a cognate of fiēlo (fiēlo) appears from a line preserved only in the Ambrosian MS., Pseud. 422 iam ille felat filius, and in Umbrian the word seems to have had the sense of ‘suckling,’ e. g. sif fiēlo trif, sif sīfeluf, ‘tres sues lactentes’ Acc., as well as that of ‘son,’ e. g. fel. for filius, ‘filius’ on an Umbrian epitaph. (Büch. Umbr. p. 174.) (On Praenestine filo(a), a nurse (?), see A.L.L. ii. 482.)

§ 7. I for ē. Deltniu, a byform of deēntio; Piēnus (dialectal?) apparently from plēnus; convdictum from root weq-, ‘to speak’ (?); suspicicio from root spēk-, ‘to look,’ all seem to be examples of this change of ē to i, produced by a y-sound in the next syllable. Filius is spelt fielius on an inscription (C. I. L. xiv. 1011), and seems in Umbrian to have the ē-sound, spelt e or i. On the spellings Cornuli, Aurilius, which prove the affinity of Latin ē with an i-sound before a syllable with y, see ch. ii. § 11 [Aurilius occurs on an inscr. of 200 B.C. (C. I. L. xiv. 4268, with xedtio)]; and on the spelling stēlīo, for stēlīo, 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. *kentom (or *kentom), O. Ind. šatām, Gk. ἐ-καῖρον, O. Ir. cēt, W. cant, Goth. hund, Lith. szimtas, O. Sl. sūto), Lat. centum (see § 81). I.-Eur. ēw became ēw in Latin, which in the unaccented syllable passed into u, e. g. nūvus (Gk. νεῦς) and dē-nu, and similarly I.-Eur. wē became w, e. g. sōv for I.-Eur. swēsor, in certain circumstances (see below), and I.-Eur. el became ēl (āl) except before e, i or in the group ell, e. g. vēlo, but vēlim, velle. Latin ē became i before ng, e. g. tingo (Gk. τέγγω).
before *gn, e.g. *dignus from *decect (see § 119), just as in the Teutonic languages ē has become ĕ 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 nēcō was ē-nēco (later spelt eneco), the ordinal of dēcem was dēcimus, 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, an-ceps from cāput (see ch. iii. § 18). Final -ē was often dropped, e.g. nēc for nēque, 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 ĭ, e.g. Osc. estud ‘esto,’ Umbr. fertō ‘ferto.’ The change to ō before l is apparently unknown. (For particulars, see von Planta, i. p. 83.)

§ 9. Latin ē for I.-Eur. ė. I.-Eur. -ē in the Voc. Sg. of O-stems (O. Ind. vīka, Gk. λῶκος, Lith. vilkė, O. Sl. vlūče) is Latin -ē of lupē, &c., as in the Imperative 2 Sg. Act., e.g. *āgē (O. Ind. āja, Gk. ἄγε) Lat. āgē, dropped in diē, diēc, fāc (ch. iii. § 36); the conjunction ‘and,’ I.-Eur. *qē (O. Ind. ca, Gk. κα) is Latin quē, with ē dropped in nīc for nēquē, &c.; the first personal pronoun (O. Ind. āhām, Arm. es, Gk. ἐσώ, Goth. ik, O. Eng. ic, Lith. ės, O. Sl. azů) is in Latin ėgo. Other examples are Lat. velēta (Gk. ἑφέλα, O. Ir. nēl from *neblo-), W. nifwfr, O. H. Germ. nebul, Germ. Nebel; Lat. sēquor (O. Ind. sāc, Gk. ἑπομαυ, O. Ir. sechur, Lith. sekū); Lat. ēt (Gk. έτι); Lat. médius (O. Ind. mādyur, Gk. μέσος, méros, Goth. midjís, O. Ir. mdón, *thémiddle,’ O. Sl. mdža; Lat. séquus (O. Ind. ásva, O. Ir. ech, Gaul. Epo-rédia, W. ebol, ‘a colt,’ Goth. aihva-tundí, ‘a bush,’ lit. ‘horse-tooth,’ O. Eng. eoh, Lith. asžva ‘a mare’); Lat. vēho (O. Ind. vah-, Pamphyl. Gk. φίχω, Ir. fēn from *wegno-, ‘a waggon,’ Goth. geha-giga, ‘I move,’ Germ. be-wege, Lith. vežū, O. Sl. vezg.)

§ 10. ō for ē with w and l. I.-Eur. *nēwp (O. Ind. nāwa, Gk. ἐννόω for *en-vefā, Ir. nōi, W. naw, Goth. niun) is in Latin nōve; I.-Eur. *nēwo- (O. Ind. nāwa, Gk. νέως, O. Ir. nē from *nowio-, Gaul. Novio-dūnum, W. newydd) is Lat. nōvis, Novius, while in the unaccented syllable we see ō for I.-Eur. ew in ãmena. (For other examples of this ō, see ch. iii. § 24.) The change of ō to ō before w, which is shared by the Celtic languages (e.g. Gaul. Noviodūnum, O. Ir. nū for *nowio-, W. newydd from *nawydd for *nowio- from I.-Eur. *nēwo-, cf. Gk. νέως, Goth. niujis; O.-Ir. nōi, W. naw from I.-Eur. *newpon), and by the Balto-Slavic (e.g. Lith. tāvas for I.-Eur. *tēwo-, Gk. ve(f)ōs; O. Sl. novū for I.-Eur. *nēwo-, Gk. νέως, does not affect the ev (Latin ev, but not I.-Eur. -ew-) of words like lūis (Gk. ὁλάχως), ēstērus,
apparently from root sēgh-, brēis (Gk. βρέις), 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 Baltic-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. *swēsor- (O. Ind. svāsār-), Gk. ἄλος, O. Ir. siur, and after a vowel fūr, W. chwaer, Goth. svistar, Lith. sesū, O. Sl. sestra) is in Latin sōr; I.-Eur. *swēkūro- (O. Ind. śvāśura-, Gk. ἰκοπός, W. chwegrn, O. H. Germ. swehur, Germ. Schwäher, Lith. šezzasuras, O. Sl. svekrū) is Lat. sōce; I.-Eur. *swēpno- (O. Ind. svāpna-, O. Scand. svefn, O. Engl. svefen) is Lat. sūnus for *sīgnus; cf. sūpor. I.-Eur. kwē is said to appear as sō- in Latin in combr-ātum, a bulrush (Lith. szveńdrai Plur.) from a stem kwēndhra-, though this may stand for *guombr-ātum with the O-grade of stem (see § 137); fōrem seems to represent dissyllabic *faērem. But ē of dwē-remains, e.g. bellum, older duellum, bēné (cf. older Donnos). Quē from I.-Eur. qē, kwē, &c. remains, and does not become co, e.g. -quē (I.-Eur. qē), quēr from kwē- (cf. Gk. κωῦν), though quo became co in course of time, e.g. coē, the O. Lat. form of which was quo, as in the old inscription of the Faliscan 'collegium cocorum,' written in rude Saturnians, and with equally rude spelling (Zvetaiiff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. 72a):

gonlegium quod est sciptum atetaei aged[āi],
opiparum ad uictam quolundam festosque dies,
quei soueis astutieis opideque Uolgani
gondeorant saipisumae comuiuia loidosque,
ququei huc dederunt inperatoribus summeis (i.e. Jupiter, Juno and Minerva)
utei sesed lubentes beneiowent optantis,

where also coqui is written qucei (so qolunt for cobunt in the Plautus Palimpsest in Pseu. 822). The compound inquilinus, 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 incēla, (but see p. 229). That quō had come to sound like cō as early as the beginning of the second cent. B. C., we may infer from the spelling in equoted, for in occito, on the S. C. of Bacchanalibus (C. I. L. I. 196) of 186 B.C.; for occito must be connected with cō, which has not the q3-guttural (cf. Ir. celim, W. cēlu with the ē-grade of the same root). The analogy of quam, queum, &c. would preserve the spelling quom till a late date, though the word was probably pronounced *com, for the preposition, I.-Eur. *kōm or *kōm, is usually spelt quom till the time of the Gracchi (Bersu, Gutturale, p. 42); and similarly loquuntur, &c. would be written after the fashion of loquantur, 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, cōrum, 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 quo 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' dicunt quam per 'co' cotidie, cum et dicatur melius et scribatur. non enim est a quoeto die 'quotidie' dictum, sed a continentie die cotidie tractum), and by Marius Victorinus [13. 21 K. nam concussus quamvis a quatio habeat originem, et cocus a coquendo (v. l. quo-
quendo), et cotidie a quoque die, et incola a. ab inquilino, attamen per e quam per qu scribuntur]. Cottidie and cotidie are the spellings of the best MSS., and are found on inscriptions (see Georges, Lex. Worft. s. v.), though no doubt the older spelling would have quo.-

Lat. vvo- became ve- (see Solmsen, Stud. Lat. Lautg. p. 1) in the middle of the second cent. n. c. Quintilian tells us that Scipio Africanus (Minor) was credited by tradition with this change of orthography (i. 7. 25 quid dicam 'vortes' 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 Plantus show the older spellings vorto, vorsus, and compounds, voster, volo (I.-Eur. g?), vorto; and in vorto, divorsi, vortex are found even in the MSS. of Augustan poets, like Virgil. The grammarians of the Empire sometimes advised the retention of these forms for the sake of distinctions, e. g. Caper, 99. 17. K. vortex fluminis est, vertex capitis; 97. 15 vorsus paginae dicetur, versus participium est a verbo vertor. One of the o-forms indeed, voster, was retained to the last (perhaps by analogy of vös, or of vöster) in Vulgar Latin (cf. Roumanian vostru, Ital. vostro, Fr. vōtre), as o was retained in classical vōco (by analogy of vös ?), vōmo, vōro (I.-Eur. g2%). O was retained before single l and l before another consonant, e. g. volo, to wish, volo, vōla, hollow of hand, vōlō, vōlus, later volumn, &c., and before v, e. g. vovo; though Cassiodorus, a doubtful authority, makes convellere the old spelling of convellere (149. 17 K.). Voldæcæ for Etruscan Velæcři, Vobanniæ for Etruscan Velimna cannot be quoted to prove that Latin ve- was ever pronounced vō-. They exemplify the phonetic law that d became ð in Latin (see below). There is no evidence that vēhō was ever *volo, or Vēnus *Vonus, or vētus *vontus, or vēru *voro, &c. The old spelling vorto (I.-Eur. *wörtō, Goth. wairja) probably belongs to a period when vo- 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. *wrt-to-), where Lat. or represents I.-Eur. ð.

Oi may similarly have become ei after e, so that vidi may represent an I.-Eur. *woiðai (O. Sl. vēdė ; cf. Gk. ὑδα, ch. viii. § 39) ; but the appearance of e beside o in Latin in words like amplector, O. Lat. amplector (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. velae, 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. volo, though there are a few exceptions to the rule, and not very many instances. Thus the Greek ελαι(φ)α, when adopted by the Romans (in the period of the Tarquins, Plin. Nat. Hist. xv. 1), became *olaiwa, then *oleiva (§ 27), oliva. A following ɛ- or i-vowel prevents the change, e. g. velim, melior. The older type of declension hōlus, *holēris (from *helēses) has left traces of itself in hōlus, holēris and O. Lat. helus (Paul. Fest. 71. 13 Th. 'helus' et 'helusa' antiqui

1 Pliny contrasts the l of lectum, lection 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.
dieceant, quod nunc holus et holera; cf. the gloss 'helitores' hortolani Löwe, Prodfr. p. 339), but *sagius has not survived beside *sagioris. 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, *sikel, celus, and for other instances of the change to ol, see Osthoff, Dunkles u. helles 'l' im Lat.). Inquiturus may thus represent an older *enquelinus, indolita an older *enquolita, both from an early qel.

§ 11. I for (accented) e. Other examples are: before ng, Lat. lingua, older dingua from I.-Eur. dnghua (O. Ir. tenge, W. tafod, Goth, tugga); Lat. inguen from I.-Eur. *nghu- (Gk. ἄδφρ); Lat. stringu, I bind, draw tight (O. Ir. srengim, 'I draw'); Lat. seplegenti, confringo, attingo, &c. for *seplengenti, *confrengo, *attengo, &c.; before gn, ignis from I.-Eur. *igni- (O. Ind. agni-, Lith. ugnis, O. Sl. ogni); Ignatus, a late spelling of Egnatius (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 334); ilignus and idigenus from igest, but abiignus (with ë, according to Priscian, i. p. 82. 8 H.) from ëbies; the old religious term for a sheep, brought with its two lambs to the sacrifice, is given by Paul. Fest. as ambega (§ 7 Th. 'ambegni' bos et vertex appellabantur, cum ad eorum utraque latera agni in sacrificium ducabantur), but in Glossaries as ambiga (Mai, vi. p. 566 b. 'ambignae,' oves ex utraque parte agnos habentes; and 'ambignae,' oves quas Junonii offreabant, quia geminos parerent), while the MSS. of Varro give ambizia, which may indicate a correction of ambega to ambigua (L. vii. 31 'ambiegni' bos apud augures, quam cecum alie hostiae constituantur). We have *sim- for *sagm- (I.-Eur. sm-, Gk. ἀ-παλος, &c.), in simplus, simplex, simpliciarus funera (quibus adhibentur duntaxat ludi coritoresque, Fest. 498. 24 Th.) as well as singuli, sincerus, sincinia (canto solidaria, Paul. Fest. 500. 23 Th.) and in simul, older semul (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), similis, similit, but e does not become i before mpl of templum, nor before re in fivenes, and Umbrian sumel, Gk. ἀπαλός, &c. suggest that the sim- of similis and its cognates is I.-Eur. som-, and has the ë-sound of sómnus, written also sómus, lëbët later lëbet (see ch. ii. § 16); sincup is derived from sinicaput 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' *pênegh (O. Ind. pâica, Arm. hing, Gk. πέννα, O. Ir. eíc, Gaul. pêmê-ôsâ, éinçofoil, O. W. pimm, Goth. fimf, Lith. penki, O. Sl. peti) is in Latin quintae [with long ë indicated both by inscriptions and by the Romance forms, a quantity which has been referred to the influence of quin(c)hus (K. Z. xxv. 501) (see ch. ii. § 144)]. In rustic and dialectal Latin ë before re became i, e.g. Mircurios, Mirriuros (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. 'miium' et 'commircium' quoque per i antiquis relinquamus, apud quos aequo et 'Mircurius' per i dicebatur, quod mirandarum rerum esset inventor, ut Varro dicit. nostris jam auribus placet per e, ut et Mercurius et commercia dicantur). The i of country-terms like hircatus, hirtus, &c. (apparently from root gherv- 'to be rough,' whence Lat. horœ, hordeum, &c.) may be explained by this dialectal pronunciation of stircus for stererus, &c. (cf. Osc. amiricatad 'immemrado'). In other positions than before re, &c. the 'rustic' pronunciation seems to have substituted s for (ut tota litteram tollasen pleenissimum dicas, Cic. 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 fèlix, a fern (the latter approved by Capor, p. 106. 1 K.; see Georges s. v.), fiber and fibër, a beaver, from I.-Eur. bhèbrh- (see Georges); but the byforms pinna and penna, vigeo and vigevo, villus
M. and *vellus N. have not yet been satisfactorily explained. *Levir, a brother-in-law, a word only found in late Latin writers, and so misspelt with e for ae (see § 26), from I.-Eur. *dlaver- (Gk. ἀδητός, Lith. dėveris) takes i by anal. of vir. (On other byforms due to the late Latin identification of i with e, and to the change of e to i in unaccented syllables, see ch. ii. § 6).

I, 1.

§ 12. I. I.-Eur. i has been faithfully retained by the various languages in almost all circumstances, and is in Latin i, though often written in O. Lat. ei, after the I.-Eur. ei-diphthong had come to take the sound of i (ch. i. § 9). The diphthong ei in Greek developed to the same sound (thus εὕρεσα, the proper spelling, became ἐὕρεσα), so that in Greek also ei was in course of time often written for i, e.g. πολείτης, and Ulfilas adopted this symbol ei for the long i-sound of Gothic. For examples of I.-Eur. i we may take the adjective-suffix in -ino- (O. Ind. nav-īna-, ‘new,’ Gk. ἀγγειο-ίνος, often with names of animals, e.g. κορακ-ίνος, δελφακ-ίνη, γορυ-ίνη, Goth. gulp-īns, O. H. G. guld-īn, Engl. gold-en, Goth. sv-īn, O. Engl. sw-īn, Engl. swine, O. Sl. mater-īnū, ‘motherly,’ sv-inū), in Latin su-īnus, div-īnus, &c.; the optative-suffix ī (varying with yē, ch. viii. § 55) (O. Ind. dviś-mahi, Gk. εἰδεύμεν from εἰδε(ς)-μεν, Goth. vīl-ī-ma) in Lat. s-īnus; the adjective *g̅w̃iwo-, ‘alive,’ (O. Ind. jivā-, Lith. gūvas, O. Sl. živū, O. Ir. biu, W. byw) in Lat. vīvus, in old spelling veīvos; Lat. vis (Gk. ἴς, ἴ-φι); Lat. virīus (Gk. ἴος for *φίος), Lat. vītēx (Gk. ἴτεα and εἰτέα, Engl. withy, Lith. vytis). I.-Eur. i is usually a grade of an ei-root, and it is often difficult to say whether Lat. i represents the i-grade or the ei-grade.

After i, Latin ī appears as ē in lōni-ēna for *lāni-īna, &c. (cf. tonstr-īna), as we have ē in sōcītās, anxinītās, but ī in castītās, nōxītās, &c. (see ch. v. § 83). Latin ī represents I.-Eur. ei in dīco (O. Lat.dēico, Gk. δικ-νū-μ), ad-dīco, &c., fūdo (Gk. πεφῶ for *φεφῶ), con-fūdo, &c. (see ch. viii. § 6), and has come from ī lengthened by compensation in words like nīdūs for *nīūdo- (*nīzdo-) (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. poploe, then populei, ch. vi. § 40). Vidi, older videi, from I.-Eur. *woidai (O. Sl. vědě) 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 ē 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 ē in filius, § 7. I.-Eur. i remains in Umbro-Osc. and is written in the Oscan alphabet ĭ or i (in Lat. alph. i), in Umbr. i (in Lat. alph. i and ei), e.g. Ose. liúmitū[m 'limitum,' Umbr. si, sir, sei, 'sit' (see von Planta, i. p. 102).

§ 13. I.-Eur. ĭ is Latin ĭ, sometimes written in Old Latin e (e.g. Tempestatebus on a Scipio epitaph), after unaccented ē had come to take the ĭ-sound (see also ch. iii. § 18). The I.-Eur. pronoun *į-(O. Ind. i-d-ām Neut., Goth. is Masc., ìta Neut., Engl. it) is Lat. ĭs M., ĭd N.; the pronoun *kį-, 'this' (Goth hi-mma Dat., hi-drē Adv., Engl. him, hither, Lith. szis, O.S. si) appears in Latin cīs, cíttra; the interrogative and indefinite pronoun *qį-(O. Ind. ci-d, Gk. τί(δ), O. Sl. či-to) is Latin quīs M., quīd N. (cf. Umbr. pis); from the root mīn-, 'to lessen,' from the primary root mei- (O. Ind. minōmi, Gk. μινῶθω, Goth. mins Adv., O. Sl. mǐnijī Adj.) we have Lat. mīnnum, mīnor.

I.-Eur. ĭ is generally the weak grade of the diphthong ei (as mǐn- from mei-, 'to lessen'), and so in Latin, e.g. in-dīco beside dīco (older deico), fīdes (cf. Gk. ἔθιδων) beside fīdo, older fēido (cf. Gk. πείθω for *φείθω). For ĭ varying with ĭ, e.g. I.-Eur. *wīro, 'a man,' see § 58. Latin ĭ may represent any short vowel in an unaccented syllable, not long by position, e.g. concīno for con-cano, dilīgo for dilego, inquīlinus for *inquolinus, quīllībet for quīlldībet (whence libet for lubet, ch. ii. § 16). In an unaccented syllable long by position ĭ became ē, e.g. indicī beside indicō, jūdecī beside jūdīco (cf. jūrī-dicus), cōmes, properly *comēs, Gen. comĭtĭs, and in an open unaccented syllable before r, e.g. cīn-er-īs from cinis, and also when final, e.g. mārē but-maria, mariĭnus; lēvē, Neut. of levis (contrast Gk. ἱππός, Neut. of ἵππος), rurē, Loc. of rūs, in which case it may be dropped, e.g. anīmālī for animāle, Neut. of animālis. Latin -rī- in the unaccented syllable, when preceded by a con-
sonant, became ūr, e.g. acerbus for *acrī-bus from *acrū-dho- (Lith. asstrūs, O. Sl. ostrū), incertus for *incrītus (Gk. ἴκρος); and apparently this may occur in the accented syllable too, e.g. ter, properly tērs (cf. terr-uncius) for *tērs from *trēs (Gk. τρίς), testis for *trī-stis (cf. Oscan trīstaementud, in Lat. testāmentō Abl.) (but see ch. iii. § 15. 8). Similarly for -ī-, 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 āil (older ōil) in Latin, e.g. fāculas for *facil(ī)tas beside facilītas, similītas for *simil(ī)tas beside similītas.

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

§ 14. Other examples of Lat. ĭ for I.-Eur. ĩ. The -is- of the I.-Eur. Superlative suffix is-to- (O. Ind. svād-iṣṭha-, Gk. ἰδιός, Goth. suit-ista, ‘sweetest’) appears in Latin māg-is-ter (in O. Lat. written magister according to Quintilian, i. 4. 17 quid? non e quoque iloco fuit? ‘Menerua’ et ‘leber’ et ‘magester’ et ‘Diovi Victore,’ non Diovi Victorī), mīn-is-ter. The weak grade of an ei-root is seen in I.-Eur. tri- from root trei-, ‘three’ (O. Ind. tri-śū Loc., Gk. τρι-οί, Goth. ṣr-m Dat., Lith. tri-sē Loc., O. Sl. tri-chū) and Latin tri-bus, though in ter, terni, &c. there is the usual change of -ri-to-er-; Lat. pīcis (Goth. ḳiske), while O. Ir. iasg from *peisco-shows the ei-grade ; Lat. videō (O. Ind. vid-mā, I Pl., Hom. Gk. ϕίς-μεν, W. gwedd, ‘aspect,’ Goth. vit-um, I Pl., Engl. wit, Germ. wissen) from root weid-, ‘to see, know,’ with Perfect-stem woid- (Gk. ὤβα); Lat. fīd-ī, findō (O. Ind. bhid-), ‘to split,’ Goth. bitum, I Pl. Pret., Engl. bit, Germ. bissen), from root bheid- (Goth. bītan, Engl. to bite, Germ. beissen).

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

§ 15. ĭē, not ĭī. Other examples are pīetas, sātietae, ūvrietae and other derivatives in -iē from io-adjective stems, ściertis, ściets, &c., vāriego, &c. beside vēgo, &c., hietare, and the earlier spellings comiectant, proiectad, iniecietis, traicere, &c. (see ch. iii. § 18, p. 188).

Ō, Ō.

§ 16. Ō. I.-Eur. ō is Latin ō. Thus the I.-Eur. root pō-, ‘to drink’ (O. Ind. pā-, pā-na-, Noun, Gk. πᾶ-πω-κά, ἀμ-πω-τῖς, the ebb, Aeol. πώ-νω, Lith. pū-ta) is Latin pō- of pō-to, pō-lus, pō-culum; dō-, ‘to give’ (O. Ind. dā-na- and dā-ti-, ‘a gift,’ Arm. tur, Gk. δο-ρω and δωτίνη, Lith. dú-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 dú-num, dú-s. On
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the other hand, I.-Eur. ó is often a grade of ē or ē (e.g. Gk. πωτάλωμα from root πετ-, κλάψ, a thief, from κλέπτω, θωμός from τίθυμι) (see §§ 51, 53). A root like ĝnō- (Gk. γνωστός, Lat. nōsus, older gnōlus, gnōsco) beside ĝn-, admits of being explained either as an addition of the suffix -ō- to the weak grade ĝn-, or as a grade of a dissyllabic root ĝen-, so that gnōlus from ĝen- would be like ĝnārus from ĝena-, &c. (§ 1).

Latin ő sometimes represents an ō lengthened by ‘compensation,’ e.g. pōno from *pō-s(i)no (cf. pō-sītus); sometimes it is due to erasis, e.g. cōpula for *co-apula, cómburo for co-ambr-uuo (see ch. ii. § 149); sometimes it is the ‘rustic’ development of Latin oun, which in standard Latin became ù, e.g. rōbus for *rūbus (cf. rūbidus) from I.-Eur. reudh- (Goth. raufs) (see § 41); sometimes it is the ‘rustic’ form of au, e.g. plōstrum, a byform of planstrum, from plauo (ch. ii. § 37). But ő is also found to vary with au in Latin, when both are sprung from an original ůu, e.g. osculum, ausculum (ib.).

In unaccented syllables ő remained unaltered, e.g. con-dōno and co-qnūco, but final -ō became shortened in course of time (see ch. iii. § 45). Octāvus from octō (I.-Eur. *oktō, *oktōu) appears to show āv for ōw, as cavus shows āv for ōw (§ 19). Für, cūr (O. Lat. quōr) seem to represent an I.-Eur. *bhōr (Gk. φῶρ, p. 254), *qū-r (Lith. kuř, ‘where,’ for *kūr, ch. x. § 10), and nōn to stand for *mūn, a development of noen(nwm) (ch. x. § 18).

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

I.-Eur. òv seems to have become ò in the beginning of the second century B.C., e.g. cōnus, older covus (Gk. κόος, cavities, Hesych., κοῖος for *κοῖος). Latin vō- became vē- in the middle of the second century B.C. in versus, older vorus, &c. (§ 10); but vōco was the older form of vāco, as we see from Plautus' pun in Cas. 527:

nāc habeant linguām tuae aedes. Quid ita? Quom ueniám, ucent.

Latin -ōv- may represent I.-Eur. -ēw-, as in nōvem, nōvus (see § 10); Latin sṿ-, I.-Eur. sṿ-, as in sōrör, sōcer, somnus (see § 10); Latin āl, ēr, the I.-Eur. sonant or syllabic l, r, as in fores, cor (see § 92). In the accented, as well as the unaccented syllable, Latin õ became u, before l with a consonant (not ll), before m with a labial, before ngu, e.g. vult (volt) from volo, lumbus, unguis. 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 ā, to the rule that a short vowel became ē, then ē, in open syllables; e.g. adnōto, arrōgo have not changed their vowel like adīgo (from āgo). In syllables long by position, õ became ā about the end of the third century B.C.; and any õ which had escaped weakening to ē, ē 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, prognatus 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 ā, e.g. dolom and dolum (von Planta, i. p. 111). Final õ became ē, like final ā, ē, &c., e.g. sēquēre imper. for I.-Eur. *seqēso (Gk. ἔπεο) (see ch viii. § 77).

§ 18. Latin ō for I.-Eur. ō. Other examples: from the I.-Eur. root òqʷ- 'to see' (varying with òqʷ-) (O. Ind. ākṣi-, 'the eye,' Arm. akn, Gk. ἄμα, ἄφωμα, Lith. akis, O. Sl. oko) comes Lat. oculus; the I.-Eur. preposition *prō, 'forth' (O. Ind. pra-, 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. prā-, O. Sl. pro-) is Lat. prō- of prō-ficiscor, &c.; another preposition, I.-Eur. *kom 'with' (Gk. κοινός from *κοιν-γος, O. Ir. con-, 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. νίκη, O. Ir. in-nocht, 'to-night,' W. henoeth, nos, Goth. nahts, O. Engl. neah, niht, Lith. naktis, O. Sl. noštǐ) is
§ 19. Lat. ë for I.-Eur. ő, under influence of v. Other examples are Lat. cœce for *cœce (Gk. κοβειω, to perceive, ἀνοιω), Lat. autim for *αιτουνó from *αιτουνω (Gk. οιτω), Lat. ëco for *cœco (Gk. λοωά). Lat. fœilla for *fœilla from I.-Eur. root dhegē, ‘to burn’ (O. Ind. dah-, Gk. τῆφ-pa, ashes, Lith. degū, ‘I burn’). The example previously quoted, Lat. cœus for cœus, enables us to assign a date to this change of I.-Eur. ow, Lat. ow to æ. The Spanish and Portuguese words (Span. cueva, Port. cova) show that cœvo-, not cævo-, was the Vulgar Latin stem at the time when Spain was made a province. The country-term coum (cohun), the hollow in the plough, used by Ennius of the innermost part of the heavenly sphere, retained the ō, as did oris (Gk. Ὠ(φ)ε), though whether the avo- of avadubulus ‘pastor ovium’ (Löwe, Prodr. p. 348), avillūs ‘agnus recentis partus’ (Paul. Fest. 10. 32 Th.) is better referred to this root or to agis- the root of agnus (Gk. ἀγνός for *ἀγνός) is not clear. (Varro, L. L. v. 135 explains coum as ‘sub jugo medio cavum, quod bura extrema addita oppilatur,’ and adds ‘voeatur coum a covo’; cf. Paul. Fest. 28. 1 Th.; Isid. Nat. Rer. 12 cous (v. l. chous) est quo caelum continetur, unde Ennius,

vix solum complever coum (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 inocho, for he derived the word from cohun, the Old Latin word for mundus. We have already found that I.-Eur. őw became ő in Latin (e. g. Lat. novus for I.-Eur. *newos), and that probably at a very early date, seeing that the change is shared by other Italic languages (e. g. Osc. Nuvellum). 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. ow 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 *nævos; novem, not *nævem). Latin ov from I.-Eur. oghē shares the change to av, e. g. fœilla from I.-Eur. dhegē, the o-grade of the root dhegē-, ‘to burn’; but nādus for *nov(s)due from I.-Eur. *nogē-, ‘naked,’ shows that the change of ov to av was later than the syncope of ő in the post-tonic syllable.

Lat. vōco (Plaut. Cas. 527) for vāco (Umbr. vaqeto- P. P. P., vakaze, for *vakaz se, Lat. vacatio sit?) 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 *vōcis, 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. ū for ō. (1) in close syllables, unaccented (according to the early Accent-law): vititatus for *vetitos-to- (Gk. (F)τρός), and other derivatives from Neuters in -os (class. Lat. -us), such as augustus, vēnustus, őmōstus; hōmōlōs for *homōlōs from *homōn-to-, and other to- Diminutives from on-stems, like tēnūlās, whereas Diminutives from on- have -oll-, e. g. persōlla, cērolla; so also Diminutives in -o-to- from on-stems, like hōmīnūlēs, latrinūlēs; altūmās (cf. Gk. ἄρα ὣμος) and similar formations, Vertumnus, Autumnus, columnā, &c.

(2) before l with consonant (not ll): cūlēn (contrasted with colōmen); stūltus (contrasted with stōlidus); pudēs (contrasted with pollen); fūlēs (contrasted with soīo for *soīū). In Old Latin we have o, e. g. on inscriptions, Poleius (C. I. L. vi. 1307, of 187 B. C.; Eph. Epigr. viii. 476, c. 135 B. C.; C. I. L. i. 554 and
555, both of 130–129 b. c. &c.) Poleo[er] (ib. i 552 of 132–131 b. c.). Priscian
(i. p. 27. 33 H.) tells us that volpa was the O. Lat. form of culpæ; and in
the lines of Ennius about Servius Tullius (Ann. 337 M.) the corrupt reading of
the MSS. ultimus for ultimum, probably indicates the spelling ultimus (cf.
Osc. ultiumam):

mortalem summum Fortuna repente
reddidit, ut summò regno famul ultimus esset.

On the spellings volca and vulca, Fem. of adj. *volvens from volvo, see Georges,
Lex. Worlf. 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 ò may be I.-Jur. òl, e.
g. volt, vult (§ 10).

(3) before m with labial: umbo for *ombo, like umbilicus for *ombr-* (Gk. ὄμφαλος);
the Greek (Thracian ?) ὄμφαλα is rumpia in Ennius (A. xiv. fr. 8 M.) and Livy
(XXXI. 39. 11). Perhaps also before ms, e. g. unèruses from omso- (O. Ind. ßsa-,
Arm. us, Goth. ans, Umbr. ònso-).

(4) before ngu: unguo, unguen, unguentum for *ungu- (O. Ind. aŋį-, 'to anoint');
ungula, like unguis (Gk. ὄμψυ); but longus, where the g is not velar (gu), retains
the o (we find however lun[gam] beside lon[gam] in neighbouring inscription,
C. L. i. 1072). We have also unceu for *omcan (Gk. ὄμας), (but sescentia
C. L. i. 1430, in a Cremona inscription), &c. On the occasional use of u for ò,
often for Greek o, before other consonant-groups, e. g. turnus beside tornus,
from Greek τόρπσ, O. Lat. frundus (see ch. ii. § 22). Some isolated cases of
u for accented ò have various explanations; hímus, for *homus (cf. Gk. χόμυς),
may take its u from the analogy of hidmeo, 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 aude facere laconam, at in humu calcës facis elixos; Enn.
Trag. 396 R. cubitis pinsibant humum; Pae. Trag. 351 R. tractate per aspera
saxa et humum; cf. Gracch. Trag. 3 mersit sequentis 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 olina,
adapted to the derivation from colo (Varro ap. Non. 55. 20 M.; 'Serv.' ad Aen.
iii. 134); *fìlica, if for *fìlaca, either follows the analogy of fūlgo, or shows the
vowel of falsca, the form used by Furius Antias ap. Gell. xviii. 11. 4.

(5) in syllables unaccented under the later Accent-law: the 3 Plur. suffix
-ont became -und 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. L. i. 181, from Picenum), coventient on a Scipio epitaph (i. 32) (so on the
restored Columna Rostrata, excipient, i. 195). Festus (244. 13 Th.) quotes
praed-opiant (MS. praeediont), in the sense of praeeoptant, from the Carmen Saliare,
and nequentont, an old 3 Pl. form of nequeo, from the Odysseia of Livius Andronicus

partim errant, nequïont Graeciam redire;

the Nom. Sg. termination of Neuter ES-stems is -os on an old inscription, epos
(C. L. i. 52, probably from Orvieto) (cf. Cenos 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 ò, ò,
e.g. equos, arvom, till the time of Quintilian, though the pronunciation may have been the ̅u-sound (see § 70). (On this reduction of ̅o to ̅u in unaccented syllables, see ch. iii. §§ 18, 26; another example is the verb sum, for *somm, with ̅u for ̅o, because of its usual unaccented character.) In late Latin, when ̅o and ̅ʊ had come to have nearly, or altogether, the same sound, ̅u is often written for ̅ʊ, so that the older spelling seems to be revived (see ch. ii. § 29).

**Ü, Ū.**

§ 21. Ū. I.-Eur. ū is Latin ü, I.-Eur. *dhūmo-,* 'smoke,' from root dheu-,* 'to move violently' (O. Ind. dhūmā-, Gk. θύμος, passion, Lith. dūmai Pl., O. Sl. dymū), Lat. fūmus; I.-Eur. *mūs-, 'a mouse' (O. Ind. mūś-, 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 ü, older ou, may represent also I.-Eur. eu or ou, e.g. duco, older douco (see §§ 35, 41), Latin ū, older oi, oe, I.-Eur. oi, e.g. cura (§ 38), and sometimes has arisen from ū by 'compensation,' e.g. dūmus, older dūsмо- (Paul. Fest. 47. 20 Th.), a spelling retained in the proper name Dūmus; dūmetum for dusm-, in Virgil MSS. spelt dummetum, shows that ūm- is equivalent to -ūmm-. In the unaccented syllable ū may represent au, e.g. defrūdo from fraudo, inclūdo from clando (ch. iii. § 18). On für, cur for *für, quōr, see § 16. I.-Eur. ū is in Umbr. and perhaps in some other dialects i, e.g. Umbr. frif 'fruges' Acc. Pl. (see von Planta, i. 129).

§ 22. Other examples of Lat. ū, I.-Eur. ū. Lat. frāniscī (Goth. brükjan, 'to use,' Germ. brauchen, O. Engl. brūcan, Engl. to brook); jūs, broth (O. Ind. yūja-, Gk. ὑῷα, for *Ėw-ym, leaven, Lith. jūszė); sūtus (O. Ind. syūtá-, Gk. νεοκάττυτος); so-lūtus (Hom. βουλιτήρῳ-δε).

§ 23. Ū. I.-Eur. ū, Lat. ū, 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. ὑγών, Goth. jūk, O. Sl. ig for jūgo), Lat. jūgum; I.-Eur. lūk-, weak grade of leuk-, 'to shine' (O. Ind. rūc-, Gk. ἄμφυ-λόκη, twilight), Lat. lūcēna. I.-Eur. ū (Lat. ū) is also the weak grade of a wē-root, e.g. I.-Eur. *pēruti, 'last year' (Gk. πέρυρι), from *wetesi, 'year,' and similarly in the unaccented syllable Latin ū often appears for vē, e.g. concutio for *conquetio from quātio (see ch. iii. § 25). Lat. ū often represents I.-Eur. (and older Latin) ō; for an ō passed at the end of the third cent. B.C. into the sound ū, 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 *ō* 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. *ū* offered more resistance than *ē* to the usual transition of a short vowel in the open unaccented syllable to *ī* (earlier *ē*, and always before *r*), e.g. *sōcer* (Gk. *ἐκυψός*) (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 *ū*-sound, which ultimately was written and pronounced *ē*, e.g. *mānubiae*, *manibiae*, *manibus*, *dissudo*, *dissipo*. That it ever had the *ū*-sound, the sound of Greek *v*, 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 *u* may represent I.-Eur. *ew*, *ow*, Lat. *ov*, e.g. *dēnuo* for *dē novō*, *ēluo* for *ē-lavo* (I.-Eur. *ἐλῶ*) (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 *ō*, e.g. *hōmullos* for *hōmōn-lo-* (see § 20). Final -ū, like other short vowels, normally became *ē*, and might be elided (ch. iii. §§ 37, 38).

A close relation exists in Latin, as in I.-Eur., between *ū* and *w*, vocalic and consonantal *u*. After *l* and *r* the vowel *ū* became a consonant in the second cent. B.C. in Latin, e.g. *lārva* (*lārna*, Plaut.), *arvum* (*ārnos*, -a, -om Plaut.), *milvus* (*mülos*, Plaut.), *pelvis*, &c. (see ch. iii. § 48). For Latin *ū* (earlier *ō*), the parasitic, or svarabhaktic vowel, in *oculus* from *ōc-lo-, *speculum* from *spēc-lo-, *ōrāculum* from *orā-clo-, see ch. ii. § 154.

I.-Eur. *ū* 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* (?), e.g. *tiurrī* 'turrīm,' *Diumpās* 'Lumpis' ('to the Nymphs'), *Niumsieis* 'Numerii' Gen. Sg., an affection of *u* which resembles Boeot. *τυάχα* (Att. *τύχη*), or Engl. 'pure,' &c. (pronounced *pjū-*), (see von Planta, i. p. 122).
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Engl. of-ten) is Latin s-ub (see ch. ix. § 52); the preposition *upēr, *upērī (O. Ind. upārī, Gk. ὑπερά, ὑπερό, O. Ir. for, from *wer, with suppression of p, Goth. ufar, Engl. over, o'er) is Latin s-uper (see ch. ix. § 53); I.-Eur. *snūso-, 'daughter-in-law' (O. Ind. smūsā, Arm. nu, Gr. νυ(σ)άς, O. Engl. snoru, Germ. Schmūr, O. Sl. snůča), is Lat. nūrus; I.-Eur. *klūto-, 'famous, from kleu-, 'to hear' (O. Ind. śrutī, Gr. ακουτός, O. Ir. cloth, Gaul. Cluto-ida, O. H. Germ. Hliud-olf, Hlot-hari, from hari, 'army,' whence Lothair, &c.), is Lat. in-clitus, later in-clitus; I.-Eur. *rūdhr-,'red,' from the root reulh-,'to be red' (O. Ind. rudhirā, Gk. ἐρυθρός, O. Sl. rūdrā) is Lat. rūber; Lat. musca (the Romance forms prove it), Gk. μυῖα for *μυγγα, Lith. musū; Lat. jāvenis (O. Ind. yūvan-), jāvenus from I.-Eur. *yūvānō (O. Ind. yuvaśā, Gk. Τάκ-υβος, O. Ir. OCKET, Welsh ieuanc, Gaul. Jovincillus, Goth. juggs for *juvunga-, O. Engl. geong); Lat. fūga (Gk. φυγή) from root bhēug-, 'to flee' (Gk. φύγω); Lat. urgeo from urg-, the weak grade of the root werg-,'to confine, press' (Gk. ἱ(γ)ῆγω, Lat. vergo.)

§ 25. Latin ë and Latin ū. We have seen that Latin ë became ū when unaccented, and even in the accented syllable before certain consonant-groups, and that in late Latin ë and ū 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 turba and turba (Gk. τῦβης, στῦβάω) come from I.-Eur. turb-, from tûr-, the weak grade of twér-, 'to twirl,' so I.-Eur. qûr-, ghrēr-, the weak grades of qûr-, ghrēr-, seem to appear in Latin as cur-, fur, e. g. furnus, an oven, from I.-Eur. ghōrno- (O. Sl. grůmë, 'a kettle'), but formus, warm, from I.-Eur. ghōrmo- (O. H. G. warm, Engl. warm). Whether Nonius, who derives furnus from formus, has any justification in spelling the word furnus (531. 24 M.) is uncertain; but formus has o, and Plautus Epid. 119 pons on furnus (so the MSS.), and foro. Carro may then stand for *qûrōs- from the root qûr- (cf. Lat. querūrā) curus cannot be the same as Gk. κηρός, from the root ker- of Gk. κῆρας, but must stand for *qûrō-, from a root qû-; corpus must represent *qûrōs-, not *qûrēs- (cf. O. Ind. kîp-); ursus may be a loanword (Lucanian, according to Varro, L. L. v. 100), or may owe its u to a velar guttural -r̩; ursus cannot be connected with órca; the spelling forecillus in MSS. of Catullus (cv. 2) must be late, if the word is connected with Hesychius' φόρκος, φορκός, which point to u (Cyprian φορκές = χάρακες shows dialectal o for u); urbs (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 (oï?) in the post-tonic syllable, (3) I.-Eur. ai, oï in the final syllable], oi, on, [(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 as in German and English.
dēvo-, Osc. deīvo-, 'god'; Umbrian tōro-, Osc. ταῦπο-, bull; Umbr. tōto, Osc. τῶτο, people, community [I.-Eur. *teutā-, Goth. āiuda, whence some derive 'Teuton,' O. Ir. tuath, Gaul. Teuto-bōdiāci, W. tud (in Gaelic tuath is used for 'the countrypeople,' '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, ō, ō, 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 ā-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), incideretis (I.-Eur. post-tonic ai), foideratei (I.-Eur. final -oi). But this diphthong soon became identical in pronunciation with the long ā-vowel, so that spelling-reformers like Accius and Lucilius used i and ei for this long ā-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 ā. 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 aeí; 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 (coaraverunt), e.g. C. I. L. i. 567 (Capua) of 106 B.C.: murum et pluteum faciund. coaravere, where the spelling murum (older moerum, 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. dévā and dévāu 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 aī, āu (āw) to au, ēu to eu, ōi to oi; just as we have vēntus from *wēnt- (root wē-, 'to blow,' Gk. ἄμυτ) (see below, § 45).

§ 27. AI. I.-Eur. aī is Lat. ae (older aī), e.g. the I.-Eur. root aivē-, 'time, life' (Gk. αἰών, δεῖ for *αλφ(σ)), with Ion. Att. ā for alf-, as in ἄλδα for *潟αίϝά, 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 aedes, lit. 'where the fire is kept up,' aëstus. In the last root I.-Eur. aī is the weak grade of ayē, thus aidh- of ayēdh- (aye- is seen in I.-Eur. *ayēs-, 'metal, gleaming metal'), and in the first of aī (§ 45) (cf. O. Ind. āyu-). In the unaccented syllable ae became ā, e.g. inquīro, occīdo from quāero, caedo (see ch.iii. § 18), or rather aī became ei, then i, e.g. inceideretis on the S. C. de Bacch.; and in the final syllable, e.g. tātiā (O. Ind. tutudē) with the r Sg. Perf. Middle ending -ai or -ai
§ 28. I.-Eur. ai, Lat. ae (ai). Lat. caedo from I.-Eur. root skaidh- (Goth. skaidan, O. Engl. scædan, Engl. water-shed, Lith. skédžiu, 'I separate'); Lat. scaevers (Gk. σκαύς f.) ; Lat. laerus (Gk. λαύ(F)ός, O. Sl. lěvů); Lat. caecus from I.-Eur. *kaioko, 'blind' (O. Ir. caech, with another sense, 'empty,' cf. Gael. caoch-ag, 'a nut without a kernel,' Goth. hais; in Gk. κοῖνός, 'to goape about,' the a has become o, through the assimilating influence of the accented v); Lat. haecro from I.-Eur. root ghaís- (Lith. gaiszti, 'to tarry'; Goth. us-gaisjan, 'to frighten,' lit. 'cause to hesitate,' Engl. gaze); Lat. haedus (Goth. goais, Engl. goat); Lat. lēvir from I.-Eur. *daier- (O. Ind. dévār-, Arm. taigr, Gk. δήρη, O. H. G. zeihhur, O. Eng. tācer, Lith. déveri, O. Sl. đeverli) is a late Latin spelling for laevir, the i being due to the analogy of vir.

§ 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, tabeia, datia, &c.); Aemilius on three inscriptions of 187 B. C. (i. 535-7), but Aemulius (C. I. L. ii. 5041) of 189 B. C.; aedate on a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B. C. (i. 34), (along with quairatic); quaeter, quaero, praeter, praetor are established spellings in the Lex Bantina of 133-118 B. C. (i. 197), the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B. C. (i. 196), &c. The spelling ai, which we find once or twice towards the end of the second cent. B. C., conguassavet (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.,' Momms., and i. 1487, from Majorca), Caecilianus (i. 378, on a coin with an alphabet A-X, so older than the introduction of Y, Z (ch. i. § 2)), Caedicia (ix. 3087, from Sulmo), seems to mark the transition stage. Often ai and ae are found side by side, e. g. praetores aere Martio emere (i. 1143, from Cora); aedatei and saepi'stiume on the dedicatory inscription of the Faliscan 'collegium cocorum' (Zvet. I. I. L. 73 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 Valerian (Rossi, i. 113, of 352 A.D.), quai and filiani (Rossi, i. 410, of 393 A.D.), &c. E is not regularly exchanged with e; till the fourth cent. a. D. on inscriptions (Seelmann, Ausspr. Lat. p. 252), but in dialectal inscr. it is of course much earlier, e. g. cedre 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 ā is a feature of inscriptions of the Etruscan country (see Mem. Ist. Lombard. 1892), e. g. Painsscos on a Praenestine mirror (C. I. L. xiv. 4998) [cf. Saetturni on a Praenestine vase (i. 48)], and perhaps Lat. Aesculapius for 'Arsδόνιος'; we have ei in questiones (i. 183, Marsie).

§ 30. AU. I.-Eur. au is Latin au, which in the unaccented syllable became ā (see ch. iii. § 18), and in the accented syllable was in dialectal Latin ā (e. g. Plautus' Umbrian name was Pollus '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(φ)έξω (O. Ind. øjas-, Goth. aukan, 'to multiply,' Engl.
eke vb., Lith. áugu, 'I grow,' Gk. aὐξω, aὐξάνω) appears in Latin aug-eo, augus-tus; the I.-Eur. particle *au [Gk. ἀυ, ἀο-τε, ἀο-τις, Goth. au-k, 'also' (with -k like Gr. γε), O. Engl. éac, Eng. eke advb.], in Latin au-t (Osc. avti, Umbr. ote), au-tem (Osc. avt). 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. óu-root in auscultum (Plaut.) beside òs from I.-Eur. *óus (cf. cátus beside cós, § 54).

§ 31. Other examples. Lat. paucus (Goth. favai Pl., Engl. few); Lat. aurūna for *αυρόνα (Gk. αὐρόν for *αὐρόν, ἀγχ-αυρόν vīg Apoll. Rhod., 'nearing the dawn,' Lith. ausz-rū, O. Scand. austr; O. H. G. östar, Engl. east) from I.-Eur. aus-, a weak grade of ἀώς-, 'to gleam' (cf. Gk. ἀώς for *ἀφως), whence *auso-, 'gold' (Lat. aurum, Lith. āuksas); Lat. auris for *αυσία, αυσ-κύλο (O. Ir. au, a Neuter S-stem, Goth. ausō, an N-stem, Lith. ausis) from I.-Eur. *aus-, a weak grade of *aúde- [cf. Gk. αὐδώ (ἀώ), I perceive; but αὐς is a Greek development of the high grade ἀου; cf. O. Ind. आवि, '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,' avabh-, 'aufero'). It is often difficult to distinguish this Lat. au, representing I.-Eur. au (a reduction of I.-Eur. ἀώ) from Lat. au, a reduction of Lat. ãvē, ãvē, e. g. avideo from avídes. (Other examples in ch. iii. § 16. 9.) On the occasional appearance of ū 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 ū, 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 Oscan, however, the diphthong is preserved. In Latin it is used in the interjection hei, ei, from which comes the verb eijūlo. Instances of I.-Eur. ei, Latin ei or i, are: I.-Eur. deik-, 'to show, say' (Gk. δεῖκνυμι, Goth. ga-teiha, 'I declare'), Lat. dīco, O. Lat. deico, Osc. deicium Inf.; I.-Eur. bheidh-, 'to believe, trust' (Gr. πεθομαι), Lat. fidō, 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 lūtūtū Perf. (O. Ind. tutudē), I.-Eur. -ai or -a (ch. viii. § 76); in pōpūlē Nom. Pl. (oldest Lat. poplēo),
I.-Eur.-oī; in con-cido from caedo, older caido, I.-Eur. ai. The older spelling of all these words shows -ei, tutudei, pop(w)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 ἐ, e.g. Alexandrēa, Dārēus (shortened to ἕ, e.g. balnēum), later ἕ, e.g. Alexandrēa (shortened to ἕ) (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. ēti, Gk. ἔτη, Lith. ėtė, ėtė, Lat. ētī (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 -ē, ch. iii. § 49); I.-Eur. *deiwo-, ‘god’ (O. Ind. dévā-, Lith. dévās, Ir. dia, Gaul. Ἀθωνος, W. dwy-fol, ‘divine,’ O. Engl. Twes-deg, ‘Tuesday’; but Gk. διός is for ἰδιος, like O. Ind. divya-). Lat. divus, on the Dvensen inscription deivo-. When ἕ of the final syllable was weakened to ēi, deiwos became *deiws (for *deiws, the v being absorbed by the following u, § 70), deiwom became *deiwm, which passed into de(y)um, de(y)um as *ei-yum, ἅcc. M. of is, into e(y)-um, *ei-ō 1 Sg. into e(y)ō, so that the word would be declined deus, deiwēi, deiwō, deiwm, &c.; from this variation arose the ‘doublets’ divus, diwēi, divō, divum, &c., and deus, deiwō, deiwum, &c. (cf. C. I. L. i. 632 sei deo sei deivae); 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. ricālis, older reivē), seu (cf. steve, older steve) are to be similarly explained, though some prefer to suppose that the prior stages of all three words were *dēwos, *rēwos, *sēwos (like Alexandrēa, Dārēus, &c.), and quote lēwos as an example of the passage of ei before v into e (cf. Gk. λεῦ(f)os) (von Planta, Ὀσκ.-Umbr. Dial. i. p. 145). Nēw, ceu are most naturally explained as shortenings from *nēwos (cf. nēve), *sēwos (cf. Gk. κῆ, Lat. cē-tori, B. B. xv. 313), though they also admit of being referred to *nei-y (from O. Lat. nei, ni, used in the sense of class. nē), and from a Locative, either Demonstr. *cei (ch. vii. § 15) or Relative qui, qui (ch. vii. § 23). On meo see ch. viii. § 6, ejus ch. vii. § 13, peiōr 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 (I.-Eur. ei), incideeretis (I.-Eur. post-tonic ai), foedereati (I.-Eur. final -oi). But we have ei employed merely to indicate long ē in audire de Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 b.c. (i. 198); ameicitiam of the Lex Agraria of 111 b.c. (i. 200); ameicorum, vēneire (i. 203, of 78 b.c.); erecivanda deividundā and feicent of the Lex Rubria of 49 b.c. (i. 205); esurēs on a leaden bullet used at the siege of Perusia with the cruel message carved on it, esurēs et me celos (i. 692); veivos (i. 1256), &c.; and this seems to be the function of ei in the Plinean text represented by the Codex Ambrosianus (see Index to Studemund’s Apograph, p. 504). Even as early as the end of the third cent. b.c. we have opénod dēvinum tol 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. aemiiserunt, i. 204), though this spelling is often nothing but a dialectal variety, e.g. ueos (Lat. vei-, vucus) 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 ineiporatus on the inscription of Aem, Paulus Macedonicus, from Spain (C. I. L. ii. 5041, of 189 B.C.), letteras (see ch. ii. § 130), and sene on the Lex Repetundarum (i. 198); so in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus, ibeiin, Cas 92; curabeis, Merc. 526. And ei appears occasionally even for the e-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 sibyq for pro se sibyque, &c.) (C. I. L. xiv. 2892), and in decrevit 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 Seisipitci 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 -ei, -et, e.g. fijiaced on the Praenestine fibula, detet (beside cepit) on a Scipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 32), as graphical varieties of -eit (e.g. probaxcit beside cocxavit, i. 600) (see ch. viii. § 70). The Plautine spelling must have been menditcor, eira to judge from the remarks in Rau. 1305 that mendicus has 'one letter more' than medicus, and in Truc. 262 that comprise sis eram becomes comprinse sis eram 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 ou, and Gothic, with in and au, will serve as criteria. We find eu in Latin in the interjections hen (cf. Gk. φεύ), ehen, heus; the pronoun neuter [a trisyllable (ch. ii. § 32)], from ne and uter, with accent on the ne, whereas in neutiquum, pronounced nütiqum (or nütiqum, ch. ii. § 149), ne being unaccented, was elided; the conjunction nen, a byform of nüve, sev, a byform of see (older seive), cen from *cę-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 Carmen Saliare on the strength of the quotations Leucesie (Ter. Scaur. 28. 11 K.), and coezeulodorieso of Varro, L. L. vii. 26 (perhaps O Zen, &c., ch. ii. § 5), whether rightly or not is a matter of doubt. (See Rhein. Mus. xxxiv. 1 on Latin eu.)

Examples of I.-Eur. eu, Latin ù (O. Lat. ou) are: Lat. düeceere (Goth. tiuhan, O. Engl. tēon, Germ. ziehen); Lat. jügeribus Abl. Pl. from *jügus (Gk. ζῦγος); Lat. ûro (Gk. έω for *εύω). The Greek Πολυδεύκης is in O. Lat. *Polluces, written in the orthography of the early Praenestine inscriptions Poloces (C. I. L. i. 55), and Poloces (xiv. 4094), then Pollucês (so the MSS. in Plaut. Bacch. 894; cf. Varro, L. L. v. 73 in latinis litteris veteribus nomen quod est, inscribitur ut Πολυδεύκης, 'Polluces,' 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. *dēvīdō* (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*. *Juppiter*, in the usual Latin spelling *Jūpiter* (ch. ii. § 130), may have been originally a vocative like Gk. *Zeū pārip*. (Can the fragment of the Carmen Saliiare quoted above from Varro have *OZeū* with *Z* for the sound *dy*., as in Oscan inscriptions written in Roman characters we find *siculo-* as the Diminutive of the word for 'day,' like Latin *diēcula*?).

§ 37. **OU, U in Inscriptions.** The diphthong was reduced very early to a simple sound, as is natural where the two elements of the diphthong have 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 epigraphs (C. I. L. i. 32 *Lūciom*; i. 30 *Lucius* with *Loucanam*, and *abdoucit*), not later than 200 B. C.; *deducundae*, 181 B. C. (i. 58); *Lucius* in a dedicatory inscription of the consul *Mummius*, 146 B. C. (i. 542); *lūci* and *invarint* (with *lōvanto*, *lōdicetur*, *lōdex*, &c.) in the Lex Bantina of 133–118 B. C. (i. 197); *lūtando, lūticitūs, dūco* (with *lōdicium*, *lōdicatō*, *lōns*) on the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 B. C. (i. 198), while the spelling with *ov* is entirely discarded in the Lex Cornelia of 81 B. C. (i. 202, with *inuv*, *ūre*, &c.). Now and then *ou* occurs for a short vowel, e.g. *lōbētatis* (beside *ionsēt*) in the S. C. Bacch. (i. 196) (but see ch. viii. § 29), *proboum* on old coins (i. 16), *Lavamela* on an old Praenestine vase (xiv. 4108, or *Lad-?*), possibly to represent the transition-sound between *o* 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. *cov(e)rverunt* (i. 1419, from Picenum), *plo(u)rume* (with *Clou[i]*) for *Cloelius*, i. 1297, from near Amaterrnum), though not at all to 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. *Polones* and *Losna* on a Praenestine mirror (i. 55) (cf. Umb. *toro-* for Latin *tavor-*). On Latin inscriptions *o* occurs for I.-Eur. *ou*, and for the new *ou*-diphthong, which arose by syncope in words like *nov(e)ntius, cov(e)natio*, but not for I.-Eur. *eu* or *ū*. The spellings *pōb(e)us, pō(l)pus*, &c. (see index to C. I. L. i.), are due to confusion of the two radically different words *pābes* and *pōp(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*), *bloedio*, in the poetic words *foedus*, foul, *amoenus*, and in the family name *Clœlius*. Thus I.-Eur. *oine-*, 'one' (cf. *oiwo-, Gk. *ōs*, 'alone') (Gk. *ōmι*), the ace, O. Ir. *e*n, W. *un*, Goth. *ains*, O. Engl. *ān*, Engl. one, an, a, Pruss. *ains*, Lith. *vēnas*, O. Sl. *iūn*; in Greek the numeral-root used was I.-Eur. sem- of Lat. *sēmel*, &c., *ēs* for *sem-s, μία* for *σμιά, ἐν*
for *sem), Lat. ūnus, 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 weil-, 'to know' (Gk. oiōna and πέποιθα from πείθω, I.-Eur. beidh-, Lat. fīdo, feido), *qśoinā-, 'an assessment, fine,' from qśei-, 'to value, care for' (Gk. ποιήν, from τείω, often written τίω, borrowed by the Romans, poena, Zend. kaṇā-, O. Sl. čena, the k and c in these two examples indicating oi not ei) and similarly in Latin, e.g. foedus, a treaty, from feido, fīdo, just as ȳ appears in the similar grade of ē-roots, in pondus from pendo. After initial v- Latin oi became ei, as ȳ became ȳ in versus, verus, &c. (§ 10), e.g. vidi in older spelling veidei, from L.-Eur. *woidai (-ai), Perf. Mid. (O. Sl. vědě; cf. Gk. oūda, Goth. wain, O. Engl. vāt, Engl. wot).

In the unaccented syllable oi became ei, class. ʰ in the nautical term anquina, a truss, a loanword from the Greek (ἀγκόλον), perhaps adapted to Latin nouns in -īna (Non. 536. 5 M. anquinae vincula quibus antennae tenentur), but in most cases was as resistive of weakening as o (ch. iii. § 18), e.g. sé-cursus from cura, older coira, impunis (impone Cato frag. p. 37. 21 Jord.) from poena (cf. punio); in the final syllable ei, ʰ is regular, e.g. Nom. Pl. populi, earlier pop(v)lei, from a still earlier poploe. (Fest. 244. 24 Th. quotes from the Carmen Saliare pītumno pōploē, a designation of the Romans 'velut pilis uti assueti.') A spurious diphthong oi, oe, class. ʰ, has arisen through composition in coepi (older oēpēi), coelus for co-itus, and through loss of v before the accent in Julius, older Itiūio- from *īo(v)iliaus (§ 43) (cf. Cloelius, older Cluilius, from the root *klew-, 'to be heard, famous'). On cui from qui, see ch. vii. § 25, and on nōn from noen(um), ch. x. § 18.

§ 30. Other examples of I.-Eur. oi. Lat. mānus, Pl. mānera, *mūne, Pl. moenia, mānia, mānicipium, com-mānus, im-mānus, O. Lat. mōni-cipio-, conoinem (C. I. L. i. 196, of 186 B. C.) (Goth. ga-mains, Germ. ge-mein, 'common,' Lith. mānas, 'exchange,' O. Ir. mōni, maini, 'gifts'), and from the same root māto, to exchange, mānus, lent (Sicil. Gk. mōtros, requital, Goth. maijms, 'a gift,' Lett. meetō, 'to exchange'; Lat. .Socket, O. Lat. _SOCKET (C. I. L. i. 201. 9), oeti (i. 603. 6. 8), &c. (cf. Mart. Cap. iii. 236 'oisus' etiam dicitur; sic enim veteres usum dixere) seem to show, like Gk. oīros, fate, 'portion,' the o-grade of a root eit-, seen perhaps in Osc. eitivvā-, 'money,' for *eituo-; cīnas shows the o-grade of the root keī-, 'to lie' (Gk. κεί-μαι; cf. coirn).

§ 40. 01, OE, U on Inscriptions. Oi is reduced to ʰ in a Scipio epitaph of the beginning of the second cent. B. C. (C. I. L. i. 33) with utier; so wuira in one of Mummius' tithe-dedications to Hercules (i. 542) of 146 B. C.; mura Acc.
a Capua inscription of c. 135 B.C. (Eph. Epigr. viii. 476) ; procurandae (with vōnā and moenicius) on the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 200). But the spelling oï, and after it the spelling oe, long continued to be used, especially in such phrases as faciundum coiraverunt (coeraverunt) in magisterial inscriptions (e. g. i. 566, of 106 B.C. coiravere and loidias ; 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. ploeres, Legg. iii. 3. 6 ; oenus, ib. iii. 3. 9 ; coerari and oenus, ib. iii. 4. 18), though in the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 206) we have regularly uero, utor, municipium (once formi), 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 coiraverunt, &c., e. g. i. 567, of 106 B.C., murum . . . coiravere . . . loedus ; i. 568, of 104 B.C., murum . . . coiraver- ; Eph. Epigr. viii. 460, of 108 B.C., murum . . . coiraverunt, Examples from the older literature are, euenigēnes ‘unigenitos’ Paul. Fest. 225. 2 Th. ; uerum Plaut. Truc. 104 (B.) ; proiloio Men. 186 (P.) ; moenis, obliging, quoted by Nonius 23. 9 M. from Facilvius ; moerus Accius Trag. 347 R. ; moenoio in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus (see Index to Studemund’s Apograph); ‘loesobus’ 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 appellent, Liberum Loeba- sium ; 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 ū ; and the earlier instances of ū for I.-Eur. oï probably indicate this sound. Plautus (Bacch. 129) puns on Lydus (Gk. Λύδος) and ludus :

non omnis acetas, Lyde, ludo conuenit;

and oe is often used to express Gk. ύ, 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. eluo (ch. iii. § 24). For I.-Eur. ou before a consonant we find sometimes ū, sometimes ū. Occasionally both these spellings occur for the same word. Thus I.-Eur. *roudho-, ‘red’ (Goth. raups), is Latin rōbus, rōb-igo [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 rīfus, 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. hūmidus from hūmeo, cătīdus from căleo, &c.), *rūdeo, with I.-Eur. eu of Gk. ἐρέω, while the ordinary form of the verb, rīdeo, shows, like rīder (Gk. ἑρέω), 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 rūdis, which means rough, literally, e. g. aes 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 'raudus-culo 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 roudus (so the MS.) saxeum; Paul. Fest. 377. 1 Th. Rodusculana porta appellata, quod rudis et impolita sit relicta, vel quia raudo, id est aere, fuerit vincta]. 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 *ö*, sometimes, like Lat. *ou* from *I.-Eur.* eu (§ 35), as *ü*; 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.* ü would have in Latin ü (§ 23), while a *ü*-grade (I.-Eur. ü, Lat. ü) 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.* -og(h)*²*, for the velar *g(h)*² took in Roman lips the sound of *v* (*u*). Thus *I.-Eur.* *nōg(h)do-* became in Latin *novedo-, noudo-,* whence *nūdus,* an example which suggests that the *ou* from *I.-Eur.* og(h)*²* had the same sound as the *ou* from *I.-Eur.* eu, and was developed in the same way to long *u*. Also by syncope in words like O. Lat. noventius (as in the prophecy of Cn. Marcius: quamuis nuentium duonum negumate, ap. Fest. 164. 28 Th.) with Lat. *ūv,* *I.-Eur.* ēw, O. Lat. *novendīnae,* from nōvem (I.-Eur. *nēwn*) and *dīn-,* a stem for 'day,' seen in O. Sl. dīně, 'a day,' O. Ind. dīnā-, &c. For this spurious *ou* we have first ō, later ü.

§ 42. Other examples of *I.-Eur.* ou. From the root neud-, 'to use, enjoy' (Goth. niutan, 'to enjoy') comes the Latin nātrio, nātrix (in Old Latin notrix,
Quint. i. 4. 16), perhaps showing the o-grade, I.-Eur. noud- (Goth. nauþs, O. Engl. nœd, Engl. need, Germ. Noth. Cf. Latin unus est, there is need); Lat. clōnis seems to represent L.-Eur. Ælou- (O. Scand. iloan, 'haunch,' but Gk. κλάον), though the word occurs so seldom in the earlier writers that we cannot say whether *clauonis, *clōnis were earlier spellings; Lat. lucus is L.-Eur. *louko- (O.H.G. loh, 'cope, brushwood,' the -loo of Water-loo, O. Engl. leah, Engl. lea), properly an open space in a wood, like the German Lichtung (cf. colūcare, to make a clearing in a wood), showing the o-grade of the L.-Eur. root-leuk- of Lat. lūco, &c., so that the old etymology 'lucus a non lucendo' had a grain of truth after all. The O. Lat. spelling shows -ou-, e.g. in hoc locarid on the inscription of Luceria (C.I.L. ix. 782); hunc locam . . . quod locui sit on the inscription of Spoletium (C.I.L. xi. 4766); the Perfect Part. Pass. of *lūceo, to wash, L.-Eur. lōw- (Gk. λοώ) is lautus, later lotus (see Georges, Lex. Worf. s.v.); the Dat. (Abl.) Plur. of bōs, bōvis (I.-Eur. *bobús-s, *bobów-es) is bōbus and bābīus; 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 Cyrillus, and stated in both glossaries to be the equivalent of the Greek βοστάριον, a word which must have belonged to the older period only, for Spanish and Portuguese alone preserve it [Span. bostar, Port. botal, indicating a Latin original bōstar; bustar, a place for burning a dead body, (Charisius 38. 19 K.), is a quite different word, connected with būstum]; Lat. über appears to show the ü-grade of the root, like O. Ind. udhār, O. Engl. ud, Lith. udrūtis, 'to give milk,' but the ou-grade of Gk. oóbar, Gen. -atós, meaning (1) udder, (2) fertility of soil, may appear in the (dialectal) name of a river in Latium, Úffens (modern Uffeante) [cf. the Apulian river, Auffsus (modern Ofanto)], from which comes the name of one of the Roman tribes Úfentinaria, in Old Latin Uffentina (see Index to C.I.L. i.), also Vefentina, and Ofentia (C.I.L. xi. 5702), in Greek inscriptions 'νυπ-, òβσωρ-, (Eckinger, p. 44).

§ 43. û for older ovi, ovē. By the composition of con-, co- with vir we get the word *covīria (cf. Volsc. covehríat-,), which became by syncope *cov(i)ria, covīria. The name Julius (written Iulīo 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 *Jovīlio, from a word found in Oscan in the form diuvīla-, later iūvīla-, meaning apparently a gift presented yearly by a corporation or clan to its tutelary god. Here the older spelling Iulī- suggests that the û represents not ov(i) but o(v)i, the v having been suppressed before the accent (see ch. ii. § 53). Julius is the original form of the substantival name, of which Julius is an adjectival derivative. The trisyllabic Iulīus is an invention of Virgil's (Herm. xxiv. 155). Similarly Chilīus, the older form of Cloelius (written on an old inscription Clōli[i]s, C.I.L. i. 1297), shows its derivation from the name Clōlius, a name evidently connected with the root klēu-, 'to be famous' (Gk. κλής-os) [compare the gloss durior: nobilior, Lōwe, Prodr. p. 364; Paul. Fest. 39. 2 Th. refers the word to Clōnios: Cloelia familia a Clonio Aeneae comite, est appellata. The family name retained, as often happens, the older spelling with oe, Cloelius, not Chilīus]. Similarly O. Lat. coventio (conventiōna on the S. C. Baech. 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 ë; centio (but see ch. ii. § 147, and below on municius).

§ 44. The spurious diphthong ou. Nontio, the older spelling (deponentari on
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; *nontia* on the Epistula ad Tiburtes of c. 100 B.C., i. 201; *pronontiato and pronontiatum* on fragments of old Laws, i. 207 and 208) became *nunio* at the close of the Republican period (*renuntio* is the spelling throughout the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C., i. 206; so *nuntiationem* on the Lex Rubriae of 49 B.C., i. 205), though Cicero in his Laws (ii. 21) uses *nuntius.* Marius Victorinus (12. 18 K.) says the old spelling had *ou.* For *nundinae* the oldest spelling is with *ou,* *nundinum* on the S. C. Bacthe of 186 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 196, then with o, *nundinum* on the Lex Bantina) (i. 197).

§ 45. **AI.** The I.-Eur. root, referred to in § 27, as aiwē-, 'time, life,' is perhaps more correctly āiwē- (cf. O. Ind. āyu-, 'life'), with the diphthong originally long, but shortened in Latin *aevum,* 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. *Iunonei Locicina* (C. I. L. i. 189), *Iunone Locicina Tuscolana sacra* (i. 1200); (2) -ai (one syllable), class. -ae (presumably āe; cf. Osc. -afi, 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 -ō and -ōi seem to show themselves for I.-Eur. -oi in O-stem Datives [(1) class. čqvō, dōminō, (2) O. Lat. populoi Romanoi, Numasioi; 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. -ai became -ai, e.g. χάρπα, later -a, but in dialects also -α (presumably āi), while this I.-Eur. -ē became -φ, e.g. ίππφ, 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. ὄφνη) has become in Gk. ὄφνη, in Goth. vind, our 'wind,' as in Latin *ventus* (Span. viento); the I.-Eur. word for the heel or the ham (O. Ind. pāṣṇi) is in Gk. πρόση, in Goth. fairzn, and in Latin *perna* (Span. pierna) [curiously enough Mar. Sacerdos (vi. 451. 5 K.) cites a derivative of this word, *pernis*, 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. -eis has become in Greek -oς, as in Latin -eis,
-is (ch. vi. § 48); lēntus is a cognate of lēnis. (Cf. Engl. 'kept,' 'wept' from
'keep,' 'weep').

§ 46. ĀU. The I.-Eur. long diphthong āu is seen in the stem
nāu-; 'ship' (O. Ind. nāus, nāvās, Gen.; Hom. Gk. νήσος, νῆσος Gen.,
Arm. nav, O. Ir. nau, naue or noē, Gen., W. noe, 'a dish,' like our
'butter-boat,' O. Scand. nör), which is in Latin an i-stem nāvis,
like clōvis (Gk. κλής). The -au- of nau-frāgium, nau-stibulum
'was alvei simile' (Fest. 172. 23 Th.), clando shortens the first
element owing to the fact that a consonant follows (see above,
§ 45). [That clando 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. excludere, like defraudare.] For Latin āv from
I.-Eur. ów, e.g. octāvus, and perhaps flāvus (beside flōrus, Gk.
χλωρός), see § 50. Gāvus (a trisyllable till late Latin, Harvard
Studies, 1891) is the class. form of older Gāvius (Osc. Gaaviis),
with suppression of intervocalic ā (§ 70), a name apparently
derived from the root of gaudeo, gāvīus sum (Gk. γαῦδω for
*γαῦδων) (cf. Rainus and Rāvius) On the curious remark of Teren-
tianus Maurus about the pronunciation of Lat. au, see ch. ii. § 34.

§ 47. EI. I.-Eur. eī appears e.g. in *rei-, 'property' (O. Ind.
rās, Gen. rāyās), Lat. rēs, Gen. rēi for *reyē, a root in which the
diphthong had apparently in the 'Indo-European period' the
doublets eī (ēy) and ē. The Loc. Sing. ending of E-stems shows the
second of these doublets in Latin, e.g. diē crastini, postrīdiē, &c.

§ 48. EU. The I.-Eur. Nom. *dyēus, 'the sky,' shows the long
diphthong ēu (O. Ind. dyāus, Acc. dyāvam and dyām, diyām; Gk.
Zeus for *Zeus, Lat. diēs like Acc. diēm; 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
neu; ceu is probably to be referred to an older *cē-ve (ch. x. § 11).
The Loc. Sg. ending of U-stems, if this was I.-Eur. -ēu, appears
in noctū, where the ē 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. ÓI. 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) -ē, the classical ending, e.g. ēquō, dōminā, (2) -ōi (presumably -ō̅i), an ending found in very old inscriptions, e.g. Numasioi (Osc. -ūi, Umbr. -e) (ch. vi. § 26).

§ 50. ŌU. I.-Eur. ōu- is seen in the numeral *ōktōu, a dual in form, with the sense apparently of ‘two sets of four’ (O. Ind. aštāu, aštā, Gk. ὀκτῶ, Goth. ahtau, O. Engl. ahta, 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. ὁκτός). The long diphthong seems to have occurred in the I.-Eur. declension of the word for ‘ox,’ stem *gōou- (O. Ind. gāūs, Loc. gávi, Acc. gám, Nom. Pl. gāvas, &c., Arm. kov, Gk. βοῦς; Dor. βῶς, according to the grammarians, O. Ir. bou, bó, W. bu, buw, O. Engl. cū, Lett. gāws); 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 for *āvis (I.-Eur. *ōwi-), § 19), and not a genuine Latin development.

§ 51. Variation (Ablaut) of Vowels. A root like pet- of Gk. πετοσθαι, to fly, O. Ind. pātati, ‘he flies,’ appears in the form pt- in Gk. πετοσθαι, 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. ei-στι, 3 Sg., Lith. éi-ti, Lat. it, older ei-t, ch. viii. § 2), loses the ē of the diphthong in the P. P. P. *et-tō- (O. Ind. -itā-, Gk. -tós, Lat. -itūs), where the accent falls on the suffix; and eu becomes ū, through loss of accent, in I.-Eur. *bhūgū, ‘flight’ (Gk. φυγή, Lat. fūga) from *bheūgō, ‘I flee’ (Gk. φεῦγω); while en, em, er, el, similarly reduced, appear before a vowel as n, m, r, l, e.g. Gk. γλ-yv-ouai, 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 φευ-, to kill, I.-Eur. γθυ-ν-, ὑπάκων (O. Ind. dr̄sánt-) from δερκ-, 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-tī-, O. Ir. brith, Goth. gabaurjës) from bher-, 'to bear' (see §§ 81, 92). We may call these reduced forms pt-, bhūg-, bhṛ-, &c., the 'weak grade' of the roots, and pet-, bheug-, bher- the normal or Ē-grade. We find these roots also with their ō replaced by ō in such words as Gk. γέ-yov-a Pft., οίρος, a Derivative Noun from the root ei-, 'to go;' γόνος from the root γέν-, φόνος from gh₂en-; and γόν-, οί-, gh³on- may be called the Ō-grade of these roots. There are also occasionally forms with ē, ō, e.g. Gk. παράομαι from pet-, 'to fly.' This variation, or gradation, called by the Germans 'Ablaut,' of I.-Eur., forms has not yet been thoroughly explained or systematized; the relation for example of ū, ī to the ordinary weak grade ū, ī in words like I.-Eur. *kłū-tó- (O. H. G. hlüt, 'loud,' Zend. sṛū-tā) beside I.-Eur. *kłū-tó- (O. Ind. sṛū-tá-, Gk. κλῦ-τός) is not quite clear, nor yet that of the Ē- and Ō-forms to the Ē- and Ō-forms, e.g. Gk. ποράομαι beside πορέομαι. They are generally called 'lengthenings' of the weak grade (of diphthongal roots), of the Ē-grade and of the Ō-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., *rēks- (Lat. réx-i) for *rēg-ēs-, &c.]. Nor have the grades of other than Ê-roots been properly equated to grades like pēt-, pt-, pōt-; the variation of the root dō-, 'to give,' for example, which has ō in Gk. δό-ω-μι, Lat. dō-num, but a short vowel in Gk. δό-ός, Lat. dó-tus, of the root sē-, 'to throw,' or 'to throw seed,' with ē in Gk. ἑ-η-μι for *sê-η-μι, Lat. sē-men, but with a short vowel in Gk. ê-ός, Lat. sē-tus, of the root stā-, 'to stand,' with ā in Gk. ἀ-στήμι for *sê-στά-μι, Lat. stā-re, but with a short vowel in Gk. στά-ός, 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. ἄγω, Ir. agam, Lat. āgo, āg- in O. Ind. ājī-, 'a contest,' O. Ir. āg, 'a contest,' Lat. amb-āges; and the variation of ō and ō, e.g. in Lat. fōdiō beside fōdi, Gk. ὃ-μι beside εἰ-ώνη; not to mention the variation of ā and ō in Lat. scābo beside scōbis, ácies (Gk. ἄκρος, Hom. ἄκρις, a hill-top) beside O. Lat. öcris, a rugged hill (Gk. ἄκρις, a point), from the root ak-, ok-, 'sharp.'
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. fūga (Gk. φυ-ή) from the root bheug-, 'to flee,' jūg-um (O. Ind. yūg-ām, Gk. ζύγ-όν) from the root yeug-, 'to join'); fors (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-tus from dūco for *deuco, ās-tus (A. L. L. ii. 607) from āro for *euno (Gk. εύω for εὕω), per-culsus for *kīd-to- (cf. clādes); (3) in Reduplicated Present-stems, e.g. gi-gu-o from the root ēgen-, sīdo for *si-s̄o from the root sēd-; (4) in Nasalized Present-stems, e.g. jū-n-g-o from the root yeug-, ē-n-su from the root leiq³- (Gk. λείπω), fī-n-d-o from the root bheidh- (Goth, beita, 'I bite'); (5) in some Present-stems with the YO-suffix, e.g. fūg-īo from the root bheug-.

(b) Normal or E-grade in (1) Neuter ES-stems, e.g. gen-us from the root ēgen- (Gk. γεῦ-os), decus from the root dek-, nemus from the root nem-; (2) Present-stems formed with the Thematic Vowel, e.g. veho from the root ḍeigh- (O. Ind. vah-, Lith. vežū, O. Sl. vezā), sequor from the root seq²- (O. Ind. sac-, Gk. ἑπομαι, O. Ir. sechur), fūdo, O. Lat. feido, from the root bheidh- (Gk. πείδω for *φείδω), dūco, O. Lat. deico, from the root deik- (Gk. δείκνυμι), dūco, O. Lat. donco for *deuco (§ 35), from the root deuk- (Goth. tiuha), āro for *euno from the root eus- (Gk. εύω for εὕω) pluvo, O. Lat. plovo for *pleowo, from the root pleva (Gk. πλέω). (On the u of pluvo see ch. viii. § 6.)

(c) O-grade in (1) Derivative Nouns with Ā-suffix, O-suffix, &c., e.g. prencus 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 men- (Lat. me-min-i), torrecu, lit. 'cause to dry up,' from the root terts- (Gk. τέρσομαι).

II. in E-suffixes. (1) Nouns of the Second Declension with Voc. Sg. in -ē, e.g. eque, Nom. Acc., &c. in -os, -om, e.g. equos, equom; (2) N-stems, R-stems, S-stems, &c., e.g. temp-ūs (O. Lat. temp-ōs), temp-ūr-is for *temp-ūs-es Gen., temp-ūr-i Adv., aug-ūs-tus for *aug-ūs-to-, auxilium for *aug-silio-, pēb-ēs, dēc-or (O. Lat. dec-ōs); nō-mēn, car-n-is, rāti-ōn-i. In the I.-Eur. declension
of these stems the suffix may have shown in the Nom. Sg. č when accented, ō when unaccented, e.g. Gk. δο-τήρ, δώ-ταρ, in the other ‘strong’ cases č when accented, ō when unaccented, e.g. Gk. πα-τέρ-α, φρά-ταρ-α, and in the ‘weak’ cases the weak grade, e.g. Gk. πα-τρ-ός, πα-τρά-σι (O. Ind. pi-tf-šu), but the divergences of the suffix-form have been to a great extent removed in the various I.-Eur. languages, e.g. Gk. μητέρος as well as μητρός, πατέρον instead of πατρών. 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. πούς, πόδος (cf. Lat. trī-pōl-are) and Lat. pes, pēd-īs (cf. Gk. τέπας, τρά-πέτας, lit. ‘four-footed’, πεζός, &c., for *ped-ya-/*ped-yo-), Lat. pecten and Gk. κτείς for *πκτεινς, &c.

The combination yē, wē was treated somewhat similarly to ei, eu, being reduced by the loss of accent to ĭ, ū, e.g. Gk. ὑπ-νος for *sǔ-pons (O. Sl. sīnut) from the root swep (O. Engl. swefn, ‘a dream’). Gk. ἔρυθι, last year, for πέρυτι (O. Ind. par-ūt) from the root wet- (Gk. (f)έτος, a year, Lat. vētus). This root wet-seems to have lost by procope an initial ā, and the reduced form of ἡwēt- appears in Gk. ὑμ-αντ-ός, just as the reduced form of ἡwēg- (Gr. ἄ(f)έςω) in the aug- of Lat. aug-eo, Gk. αῦξω, O. Ind. ὃjας-, ‘strength,’ while ὑg- the reduced form of ἡwēg- (with procope of initial ā) appears in O. Ind. ukš-, ‘to grow strong,’ Gk. ἴγνις for *ἰγνις, &c. And as we sometimes find ĭ, ū beside ĭ, ū the weak grades of ei, eu, so we find the same long vowels in forms of yē- and wē-roots, e.g. ĭũ- (O. Ind. ūn-ā, ‘want, emptiness’) from the root ḵwē- (Gk. κ(f)εύος, empty). On the variation of ĭ 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-cūt-io for *con-quēt-io from quātio, 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 ĭ, wē to ū, 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. ē (Lat. ē) varies with Lat. ā in Lat. sē-men (Gk. η-μα, a casting) and sē-lus (Gk. ἐ-ρῶς) from the
root sē-, fēc-i (Gk. ε-θηκ-α) and fāc-iō, an extension of the root dhē- (Gk. τμ-θη-μι); I.-Eur. ò (Lat. ò) varies with Lat. ǣ in Lat. dō-num (Gk. δωρόν), and dō-tus (Gk. δωρός, δώεις) from the root dō-, cōs (O. Ind. śā-, ‘to sharpen’) and cūtus, which in O. Lat. meant ‘sharp,’ ‘shril’ from the root kō-; I.-Eur. ā (Lat. ă) varies with Latin ā in Lat. fā-ma (Gk. φύ-μη) and fā-l-eor (eh. viii. § 32) (Gk. φάρος), stā-re (Gk. ιστημι for *σι-στα-μι) and stā-tus (Gk. στά-ρος). In all these cases the Latin weak-grade vowel is ā, while in Greek we have e for Ê-roots, o for Õ-roots, ā for Æ-roots, but in Sanscrit ɨ for all roots (e.g. hi-tā- from root dhē-, di-ti- from root do, sthi-tā- from root stā-), just as we have Lat. ă of pater, which is also ā in Greek and other languages (Gk. πάτηρ, O. Ir. athir, Goth. fadar) represented by Sanscrit ɨ (pītār-). We find even in Greek occasionally ā in the weak form of Ê-, Õ-roots (e.g. κεκάδουρo beside έκεκήδει, δάνoς beside δωρον), 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 frāngō (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. gripcs, ‘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. òr, òl, ēm, 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) ā in forms of Œ-roots where ē is not preceded by a liquid or nasal, e.g. pateo (Osc. pate-) from the root pet- (Gk. πέταυμα); its relation to the obscure or indeterminate vowel (like the Hebrew shēva), written ā, ə, ẹ, &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-culm, for example, may then exhibit the weak grade of the stem *ōus- (O. Ind. ās-, Lat. ēs-). It may also be the weak grade of ěu (Caurus or Čùns, Lith. šviurė, beside O. Sl. sēverū, is quoted as an example), and of āu; and similarly āi of ōi, ėi, āi. It is also possible that as ā varies with ō, so ai may vary with oi (e.g. Lat. aeōdis and Gk. oïdōw), and au with ou (e.g. Gk. kaulōs, a stalk, and koilōs for *kōfilōs, hollow); and some explain in this way Latin forms like lávo beside Gk. λῶο (on which see § 19).


§ 53. ē and ō. This ō is best seen in the Noun Suffixes -ōn-, -ōr which vary with -ēn-, -ēr and -ēn-, -ēr, as well as with -ōn-, -ōr, e.g. Lat. homo Nom., hominis for *hominis Gen., Lat. dōtor, datōris beside Gk. δότωρ, δότωρος and δότηρ, δότηρος (see ch. v. § 57); in Greek it is seen also in the Perf. of verbs with č, e. g. τέθωναι from ἥγα, ἀφέωνα from ἀφήμα, &c. The root of Lat. fōs, Flora is bhlo- (Ir. blāth, Goth. bhlo-ma, Engl. bloom; O. Engl. blōs-tm, Engl. blossom; O. Engl. blō-wan, Engl. to blow, of flowers), which is connected with the root bhle- of Lat. flōma, congestion of blood (Goth. uf-blēsan, Germ. auf-blasen), 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. lár, Engl. floor, &c.; but these are rather to be explained like ĝnō- and ĝnā- of Lat. gnōtos, and gnārus (§ 1)

§ 54. ā-ā, ē-ē. From root lēd-, ‘to leave, to let’ (Goth. lētan, O. Engl. lētan, Engl. let), with ō-grade in Goth. lāi-lōt Perf., we have in the weak grade Lat. lāsus (Goth. lēts, Germ. lass); Lat. cātus, 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 Ennius): iam cata signa fere sonitus dare voce parabant.

Cata acuta; hoc enim verbo dicunt Sabini: quare:
catus Aelius Sextus
non, ut alunt, sapiens, sed acutus) is in O. Ind. šītā-, ‘sharp,’ from šā-, ‘to
sharpen,' and is connected with Lat. *ōs, a whetstone (like *ōs from root *dō-). Similarly we have *rātus beside rē-rī, fāc-īo beside fāc-ī (ch. viii. § 41), and from I.-Eur. ōk-, 'swift' (connected with *āk-, 'sharp?') (O. Ind. āṣū-, Gk. ἄκης, Lat. āctor) accepĭt (nec- Ter. Maur. 1267) is probably a corruption of *ācu-pter (cf. O. Ind. āṣū-pitvan- for *ōkū- 'swift-flying,' and Gk. ὠκώ-περγη, the epithet of a hawk in Hesiod, Ὠ. 210), due to a popular etymology from accipĭo; the form acceptor, the original of O. Span. acetor, is used by Lucilius (inc. 123 M.) exta acceptorĭs et unguĭs, 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. ὄμοι).

§ 55. ā-ō. Examples of this interchange are Lat. atrox for *adrox (Arm. ateam, 'I hate') and odium; scabo, to scrape (Gk. σάρασσα, to dig) and scobis, sawdust; aco, acus, acies, acer-bus (Gk. ἀκρός, Hom. ἀκρα, a hill-top) and acris (Gk. ἀκρα, a point, ἀκρίδες, an epithet of unhewn stone in Homer), an Old Latin word for a rugged hill. [Fest. 196. 17 Th. oerem antiqui, ut Ateius Philologus in libro Glossatorum refert, montem confugam vocabant, ut apud Lívium:]

sed qui sunt hi, qui ascendent altum oecīm?

... unde fortasse etiam oecae sint dictae inaequaliter tuberatae; in Umbrian, and Marrucinian the stem oeri- (Nom. Sg. ocar, 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. ancus 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. ἄγκωρ and ἀγκύλη, O. Ir. ceath, 'a hook,' from root ank-), and ances, a hook, reducem brachium, aduncus unguis (Gk. ἄγκος, a hook); doco and Gk. διδάσκω for *di-δακ-κος. We have Oscan a, Latin o in tongere, a word used by Ennius, declared by Aelius Stilo to be equivalent to noscere, and to be still employed in the Praenestine dialect (Paul. Fest. 539. 5 Th. tongere nosse est, nam Praenestini 'tongitionem' diecut notionem. Ennius: alii rhetorica tongent. Cf. Fest. 538. 9 Th. [tongere Aelius Stilo ait noscere esse], appearing in Oscan in the noun tangion- with the sense of sententia, e.g. senatios tanginud, 'senatus sententia,' the cognate of our word 'think,' probably from a root tang-. [Cf. the (dialectal?) variation of names like Blossius, Blasisius; Fabius, Fobius.]

§ 56. ā and ą. i. Eur. pāg-, 'to fasten' (cf. pāk-) (Sanscr. pāśa-, 'cord),' Dor. Gk. πᾶγγιμος and ἐπάγγες, Mid. High. Germ. vugue, 'deftness in fastening,' &c., Mod. Germ. Fuge, and Goth. fagrs, 'suitable'), Lat. pingo (with ā; cf. com-pingō), pepīgī (from *pe-pīg-i) and com-pīges, pācīsor and pāc-īm Acc.; i.-Eur. swīd-, 'to make pleasant' (O. Ind. swādati and śvādēt, Dor. Gk. ἄδωμα and Hom. Gk. εὐδοκοῦ, ἀδον Δορ.), Lat. suīdē; i.-Eur. *nās-; 'the nose,' probably Nom. nās(s), Gen. nās-os (O. Ind. nās- and nās-, Lith. nosis and O. Sl. nosů), O. Lat. nāsum, class. Lat. nāsus (ch. ii. § 129), nāris; similarly Lat. sāgio, sāgus and sāgax (Dor. Gk. ἄγλομα, Ir. saigim, 'I seek,' Goth. sēkja, Germ. suche, O. Engl. sēce). The Latin words sāgio and sāgax were used of hounds on the track,
whence præssāgiō, to ‘scent out’ the future (Cic. Dīr. i. 65; cf. Ennius, A. 375 M. nare sagae Sensit; voce sua nictit ululatūque ibi acuta); saga 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 conciliatrix). So Latin ācer, stem acri- and āceo (Gk. ἀκρός, Lith. askr-rs, &c., show I.-Eur. ā); Lat. āeri—beside Gk. ἀκρο—reminds us of Latin sācri- (sacrēs porci, pigs for sacrifice, Plaut.) beside sācro—.

§ 57. ὦ and ὐ. I.-Eur. *wójo-, ‘to eat’ (O. Ind. ad-, ‘to eat’ and ādyā-, ‘eatable,’ Gk. ἄφωμαι and ἄφως, Goth. itan and ātum, Lith. ēd-ės Part., O. Sl. jad-ė, Lat. ēdo and ēdī Perf.; Lat., lex, lēg-īs and légo, &c.; I.-Eur. rēg- ‘to stretch, rule’ (O. Ind. ráji-, ‘a row,’ ráj-, ‘a king,’ O. Ir. rigim, ‘I stretch,’ rī, ‘a king’), Lat. rēgo, I rule, rēγ-, a king. This lengthening appears chiefly in Preterites, e.g. O. Sl. nēsů, ‘I carried’ (beside nēsq, ‘I carry’), Goth. sētum, ‘we sat’ (beside sītām, ‘we sit’), O. Ir. ro mīdār, ‘I judged’ (beside mīdīr, ‘I judge, think,’ from the root mēd- of Gk. μεθομαι), and in the nouns derived from Verb-stems like lex, rēx. The occurrence of the long vowel in some Present-forms like Lith. ēd-mi, ‘I eat,’ is probably due to the use of a Perfect-stem as a Present (like Gk. ἀνώρα Pres. from ἀνώρα Perf.).

§ 58 I and ī. I.-Eur. *vīro-, ‘a man’ (O. Ind. virā-, Lith. vyras have ī; O. Ir. fer from *vīro-, Goth. vair from vīro-, O. H. G. wer, Germ. Wer-wolf, Engl. were-wolf and Lat. viv have ī); I.-Eur. *gīro-, ‘lively’ (O. Ind. įrā-, Lat. vīro). But most examples of Latin ī-i are really cases of i-ī, e.g. fīdes and īdo, older feōdo (see § 13).

§ 59. ὑ and ὲ. The I.-Eur. root ὑγ-, ‘to see’ (Gk. ἄφωμαι and ἄψ is) appears in Lat. oc-uīs; the root ὑδ-, ‘to smell’ (Gk. ὑμῇ, Arm. hot, and Gk. ὑγ-όδης, Lith. ūdžiu) in Lat. ēdōr; νῆγ-, ‘naked’ (O. Ind. nagnā-, Ir. noch, Goth. naqa-), and Lith. nūgas, in Lat. nūdas for *nōv(ī)ūdus; člen-, ‘the elbow’ (Gk. ἄλεν, Goth. aleina, ‘a cubit,’ ‘ell,’ O. Ir. uile, uilenn Gen., W. elin, O. Engl. eln, Engl. ell, el-bow) is Lat. ūna for *νῆ(ί)να. As with ὁ (varying with ὺ) we find ὡ (varying with ώ) in the Perfect-stem, in nouns derived from Verb-stems, &c., e. g. Gk. ἀν-ω-α, ὑψ.

§ 60. ά and ū. I.-Eur. *nū-, ‘now,’ from the root neu- of *newo-, ‘new’ (O. Ind. nū, Adv. and Particle, nūnām, Gk. νῦ, νῦν, O. Ir. nō and nū, a Verbal Part, often used with the Present Tense, e.g. no chanim, ‘I am singing,’ Goth. nū, O. Engl. nū, Germ. nun and sometimes nu, Lith. nū-egl, O. Sl. nū-nē), Lat. nu-dius tertius the day before yesterday, lit. ‘now the third day,’ -num in etiam-num, &c. (Gk. τοι-νῦν), nūn-c; I.-Eur. īn- from the root leu- ‘to lose’ [Gk. βουλον-δε, about the time of loosing the oxen from the plough, towards midday (Class. Rev. ii. 260; Schulze, Quœst. Ép. p. 321), and ἀντιό], Lat. so-lātus; I.-Eur. sū-, ‘a sown’ (O. Ind. sū-kara-, Gk. σῦ, O. Engl. sū), Lat. sūs and sū-cerda, ‘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. τοῦ-νη and τῦ, &c.), Lat. tū (on tū-gudem, see ch. iii. § 51); I.-Eur. pū-, ‘to rot’ (Gk. πῦθω, Goth. fuls ist, ‘he stinketh,’ O. Engl. fūl, Engl. foul, Lith. paštį; Gk. πῦς for *πῦος), Lat. pūteo and pūter; I.-Eur. *kūti-, ‘skin’ (Gk. γυναικα and O. Engl. hyd, Engl. hide, O. H. G. hūt, Germ. Haut), Lat. eītis. But usually the alternation of a ā with ū in Latin is the alternation of I.-Eur. ān, ou with ū, e. g. duō and duē, fūgi and
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fungio (see § 23). The ù-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. *tā-to- (Lat. so-lūtus, Hom. βοῦ-λυτόν-δε), though the ù-grade and i-grade are most common in the P. P., e.g. Gk. ἄ-τας (ib.) (cf. defrātum, must boiled down, Plaut. Pseud. 741, Mar. Vict. 24. 15 K. in defruto apicem secundae syllabae imponere debetis, nam a deferendo et decoquendo fit tale; but defrātum Virg. G. iv. 269). [See Osthoff's list of forms with i, ù in Morph. Unters. vol. iv., such as Lat. fū-mus (I.-Eur. *(dhū-μο-), O. Ind. dhū-má-), situs (Gk. νεο-κάττορος, O. Ind. syū-tá-), pū-rus, &c.]

§ 61. 8 and á. Cognate with O. Ind. asán-, Lettish asins, 'blood,' is an O. Lat. word aser, blood, with a derivative *asərətum, a mixture of wine and blood (Paul. Fest. 12. 19 Th. assaratum apud antiquos diecubatur genus quoddam potionis ex vino et sanguine temperatum, quod Latinis prisci sanguinem 'assyr' vocarent; Gl. Philox. 23. 56 G. aser: atma) which appears with an e-sound in Greek (ἐαπ in the Cretan dialect, ἀλαρ ἐαпа Callimachus). Another Old Latin word sacena, a priest's knife or axe, whose byform sceña recalls the Irish word for a knife, sean (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 securis an dolabra sit, ambiguitur, quam Cincius in libro qui est de verbis priscis, dolabram ait esse pontificiam. Livius in Lydio:

corruit quasi ictus scena, haut multo secus)

may be, like another word for a priest's knife, seeespiata (Fest. 522. 4 Th.; Paul. Fest. 523. 3 Th. dicta autem est seespiata a secano; 'Serv.' ad Aen. iv. 262) derived from seco, to cut. O. H. Germ. sahs, O. Engl. seax Neut., 'a knife,' suggest connexion with Lat. saxum. Lat. arius, Gk. ἄραφος, is in Lithuanian ėras, 'a lamb,' with ė, and has in Umbrian some e-sound, erieut Acc., so that it has been suggested that Lat. ā, Gk. ε (but see § 51 on kekádovo with ā from root κήδ-) may be weak grades of an ē-root; and the same explanation might be given of aser and sceana. In several cases of Lat. ā, Gk. ε we have a Gk. byform with ι, e. g. Lat. pateo, pando, Gk. πετάνυμι and πιτήμιμ; Lat. quattuor (Osc. petora, Umbr. petur-), Dor. Gk. τέτορες, Aeol. τέτωπες and Hom. πίπωρες; Lat. labes, Gk. λέμα, and in Hesych λέφ. . . . πέρα. Other examples are: Lat. gradior, and Jessus (O. Sl. грědđa, 'I come,' O. Ir. ingennim, 'I pursue,' from root gred-, Goth. grips, 'a step'); Lat. magnus (cf. māgis, mājor, ch. ii. § 55), Gk. μέγας (Gothikis, Arm. mee); Lat. nancis-cor, nactus, Gk. ἐνεκάτω (Lith. nēstti, 'to carry,' O. Sl. nesti, O. Ir. conicim, 'I am able'); Lat. labium, labrum (by analogy of lambo (?), O. Engl. lippa from root leb- (?); Lat. glacies and gelu; Lat. albūs, Lith. elkūnas, O. Sl. jelčha, O. H. G. elira and erila, Germ. Erle). Parcio (cf. frequent) shows ār (cf. confer(t)us), perhaps by metathesis (like Gk. φακτός beside φακτός) (but see § 92).

§ 62. ūu-ūu. Another example of *āus-, the weak grade of the I.-Eur. stem *ous-, 'mouth,' is aurea, whence, by composition with õgo, aurīga (Paul. Fest. 6. 27 Th. 'aureax': aurigs, 'aureas' enim diecubant frenum, quod ad aures equorum religabatur; 'orias' quō ora coherecebantur, with an absurd reference to auris, ear), a byform of õrea (Fest. 202. 23 Th. 'orea': freni quod ori inseruntur . . . Naevius in Hariolo:

deprándi autem leóni si obdas õreas,
like our proverb 'to beard a lion'); *austinum (C. I. L. i. 1463) (O. Pruss. austin,
'mouth,' O. Ind. õñtha, 'lip'), a byform of õstium (Lith. õsta, 'mouth of river,'
Lett. õsta, 'harbour'). (Schmidt, Phralb. p. 221.)

Y, W.

§ 63. Y. I.-Eur. initial y is represented in Greek sometimes
by the rough breathing, e.g. ῥάκ-υθός, from I.-Eur. *yūwnk-, sometimes by ζ, e.g. ζυγόν (I.-Eur. *yūgo-), the same letter as
we find used for an initial y- or yy-sound which has developed
from an original dy-, e.g. ζεός (I.-Eur. *Dyēu-). 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. jūvenec-ns, jūgum.
The question whether this j was pronounced like a consonantal
spirant (γ), or like the half-vowel ATEGORIES, 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 γ, or by the vowel
i (or iy, ii, oy, &c.). This would no doubt often depend upon the
preceding consonant or consonant-group. The I.-Eur. word for
'middle,' for example, we write *mēðhyo- (cf. O. Ind. mādhyā-
Gk. μέσ(σ)ος, Goth. midjis, O. Sl. mežda, 'the middle'); the
word for 'paternal,' *patr'io- or *patriyo- (*patriyo-, *patrayo-)
(cf. O. Ind. pīṭriya-, Gk. πάτριος). In Latin, this suffix -yo-
-io- appears as -io-, mēdius, pātrius, though a word like sōcius
gives us a clue that -yo- may often have been the original form.
For in this word the qu of the root seqw-, '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 qw (Lat. qu) had preceded a consonant (§ 116) (cf. Gk. ἀ-ος
ητήρ from *δσο- for *soq(yo-); 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 Adjective-
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 *Tityus, and then something like *Titus; 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. brachium, through *braczy-; nièce from neptia, through *netty-; ache from òpium, through *apy-; rage from ràbies, rabia, 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-igo-, socius, as *oc-lo- (from root oqⁿ-) 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. *eyä-, the Fem. of the Demonstrative (Goth. ija Acc.) is Latin ea (so in Umbro-Osc., Umbr. eo, ea, Osc. iú, io; von Planta, i. p. 175). Causative Verbs, which ended in I.-Eur. in -eyô (e.g. O. Ind. mānāyā-mi from root man-, the I.-Eur. root men-; Gk. φοβέω from root φεβ-), end in Latin in -eô, e.g. mēneo, I remind, 'cause to remember,' from root men- of mēmēni for *me-men-i, I remember. On the weakening of -yē- to ū in I.-Eur. and in Latin (e.g. ab-icio), see § 51, p. 256.

The intervocalic j (y) which we find in major, aio, &c. (pronounced ‘mâyyor,’ ‘âyyo,’ ch. ii. § 55), has arisen through suppression (or assimilation) of h (for I.-Eur. ãh) 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. Zêús, while Lat. diēs shows a system *diēu-, O. Ind. Diyāús), though how far this j (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. ι-) 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. diuviai *diuiae, mefiai *mediae; heriid is 3 SG. Pres. Subj. of the verb and heriam Acc. SG. of the noun derived from her-, ‘to wish’ (I.-Eur. *her-). The presence of the y-sound is indicated by the doubling of a preceding consonant after the accentual vowel, e.g. medikkaiai *medicae Dat. SG., *stariis ‘Statii’ Gen. SG., *petioi, &c. In the Oscar 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. δ (ch. ii. § 51), written s in Musea.]


§ 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-σώω, a compound with καρ(α), Goth. sijian, O. Engl. seowian, Lith. siūti, O. Sl. šiti), Lat. so; *gēhyēs-, ‘yesterday’ (O. Ind. hyās, Gk. χήθης; cf. Goth. gistra-dagis), Lat. hērī, 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. sōnu (Gk. πᾶς, Lith. spiuāu, O. Sl. pljuja, &c.). There is a similar doubt about dy-. It may have lost the dental at a very early period, for we have Iovēs (‘Iovios’?) on the ancient Dvenos inscription, and it is not possible to prove that the form Diovēm had gone out of use by the time that the form Jovēm came in (cf. Dionem, C. I. L. i. 57, Iovai, i. 56, both on old Praenestine mirrors). Diovēm may quite well have come from a byform *dyēw-, as O. Lat. siēs from *siyēs (O. Ind. siyās), a byform of *syēs, (O. Ind. syās) and have been discarded in course of time for the other ‘doublet’ *dyēw- Jovēm.

(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-τω for *τυν-γο, χαλε-τω for *χαλεν-γο; but in Latin these verbs appear with -pio, e.g. cápio, sépio; after n we find y producing epenthesis in Greek, e.g. βαλω for *γυμ-γο, root gleam, but not in Latin, e.g. vēnīo. But -gly-, as has been mentioned, became hy,
then y or rather yy, e.g. *āiuō, pronounced *aayyo, and often written aiio (eh. i. § 7), from āgh-, ‘to say.’

§ 66. I.-Eur. y between vowels. The Nom. Pl. of I-stems shows I.-Eur. -yēs, e.g. I.-Eur. *treyes from the stem tri-, ‘three’ (O. Ind. trāyas), *ghoosteyes from the stem ghoosti-, ‘a stranger’ (O. Sl. gostije), in Latin -ys for *ye-es, e.g. tres, hostes. In the words dhēmus, dhēnes the letter h indicates the hiatus caused by the dropping of y of I.-Eur. *āyēs-, ‘metal,’ *ayēs-, ‘made of metal’ (O. Ind. āyas-), like h in the Umbrian stahu for *stā-yo, ‘I stand’ (Lat. stō). Like Lat. stō for *stā-uo (Lith. pa-stō-ju), are fēo for *fē-uo (O. Sl. blē-ja), neo for *nē-uo, &c., where the similar vowels o and o are blended into one sound, but the dissimilar, e and o, remain in hiatus. Similarly Lat. forno for *formā-uo, from forma (stem *formā-), and other 1st Conj. verbs from 1st Decl. nouns, like Gk. τιμāω, for τιμά-ω, *τιμάω, from τιμή, 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 audes. The j (y) is dropped, like I.-Eur. y in suo, in the form södes, a form which seems to have come into use in the period between Plautus and Terence. For Plautus has the full si audes, e.g. Poen. 757 mitte ād me, si audes, hōdie Adelphsiiām tuam, but Terence the shortened form, e.g. Andr. 85 die, sodes. Internal j (y) after a consonant becomes vocalic in nunc-iam (3 syll. Plaut.), and between two vowels disappears in bigae for *bi-jiga from bi- and jugum. On objecio, objicio, abicio see eh. iii. § 18, eh. ii. § 48, eh. 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 eh. ii. § 48), e.g. I.-Eur. *weghō, ‘I carry’ (O. Ind. vāhā-mi, Gk. (£)ωχος, Pamph. £χω, O. Ir. fein 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 *fusnus (§ 148; cf. fus-cus), Minerva, a quadrisyllable in Plautus (Bacch. 893); though Syncope, like that which reduced Titius, &c. to *Tityus, reduced ārvm, lārva, mīlvs (all trisyllable in Plautus) to ārvum, larva, milvis. Between vowels v remains, e.g. ōvis, ōvis; but in the unaccented syllable we find u for ēv, ēv, ēv, e.g. dēnuo for de novo (see eh. 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. dū(v)īnus, là(v)ābrum (see eh. ii. § 53). After a consonant in the initial syllable, w is dropped in pīus for *pw-īyo- (?) from the same root as pārus, but remains (like y) after d, e.g. O. Lat. duonuīs, Duenos, duellum; though at the beginning of the literary period this dv- passed into b-, e.g. bōnus, bēnē, bellum. Side by side with dissyllabic duonus, duellum
we find trisyllabic duonnis, duellum, just as in I.-Eur. we have duw- and dw- in the words for 'two' (O. Ind. dūvā, and dvā, Gk. δω and ἰδω, Lat. duo and bis), 'dog' (O. Ind. šuvān- and švān-, Gk. κωνωv and Lith. švū). And side by side with I.-Eur. *twōi, the Locative case of the 2nd Pers. Pron. Sg. we have the unaccented form *toī (O. Ind. tvē and tē, Gk. σοι 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 (aw), and to determine when the w has been dropped in the 'I.-Eur. period' and when in the 'Latín period.' An ē has been turned into ō through the influence of a preceding w in the group swē-, e.g. sōr (I.-Eur. *swēsor-), sōcer (I.-Eur. *swēkūro-), &c. (see § 10). Before a consonant (l, r) I.-Eur. w is dropped in Latin, e.g. rādix for *wrād- (cf. Goth. vaurt, Engl. wort). On the weakening of unaccented wē to ō in I.-Eur., e.g. *pērūt(i) (O. Ind. parū, Gk. προφύς) from the root wēt- (Gk. Fēros, a year, Lat. vētus), and in Latin, e.g. con-cūtio for *-quetio, see § 51, and on fervī for fervui, ch. ii. § 52.

Latin v often represents I.-Eur. g², gh² (see §§ 139, 143), both initial, e.g. vēnīo for *g²myō from the root g²em- (Gk. βαίνω, O. Ind. gam-, Goth. qima, Engl. come), and between vowels, e.g. nīv-em Acc. for *nīgʰm (Gk. νύφα Acc., W. nyf) from the root sneigh²- (e.g. O. Ir. snechta, Goth. snaivs, Lith. snaigytī, 'to snow,' O. Sl. sněgū, '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, vatuva (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. φαίνα, O. Ir. fiadam, Goth vait, O. Engl. wäit, Engl. wot, O. Sl. vidēti, 'to see,' vēdēti, 'to know') appears in Lat. video; the I.-Eur. *weīk- (O. Ind. vi-, vēk-, Gk. ούκος, Goth. weīhs, O. Sl. visti), in Latin vicis; the conjunction *weī, 'or' (O. Ind. wā, Gk. ἦ(এ)τ, Lat. -ē; the root wert-, 'to turn' (O. Ind. var-, Goth. vairja, Engl. 'woe worth the day,' W. gwerthyd, 'a spindle,' Lith. vartaļ, O. Sl. vratiti Inf.) in Lat. vēra. Similarly Lat. vīcō, vītis (O. Ind. vi-, Lith. vītī, O. Sl. viti, Ir. feith, 'woodbine,' W. gwydd-fid); Lat. vēlūs, with ì for in (§ 78), (Goth. vulla, Engl. wool, Lith. vlinos, O. Sl. vlūna); Lat. vērōs (O. Ir. fr, W. gwir, Goth. tuz-vērjan, 'to doubt,' O. Engl. wār, 'true,' Germ. wahr; cf. Lith. vērā, 'faith,' O. Sl. vēra); Lat. vespa (O. Engl. wæsp and
waeps, O. Sl. vosa); Lat. virtus (O. Ind. viśā-, Gk. ὁσ for ἕσως); Lat. vōno (O. Ind. vacm-, Gk. ἑῳδόν for ἑϋμό, Lith. vemiū).

§ 70. I.-Eur. w (and Latin v) between vowels. I.-Eur. *γνιόω-, ‘alive’ [O. Ind. jīvā-, W. byw, O. Fr. bhu, Goth. qius, O. Engl. cwicu- (with *-e-developed before u), Engl. quick, Lith. gyvas, O. Sl. živu] is Lat. vivēs; I.-Eur. *new-, ‘new’ (O. Ind. nāva-, Gk. νέος, O. Sl. novī) is Lat. novēs; I.-Eur. *newn, ‘nine’ (O. Ind. nāva, Gk. ἑννέα, O. Fr. novī, O. Fr. novi) is Lat. nēven; I.-Eur. *yūwnko-, (O. Ind. yuvaśā-, Gk. ἕτος, W. ieuanc) is Lat. jīvens. Similarly Lat. clāvis (Gk. κλη̄(F)ίς); Lat. lēvir, better lēvir, brother-in-law (O. Ind. dēvār-, Arm. taig, Gk. δαίρ from *dāfer-); Lat. aeuen (Gk. αἰ(ν)ω, Goth. aivos, O. Engl. ā); Lat. leuvis (Gk. λαυ(ν)ός).

The question of the change of the ending -vos to -rus and -us is a difficult one. The most natural explanation of the change of deivros to deus (the form in ordinary use as early as Plautus) is that given in § 33 (through *de( UPS)), which takes for granted that -vos became -rus when -os became -us (§ 17) [cf. Fleus on a coin of 300-150 B.C (C. I. L. i. 277), Gnaeus, bonum, comum 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 ā (ch. i. § 9) or vu. Velus 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, sollicet quia sciebant vocales inter se ita confundī non posse ut unam syllabam [non] faciant, apparetque eos hoc genus nominum alter scrīpsisse, aliter enuntiass. Nam cum per o scriberent, per u tamen enuntiabant.

The tendency to re-insert the v from other cases and cognate words, dīvo, divos, diva, &c., would interfere from time to time with the natural development of the sound. (Cf. § 67 on abijeo, abijedio and abiciatio.) On Republican inscr. we find v in inventa (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 Pācu(ν)ūsus also written Pāquius; Vēnu(ν)ūsus, 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. Lanty. sect. iii.]

The process of Syncope affected at various periods intervocalic v in different ways. Under the early Accent Law *vē-i-speξ was reduced to anspeξ (cf. au-eps), *vēiita (Lith. gywata; cf. Gk. βιοτίν) to vita, &c.; under the Paenultima Law *āvidēre became audere, &c.; in the period of the Early Literature aevitas became actas, āvidus became avidus, praevides became praedaes, &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. Avidus from Ausvios (C. I. L. i. 83, Paeneste). (On the loss of v through Syncope see ch. iii. § 16. 9.)

§ 71. I.-Eur. w after a consonant. (1) In the first syllable:—Latin serius (Goth. svērs, ‘honourable’; Germ. schwer, ‘heavy’) is from the root ser-, ‘to weigh’ (Lith. sveštis); for Latin si we have in Oscan svaī, in Umb. sve; Latin stāus is connected with Lith. stvdiā, ‘to shine’; Lat. suf-flo, to fumigate, with Gk. bivio, from I.-Eur. *thw-iyō. But swā- is Lat. suā- in suavis (a trisyllable in Vulg. Lat., cf. Ital. soave; Servius ad Aen. i. 357 says that many persons in his day made suādet a trisyllable). Lat. ātis-, apart, asunder, seems
to be I.-Eur. *dis-, a byform of *dwis (Lat. bis, O. Lat. duis), as I.-Eur. *toi (unaccented) was a byform of *twoi (accented), though some regard Lat. dis as the direct descendant of I.-Eur. *dwis, and O. Lat. duis (class. bis) as the descendant of I.-Eur. *dūwis. Sātium, a kiss, seems to represent s(ā)vium.

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

(2) In other syllables:—Internal -dis- becomes -v- in suavis for *suad-vis; *derviosus, later derbiosus (see ch. ii. § 52), for *der-chel-os(ī-) (O. Ind. dardū-; cf. Engl. tetter). "Vītus does not show I.-Eur. -dhw-, but -dhēw-, for it represents I.-Eur. *wīdhēw- (O. Ind. vidhāvā-, Gk. ἤ(v)θε(ἀ)ος, O. Sl. vidova, 'widow.') Postconsonantal u, later v, is in Vulgar and Late Latin dropped before the accent in Jan(v)arius; Feb(r)arius; bāt(ix)ēre, cons(v)ēre, quatt(r)ovdecim, contin(v)āri, 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 mortuus (O. Sl. mrtivū). So quattuor (O. Ind. catvāras, Lith. ketveri, O. Sl. četvero); tēnis (O. Ind. tanvī F.), gēnua (Zend. zanvā, Lsb. Gk. γέννα for *gorfa-), though teniva, genova are found in classical poetry, and in the first cent. A. D. tenuis is declared to have wavered between a dissyllable and a trisyllable (Caesellius ap. Cassiod. vii. 205 K.). Late-Lat. mortuus, &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); duovis seems to be a trisyllable in the Saturnian fragments (cf. ch. ii. § 141 n), viz. C. I. L. i. 32: duonōro óptumo fuise uiro, and Naevius (?) ap. Fest. 532. 22 Th.: simul dūona eōrum pōrant ad nāuis, duellum to be a dissyllable (Aem. Lepidus' inscr. ap. Caes. Bass. 265. 25 K.: duēllo māgno diriméndo, rēgibus subīgēndis), as it always is in Plautus (e.g. Amph. 189; extīcto duello máxumo), whereas Ennius has (A. 168 M.): pars occidit illa duellis, a scenasis imitated by later poets. (On O. Lat. duis, duī- for bis; bis- 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. tīqua, tīvor stand for *veig- (O. Ir. fiegh, 'wet'); Lat. rēpens may be a Pres. Part. of I.-Eur. wreīp- (Gk. βηπ, to fall; cf. Lith. virpėti, 'to tremble') (but see ch. vii. § 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. μᾶρναμαι Mid.). And in Greek, owing to the fact that γ before ν of γίνομαι, &c. had come to take the sound of the Agma (see ch. ii. § 63), *γίνομαι (cf. Dor. γίνομαι), γ was used to express the guttural nasal, e.g. ἀγκυρα, ἐγγύς, though in inscriptions we often find ἀγκυρα, 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. Ἰγύλα, 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. *mäter-(O. Ind. mätár-, Arm. mair, Dor. Gk. μάτηρ, O. Ind. māthis, O. H. G. muoter, O. Engl. módir, Lith. motę, ‘wife,’ O. Sl. mati), Lat. mäter, or internal, e.g. from I.-Eur. root wem- (O. Ind. vám-, Gk. (ἴ)μέω, Lith. vematai, Pl.), Lat. vómo; I.-Eur. *termen- (O. Ind. tárman-, Gk. τέρμων), Lat. termō, terminus; I.-Eur. rump-, ‘to break’ (O. Ind. lumpámi), Lat. rumpo, or final, e.g. I.-Eur. -m of the Acc. Sg., as in I.-Eur. *tôm (O. Ind. tám, Gk. τόν, Goth. þan-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 quàntum (for quom jam, and originally used in a temporal sense ‘when now,’ ‘now that,’ ch. x. § 13), quan-sei, C. I. L. i. 200. 27 (on quāsi, see ch. x. § 11), altrin-secus, centum from I.-Eur. *kmtom (Lith. szintašas), septen-triones (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 etiamnum 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 *prüm(i)-ceps; though a traditional spelling is often used, e.g. numeúbi, quamts, O. Lat. quamde, than, &c. (see ch. ii. § 61). A p is inserted to facilitate the pronunciation of these groups in sumptus, sumpsi for sum tus, sumsi, exemplum for *exemlum, &c. I.-Eur. mr is Latin br in hibernus from *hibrino- (§ 13), (Gk. χιμερόδ), 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 inpello, an original labial before n, e.g. scannum 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).
§ 74. I.-Eur. m; other examples. I.-Eur. *mēdhyo- (O. Ind. mádhya-), Gk. μέσος, Ir. medon, 'the middle,' Goth. midjis, O. Sl. mežda, 'the middle') is Lat. medius; I.-Eur. root men-, 'to think' (O. Ind. man-, máman-, 'thought,' O. Ir. men-me, 'thought,' O. H. G. minna, 'remembrance,' Lith. menū, 'I remember') appears in Lat. mēmīni for *me-men-i, mens, &c. Similarly Lat. mī (O. Ind. mām, Gk. με, Ir. mi, Goth. mi-k); Lat. sēmī- (O. Ind. sāmi-, Gk. ἱσμός); Lat. hēmō (Goth. guma, Eng. groom, bride-groom); Lat. cum, com-, with (O. Ir. com-); Lat. mors, mortis (O. Ind. mūrti-, Lith. mirtis, O. Sl. sù-mrīt; cf. Goth. maurþr, 'murder'); Lat. fāmus (O. Ind. dhūmā-, Lith. dūmāi, Pl. O. Sl. dýmû).

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

§ 76. I.-Eur. ms. In Lat. tēmbrae (Plur., like O. Ind. tāmāśi, Russ. sumerki) from the I.-Eur. root tem- (Lith. tėmti, 'to grow dark,' Ir. tem, 'dark,' temel, 'darkness') the n seems to be due to the influence of s, for O. Ind. tāmisrā, O. H. G. dinstar, Germ. finster, show that *tēmbrā- or *tēmsrā- was the old form of the stem in Latin. The m remains in tēmbrē Loc., 'in the dark' (ch. ix. § 5) (cf. O. Ind. tāmas- from I.-Eur. *tēmes-, 'darkness,' and Germ. Dämmerung). Another example of I.-Eur. -ms- (mes-) is Lat. āmērus (Umbr. onso-, O. Ind. āsa-, Arm. us, Gk. ἄως, Goth. ans), and perhaps Lat. nūnērus, Numerius (cf. Numisius, O. Lat. Numasio-, Osca Niusocio-); and another example of -msr- is Lat. membrum for *mems-ro- (cf. Goth. mimz, 'flesh,' O. Sl. meso; also Gk. μῆρος for μηρό, the thigh, O. Ind. māsā-, 'flesh,' Arm. ms.) The fewness 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-sillo, &c., from com-, where the m might be regarded as the final letter of a separate word, but mps, e. g. sumpsī, dempsī, where the m could not be so regarded. (On the spellings sumpsi, sumsi, &c., hiems, hiemps, see Brambach, Lat. Orth. p. 248; the Roman grammarians approve of sumpsī, &c., but not of hiemps.)

§ 77. I.-Eur. mr, ml are equally difficult to trace in Latin. They are represented by βη, βδ in Greek when initial, e. g. βηρός, βδύς, βδήτος (from μέλι), by μθρ, μθλ when medial, e. g. μθρος, μθλος. In Irish we find initial mr- to be an early spelling, which was changed later to br-, e. g. mraiach, 'malt,' later braich, from a stem *mracī-, and similarly ml-, later bl-, e. g. mliecht, blict, 'milk.' The Latin fraces, olives, seems to be the same as this Irish word mraiach, in which case br- will be the Latin equivalent of I.-Eur. mr- (for other examples, see Osthoff, Morph. Unters. v. 85), and the b of hibernus, tāber, a swelling, a truffle (from tūneos, to swell), will be like the b of ruber, &c. (§ 114), for which f is found in other dialects, e. g. Umbr. rufro- [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, tāber might then be explained like the long i of infrero, infringo, &c., (ch. ii. § 144), and the original forms would be *(h)embrino-, tāmfrō-. 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 *gēn*r, a word which it is hard to dissociate from Gk. γαμβρός, 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, tímulus*, &c. (ch. v. § 21).

§ 74. N. I.-Eur. *n* is in Latin *n*, whether (1) initial, e.g. I.-Eur. *nēwο*, *newio-*, ‘new’ (O. Ind. náva-, návy-, Arm. nor, Gk. νέος, O. Ir. nūe, Gaul. Novios, W. newydd from *noviyo-, Goth. niujis, O. Engl. nöwe, Lith. naūjas, O. Sl. novu), Lat. nōvus, *Novius*, or (2) internal; e.g. the I.-Eur. root sēn-, ‘old’ (O. Ind. sána-, Arm. hin, Gk. ἑώς kai véa, O. Ir. sen, W. hen, Goth. sineigs, sinista Superl., Lith. sēnas) appears in Lat. sēnex, senior, the root angh-, ‘to choke’ (O. Ind. ḳhas-, ‘need,’ Arm. anjuk, ‘narrow,’ Gk. ἀγχω, O. Ir. cum-ung, ‘narrow,’ Goth. aggyvs, ‘narrow,’ Engl. anger, Lith. aūksztas, ‘narrow,’ O. Sl. ązuki) in Lat. ango, angor, angustus, or (3) final; e.g. the I.-Eur. preposition *ēn* (Gk. ἐν, O. Ir. in, Goth. in, Lith. i) Lat. in, 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, german* for *gen-men*, just as the *wm* 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. amne, alme, and arme, Catal. arma and alma, Sicil. arma, Milanese armella). Before *l* it was assimilated, e.g. cōrōlla for *corōn-la, hōmullus* for *homōn-lus, ilīgo, illex, malulliae*, water for washing the hands, from *man-luvia* (so before *r* in irritus, &c.), and also after *l*, e.g. colliis for *col-ni-s* (Lith. kūnas; cf. Gk. κολωνύς), vellus (Lith. vīna, O. Sl. vlīna), as in Greek we have *λλ* for *λν* in ἐλλός, a fawn (Lith. ėnis, O. Sl. jelent), &c. In ulna, &c. a vowel originally came between *l* and *n* (cf. Gk. ὀλένη). On the pronunciation of *ns* as *ss*, or *s*, with lengthening of the preceding vowel, e.g. vicesimus and vicēsimus from vīcesini-mus, see ch. ii. § 64. So with *n̂* (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. ἀνῆρ (cf. *Nēro*). Before mutes and spirants we find *n* often dropped, especially in O. Umbr., e.g. ivenka ‘juvencas’ (N. Umbr. ivenga), but in Umbr. of all periods before *s*, e.g. aseriatu and aseriato, anseriato; in Oscan before *a* mute in an unaccented final syllable, e.g. *et* for
ent 3rd Plur., íák in Acc. Sg. for íank (Lat. eam, with the particle -ce, ch. vii. § 15) (see von Planta, i. p. 301).

§ 79. I.-Eur. n; other examples. I.-Eur. *néwn, ‘nine’ (O. Ind. náva, Gk. ἱβ-ά, O. Ir. nóí, W. náw, Goth. niu̯an, O. Engl. nígon, Lith. dėvyn, O. Sl. devežti with d- by analogy of the words for ten, just as Vulg. Engl. ‘thruppence’ takes its n from ‘tuppence,’ ‘twopence.’) Lat. nōvem [for novem (§ 81): a similar substitution of -m for -n has been found in Subj. feram, (O. Ind. bharāṇi)]; I.-Eur. *nō, *nōu, ‘we’ (O. Ind. nāu, Gk. νάυ, O. Sl. na; cf. O. Ir. ní), Lat. nō-ś; I.-Eur. *nās-, ‘the nose’ (O. Ind. nāśa Du., Lith. nōysis; cf. O. Engl. nose). Lat. nāris for *nās-is; I.-Eur. *nāu-, ‘ship’ (O. Ind. nāu-, Arm. nav, Gk. νας, O. Ir. nau, W. nāc, ‘a dish, vessel’), Lat. nāvis; I.-Eur. *nēpōt-, ‘grandson’ (O. Ind. nāpāt-, M. Ir. niē, niath Gen., W. na), Lat. nēpōs, Gen. nepōtis; I.-Eur. sneīgh-, ‘to snow’ (Zend. snacæžaīti, Gk. νίφα Acc., ἄγνιψος for *άγνυ-άνφος, O. Ir. snecht, W. nyf, Goth. sneīfs, Lith. snēgů, Vb., O. Sl. snēgů), Lat. nīx, nīnguit; I.-Eur. *gnō-to-, ‘known’ (O. Ind. jūnātā-, Gk. γνωτός, O. Ir. gnáth, ‘acustomed’), Lat. nōtus, O. Lat. gnōthus; the I.-Eur. root bhendh-, ‘to bind’ (O. Ind. bándhana-, ‘binding,’ bândhu, ‘a relation,’ Gk. πένθρος, stepfather, πέισμα, a rope, for *πενθ-όσμα, Goth. bindan, ‘to bind’) survives in the religious term, of-fendices, the knots with which the priest’s apex was tied on, an old word wrongly connected by some Roman antiquarians with offendo [Festus 244. 2 Th. offendicès ait esse Titius nodus, quibus apex retinatur et remittatur. At Veranius coriola existimat, quae sint in loris apieis, quibus apex retinatur et remittatur, quae ab offendendo dicantur. nam quom ad mentum pervenit sit, offendit mentum. Paulus Diaconus, the epitomator of Festus, has been misled by the corruption of fendimentum for offendit mentum (Paul. 245. 1 Th.): offendices dicebant ligaturae nodus, quibus apex retinatur. Id cum pervenisset ad mentum, dicebatur ‘offendimentum,’ whence the ‘ghost-word’ offendimentum has come into our Latin dictionaries; cf. C. G. L. iv. 132. 3 offendicès nodus proprius quo apex flaminum retinuet (MS. restinguitor) et remittitur]; I.-Eur. *gâns-, ‘a goose’ (O. Ind. ḫâsâ-, Lith. žâsis, O. Engl. gōs; cf. Gk. χιφ’; in Irish the word means a swan, gēs from stem *gēs-, originally *ghansi-), Lat. anser, properly hanser.

The instances of a nasal (n or m) being dropped before a consonant in Latin without ‘compensation’ are illusory: ligālā, a spoon, from lingo, to lick, is a different word from lingula, 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 ligalam dianct equitesque patresque,
diec ab indoctis ‘lingula’ grammaticeis,

(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 λάτος; τήχναμ is Gk. τύχανος, tympanum, Gk. τύμπανος, &c.

§ 80. nm. How far the theory that *canmen became carmen is supported by the comparison of cancer with O. Ind. karkara-, ‘hard,’ Gk. καρπίνος, and of crēpus-culium with Gk. κνέφας 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 caeruleus (§ 84), and the second example, if correct, would exhibit
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the same change of initial en- to er- for facility of pronunciation, as is seen in dialects of Gaelic, e.g. cu, ‘a nut’ (pronounced cru with nasilized vowel; crepusculum, creper, ‘dark’, if they represent an earlier en-, must be dialectal. Varro makes them Sabine words (L. L. vi. 5 secondum hoc dicitur ‘crepusculum’ a crepero. id vocabulary sumserunt a Sabinis, unde veniunt ‘Crepusci’ nominati Amitierno, qui eo tempore erant nati, ut ‘Lucii’ prima luce in Reatino; ‘crepusculum’ significat dubium; ab eo res dictae dubiae ‘creperae,’ quod crepusculum dies etiam nunc sit an jam nux multis dubium). The Probi Appendix censures the pronunciation ‘parcarpus’ instead of pancarpus (Gk. παντάρπος) (197. 32 K.; the reading is doubtful; ‘prancaropus’ 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 *ges-i-men from *goro for *geso, cf. gesi, ges-tam) and gamma to *gen-ma. Carmen may be connected with O. Ind. kārī-, ‘a singer,’ or with cūro (in Lat. a portion of meat, flesh, but in Osc. any portion, e.g. maine corneis seneiis inquisitum ‘maxima partis senatus sententia’), as O. I. drciht means (1) part, portion, (2) song. (O. Ind. kāsman-Neut., ‘praise,’ a word which occurs only once in the Rig Veda, comes from the O. Ind. root kās-, ‘to praise,’ which is usually connected with Lat. carmen). In Compounds with in, con- &c. -num became mn, e.g. in-mitto, com-mitto, so that gamma seems a natural development of gen-ma.

The connexion of n with l seen in Provençal alma for Lat. an(ē)ma, &c. receives an equally doubtful support from the mispronunciation censured in the Probi Appendix (197. 24 K.) ‘cuntellum’ for cattellum, and in the curious form of the word nepis mentioned in glossaries, ‘leptis’ (Lōwe, Prodr. p. 340); nuscicio explained as ‘caecitudo nocturna’ (Fest. 180. 23 Th.; cf. nusciciosus, ib., nusciosus in glossaries (Lōwe, Prodr. p. 17 ‘qui plus vespere videt’) seems to be a popular adaptation of lusitio (-cio?) (Paul. Fest. 86. 21 Th.; derived from luscus, to the word vox. Cuncella, the Diminutive of cūs (C. G. L. iii. 322. 9) (cf. Ital. conocchia, ‘a distaff,’ from Lat. *concuta, Fr. quenouille, &c.), may be influenced by cūmus. N appears as l in dialectal Greek, e.g. lápwo für νάρῳ. (K. Z. xxiii. 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 (mē, mē) are reduced in the unaccented syllable of such a word as I.-Eur. *tntō- (O. Ind. tatā-, Gk. tātos, Lat. tentus) from the root ten-, ‘to stretch,’ some write, m, n, others ōm, an (mo, na), the ō indicating an obscure vowel sound, or else ëm, ën (mē, nē). In Latin these sounds became ēm, ēn, e.g. décem (Gk. δέκα, Goth. taihun), tentus, the ê being subject to all the changes of ē for I.-Eur. ë (e.g. incertus, Gk. ἵππιος, undécim, decumus, decimus, &c.); in Greek they became a before a consonant [but αμ, αυ before vocalic i (y)]; in Teutonic um, 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. ōm, ōn. 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 nêk-, nenêk-, 'to obtain' (O. Ind. naś-, Gk. ἐ-νεκ-ίν, Mid. Ir. co-emnacar, 'potui,' Lith. nèšti, 'to carry,' O. Sl. nêsti). (See Osthoff, Morph. Unt. v. Pref., and cf. above, § 61.) Whether Gk. νά, Lat. nā of Gk. νήσσα (Lat. ñnas) for *vār-ya, a duck, Lat. gnātus, and Lat. an, O. Ind. ā of Lat. antae, O. Ind. jātā-, 'born,' are rightly called the long sonant nasals from roots like ġen-, &c. is a point which has not yet been settled (see § 1). I.-Eur. initial ōm, ōn have been also referred to a weakening of an original initial am-, an-, e.g. *ambhi (Gk. ἀμβή), like *po beside *apo (Gk. ἀπό) (ch. ix. § 12).

I.-Eur. ōm, ōn are in Umbro-Osc. treated as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. desen- 'decem,' ivenga 'juvenecas,' Osc. tristaamentud 'testamento' Abl. Sg. Why an- should appear for Lat. in- (en-), in Umbr. antakres 'integris,' Osc. amprufid 'improve,' Umbro-Osc. anter 'inter,' is not quite clear (see von Planta, i. p. 315).

§ 82. Other examples of the Nasal Sonants. I.-Eur. -ṁ of the Nom. Sg. Neut. of men-stems (e.g. Gk. ἴμα) is Lat. -men, e. g. sēmen; the weak form of the root ten-, 'to stretch,' appears also in I.-Eur. *tamū, 'thin' (O. Ind. tanū; cf. Gk. τανῦ, stretched, of τανῦ-γλωσσος, τανῦ-πτερος, τανῦ-πενλος), Lat. teneris from the Fem. form (O. Ind. tanvī) (ch. v. § 47); I.-Eur. *ktōn, 'hundred' (O. Ind. ἱκτάμ, Gk. ἱ-κτόν, O. Ir. cēt, W. cant, Goth. und, Engl. hundred, lit. '100-number,' Lith. ščintas, O. Sl. sùto) is Lat. centum; I.-Eur. *gānti-, the Verbal Noun from the root gāmēn, 'to go' (O. Ind. gāti, Gk. βῶς, Goth. ga-qumįs, 'assembly,' Germ. Her-kunft, &c.), Lat. inventi-o; I.-Eur. *sm-, the weak grade of the root sem-, 'one' (O. Ind. sa-kft, 'once,' Gk. ἁ-πατ, ἃ-πλόν), Lat. simplex; I.-Eur. *mēnto-, mēnti, the P. P. P. and Verbal Noun of men-, 'to think' (O. Ind. matā-, mati- Gk. σμό-μορος, O. Ir. dēr-met, 'forgetting,' Goth. ga-munds, 'remembrance,' O. Engl. gemýnd, Engl. mind, Lith. mištas, O. Sl. měti, pa-měti, 'memory') appear in Lat. com-mentus, mens, Gen. mentis. Similarly Lat. ensis (O. Ind. asī); Lat. ingens, lit. 'unknown,' 'uncouth' (O. Eng. un-çáid) from the root ġen-, 'to know'; Lat. jīvencs (see § 64); Lat. lingua, older lingua (Goth. tuggō, O. Engl. tongue) (On nōen for *noren, see § 79.) The late retention of the ō-, ð-sounds (as of the ā-, ē-sounds, § 92) has been inferred from patrēm (beside patris), nōmen (not -nū) (but see p. 186).

§ 83. Other examples of am, an, mā, nā. Lat. gnārūs from root ġen-, 'to know' (O. Ind. jānāmī); antae, pillars at door of a temple (O. Ind. ātā-, Arm. dr-and); Lat. ianītrices, sisters-in-law (O. Ind. yātār-, cf. Gk. εἰδρέπεικ, O. Sl. jętry). Lat. āmāre is explained by some as derived from ēma, 'I take,' with
§ 84. L, R. These two sounds are often interchanged in Latin by 'Dissimilation' of *l-, e.g. *caerúleus from *caelum, pōpūlā-ris and austrā-lis (ch. ii. § 101). The same thing is found in other languages, e.g. O. H. G. turtula-tūbā, our 'turtle-dove' from Lat. turtur (Gk. κέφαλαργία and κέφαλαλγία) and perhaps occurred in what is called the I.-Eur. period, e.g. I.-Eur. gēr-gēl-in in the reduplicated root (Lat. gur-gul-io, O. H. G. querechela, Lith. gargalūjū). On the parasitic vowel often found between a consonant and *l (*r), see ch. ii. § 103, and on the avoidance of *r-*r, e.g. praest(r)ūgiae (like Gk. ὅρπ-φακτος for ὅρπ-φρακτος) ib.

§ 85. L. I.-Eur. 1 is Lat. 1, e.g. the I.-Eur. root leiq, 'to leave' (O. Ind. ric-, Arm. li'šanem, Gk. λειπω, O. Ir. lēcim, Goth. leihvan, 'to lend,' O. Engl. lēcn, Lith. lēkū, 'I leave,' O. Sl. oti-lēkū, 'remainder') appears in Latin linguo, Pft. ligi; the root ḵlei-, 'to lean' (O. Ind. ṣri-, Gk. κλίω, O. Ir. cloen, 'awry,' Goth. hlains, 'a hill,' Lith. szlaitas, szlētī, 'to lean'), appears in Lat. clīvus, ac-clinis; suffixal -lo, -lā, as in derivatives from the root ḵhē-, 'to suck' (O. Ind. dhārū-, Arm. dal, 'beestings,' Gk. θηλυ, ḵilih, O. Ir. dēl, 'teat,' Gael. deal, 'leech,' O. H. G. tīla, 'teat,' Lith. dėlė, 'leech'), in Lat. fellāre for fé-lare, &c. (ch. ii. § 130).

We find *l in Latin in original *l, e.g. per-cello (cf. Gk. κάλαλαρός, brittle, Lat. clādes), ln, e.g. collis (Lith. kālnas; cf. Gk. κολλώνος) (ultna had I.-Eur. -lēn-; cf. Gk. ωλέννη), ls, e.g. collum, O. Lat. collus (O. Engl. heals, Germ. Hals M.), velle for *vel-se (cf. es-se), rl, e.g. stella for *stēr-la, āgellus for *ager-lus. So dl in compound verbs, e.g. allīgo for ad-līgo. But usually a parasitic vowel was inserted to facilitate pronunciation, when *l was preceded by a consonant, e.g. *piaculum for pia-clum (see ch. ii. § 154).

I.-Eur. *d became *l in the Sabine dialect (see I. F. ii. 157), and this form was sanctioned in a few words in Latin, e.g. *lingua, older *dingua, from I.-Eur. *ānghāa- (Goth. tuggō) (§ 111). On fācul, &c. for *fæcth, fæc(i)lē, &c., see § 13; on leptis, a byform of neptis, ch. ii. § 106; on the change of ḵ to l (l) before Latin *l [except before ḵ followed by e, i (y) or before the group ll], § 10, and on the various pronunciations of Latin *l when alone, when double, and when preceding a consonant, ch. ii. § 96.
I.-Eur. 1 is Oscan 1, e.g. ligatúis 'légatús.' 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 ν in words like vasef (Lat. láūdes? Acc. Pl.), Vuvçis (Lat. Lūcius? cf. Osc. Luvkis), yutu (Lat. lāvito?); between vowels l became (like d) r (rs) in karētu, *carētus* 'let him call' (Gk. καλέω, Lat. călāre), famerias 'familiae,' &c.; before t it was dropped in muta 'multa' ('a fine,' Osc. múltā-), &c., while the Umbrian name Voisiēno- (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. ruc-, Gk. λέυκος, O. Ir. lóche, lóchet Gen., 'lightning,' Gaul. Leucetios, W. Iluched, Goth. liehath, O. Engl. lëoh, O. Sl. luji) appears in Lat. lūx, lūsco, luērna; the root ūgel-, 'green, yellow' (O. Ind. hārī-, Gk. χλανός, χλόη, O. Ir. gel, 'white,' O. H. G. gelo, 'yellow,' Lith. žėlti, 'to grow green,' O. Sl. zelijé, 'vegetables,' zelēni, 'green'), in Lat. helvus, helu, and helus. Similarly Lat. sal (Arm. aÅ, Gk. ἄσ, O. Ir. salann, W. halen, Goth. salt, O. Sl. soli, Lith. salunka, 'salt-box'); Lat. flōs (O. Ir. blāth, 'bloom,' W. blodau, 'flowers,' Goth. blōma, O. H. G. bluomo); Lat. clānis (O. Ind. śrōni-, W. chun, O. Scand. klaun, Lith. klaunis); Lat. plēnus, piēr-que, plētus (O. Ind. prat-, Arm. ū, Gk. πλῆς, O. Ir. linaim, 'I fill,' lin, 'a number,' Lith. pilnas, 'full,' O. Sl. plūnû); Lat. in-clātus (O. Ind. śrutā-, 'heard,' Gk. κλανός, in Hom. 'heard, loud,' e.g. ὄνομα κλανόν, λιῳδέ κλανός, 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. rāj-an-, O. Ir. rí, ríg Gen., W. rhi, Gaul. Catu-řiges, lit. 'kings in fight') is Lat. rēx, stem rēg-; I.-Eur. *bhērō*, 'I carry' (O. Ind. bhārā-mi, Arm. berem, Gk. φέρω, O. Ir. berim, W. ad-feru Inf., Goth. baira, O. Engl. bere, O. Sl. ber) is Lat. fērō; I.-Eur. wert-, 'to turn' (O. Ind. vrt-, Goth. vairþan, Engl. worth, in 'woe worth the day,' Lith. vėrsti and vartytı, O. Sl. vratiti) is Lat. vērlere; I.-Eur. *kāpro- (Gk. κάλπος, boar, O. Engl. hafer, 'goat') is Lat. cāper, stem *cāpro-, I.-Eur. rs before a vowel became rr in Latin, e.g. torreo for *torro (O. Ind. t̪ṛ-, Goth. jaursjan, 'to thirst'; cf. Gk. τέρσομαι). But r was assimilated to a following s in pronunciation, e.g. Persa pronounced *Pessa (see ch. ii. § 96),

¹ On inserr. of Assium the Umbr. Voisiēner Gen. Sing. (C. I. L. xi. 5389 = Bücheler, Umbrica Inscr. Min. i., p. 172) corresponds to Lat. Volsiēnus (xi. 5390 = i. 1412). The Volsiēnus of no. 5390 seems to be the son of the Volsiēnus of no. 5389.
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and I.-Eur. rs before a consonant became ss, e.g. tostus for *tostus, *torstus from toreo. R was also assimilated to l in Latin, e.g. stella, āgellus for *stēla, *agēlīlus. The Campanian town of which the Latin name was Atella 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 rī became ćr, e.g. ter, terr- (*ters) for *trēs, 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 *cārca- (Gk. καρκ-ίνος; cf. O. Ind. kar-kar-a-, ‘hard’) (but see ch. ii. § 105). On cārmen, possibly for *can-men, see § 78, and on r for d before f, r, g, e.g. arfuerunt, arvorsum, arger, § 112. Between vowels I.-Eur. s became r in Latin, e.g. gēneris from the stem gēnēs- [cf. Gk. γένεσ(σ)ός], on which see § 148). I.-Eur. r is Umbro-Osc. r, e.g. Umbr. rehte ‘recte,’ Osc. Regaturei *Regatorī’ (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. rīda (O. Ind. rātha-, ‘chariot,’ O. Ir. roth, ‘wheel,’ Gaulo-Lat. petor-rītum, ‘a four-wheeled vehicle,’ O. H. G. rad, ‘wheel,’ Lith. rātas); Lat. porcus (Gk. πόρκος, O. Ir. orc, O. H. G. farh, Engl. f arrow, Lith. paņzas, O. Sl. prase); Lat. vir (O. Ir. fēr, Goth. vair; cf. O. Ind. vīrā-, Lith. vyras); Lat. inter (O. Ind. antār, O. Ir. eter); Lat. servo (O. Ind. sr̥p-, Gk. ζωος); Lat. rīber (O. Ind. rudhirā-, Gk. ῥοδής, O. Sl. růdrů; cf. O. Ir. raud, Goth. raufs); Lat. rumpe, (O. Ind. rup- and lup-, O. Engl. bereofan, ‘to bereave,’ Lith. rūpetī, ‘to trouble’); Lat. prīt-. O. Ind. prā, Gk. πρέπει, 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. pra-, O. Sl. pro-.

§ 89. ss for rs before consonant. Other examples are: Lat. testāmentum for *test-st-*test-st from *trist- (Osc. tristamentum abl. sg.; cēna for *cesna, *cessna from *cersna (Osc. kersna-, Umbr. ēsena-). The spelling coena, due to the analogy of Gk. κοινά, 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 fieri porād (= fieri poro) = another replies cocei (= concoet); a third orders made nīrecie (= made mī rīce or made mīre, cie); a fourth misc sanc (= miscī sanē); a fifth says asom ferō (= assum fero); a sixth confect piscim. The title is coenaltia or coena pīa (see Mēl. Arch. 1890, p. 303). Similarly Lat. fastīgium for *fāst-st- (O. Ind. bhṛṣṭi, ‘a point’); posco for *porco (O. Ind. prchāmi, O. H. G. forsçōn, Germ. forschen).

§ 90. rr for rs before vowel. Other examples: Lat. farreus (Umbr. farseo- and fasso-; cf. O. Sl. brašine, ‘food’); garrro (Lith. garšas, ‘noise’); horreo (O. Ind. hṛṣi-); porrum (Gk. πάρος); terreo [O. Ind. tras-, Gk. τρέω(α), Umbr. tursitu trena(tu)] ; verres (Lith. vežsiz, ‘calf’; cf. O. Ind. vṛṣi-, ‘ram’); vennica, ‘a rising-ground’ in O. Lat. (Lith. vīrszus; cf. O. Ind. vārṣman-); Muspīter,
a byform of Marspiter; Tusces (Umbr. Turseo- and Tusco-). Lat. *fors* has probably re-appended -s to an older *fer, *ferr for *fer-s [so *ul-s has appended -s a second time to *ul, *ull 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. capirse (in the native alph. kapiře), (Lat. capiti), Dat. Sing. of ćapid-, a bowl.

§ 91. n for r. Lat. crépuscūlum, 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 (prounced 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 merenītris for meretrix, &c., see ch. ii. § 105.

§ 92. The L- and R-Sonants. For the sounds to which ħl, ṭr (l̆, r̆) are reduced in the unaccented syllable of such a word as I.-Eur. *dr̥t̥o-, *dṛti (O. Ind. dṛtī-, Gk. δρᾰτός and δρατός, νάργισ, Lith. nu-dirtas, Goth. ga-taurūs) from the root der-, ‘to flay,’ some write l̆, r̆, others ol, ar (la, ra), the ā indicating an obscure vowel sound (also r̆, ēl, &c.). In Latin these sounds became ōl, ēr, e.g. mors, Gen. mortis (O. Ind. mṛtī-, Goth. maurpr, O. H. G. mord, Lith. mirtūs, O. Sl. sū-mrītī), fors, stem *forti- (O. Ind. bhrītī-, O. Ir. brith, Goth. ga-baurūs, ‘birth,’ O. Engl. ge-byrd, ‘fate’), the ǫ being subject to all the changes of ǫ for I.-Eur. ǭ (e. g. pulsūs, Gk. παντός from the root pel-), while before a vowel we seem to find ōl, ēr in sālia (O. Ir. sail; cf. Gk. ἡλίκη with E-grade), cāro (Umbr. karu, ‘a portion ’; cf. Gk. κελφω); in Greek they became ᾅρ (rā, e.g. πατράσι), ǭl (lā), in Teutonic ār, ōl; in Slavonic īr, īl, and so on; so that it is only by reference to another I.-Eur. language that we can tell whether Lat. ōl, ēr are I.-Eur. ōl, ēr, or I.-Eur. īl, īr. (Lat. ōl may also be I.-Eur. īl, § 10.) We occasionally find โ�� in Latin words from roots in l̆, r̆, which are probably to be explained similarly by the weakening influence of the accent, e.g. frāngo, frāgilis from the root bhref-, ‘to break’ (Goth. brēkan, O. Engl. brēcan) (see Osthoff, Morph. Unt. v. Pref., and above § 3). Whether Gk. ρω, ρā, Lat. rā, of Gk. στρωτός, τετρωταί, κράτος, Lat. strātus, clādes, and Gk. ὀρ (ap), Lat. ar of Gk. ἀρπωμι, Lat. pars, partīor, quārtis, 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 ‘paecer (pacris) sit,’ ‘may she be propitious’ (Zv. I. I. I. 8) (cf.
Umbr. pacer, Lat. aeer; aeris Fem.), Sabine Atruo (Zv. 10), Osc. Tantrnnaüm Gen. Pl., though how far these are merely graphic is hard to decide (cf. ch. iii. § 14); corresponding to Gk. ἁγρός we have in Lat. ager, in Umbr. ager, and so on (see ch. vi. § 4). On Lat. ter(r) for *trīs, factūl for fac(i)tī, see § 13. I.-Eur. 1, r receive the same treatment in Umbro-Osc. as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. or- (Lat. ortus), Osc. molto (Lat. multa, a fine) (see vonPlanta, i. p. 314).

§ 93. Other examples of the liquid Sonants. I.-Eur. *prēk-škō (O. Ind. prēchāmi, prēhā, ‘enquiry,’ Arm. harcanem, hare, O. H. G. forsčon, forse) Lat. posco for *porc-SCO ; I.-Eur. *krd- (O. Ind. ḫīd, Gk. καρδία and κραδή, O. Ir. ḫīde, Lith. szirdis, O. Sl. sridicė, Lat. cor for *kord ; I.-Eur. *prēkā, ‘the ridge of a furrow’ (W. rhyh F., O. Engl. furh F.). Lat. porca (Varro, R. R. i. 29. 3 qua aratrum vornere lacenam striam fecit, ‘suleus’ vocatur. quod est inter duos sulcos terra dictur ‘porca’; Paul. Fest. 77. 1 Th. explains the name Imporcitor as ‘qui porcas in agro facit arando,’ the name of a deity invoked by the flame in the sacrifice to Tellus and Ceres, with a number of other agricultural divinities: Vervector, Reparator, Imporeitor, Insitor, Obarator, Occator, Saritor, Subreunciator, Messor, Convector, Conditor, Promitor, whose names are given by Fabius Pictor ap. Serv. ad Virg. G. i. 21. The word porca occurs also in a line of Accius ap. Non. 61. 19 M. bene processsas consi- gerare ordine porcas) ; I.-Eur. ḫin- (Gk. κάρπος Hesych., Goth. haurn), Lat. cornu (cf. Lat. cornus, cornel, Gk. κράνος, κράνον) ; I.-Eur. *pyso- (Gk. πύσον), Lat. poryzam for *porzam. Certain examples of I.-Eur. l in Latin are not numerous. Ulmus may stand for *lmo- (Ir. lem, Russ. ilem); or for *elmo- (O. Engl. elm); or for *olmo- (O. Scand. alm) ; melulos, milked, for *mikto- (Lith. mitszas, O. Ir. mlicht or blicht, ‘milk’); oc-cultus for *-k̞to- from the root kel-, ‘to hide’; cf. sepultus from sēp̞ilio.

§ 94. Other examples of al, ar, là, rā. Lat. palma, palm of hand (O. Ir. lām F.; cf. Gk. παλάμυς; scalpo (cf. scalpo); clādes (cf. Gk. κλαδόπος, pereclus), from the root keld- of per-cellō); clāmo (cf. calo, cīlendae); flāvus (cf. flateus, O. Lat. Flāvius); lātus, carried (cf. tollō); lūtus, wide, earlier stūtus, from the root stel-, ‘to extend’ (O. Sl. stelja); arīde (cf. Gk. ἱ-πάλιος); armus (O. Ind. irmās, Goth. arms, O. Sl. ramę; cf. Pruss. irmo); carpo from the root kerp-, ‘to cut’ (Lith. kerpū) (cf. Gk. καρπός, Engl. harvest); fustūgnum for *furst- (cf. O. Ind. hr̞p̞i̞ti̞, ‘point,’ O. Engl. byrst, ‘bristle’), or *frast- (see ch. viii. § 18, on farcio for *fracio); crābro for *crā-SCO (cf. Lith. szirsčio, O. Sl. srūšenio); crātis and cartālōgo (cf. Gk. κάρπαλος, basket, O. H. G. hurt, Engl. hurdle); frawxīus and farnus (O. Ind. bhurja-, ‘a birch-tree’) from the root bherg-, (O. Engl. beore, Lith. béržas, O. Sl. brža); grā̈num (O. Ind. jirnā-, ‘worn out’; cf. Goth. kaurn, corn,’ Lith. ėrnis, ‘pea,’ O. Sl. zrūno, ‘a grain’); grūtus (O. Ind. ģurtā-, ‘welcome’); rā̇tis for *vṛā̄ (cf. Goth. vaurta, Engl. wort); strāme (Gk. στρωμα) from sterno; lāna for *vīļāna (O. Ind. ėrnā, Gk. o-vōs for *folo) (On Lat. ḫl, ĥr for al, er before a vowel, see M. S. L. viii. 279, Osthoff, Dvndkes u. helles l, p. 52, (palea, pareas, tarix, &c.), and cf. § 3 on pāteo (Gk. πετεῖ), &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 h (like our th in 'ant-hill'), (4) mediae aspiratae, or mediae followed by h (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. ḍhūmāś, O. Ind. dhūmāś); in the Celtic and Slavonic families the mediae and mediae aspiratae of Sanscrit are merged in mediae (e.g. Lith. dú-ti, 'to give,' O. Ind. dā-, O. Ir. dān, 'a gift, an accomplishment'; Lith. dėlė 'a leech,' O. Ind. dhā-, 'to suck,' O. Ir. del, '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. ἵσσημος, Lat. stō, &c.), it seems probable that the I.-Eur. form of the root was stā-, whereas in O. Ind. nakha-, 'a nail, claw,' for which we have an aspirate in Gk. ὅνυχ- 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. śarakhā-, Gk. κόχυνς, Lat. conginsi, a quart); I.-Eur. skhī(n)d-, 'to split' (O. Ind. chid-, Gk. σχίζω, σχινάλμις, a splinter, Lat. scindō, O. H. G. scintan, Germ. schinden); the suffix of the 2 Sg. Pft. Ind. (O. Ind. vēt-tha, Gk. οίτ-θα, Lat. vīd-is-ti, Goth. las-t, &c.); and the same hypothesis has been used to explain the anomalous correspondence of Latin h- and Goth. h- in the verb, 'to have,' Lat. hābet, Goth. habaih (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 tenuis 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 (vexi), from Lat. vēho (I.-Eur. root wegh-), but whether this was the case in what is called 'the Indo-European period' is not certain. More plausible is the
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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-šasta-, Lat. -sessus, Lith. ščistas, 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 ἀστεμφής; O. Ind. ahám beside Gk. ἐγό, 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 cel-te for *cē-dāte, the plural of cēdī, give, lit. ‘give here’ (ch. vii. § 15), hoc(c) for *hod-ce (ch. vii. § 16); topper for *tod-per (ch. ix. § 7); ac-tus from āgo; scriptus from scrito; rec-tus from veho, &c. On spellings like opventui (Scip. Ep.,), opseaede, urpsi, 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 odium (§ 113).

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

Interchange of media and aspirata in Latin. On y 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. pāṣu, Goth. fāhu, Germ. Vieh, Engl. fee), Lat. pēcu, I.-Eur. *sēptm (O. Ind. saptá, Arm. evt’n, Gk. ἐπτά, O. Ir. secht, W. saith, Goth. sibun; cf. Lith. septn̄). P becomes m before n, e.g. somnus for *sop-nus; it is assimilated before labials, e.g. summus for *supmus, suffio for *suffio.
The Labial Tenuis receives a similar treatment in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Umbr. patre, Osc. paterē ‘patri’; but pt is in Osc. ft, in Umbr. ht, e.g. Osc. scripto-, Umbr. screihto- ‘scripto’ (see von Planta, i. p. 424).


§ 100. B. I.-Eur. b is Lat. b, e.g. I.-Eur. *pībō, ‘I drink’ (O. Ind. pībāmī, O. Ir. ibim), Lat. vībo for *pībo (§ 163). Lat. b, whether from I.-Eur. b or bh, becomes m before u, e.g. scannum beside scabellum. Latin b may represent I.-Eur. -bh-, e.g. scribo (cf. Gk. σκαριφάωμαι, scratch) (§ 103), -dh-, e.g. ruber (Gk. ἐρυθρός (§ 114), m before r, e.g. hibernus (Gk. χειμερών) (§ 77), s before r, e.g. cēreb-rum for *cerēs-rum (§ 152), dw-, e.g. bis for *hwis (Gk. δῆς) (§ 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. lambo (O. H. G. laifan, O. Sl. lobūzi; cf. Gk. λάβων); Lat. lābris (Goth. sluipan, ‘to slip’); Lat. lābium (O. H. G. lēfs, O. Engl. lippa).

§ 102. mn for bn. annmis from abh- (O. Ind. âmhas-, ‘water,’ Ir. abann, ‘river’). On the spellings ammure in glosses, see Löwe, Prodr. p. 421; cf. amnegaverit ‘Chap. IV. vi. 14672.’ Similarly bm of *glāb-ma (root gleubh-, Gk. γλάφω) became mn, and was reduced to m (ch. ii. § 127), glāma.

broad, Goth. brōpar, Lith. broter-ēlis, O. Sl. bratrů), Lat. frater. A good example of the different treatment of initial and medial bh in Latin is the word for a beaver, I.-Eur. *bhēbhrusu- (O. H. G. bibar, Lith. bēbrus, O. Sl. bebrů; O. Ind. babhrú-, 'brown'), Lat. fiber. On mn for bn (with b from I.-Eur. b or bh), e.g. scamnum from skabh- 'to support,' with Dim. scabellum (-illum) (also scamillum Ter. Scaur. 14. 6 K.), see § 102, and on dialectal f' for b (e.g. Albus, a byform of Albīus), see ch. ii. § 83. I.-Eur. bh is Umbro-Osc. f, whether initial or internal, e.g. Umbr.-Osc. fust 'erit,' Umbr. alfo-, Osc. Alafaternum 'albo.-' On Faliscan haba for Lat. ēūba, see § 121, ch. ii. § 57.

§ 104. I.-Eur bh; other examples. Lat. nēbāla (Gk. νέβλη, O. Ir. nēl for *nēblo-), O. H. G. nebül, Germ. Nebel), Lat. fētore, fāma (Gk. φημή); Lat. sorbeo (Gk. ἱοφεω, Arm. arb-enam, Lith. srebiū); Lat. umbō, umblīcus (O. Ind. nābhi-, nābhiā-, Gk. ὅμφαλος, O. Ir. imblin, O. H. G. naba, nabolo, Pruss. nabis, Lett. nāba); Lat. fās (O. Ir. bhāth, 'bloom,' Goth. blōma; Lat. albus (Gk. ἄλφος, white leprosy); Lat. ambī- (O. Ind. abhi, Gk. ἄμφη, O. Ir. imme for imbe, Gaulish Ambī-gatus' O. Engl. ymb, Engl. ember-days, from O. Engl. ymb-ryne 'running round, circuit,' Germ. um for umb); Lat. ambō (O. Ind. u-bhā-, Gk. ἀμφω, Goth. bai, bai-ōps, Engl. b-oth, Lith. abū, O. Sl. ēba); Lat. fāndō from I.-Eur. root bhēid- (O. Ind. bhīd-, Goth. beita, Engl. I bite); Lat. fāguς (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. τανύ-πτερος, O. Ir. tana, W. teneu, O. H. G. dũnni, O. Engl. pynne, Lith. dial. tenvas, O. Sl. tīnīkū) appears in Latin ten-do, tēnus; I.-Eur. *wert-, 'to turn' (O. Ind. vārtatē 3 Sg., Goth. vairpan, Germ. vorden, Lith. veśzti, vartīti, 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, tūli, 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. vēticulum or vehīcūlum, 'that by which one is carried'; pocclum or pocclūm, 'that out of which one drinks,' cūbiculum or cubīcūlum, 'the place where one lies down,' &c., by the same change as is seen in later Latin vecclus for vēl(ū)lus, in the
English mispronunciation ‘acleast’ for ‘at least,’ in Mod. Gk. σεϊκλο from Gk. σεϊρλον, &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, salissus for *salittus from sallo, *salilo, versus from verto, &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 quōtius, lōiens 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. ātrox beside ādīum (see § 113). On the loss of t in consonant-groups, e.g. now for *now(t)s, vermina for *ver(t)mina, see § 157, and on nn for tn, e.g. annus, § 161.

In Umbro-Osc. I.-Eur. t remains, e.g. Umbr. tota-, Osc. τω/το a community, but tl became (as in Latin) kl, e.g. Umbr. pihakl, Osc. sakaraklum (cf. Pelignian sacaracirix ‘sacracies,’ pristafalacirix ‘praestabulatrices’).


§ 107. I.-Eur. tl. Lat. équor is I.-Eur. tloq² (O. Ir. atluichur for ad-aluichur in the phrase atluichur bude, ‘I thank,’ ‘ad-loquier gratias’). On the spellings stlis, sēlis, sises for class. lis, see § 150.

§ 108. I.-Eur. tt. Verbs whose stem ends in a dental sound 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 findo, ansus from awdeo, fissus from fido, &c. (see § 155 and ch. v. § 28). So in formations with the suffix -tūmo-, e. g. vicenamus for *vīcent-tūmo- (ch. v. § 14), Adjectives in -ōsus (ch. v. § 65), &c.

The combination tt in Latin appears where a vowel has been dropped by syncope, e.g. cēte for *cē-dāte 2 Plur. Imper., egret(t)us, adgret(t)us (§ 109).

'ten' (O. Ind. dāśa, Arm. tasn, Gk. ὄξικα, O. Ir. deiech, W. deg, Goth. taihun, O. H. G. zehan, Lith. dėsžint, dėszimtis, O. Sl. deset), Lat. dēcem; I.-Eur. root weed-, '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. videō, 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. lacrima, older dacrīma, dacrēma (Gk. ὀἀκρν, Welsh dagr, Goth. tagr), (Paul. Fest. 48. 15 Th.'dacrēmas' pro lacrēmas Livius saepe posuit). D became r before g in mergo, mergus (O. Ind. madgrī-, 'a waterfowl'), &c., and before v and l; though the old forms arger, arvorsus, arfuerunt, had their l restored from ad at the beginning of the second cent. B.C. Initial dw- became b, e.g. bellum (older dvellum, always a dissyllable in Plautus), bīs for *diwīs (Gk. δἰώσ), (see § 68), and initial dy- became j- (y), e.g. jovis, O. Lat. Diovis (see § 63), but internal -dw- leaves v in gnāvis (§ 71). D is assimilated to a following m in rāmentum from rádo, caemumentām from caedo, c in O. Lat. recēdo, hoc for *hod-ce, l in religio, pelluviae, water for washing the feet, grallae, stilts, from grādion, but assimilates a preceding l in percello for *celido (cf. clādes), &c. (see ch. viii. § 33), sallo for *saldo (Goth. salta). It became t before r, e.g. ātrox (cf. ēdium), and before t, this tt 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. deivo- 'divus;' but between vowels became in Umbrian a sound (ū? ch. ii. § 88) which is expressed in the native alphabet by a sign conventionally written by us ū and in the Latin alphabet by vs, e.g. ērca, derca '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- 'piansus,' Osc. úpsannō- 'operandus.'

§ 110. Other instances of I.-Eur. d, Lat. d. I.-Eur. root deīk-, 'to point' (O. Ind. diēk, Gk. δεικνύμ, Goth. ga-teihan, 'to proclaim'), Latin diēre, indicare; I.-Eur. root dék-, 'right hand' (O. Ind. dākša-, Gk. δεκτώ, δερτέρω, O. Ir. des, Gaul. Dexsiva, W. deheu, Goth. taivals, Lith. deszīn, O. Sl. desinu), Lat. dextēr; I.-Eur. root sed-, 'to sit' (O. Ind. sad-, Gk. ἱσός, O. Ir. sudim, sādaim, W. seddu Inf., Goth. sīta, O. Sl. sedlo, saddle), Lat. sedēs. Similarly Lat. scindo
(O. Ind. chind-, Gk. σχίν-δαλμίς, a splinter); Lat. divus (O. Ind. dēvā-, Lith. dēvas); Lat. pes, Gen. pēdis (O. Ind. pād-, Gk. πόνος, νοός Gen., πός, Goth. fōtus, Lith. pēdā, ‘footprint’); Lat. svādeo (O. Ind. svādū-, ‘sweet’, Gk. ὑδός, Goth. sūts); Lat. été (O. Ind. ad-, Arm. ut-em, Gk. ἀέω, Goth. ita, Lith. ėdu, O. Sl. jadí, ‘food’).

§ 111. Lat. 1 for d. Lautia, which usually occurs in an alliterative formula, e.g. Liv. xxx. 17. 14 aedes liberae, loca, lautia legatis decreta; xxviii. 39. 19 locus inde lautiaque legatis praebéri jussa) was in Old Latin lautia, a form quoted from Livius Andronicus by Paul. Fest. 48. 16 Th. ‘lautia’ (Livius saepe posuit), quae lautia dieimus, et dantur legatis hospiti gratia; lingua, for i-Eur. *d̪uŋʰwā- or *d̪uŋʰwā-. (Goth. tuggō; cf. O. Ir. tenge) was in Old Latin dīngua [nos nune...linguam per l potius quam per d (scribamus), Mar. Vict. 9. 17 K.; communio nem habuit littera (1 cum d) apud antiquos, ut ‘dīngum’ et linguam, et ‘daerimis’ et ‘laerimis, et ‘Capitodium’ et Kapitolium, id. 26. 1 K.).

(Was Aquilonia the Oscan Akudunna-, now Codogna? cf. O. Umbr. akefungia-.) Pompey, according to Mar. Vict. 8. 15 K., affected the old spelling and pronunciation kadaymitas for cādāmitas (perhaps from the same root as Oscan cadeis ammu, ‘with intent to injure,’ ‘out of malice,’ Gk. κακαδήσα, explained by Hesychius as βλάφαμ, κακώςα, στριφός); the di Novesides appear on an old inscription from Piacenum as DEIV. NOVESEDE (C.I.L. i. 178) (cf. the Marsic ecos navesede, Zv. I.I.L. 39). In many or all of these words the preference of the byform with l can be explained by false analogy; in lingua by the analogy of lingo (cf. O. Ir. ligur, ‘the tongue,’ Arm. lezu, Lith. ležuvis); in calamitas by the analogy of calamus; in lautia by the analogy of lavo, &c. Similarly O. Lat. dēlicare with the sense of indicare (e.g. Plaut. Mil. 844) may owe its l to the influence of dēliqueare, to clarify. Perhaps Lat. lympha, a Graecized form (cf. Gen. Pl. ὕμφον, Varro, Sat. Men. 50 B.) of *dumpa, (Osc. Dumpa-, with Lat. Ulysses, 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. ὁλοσφένεις; and on Gk. vases (see Kretschmer, Gr. Vas. p. 146) we have ὁλονσένες (C.I.G. 7697), frequently ὅλοντες (C.I.G. 7383, 7699, 8185, 8208), while Varro, L.L. vii. 87, quotes λυμβάνης (cf. O. Lat. Thelis for Θήλη, Varro, L. L. vii. 87). The exact relation of similis, similāgo, fine wheaten flour (cf. Germ. Semmel), to Gk. σκιμπάλα is doubtful, as also that of cassia (Paul. Fest. 33. 22 Th.; for cassila?) to cassis, cassida (an Etruscan word according to Isidore, Orig. xviii. 14. 1). The form reluvium mentioned by Festus (370. 17 th. redliuim quidam, alii ‘reluvium’ appellant, cum circa uensis cutis se resolvit, quia luea est solvere) never ousted the form rediuiia. It does not appear to have been a phonetic variety of rediueia, but rather a separate word, perhaps a grammarian’s coinage, derived from luo, as rediueia, reid-nua was derived from *iōd of in-uo, ex-uo, eixirina. Some of the forms with l mentioned above, e.g. calamitas, ‘injury to crops,’ may similarly have different words from the d-forms. [So consilium, &c. beside praesidium, &c.; cf. Mar. Vict. 9. 18 K. praesidium per d potius (scribamus) quam per l; consilium Plaut. Cas, 966 (see below on solium)]. Some appear to be dialectal; e.g. lepeosta or lepista (Greek δεσεστα [but cf. λασπαστη], according to Varro, L.L. v. 123) was Sabine (Varro, l.c.), and perhaps Novesides (id. v. 74) (cf. Paul. Fest. 77. 7 Th. ‘inipelmenta’ ‘inpendimenta dicebant); so probably lārix for *darix (O. Ir. dair for *darix, ‘an oak’), and possibly laurus for *daurus (O. Ir. daur for *darus, ‘an oak’); Melica (gallina) for Medica (Varro, R. R. iii. 9. 19).
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. cicada, ellera from Lat. hēdēra, trespolo from Lat. irès and pèdes, as tiepolo is a dialectal variety of tepido (Lat. tēpīdus) (cf. the Dīgentia, now Licenza, in the Sabine district). It is possible, but unlikely, that Lat. pōbblicus (Umbr. pupōtko-), Pōbbius from μῆβες, a name whose spelling was often altered after Puplicola and other names derived from pūbbītus (cf. Umbr. Puplico-), may stand for *pōbīt- and exhibit that change of \( d \) to \( l \) after a labial which is seen in these Italian forms tiepolo and trespolo (cf. the byform *impečimento). The town-name Telēsia shows \( d \) on Oscan coins with Tedis (Zv. I. I. I. 262). Other examples of \( l \) for \( d \) are levir, better lāevir, a brother-in-law for *daevër (O. Ind. dêvîr-, Gk. δῆφη for *δαῦρη, Lith. dêveris, O. Sl. dêveri), which Nonius (557. 6 M.) explains: quasi laevus vir ; òle, which stands in puzzling contrast to sēlor from the root od-, ' to smell' (Arm. hot, Gk. ὀδαφή, Lith. ūdižiū) (odefacit of Paul. Fest. 193. 21 Th. 'odefacit' diecubant pro olfacit, may be a grammarians's coinage). But the other instances usually quoted are doubtful ; òligo may come from *nēvis as well as from òvidus and O. Lat. sūlum (e. g. Enn. Ann. 93. M. scamma solumque) may be from a root swel- (Gk. σέλα, Lith. sūlas, 'a bench'), and not represent *sodium (O. Ir. suide) from the root sed-, as sūlum, the ground, the sole of the foot (cf. solaa, a 'slipper') stands for *swolo, (O. Ir. fol, 'the base, foundation '); *mulus might be from *maz-lo-, as Engl. mast is from *maz-do-. The interchange of \( d \) and \( l \) in lāevuma, 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 ; Laco. Gk. ἡλλα ; cf. Goth. sitils, Engl. a settle, O. Sl. sedlo, 'a saddle') by this interchange (Mar. Viet. 26. 3 K.) ; similarly ancilla from ambe-cido (Varro, L. L. vii. 43) ; sēlīquastra from sēdeo (Fest. 508. 10 Th.) ; médītata from μετέρω (Serv. ad Ed. i. 2) ; dedicatus from dedicatus (Paul. Fest. 49. 17 Th. ; who quotes a (suppositions) dedicare, 51. 25 Th. ' dedicare ' ponebant pro dedicare ; cf. Gl. Plac. 16. 11 G. dedicare: deferre, quod et ' dedicare ' diecubant pro commercio litterarum). This dedicare for dedicare is either an etymological coinage to explain dedicatus, 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, miles, silicenum, lidus (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 balīlus, from bādīus, is a ' ghost-word,' the true reading in Plaut. Poen. 1301 is bāliulus, the old spelling of bajulus).

Whether an original \( l \) is ever represented by \( d \) in Latin is doubtful. The mispronunciation alipes for alīpes (Prob. App. 199. 3 K.) was probably influenced by the Gk. ἀλήφa, but is no argument that the Greek and Latin words are connected ; the O. Lat. sedla for sella, quoted by Ter. Scaur. 13. 14 K., seems to be a grammarians's coinage to illustrate the etymology from sēdeo, though it might possibly be the same dialectal sedda, with a peculiar form of \( d \), which is still heard in S. Italy and Sardinia, where every Italian \( d \) is replaced by this \( dā \)-sound (see ch. ii. § 85). (On medīpontus and medīpontus, 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 arcenae, arcentores, arvocati, arvines, arvolare, arfori, also arger; and other grammarians mention arventum (Mar. Viet. 9. 17 K.), arzerosus, arvorsarius. Vel. Long. 71. 22 K.), arveniet (Gl. Plac.), arferia (Paul. Fest. 8. 32 Th.; Gloss. ap. Löwe Prodr. p. 13) was vinarium quo vinum ad aras ferovante; cf. adferial, Gl. Cyr.). In Cato we find arehko (e.g. R. R. 135. 7; 138); and on inscriptions asfuerunt, arfuise and arvorsum (C. I. L. i. 156) in the S. C. de Bacchanalibus of 186 B. C., arvorsario beside advascularium (i. 158), in the Lex Repetundarum of 123–2 B. C., arvorsu (ix. 782). Apor (Mar. Viet. 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 qui recte in the augur's formula for marking out a templum (Varro, L. L. vii. 8) is a doubtful example; and arbuaiter (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 as in usia cotidie loquentium (Consent. 392. 15 K.) peres for pides (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. diee and ricee for Ital. dieere in the Abruzzi; Napolitan ruree for Ital. dodici, and (like Consentius' peres) dure for Ital. piude, &c. Arger persisted in Vulgar Latin (Ital. argine, 'a dam,' Span. areen, 'a parapet.') Arbitrato, from the root (get- of Lat. 106 (O. Scand. at-kvæda, 'a decision') seems to be dialectal. O. Umbr. adputrati, in Lat. 'arbiteratu' (cf. mærerula, the form used by Plautus, classical mændula with the termination of acredula, fiodula, querquéduia, mætida, aècle; and the glosses mæridus for mædïus, solearare for sōdare, mascerad for mæridad (Löwe, Prodr. 352; Opusc. 142). The change of d to r in O. Lat. arfuerunt (preserved in the formula scr. arf. scribendo arfuerunt), &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 avercleãa from audio, and mærdis (older mæridis, Adv.) from mædis and dies. This explanation of meridies is probably right, the r being due to dissimulation (cf. Cic. Orat. xlvii. 157 jam videtur nescire dulceis, ipsum meridiem eur non 'medidem'; Varro, L. L. vi. 4, says that mætidies was the old form, and that he had seen it on a Praenestine sundial: meridies ab eo quod mediis dies. d antiqui, non r, in hoc dicebant, ut Praeneste incisum in solario vidit), though a good deal may be said for the derivation from merus (cf. mero meride, Petr. 37. p. 25. B.), and the Praenestine D seen by Varro may have been merely an old form of the letter R, as laïnod, laïnei on all coins e. c. 250 B. C.) of Larinum (modern Larino) (C. I. L. i. 24) may show the Ocean D, the symbol of r, as R was of d. Isidore (Orig. xii. 7. 69) similarly explains mërëla: mærula antiquitatis 'medula' vocabatur, eo quod modulatur; and Varro (L. L. v. 110) derives perna 'a pede.'

Modern etymologists explain in the same way glæra (Gk. χαρέα), possibly a dialectal form, simétur (ch. ix. § 8) beside simitu, and other words of doubtful origin (see Wharton, Latin Consommt Laws, in Phil. Soc. Trans. 1889, on cærea, płőra, &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. Căldicus, a loanword from Gk κρύπνων (Dor. κάρ-) may owe its d to a fanciful connexion of the word with κάλλις. In Umbrian ar- is found for the Preposition ad in compounds perhaps only before f, v-. e.g. arveitum ‘advehito,’ orfertur (and arfertur) ‘adfertor’ (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 Lat. *cesarviba*, *Aelēvρος, according to Quint. i. 46 [we find *Alēzeronem* (C.I.I. i. 50), *Aeliznente(r), Casenten*a (i. 150i), on old inscriptions from Praeneste). So Gk. *Tērhoś*, -övros, Lat. *Hydratuum*, is modern Otranto, Lat. *nutrio* is for *noutrio* (§ 42) (Lith. nouda, 'use,' Goth. niutan, 'to enjoy,' Germ. genissen); *taeto* for *taeto-ru* (cf. taetet); so *ütter, Gen. utīris (Gk. ὑππία); lītra, an otter, may be a malformation of *üttra* (O. Ind. udra-, Lith. ādra, Engl. otter). The group *dr* is not found in Latin, except in *quadru-, quadra, &c.* (but cf. *tīktrus*). 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 inventit; *antruare* and *ānu* (Paul. Fest. 7. 15 Th.) are very doubtful spellings of *antruare* (antroare) and *true* (ib. l. 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. *dhūmo- (O. Ind. dhūmā-, Gk. θυμός, Lith. dūmai Pl., O. Sl. dymū), Lat. *fūmus*; I.-Eur. *rūdro- (Gk. ḗρυδρός, O. Sl. rūdrū; cf. O. Ind. rudhirā-), Lat. *rīber, stem rūbro-; I.-Eur. root *bheidh- (Gk. πείθω for *φείθω*), Lat. *fīdo*. 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 *Alpa* (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-Osc. *f*, whether initial or internal, e.g. Umbr. *fačia, Osc. fakiiad 'faciat,' Umbr. *rufra 'rubra, ' Osc. *mešiai '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).

§ 115. Other examples of I.-Eur. *dh*. (1) Initial: I.-Eur. root *dhe-, dhek-, to place, do* (Gk. ἐ-θη-ν, ἐ-θῃ-α, Arm. d-nem, 'I place,' Goth. ga-dē-þs, Engl. deed, Lith. dē-ti, O. Sl. dē-ti, 'to lay'); Lat. *fæt-*, but with *dh* medial, *condo* (fæc-shows the weak grade of *dh-*); I.-Eur. root *dhe-, dhey-, to suck, ' (O. Ind. dhāyāmi, Arm. diem, Gk. ἰδοθα, O. Ir. dith 3 Sg. Pret., Goth. dādjan, 'to suckle,' O. Sl. děťe, 'an infant'); Lat. *fēto, usually spelt fēlo, fētus* (§ 7). Similarly Lat. *forum* (Lith. dvāras, 'court,' O. Sl. dvorù); Lat. *fōco, fāxīla* from the I.-Eur. root *dheqht-, 'to burn' (O. Ind. da-, Lith. degu, Gk. ῥέφα for *θφρα, ashes) (the original meaning of *fōco* was 'to warm' (see the dictionaries, and cf. Paul. Fest. 60. 15 Th. a fovendu, id est calefaciendo); hence *fōculum, a fire-pan, e. g. Plaut. Capt. 847 fōveri fociulis ferventibus*.

(2) Medial: from I.-Eur. root *reudh-, 'to be red ' (O. Ind. rōhita-, 'red, lōhā-,
‘metal,’ Gk. ἰ-πειδή, O. Ir. ruad, ‘red,’ ‘strong,’ Gaul. Roudou, W. rhudd, Goth. rauþs, ‘red,’ O. H. G. rost, ‘rust,’ O. Sl. růžiti, ‘to blush,’ ruda, ‘metal,’ růžda, ‘rust’) come Lat. raudus, rūdus and rūdus, unshaped metal, rūdis, unshaped, and with b, besides řuber mentioned above, řüen, řūdes, řūbor, řūdigo, while řūfis with f, is dialectal; from I.-Eur. root ḷbindh- ‘to bind’ (O. Ind. bándhana, Gk. πεῖδυμα for *πεῖδυμα, πεῖδους, Goth. bindan), Lat. affix (§ 79) with a, while Lat. umbus shows b for dh (or dhv?) (O. Sl. łądvija, O. Engl. lenden), and b appears for dh of the suffix dhl- (see ch. v. § 26), in tri-bulum, stōbulum, &c. as -bro- for I.-Eur. dhro- in crī-brum, vertē-brā, &c.; I.-Eur. *medhyo- (O. Ind. mādhyaa-, Gk. μέσος, Goth. midjís), Lat. médīus; I.-Eur. root aidh-, ‘to burn’ (O. Ind. ēdha-, ‘firewood,’ Gk. ἀίδω, O. Ir. āid, ‘fire,’ O. Engl. āid, ‘pyre’), Lat. aedes, house, lit. ‘hearth.’ Similarly Lat. vidua (O. Ind. vidhāvā, O. Ir. fedb, Goth. vídurô, O. Sl. vidova); fōdilia (Gk. πῖθος); grādus (Goth. griþs); vādes (Goth. vadi, Germ. Wette, Lith. vadūtī, ‘to redeem’); āber (O. Ind. ûdhār, Gk. ὠδῶρ, O. Engl. ūder); combretum, a bulrush (cf. Lith. szveņdrai Pl.); barba for *farba (§ 104) (Engl. beard, O. Sl. brada, Lith. barz-dā); arbos (O. Ind. ardh-, ‘to grow, thrive’); glāber (O. H. G. glat, ‘smooth,’ Engl. glad, Lith. glodās, ‘smooth,’ O. Sl. gladūkū); verbum (Goth. vaurd, Neut., Lith. vađas, ‘a name’).

§ 116. The Gutturals. There are three series of Gutturals, viz.
(1) Palatals (in some languages Sibilants, e.g. O. Ind. śatām, Lith. sziimtas, O. Sl. süto, ‘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. κόκκυς, Lat. cuculūs; cf. Lith. kukūtī, ‘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, Osc. petora, ‘four,’ corresponding to Lat. quattuor). They are most conveniently written, (1) k, ḷ, &c., (2) k, g, &c., (3) q, ḷ, &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. krę-), nor does the kw of equus, &c. (O. Ind. áśvā-) present a different appearance from the q of quattuor, sequor (O. Ind. sac-). I.-Eur. ḷ and k became Lat. c (k), ḷ and g Lat. g, ḷh and gh became a guttural spirant, which was written g with a consonant, elsewhere h; I.-Eur. q is Lat. qu (which we might write kv, kw), q is Latin qu, pv (gq), 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 became w in ‘warm,’ ‘snow,’ &c. It lost its g also when medial between vowels. I.-Eur. gh became a guttural spirant
followed by a \( w \)-sound, which was written with a consonant \( gu \) or \( g \), but elsewhere became \( hw \), this \( hw \) developing at the beginning of a word into \( f \) [just as the Greek \( hw \)-sound from I.-Eur. initial \( sw \)-seems to have developed into some \( f \)-sound (ch. i. \$ 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. \$ 75), Media and Aspirate, &c.; e.g. the guttural Media seems to replace the Aspirate in Lat. \( \lambda \iota \gamma \nu \rho \omicron \rho i o \) (cf. lingo), from the root \( \lambda i \heta h \)-, 'to lick' (Gk. \( \lambda \epsilon \iota \chi \omega \), Lat. \( a d a g i o \), \( p r o d i g i u m \), from the root \( a \gamma h \)-, 'to say' (O. Ind. \( a h \)-), Lat. \( f \iota \gamma a r a \) (cf. fingo) from the root \( d \heta h \)-, 'to mould,' (O. Ind. \( d \iota h \)-, 'to smear,') just as we find the labial Media replacing the Aspirate in Gk. \( \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \beta \omega \) beside \( \dot{\omega} \tau \tau \epsilon \mu \varphi \eta \). 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. \( \gamma \nu \nu \eta ^1 \) (Boeot. \( \beta a \nu \alpha \), O. Ir. \( b a n \)), \( \lambda \dot{\omega} k o s \) (diai. Lat. \( l \dot{u} \rho \) \( u s \)); 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 \( c o l l u m \) is a palatal or a true guttural. We are also confronted with an apparently I.-Eur. dialetcal change of \( q ^2 \) to \( p \), perhaps made in order to avoid that similarity between two successive syllables which was so sought after in Latin (\$ 163). Thus the I.-Eur. word for 'five' may have been *\( q \tilde{e} n q ^2 \tilde{e} \) in one dialect (O. Ind. \( p \alpha \nu \alpha \), Gk. \( \pi \varepsilon \tau e \), &c.), *\( q \tilde{e} n q ^5 \tilde{e} \) in another (Lat. \( q u i n q u e \), O. Ir. \( c o i c \)); the root meaning 'to cook,' \( p e q ^3 \) - (O. Ind. \( p a c \)-, Gk. \( \pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \omega \)), \( q ^2 \tilde{e} q ^3 \)- (W. pobi, with \( p \)- from I.-Eur. \( q ^3 \), Lat. \( c \tilde{o} q u u s \)), and even \( q ^5 \tilde{e} p \)- (Lith. \( k e p \). What of Gk. \( \delta \rho \tau o - \kappa \omicron \tau o s \)?) The same explanation has been suggested for the \( q ^3 \) of Lat. \( q u e c u s \) beside the \( p \)- of O. Engl. furch, Engl. fir, and for the \( p \)- of Goth. fidvörr, Engl. four, beside the \( q ^3 \) of other languages, e.g. Lat. \( q u a t t u o r \).

A Latin Guttural, to whatever series it belongs, combines with a following \( s \) into \( x \), e.g. \( v e x i \) from \( v \check{e} h o \) (I.-Eur. \( \check{g} h \)), before \( l \) becomes the group \( e l \), e.g. \( v e c t u s \), \( a c t u s \), which in late Latin

\(^1\) So \( w \) is dropped before the \( u \)-sound in Engl. 'two.'
came to be pronounced it (Ital. atto), before n, m becomes the
group gn, gm, e.g. in from ilun, see accord cygnus
from kivkos. Initial gn- became n- at the beginning of the
second cent. B.C., e.g. natus. But luna does not stand for *lucna,
but for *lucsna (Zend raoxšna-; 'shining,' Pruss. launus,
'stars'), as we see from the old form on a Praenestine mirror,
Losna (C. I. L. i. 55), just as velum, a sail, stands for *vex-lum
(O. Sl. veslo, 'a rudder'), as we see from the Diminutive form
vexillum, so that Gk. lóxos has been declared to represent
*avkños (M. S. L. vii. 91). Another instance of Greek χv
appearing in Latin as n with long vowel is the (loanword ?)
arânea (Gk. ἀράχνη). Exămen beside agmen, amb-āges (on
exagmen see Class. Rev. v. 294), contâmino beside contāgium;
[contrast propagmen (Enn. Ann. 587 M.) beside propāgo, and cf. sub-
tēmen 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,
*exāg-men becoming *exāmmen, exâmen, while āg-men remains
agmen; (2) that the Guttural is assimilated in the unaccented
syllable (under the earlier Accent Law), whence exâmen but
āgmen; (3) that the unassimilated forms had originally a connect-
ing vowel, e.g. āg(terrorism) (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, exâmen for *ex-ax-men from
*agš-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,
māgis, adagio, prōdīgium, 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 *māhior
(cf. O. Ind. māhiyas-); puřēum, fleabane, apparently from puřex,
a flea, may be dialectal, like Umbr. mvierto P. P. P., with i for
palatalized g, beside mugatu Imperat.; brēvis (Gk. βραχός) will
represent an older trisyllable brehuis, and lēvis (Gk. λαχός:
what of ἔλαφρος ?) an older *lehuis, while pinguis (Gk. παχύς),
where the Aspirate is preceded by the consonant *n, will represent an older trisyllabic form *pinguis (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), congus (O. Ind. śanská-, 'a shell,' Gk. κόνυς, Lett. sence). On dat. cl for I.-Eur. -tl-, e.g. pōc(u)lin see § 105; on cc for cc, e.g. ac for *at, atque, hoc for *hod-c(e), § 109; on the mispronunciations ss, sc for x, 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. fēgitó for fēvito, ch. viii. § 7), in the latter, it, e.g. dēitu (Lat. dīcito). In Osc. both are kt, e.g. fruktatiuif 'fru(v)itationes,' factud 'facito,' while I.-Eur. q²t (not due to Syncope) is Umbro-Osc. kt, and I.-Eur. įkt, kt (not due to Syncope) is Umbro-Osc. ht (for examples see Buck, Vocalismus Osk. Sprache, p. 145).

§ 117. x for Guttural with s. Voxi from vēho (I.-Eur. root wegh-, 'to carry'); panicx (cf. Gk. πάνγος); fluxi from fingo (I.-Eur. dheigh-); nix for *(s)nighs; cox from cōquo; līxa, prō-lixus, elliuxs from liquor for *eliquor (O. Ir. fliusch, 'wet,' W. gwylb). Before most consonants x became s, e.g. sesceni for *sex-ceni, (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 *lustres-; on Sestius, mishtus, see ch. ii. § 125), while before m, n, l it was (like s for I.-Eur. s, e.g. quālus for *quas-lus, cf. quasilus, § 151) dropped with 'Compensation,' e.g. pālis for *pæx-lus (Dim. pāxillus); ālta, wing, shoulder, for *tæx-la (Dim. axilla), like axis, an axle, from the root ag- of āgo (O. H. G. ahsala, 'shoulder,' W. echel, 'an axle,' Engl. axle); tēlum, for *tæx-lum, from texo, to shape (O. H. G. dehsala, 'an axe,' O. Sl. tesla; tīla, for *tæx-la, from texo, to weave (Ter. Hœat. 285 textem telam); tālus, for *tæx-lus (Dim. taxillus); sēni for *sex-ni; aula, Dim. auxilla.

§ 118. ct for Guttural with t. Vectus, with vectis, a lever, from vēho (gh); pantem and punctum from pango (g?); fictum from fingo (gh); luctus, grief, from lūgeo (gh); cōctum from cōquo (q²); nicto, to wink; cf. co-níveo (gh³). After a consonant c was dropped in course of time (§ 157), e.g. fortis, in O. Lat. fortis [in the XII Tables forctes 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 'forctes' (leg. 'forctis') frugi et bonus, sive validus]; quintus, in the older spelling quinctus, the older form being long retained in the names Quinctilus, Quinticius, Quinetilis, &c. (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). On Vulg. and Late-Lat. tt for ct, e.g. brattea, see ch. ii. § 95, and cf. Rhein. Mus. xlv. p. 493.

§ 119. gn, gm for cn, cm. Like ilignus from ilex are larignus from lārix, salignus from salix; similarly segmentum from seco; dignus, usually explained as *dec-nus
from *dēcēt*, but better as *die-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 *aprinus*; *aprinus* is an entirely different formation (see Georges,
Lex. Wortf. s. v.). After a consonant the Guttural is dropped, e. g. *querinus* for
*quere-nus* from *quercus*; *farnus* for *farg-nus*, a byform of *fraxinus*, though not in
Compounds with *ad*, &c., e. g. *agnosco*. When the consonant is a Nasal, it seems
to combine with the following Nasal, e. g. *quini* for *quinc-ni*, so that *contānūmo*
might stand for *con-tang-mino* as well as for *con-taug-mino*. Compounds with
*in*, *con* show different spellings; *in-* with *gnosco* gives *ignosco*, *con-* with *gnosco*
both *cognosco* and *cōnescosco*, as *con-* with *necto* gives *cōnecto*, &c. (cf. eh. ii. § 130).

Initial Latin gn became at the beginning of the second cent. B. C. n (as in
Engl. *gnat*), e. g. *nōscō*, older *gnōsco* (*gn-*), *mutus*, older *gnātus* (*gn-*)
(*gnatāre* πᾶνσωκνᾶν, C. G. L. ii. 35. 10), *nīxus*, older *gnīxus* (*kn-*; cf. O. H. G. *hnīgan*,
Germ. *neigen*), *nārīs*, older *gnārīs* (*gnaurūc* *pruīsēra*, C. G. L. ii. 35. 12), *nātus*,
older *gnātus*, *Naevius* (cf. Gk. *Naos* on the Mon. Anc.) beside *Gnaeus* (cf. Gnaevōd, 
Abl., on a Scipio epitaph, C. I. L. i. 30). For instances of the older forms, see
Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., and Löwe, Prodr. 354: e. g. *gnoscer* on the S. C. Baech.
of 156 B. C., C. I. L. i. 196. 27, but *natrium, noverit* (beside *gnatos Part.*) on the Lex
Repetundarm of 122-122 B. C., i. 198; *natus* Part. on the Sont. Minuciorum
of 117 B. C., i. 199. Plautus and Terence use, as a rule, *natus* for the Participle,
*gnatus* for the Substantive; the *g* of these forms appears in the Compounds
*agnosco*, *agnatus*, *ignarius*, *ignavus*, &c., and strangely also in *agnomen*, *cognomen*;
for *nōnem* (so in S. C. Baech.) was not originally *gnomen* (cf. O. Ind. *nāma*),
and for the various forms of the root, see B. B. xvii. 132). On *crūnsculum* and
Gk. *κρῶφας*, see § 80.

§ 120. Lat. h dropped between vowels. *Bimus* for *bi-himus*, lit. *two winters
old,* like Engl. twinter, a two-year old beast (cf. *χίμαρος*, goat, lit. *a winter
old,* Scotch gimmer, a yearling lamb); *nil* (so always in Plautus), for *nīhil*,
*nīhilum* from *nī* and *hilum* (cf. Enn. A. 8 M. nec *dispendi facit hilum*;
Lucil. xiv. 11 M. hilo non sectius vivas; Lucr. iii. 850 nil *igitur mors est ad nos
neque pertinet hilum*), *hilum* being explained as *quod grano fabae adhaeret*
(Paul. Fest. 72. 10 Th.); *praebeo* for *prachĕbo*; *cors* for *cōhors*. On the *h* of *dēminus*
( *aenus*) for *ayēs-no-,* and on the question whether *h* was used in *vehemens*,
&c. to indicate a long vowel (as in Umbrian, e. g. *comohōta* *commōta*),
see eh. 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 *hāsēna* ascribed 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, *Fircellius*) and *febus*.
Similar forms roughly classed by the grammarians as *Old Latin* we may
believe to have been dialectal, e. g. *fordeum* for *hordaem*, *falus* for *hīlus*, *fostis* for
*hostis*, *fostia* 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.
A Faliscan inscription has foied for *hodie* (Not. Scav. 1887, pp. 262, 397): foied
*uno pipafo kra karefo* 'hodie vinum bibam, cras carebo,' but a Sabine inscription
has *hirtum*, apparently from the root *gher-* (?gher-) (Osc. *heriadi*, Gk.
*χαίρω*, &c.), and Ter. Scaurus (13. 9 K.) quotes *hoba* (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, Altitatilische Forschungen, iii. p. 114.) Lat. fel has been explained as a dialectal form for *kel (cf. Gk. χόρος), and fovea for *hovea (Gk. χώνæa) (cf. the gloss 'fuma' terra, C. G. L. v. 296. 50).

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

I.-Eur. k, Lat. c, is seen in I.-Eur. *ktom, 'hundred' (O. Ind. štám, Gk. εκατόν, O. Ir. cēt, W. cant, Goth. hund, Lith. šiūmaitas), Lat. centum; *swēkūro-, 'step-father' (O. Ind. śvāsura-, Arm. skesur F., Gk. ἐκτός, O. Corn. hwigeren, hweger F., Goth. svaihra, Germ. Schwihai, Lith. szeszuras), Lat. sōcer; *úktō(u), 'eight' (O. Ind. aşťau, aśṭā, Gk. δέκα, O. Ir. ocht, W. wyth, Goth. altau, O. Engl. eahta, Lith. asztūni, O. Sl. osmī), Lat. ėctū. I.-Eur. kw was merged in gu, the representative of I.-Eur. q; thus I.-Eur. *ékwo-, 'horse' (O. Ind. áśva-; cf. Lith. aszvā, 'mare,' &c.) is Lat. equus.

I.-Eur. ķ is Umbro-Osc. k, e.g. Umbr. kletram Acc., 'a litter' (Gk. κλίνω, &c.), Kluvīer, Osc. Kluvatium from the root Klēu- (Lat. clveo, Gk. κλέω, &c.), (von Planta, i. p. 326). In Umbrian k (whether from I.-Eur. ķ or k) was palatalized before e, i, and was written in the native alphabet by a sign which we conventionally express by ç, in the Latin alphabet by s (sometimes z), e.g. ĉersnatūr, ĉesua (Lat. cēna, Osc. kersma-) (ib. p. 359).

§ 123. Other examples of I.-Eur. k. From I.-Eur. root weĩk-, 'to enter' (O. Ind. viš-, vičā-, M., 'a tent,' Gk. φόρεω, Alb. vis M., 'a place,' Goth. veilai, 'a village,' Lith. vėsėti, 'to be lodged,' O. Sl. viši, 'a farm'), Lat. vicus; I.-Eur. *vyuňko- (O. Ind. yuvāśā-, Gk. γυναικώσ, O. Ir. ñac, W. ieuanc, Goth. juggs), Lat. jūvenus; I.-Eur. *krd-, 'heart' (O. Ind. ērad-dhā, 'confidence,' Arm. sirt, Gk. καρδία, O. Ir. crīde, Goth. hártō, Lith. szirdis, O. Sl. srídice), Lat. cor, crēdo; I.-Eur. root Klēu-, 'to hear' (O. Ind. šru-, Gk. κλώ, O. Ir. clōr, cluinim, W. clwyd Inf., Goth. hlīu-ma, 'hearing,' O. Sl. sluti, 'to be famous'), Lat. clueo; I.-Eur. *pōrko- (Gk. πόρως, O. Ir. orc, O. Engl. ear, Engl. farow, Lith. paršas, O. Sl. prasē), Lat. porcus; I.-Eur. *hi-, a Demonstrative Pronoun-stem (Arm. s-, Gk. κε, Alb. si, O. Ir. cē, Goth. hī-mna, Lith. šis, O. Sl. sī), Lat. cis, citer, citra; I.-Eur. Klei-, 'to lean' (O. Ind. śrī, Gk. кλως, O. Ir. cloen, 'awry,' Goth. hlains, 'a hill,' Lith. šluistas), Lat. ac-clinis, citris; I.-Eur. *dēkū, 'ten' (O. Ind. dāsā, Arm. tasn, Gk. ἄκι, O. Ir. deich, W. deg, Goth. tajun, Lith. dzēzimt, O. Sl. desēti), Lat. dēcem; I.-Eur. root deĩk-, 'to point, say' (O. Ind. diā, Gk. ἀναρμυμ, Goth. gatelan, 'to proclaim'), Lat. dicere, indicare; I.-Eur. root prēk-, 'to ask' (O. Ind. prā-nā-, 'a question,' O. Ir. imm-ehom-arci, 'I ask,' O. W. di-er-
chim, Goth. fraih-na, Germ. frage, Lith. praszaũ, O. Sl. prošq), Lat. prēcor. Similarly Lat. crābro for *crēsro (cf. Lith. szirštû, O. Sl. srūšenî, Engl. hornet); aeus, ācer, &c. from the root āk-; 'to be sharp' (O. Ind. āsri-, 'edge,' Arm. aseλn, 'a needle,' Lith. asztrūs, 'sharp,' O. Sl. ostrû, &c.); cēvērum for *cerēs-rum (cf. O. Ind. śiras-, N., 'head,' Gk. κάπα, &c.).

§ 124. I.-Eur. kw. Lat. combretum, bulrush, from the stem kwēndhr-, seen in Lith. szveņdrâ Pl., has been compared to sīvör for *swēsor- (§ 68) but it more probably shows the O-grade of the stem, *swombr-tum (cf. O. Scand. hvōn 'angelica'), with reduction of quō- to co- as in cēlo for older quolo (cf. § 137).

§ 125. Ġ. Of I.-Eur. ġ, Lat. g, we have examples in the I.-Eur. roots ġen-, ġnō-, 'to know, learn' (O. Ind. jā-nā-mi, jātā-, Arm. can-eay Aor., Gk. γνω-σκω, γνωτός, O. Ĳr. gnāthis, 'accustomed,' W. gnawd, O. Engl. cnāwen, Engl. to know, Lith. žin-ōtis, O. Sl. zna-tî), Lat. gnō-scio, gnō-tus; melg-, 'to milk' (O. Ind. mrj-, 'to wipe off,' Gk. ἀμέλγω, O. Ĳr. bligim, O. Engl. melce, Lith. mēžu, O. Sl. mluzq), Lat. mulgeo.

I.-Eur. ġw would be indistinguishable in Latin from I.-Eur. ġ²; thus ġvēlo (cf. Gk. ψφός), if connected with the root weg-, 'to be strong' (cf. Gk. ψφυς), shows v between vowels for ġw.

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

§ 126. Other examples of I.-Eur. ġ. I.-Eur. ġeus-, 'to taste' (O. Ind. juš-, Gk. γεω for *γενω, O. Ĳr. to-gu, 'I choose,' Goth. kiusa), Lat. gustus; I.-Eur. reģ-, 'to stretch, rule' (O. Ind. rj-, ráj- or ráj-an-, 'king,' ὀ-ργα, O. Ĳr. rigim, rig Gen., Gaul. Catu-rigês, W. rhi, Goth. uf-rakja, Lith. rāčau), Lat. rēgo, rēgis Gen.; I.-Eur. ġon-, 'to beget' (O. Ind. jan-, jānas-, Arm. ein, Gk. γενεωμα, gêros, O. Ĳr. gēnar Pft., gēn, W. gēni, genid, Goth. kuni, 'race,' Engl. kin), Lat. gi-gn-o, gēnus. Similarly Lat. argentum (Zend erzata-, Arm. arcat'; cf. O. Ind. ārjuna-, 'white,' Gk. ἀργυίς) Lat. glos (Gk. γάλας, O. Sl. zlûva) Lat. āgo (O. Ind. aj-, Arm. acem, Gk. ἀγα, O. Ĳr. ag-, O. Scand. a₉a), Lat. grānum (O. Ind. jīrā-, 'crushed,' Goth. kaurn, Lith. žirmis, 'apea,' O. Sl. zrino); Lat. gēnu (O. Ind. jānu, Arm. cunr, Gk. γῖνω, Goth. kniu N., O. Engl. eneō N.) Lat. vēgeo, vīgētus (O. Ind. vaj-, 'to be strong,' Zond vax-, Gk. ψφώς, Engl. I wake, Germ. wacker); Lat. gēlu (O. Sl. žlêdica) (on ġ instead of òl, see § 10).

§ 127. ĠH. I.-Eur. ġh is in Latin k, but g before or after a consonant, e.g. I.-Eur. *ģhôrtô- (Gk. χόρπος, O. Ĳr. gort, Lith. żarðis), Lat. hortus; I.-Eur. root wegh- (O. Ind. vah-, Gk. ἀχος, Goth. ga-viga, Whit gl. waggon, Lith. wežû,
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O. Sl. vezq), Lat. vēho; I.-Eur. root angh- (O. Ind. ḍhas-, ‘need,’ Arm. anjuk, ‘narrow;’ Gk. ἀγγεῖον, O. Ir. cam-un, ‘narrow,’ Goth. angvus, O. Engl. ange, Germ. eng, O. Sl. ązukić), Lat. angus, angor, angustus; Lat. grando (O. Ind. hrādūnī). A good example of the rule for ę and ō is mingo beside mejo for *meiho, from the root mei̯gh- (O. Ind. mih-, Lith. mūsā, Gk. ῥυχεῖον).

I.-Eur. ęhw was in Latin merged in I.-Eur. ęh, e.g. I.-Eur. *ęhwēr-, ‘a wild animal’ (Gk. ὥρ, Thess. ὧρ, Lith. žvėris, O. Sl. žvērī), 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 *dheuso-, cf. Lat. ķāro for *ľūso?).

I.-Eur. ĕ is in Umbro-Osc. h, as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. hondra, Osc. huntro- from the root of Lat. hūmus (von Planta, i. p. 436). On ĥ for ŏ in Sabine fāsera ‘harena,’ &c., see above § 121.

§ 128. Other examples of I.-Eur. ĕh. Lat. hiems (O. Ind. himā-, Arm. jīun, Gk. χιών, χειμών, O. Ir. γαμ, O. W. gaem, Lith. žemā, O. Sl. zima); Lat. hūmus (O. Ind. jma- F., Gk. χειμά, Lith. žemė, O. Sl. zemlja); Lat. hūmus, older helus, helvus (§ 10) (O. Ind. hāri-, ‘yellow,’ O. Ir. gel, ‘white,’ O. Engl. geolo, Engl. yellow, Lith. želū, ‘I grow green,’ O. Sl. zelije, ‘vegetables’); Lat. tingō (O. Ind. lih-, Arm. lizum, Gk. λίξα, Goth. bli-aigō, Lith. lišū, O. Sl. liža); Lat. (h)anser (O. Ind. ķas-, Gk. χῖπ, O. Ir. ķeis, ‘a swan,’ Engl. goose, Lith. žūsis); Lat. ūngō (O. Ind. dīh-, ‘to smear,’ dēhī, ‘a wall,’ Arm. dizem, Gk. τεῖξος, O. Ir. dengaim, ‘I fasten,’ Goth. daigan, ‘I mould,’ daigs, ‘dough,’ Germ. Teig); Lat. hiare (O. H. G. ķin, Engl. to yawn, Lith. žioti, O. Sl. zijati).

§ 129. The Gutturals Proper: K, G, GH, KH. These appear as Gutturals in all the I.-Eur. languages. The fact that the I.-Eur. onomatopoeic name for the cuckoo shows this form of Guttural (O. Ind. kōka-, Gk. κοκκυξ, Lat. cucīlus, 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. cē-, kāṭa-, ‘mat,’ Gk. κάρπαλος, basket, Goth. haurds F., ‘door,’ Engl. hurdle), Lat. crātēs, cartilago; I.-Eur. kerp-, ‘to cut, reap’ (O. Ind. kṛpāṇa-, ‘a sword,’ Gk. καρπός, fruit, Engl. harvest, Lith. kerpū, ‘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).


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).


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

§ 133. GH. I.-Eur. gh, like I.-Eur. ģh, 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, hos(t)ipes (O. Lat. hostis, ‘stranger,’ Varro L. L. v. 3); I.-Eur. root ghred- (O. Ir. ingrennim, ‘I pursue,’ Goth. gripts, ‘a step,’ O. Sl. greďa, ‘I come’), Lat. gradior (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.

§ 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 Planta, i. pp. 331 sqq.). Qʰ. I.-Eur. qʰ is Lat. qu (but qoi for classical qui on the Dvenos inscription). Before u we find c, e.g. sēcūlus from sequor, a change which may have been very ancient (see § 116). Before o this qu, though often retained in writing, seems to have come to sound like c; hence quōquo-, a cook, was written coquo- as well as quoquo-, and on the other hand the Preposition cum, older cōm [for kom or kom (Osc. kŭm, Umbr. -kum)], was written quom till the time of the Gracchi, and the P. P. P. of occīlo, from a root kel- or kel- (W. celu), appears with the spelling oquolto on the S. C. de Bacech. of 186 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 196). When in the eighth cent. A. u. c. o before a final consonant, came to be universally changed in spelling (see § 20) to u, we find the spelling quo (guo) replaced by cu (gu), so that ēquos became eicus (Gen. equi), quoquos or coquos became coccus (Gen. coqui). The grammarians of the first cent. A. d. were puzzled by the want of analogy between ecus Nom., and equi Gen., &c., and reconstituted the Nom. as equus, &c. Instances of I.-Eur. qʰ in Latin are: I.-Eur. root seqʰ (O. Ind. sac-, Gk. ēpomai, O. Ir. sechur, Lith. sekū), Lat. sequor; I.-Eur. root leiqʰ- (O. Ind. rie-, Arm. e-liq, ‘he left,’ Gk. λείπω, O. Ir. lēcim, Goth. leihva, ‘I lend,’ Germ. leihe, Lith. lekū), Lat. linquo; I.-Eur. *qʰ-i- (O. Ind. -eid Neut., Gk. τί for *τίδ, O. Sl. či-to ‘what?’), Lat. quid Indef.; I.-Eur. *qʰ ê (O. Ind. ca, Gk. τε, O. Ir. -ch, W. -p, Goth. -h), Latin -quē. Before a consonant this qu became c, e.g. sōcius, older *socyo- from the o-grade of the root seqʰ, with the adjectival suffix -yo- (O. Ind. sācya-, Gk. ἄ-σος-ητήρ, with σο for κυ); dēcūlus, older *oclo- from the root qoʰ-, ‘to see’ (Gk. ὁσε, with σο for κυ, ὁμα for *ομ-μα, Lith. akis, O. Sl. oko) with the suffix -lo.

I.-Eur. qʰw has been postulated for the initial u (v) of ubi (Osc. puf, Umbr. pufe), ūt, ӯti (cf. Osc. puz, Umbr. puze) (with cu in the middle of a word, e.g. si-cūbi), vāpor (Lith. kvāpas), in-nilus and in-nilō (Pruss. quāits, ‘will’, Lith. kvēčziu, ‘I invite’), &c. (see K. Z. xxxii. 405).
In Umbro-Osc. I.-Eur. q-third 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. q-third, Lat. qua: other examples. Lat. quattuor (O. Ind. catvāras, Arm. ścirk), Ion. Gk. τέσσερες, Aeol. Gk. πέντες, O. Ir. cethir, W. pedwar, Gaulo-Lat. petor-ritum, Lith. ketūri, O. Sl. ćetyrije); Lat. quinque (O. Ind. pānca, Arm. hing, Gk. πέντε, O. Ir. ćīc, W. pump, Lith. penki); Lat. quī, quam, &c. (O. Ind. kā, Gk. πόθεν, ἤ, 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 arquitēnens, arquites, the old word for sāgittārii (Paul. Fest. 15. 32 Th.) the change to -cu- appears to be Italic and not merely Latin, if Umbr. arslata- (cf. Paul. Fest. 1a. 15 ‘arslata’ diecobantur circuli, qui ex farina in sacrificialis fiebant) comes from arcus; from quinque come quincuncx, quincuplex; from sesquse comes sesquiplus (but cf. Lōwe, Prodr. p. 403).

(2) Before a consonant: Lat. nēc for nēquē, ac from *atē for atque, with Syncope of -ē before an initial consonant (ch. iii. § 36); torcīlus from torquē; cóitum from cóquo. On ot for q-third, x for q-third, see § 116.

(3) Before o: cōlo (older quolo: we have golont in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plantus, Pseud. 322, and quolondam on the inscription of the Faliscan collegium coquorum,’ which also has quaquei for coqui, Zv. I. I. I. 72) beside inquitus; cōlus, a distaff (Gk. πῶλος, an axile). The fact that quo (I.-Eur. qo or kwō) had come to be pronounced like co (I.-Eur. ko or ko) 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. coquo but only loqui (ch. iii. § 42). But the indiscriminate spelling of every quo 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 quo as the spelling in the Nom. Sg. of equus, &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 eucus, 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. Pseud. 382; cf. quaquei 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 favēbo (Quint. vi. 3. 47). The spelling eucus, &c., was instituted by Vellius 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. oquepare, pequunia, &c., and has collected those passages of the grammarians which bear on the subject. A list of the instances of the spelling quom for cum in the MSS. of Plantus is given by Probat, Gebrauch von ‘ut’ bei Terenz, p. 178 n.) I.-Eur. qui did not, as is often stated, become quō, cō in Latin (as
it did in Celtic, e.g. Ir. cóic, W. pump, but Lat. quinque); and though -wē after other initial consonants appears as ð in Latin sōcer (swēk-), sōtor (swēs-), &c., it probably did not after a palatal; for the evidence points to kw, ġw, &c. having been merged in qū, qū in Latin. Combrētium, bulrūs, may show the O-grade of the stem kwandhr- of Lith. šveiđrau Pl. (cf. O. Scand. hvōn "angelica").

§ 138. Lat. qu of other origin. We have already seen that L.-Eur. kw became qu in Latin, e.g. I.-Eur. *ekwo-, 'horse' (O. Ind. āśva-, cf. Lith. ašvā, 'mare'), Lat. āquus. The guttural of lācūs (Gk. λάκκος, 'a tank,' O. Ir. loch), lacūnar, is not L.-Eur. qa, but when followed by a consonantal u we find qu in āqueār. The occasional spelling sterrquārium (see Georges, Lex. Worfi. s. v.) may be like that usage of Late Latin orthography, whereby qui is written for Greek κυ, e.g. quinicus, helquāstion, liquititia (see ch. ii. § 28), the ui being meant to express the ṛ-sound of Greek ṛ, 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. ġu is in Latin v, but after a consonant gu, and before a consonant g. Thus I.-Eur. *ġ̣wɨwo-, 'alive' (O. Ind. jīvā-, O. Ir. biu, Lith. gvyas) is Lat. vīvus; I.-Eur. root ong̣-, 'to anoint' (O. Ind. anj̣-, O. H. G. ancho, 'butter'; cf. O. Ir. imb, 'butter,' W. ymen-yn) is Lat. unguv; Lat. gravius is cognate with O. Ind. gurū-, Gk. βαρός, Goth. kaurus. Before u I.-Eur. ġu was replaced by g in Latin, a change probably of a very early date, e.g. gūrgēs (Gk. γύρο-βρυξα, γύρο-βρύχιος), though the u may be often regarded as a weak form of the ẉ of gwē (see § 51). Before o, Latin gu (gv) seems to have come in time to sound like Latin ġ, as guo 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 distingvum, extinguent, for which distingvum, extinguent, &c. were afterwards restored by the analogy of the other persons, distingvimus, &c. The grammarians of the Empire have difficulty in determining the proper spelling of verbs in -guo and -go, and generally follow the rule of writing -go when the Perfect ended in -xī, e.g. extingo, ungo.

§ 140. I.-Eur. ġu, Lat. v: other examples. Lat. vīniō (O. Ind. gam-, gach-, Arm. e-kn, 'became,' Gk. βαίνω, βαίνει, Goth. qima, Engi. I come, Germ. komme; Lat. vēro (O. Ind. gr-, Arm. ker, 'food,' Gk. βράδι, βραδύα, Lith. geriū, 'I drink,' O. Sl. ĕрги, 'I swallow'); Lat. vērh (O. Ir. bir N., a U-stem, W. ber); Lat. nūdus for *novedo- (Goth. naqaς); cf. O. Ind. nag-nā, Lith. nūgas, O. Sl. nagū.)
An intervocalic gw of later origin is similarly treated in māvolo (*marvolo) from *mav(e)-volo.

§ 141. Dialectal b. In Umbro-Osc. I.-Eur. ḡ is b, e. g. Umbr. benust, Osc. ce-bnust from the root of Lat. vēnio. So Lat. bōs, &c. seem to be dialectal or rustic (see von Planta, i. p. 335).

§ 142. g for I.-Eur. ḡ. (1) Before consonant: Lat. agnus (Gk. ἀγνός for *ἀβρός, O. Sl. jagne) (on évilīsus, see § 19); Lat. migro (Gk. ἀ-μείβω, O. Sl. miglivī, 'mobile'); Lat. glans (Gk. βάλανος, Arm. kalin, Lith. gilé, O. Sl. želadī).

(2) Before u. (On the spellings distinguit, &c., see Bersu, die Gutturale). (3) Before o. (On the spellings distinga, &c., see Bersu, die Gutturale). Similarly gu from I.-Eur. gh̄ is written g before o in ningo.

§ 143. gh̄. I.-Eur. gh̄ is Latin f, when initial, but between vowels v, after a consonant gu (before u reduced to g), and before a consonant g. Thus Lat. formus (O. Ind. gharmā-, 'heat,' Arm. jerm, Gk. θερμός, Engl. warm for *gwarm, Pruss. gorme, 'heat'); nīvem Acc., O. Lat. nīvit [Gk. νίφα, νίφει (νεί-)]; cf. Zend snaēžaiti, Goth. snaiws, 'snow,' Lith. snaiqyti Inf., O. Sl. sněgū, 'snow,' W. nyf]; nīngvit (Lith. sniūga) from the root snejgh̄-, 'to snow.' I.-Eur. gh̄ is f in Umbro-Osc. whether initial or intervocalic, &c. (see von Planta, i. p. 447, for examples).

§ 144. I.-Eur. gh̄ in Latin: other examples. Lat. co-niceo from the root kneigh̄- (Goth. hneivan, Germ. neigen); tergus (Gk. στεφός, τέφος); Lat. fōreo, the original meaning of which is 'to warm' (e. g. Plant. Capt. 847; foueri foculis furentibus) from the root dgeh̄-, 'to burn' (Lith. degū), and from the same root, Lat. fācīlla (Gk. τέφρα for *θέφρα).

§ 145. The Sibilants: S, Z. In Sanscrit, besides the ś (I.-Eur. ś), which corresponds to a guttural in Greek, Latin, &c. (e. g. O. Ind. śatām, Gk. ἕ-κατόν, 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 ș (like our șh) which appears after i- and u-, r- and k-sounds, e. g. ușta-, Lat. āstus. Sanscrit kṣ is the equivalent of Greek κτ in įkṣa-, Gk. ἄκτος, &c., of Greek ξ in ākṣa-, Gk. ἀξων, &c., and even of Greek χθ in kām-, Gk. χθῶν. 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. 'fornor,' Mid. Engl. forloren, beside 'lost'). Before a consonant the voiced sibilant was dropped with lengthening of the preceding vowel, e.g. I.-Eur. *nivdo (O. Ind. niída-, Arm. nist, 'situation,' O. Ir. net M., 'a nest,' Engl. nest), Lat. niīlus. An initial sibilant was often dropped in I.-Eur.; thus we have a root teg-, 'to cover, roof' (Lat. tēgo, Gk. τέγος, O. Ir. teg, 'house,' Engl. thatch), as well as a root steg- (O. Ind. sthag-, Gk. στήγω), the roots without initial s- being perhaps those used after words ending in -s (cf. ταυτεγαίς for ταῖς στεγαίς on the Gortyn inscr., δύστηνος for δύον-στήνος, &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 stlātus, stlātaria or stlattaria 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. σμέρδαλέος, O. H. G. smerzan, 'to feel pain,' Engl. to smart), before n, e.g. nārus from I.-Eur. *snūso- (O. Ind. snūṣā, Arm. nū, Gk. νῦ(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. sobrinus 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. ρύος), or is dropped, e.g. rēpo for *srēpo (cf. serpo), or becomes str-, e.g. stringo (O. Ir. rengim, 'to draw'), is uncertain. After r and l it is assimilated, e.g. verres for *verses (Lith. veřsiz; cf. O. Ind. veṣa-), collum, O. Lat. collus, for *colbo- (O. Engl. heals, Germ. Hals). Initial ps-, ks- appear to have become s-,
Latin s often represents an original dental sound, e.g. adgressus formed from the stem of adgrēdīor with the participial termination -to-. This change was probably very old, so that the form adgrettus (written in the earlier orthography adgretus), quoted from Ennius by Paul. Fest. 5. 6 Th., probably represents *ad-gred(i)tu* (like cettē for *cē-dīte*, § 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. fúsus, older fūsus, āsus, older āssus. 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 tellum, older tellum, for *tēslum, *tēxulum* (§ 117). On initial s- for sy-, e.g. suō, 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. Flusai ‘Florae,’ egmazum ‘rerum’), which in Umbr. passed into r, e.g. kuratu ‘curato’ (Pel. coisatens ‘curaverunt’). I.-Eur. ss became tt if the Perfect ending -attēn 3 Sg., -attēns 3 Pl. (e.g. Osc. prūfattēn ‘probavit,’ prūfattēns ‘probaverunt’) is rightly compared with the Lat. Future in -ssē, e.g. amassō (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. narē), Osc. Slabiis ‘Labius’ (cf. Lat. Slabonius); 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 (s), e.g. tursitū, tusetū (cf. Lat. terreō), sometimes as rf, e.g. Čerfu-; ns in the middle of a word became nts, e.g. Umbr. mense ‘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.)
§ 147. Lat. s, Latin s: other examples. 

IO. Ind. sana-, Arm. hin, Gk. ἑρυ ραυ ρεα, ‘the old and new day;’ i.e. the last day of the month, O. Ir. son, W. hen, Goth. sinista Superli., Lith. sēnas), Lat. sēn-tor, sēn-ex, Gen. senis; I.-Eur. root wes-, ‘to clothe’ (O. Ind. vas-, vāstra-, N. ‘clothing,’ Arm. z-gest, Gk. ἱσ-οθος, Goth. vasjan, vasti F.), Lat. vēs-tis; I.-Eur. *aks(i)-, ‘axle’ (O. Ind. ākṣa-, Gk. ἄξων, O. H. G. ahsa, Lith. aszis, O. Sl. osi), Lat. axis; I.-Eur. *pōtis Nom. Sg. (O. Ind. pātis, ‘master,’ Gk. πῶς), Lat. pōtis.

§ 148. Lat. r for intervocalic sibilant. 

Intervocalic s became h in Greek, e.g. είω for εἴω (I.-Eur. *eusō), and was dropped, e.g. γίνεσ, γίνουs Gen. (I.-Eur. *ginēs-ōs), but in Latin it appears as r, e.g. āro, gēnēris, having probably passed through the stage of voiced s (z), a stage at which the sibilant remained in Greek; I.-Eur. root wes-, ‘esse,’ while it suffered rhotacism in Umbrian, as in Latin, e.g. erem. The grammarians often quote Old Latin forms with intervocalic s, e.g. lasses, Valesii, Fusiī (Quint. i. 4. 13; cf. Ter. Sceur. 13. 13 K. Fusius, asa, lasses) (id. 359. 1 Th.); pignosa (id. 260. 1r Th.) (for other passages see Müller ad Paul. Fest. p. 13), and often refer similar forms to the Sabine dialect (e.g. Paul. Fest. 6. 36 Th. aurum . . . alli a Sabinis translatum putant, quod illi ‘asum’ 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 maiosibus, meliosibus, lasibus, festis (id. 359. 1 Th.); pigmosa (id. 260. 1r Th.) (for other passages see Müller ad Paul. Fest. p. 13), and often refer similar forms to the Sabine dialect (e.g. Paul. Fest. 6. 36 Th. aurum . . . alli a Sabinis translatum putant, quod illi ‘asum’ 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,’ ‘Papissi’ pro eo quod est Valerii, Papirii; Varro, ap. Vel. Long. 69. 8 K. (cf. L. L. vii. 27) gave fasena as Sabine for Lat. harea. Varro (L. L. vii. 26) quotes examples of this older spelling from the Carmen Saliare; Livy speaking of Sp. Furius Fucus, the consul of 464 B.C. says that some of his authorities spelt the name Fuscio (iii. 4. r Furius ‘Fusios’ scripsera quidam); on the inscription with the Carmen Arvale (C. L. L. i. 28 we have Lases ‘Lares’: enos, Lases, iuuate; in the most ancient piece of Latin preserved for us, the Praenestine fibula, Numasioi ‘Numero’ (xiv. 4123 Manios med faked Numasioi), and in the Dvens inser. Toties, ‘Tutoriae’. But words of the literary period with intervocalic s are either (1) dialectal, e.g. åmsius, a gallant (Sabine ?, see Nettleship, Contributions, s. v.), or (2) foreign loanwords, e.g. gaesum (Gaulish; cf. gaessati, Gaulish mercenaries, C. G. L. v. 71. 23. O. Fr. gai) (so åsis, liser, rōsas, siser, &c.), or (3) had originally ss, whether derived from I.-Eur. tt, e.g. cæsus for *caet-tus from caedo, from ns (I.-Eur. ntt, &c.), e.g. viæsimus older vicensamus (ch. ii. § 66), formosus, older formosus (ib.), from I.-Eur. ss, e.g. quaeso, older quaes-so, a different word from quaeo (ch. viii. § 33), nāsus, older nasum, 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 cæsare, cæsus, 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 ‘caessae, cæsus, divisiones’: quomodo et ipsum et Vergilium quoque scripsisse 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. fiasus. Quasitus, pisitus (cf. pisus) are said to show the same reduction in the pretonic syllable as ὤσσα (beside offa), māmilla (beside mamma) (ch. ii. § 130); rather the Dim. quasitus was formed from *quas-los
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 (μωσαφός), like other adjectives expressive of nuances of feeling, e.g. hilaris older hilarus (Gk. λαύφος). An initial s is not rhotacized when it comes after the final vowel of a preposition, &c., in a compound, e.g. po-situs from po-, a byform of ab (I.-Eur. *abpé) and the P. P. P. of sīno, but the final s of a preposition, &c., in a compound is rhotacized before an initial vowel, e.g. dir-imo from dis- and émo, diríbeo from dis- and hábeo. Furrus points to an earlier trisyllabic fus-wu- (cf. arwum from trisyllabic arwum, § 68), a byformation of fus-cus, and Minerva to *Menes-uā (the word is a quadrisyllable in Plaut. Bacc. 893, Attius, Trag. 127 R.), but before consonantal r we have s dropped with 'Compensation' in di-vello, di-vendo, &c. Other examples of forms with r beside forms with s are maero (maestus), gēra (ges-si, ges-tum), hausiro (haus-(s)i, haus-tum), quaero (quaes-tus; but quaes(s)iiri, quaes(s)iitum come from quaes(s)io, ch. viii. § 33), Etruria (Etrusci), auris (aus-culo), nāres (nās-(s)um), and oblique cases of S-stems, e.g. fāneris (funes-tus), ōneris (mus-tus), verberis (subverbus-tam Plaut. ap. Fest. 444. 15 Th.), hīmōris (honestus); by analogy of these oblique cases r has found its way into the Nominative of honor (older honos), arbor (older ardos; cf. arbustum and arbōritum), idōr (older oidos), &c. (ch. vi. § 7). (For a fuller list of examples of the Latin and Umbro-Oscean 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 s in words like 'ore' (Goth. aiz-, I.-Eur. *aies-, Lat. aës, 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. xv. pp. 270 sqq.).

§ 149. Initial Sibilant before Consonant: (1) before unvoiced consonant: I.-Eur. root stā-, 'to stand' (O. Ind. sthā-, Gk. στάς, Goth. stāþs, O. Sl. stati Inf.), Lat. stāre, statio; I.-Eur. root sper-, 'to strike with the feet' (O. Ind. spur-, Gk σπαύω, Engl. spurn, Lith. spūri), Lat. sperno; I.-Eur. root skand-, 'to spring' (O. Ind. skand-, Gk. σκανδάλθρον, a springe, O. Ir. ro se-scaind, 'he sprang'), Lat. scando. Similarly we have st-, e.g. in Lat. strāitus, strāmen (cf. Gk. στράτος, στραμματ-, spr- in sprētus, ser- in scrōbus, a ditch (Lett. skrāt, 'to scrape'), while stl- of O. Lat. stātūsit, stātūaria (stāt. lat. adv) nasīs has become class. Lat. l- of lātūs, broad.

(2) Before voiced consonant: I.-Eur. root sneighb-, 'to snow' (Zend snāzaiti, Gk. νεῖφε, ἀγ-νείφος for *dāya-σαφός, O. Ir. snechta, W. nyf, Goth. snaives, Lith. snēgas, O. Sl. sněz) Lat. nīmem Acc.; I.-Eur. root snā- (O. Ind. snā-, 'to bathe,' Gk. νίχα, I swim, O. Ir. snāim), Lat. nāre; I.-Eur. root slēg- (Gk. λάγγαζω, to slacken, λήγω, to cease, O. Ir. lec, 'weak,' W. llag, O. H. G. slack, Engl. slack), Lat. languē; I.-Eur. root sleub- (Goth. sliupan, Engl. to slip), Lat. lābricus; I.-Eur. root smerd- (Lith. smirdēti, 'to stink'), Lat. merdu; Gk. (σ)μερξό, Lat. milo. If we may infer from the treatment of an internal sibilant before a voiced consonant, e.g. nātus for *nizdo-, it would seem that the initial sibilant was first assimilated, *nīmix for *nimix (cf. Gk. φιλο-μεμιδης for *φιλο-σμειδης) then dropped, nīx.

(3) Before r. The use of t for I.-Eur. d with r in Latin, e.g. āter, stem ātro-, for *ādār-, 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. frīgas goes naturally with Gk. βύγος, but it has also been connected with Gk. φλόσασ, while Lat. rīgās, rīgās has been assigned to βύγος; Lat. frīga, strawberries, has been referred by some to
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Gk. ἀστέρι, a grape, by others to fragro, and certainly Lat. rācemus goes more naturally with ἀστέρι than ἀφάγα. Whether Greek ἀγρός, ἀστέρι originally began with σ or θ is a moot point. Lat. ἀρεπό goes naturally with serpo, but Lith. rėplio, Zend rap-, 'to go,' suggest an I-Eur. 'doublet' without the initial sibilant. The I-Eur. root sreν-, 'to flow' (O. Ind. sru-, Gk ἄστερι, Lith. srauia, Ir. sruaim, 'a stream,' O. H. G. strum), has been sought in the Latin words rūmen, [ficus] Rūmīna, Rūmon, the old name of the Tiber (Serv. ad Ao., viii. 63, 90) and in the name Rōma itself; Lat. rāitis has been connected with ċiro, Lat. rāibus with Germ. Ge-striipp, 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 I-Eur. 'doublet' which lacked the sibilant, as τέγο comes from I-Eur. τεγ-, a byform of the root step-, 'to cover,' roof. Another possibility is that str- may be the Latin equivalent, as in our 'stream,' &c. It is not always easy to decide where Lat. str- and str-, sr-, in other languages, represent an original str- or an original sr-; and similarly O. Lat. stl-, of stlocus, stilis and stilis may have been originally sl- and not stl-.

§ 150. O. Lat. stil, sl, sol. Quintilian (i. 4. 16) quotes stlocus and stilites as O. Lat. forms. The old form stilis was retained in the legal phrase deconeitra stilitibus judicandis in Cicero's time (Cic. Or. xlvii. 156); on the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 B.c. (C. I. L. i. 198) we have once stilis but usually stilis, and st., &ndik on a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B.C. (i. 38), selīth... (x. 1249); cf. stilicus (v. 7381). Stilbus, slow, is quoted from Lucilius (Paul. Fest. 455. 4 Th.); stilopos (v. i. stloppus), is used by Persius (v. 13) to indicate the sound of slapping the cheek when distended (cf. Ital. schioppo):

nek seloppo tumidas intendis rumperc buceas.

In dialectal names these combinations are preserved, e.g. Stllacius (C. I. L. vi. 26863, &c.) (cf. Lat. laccus, a swelling on the leg?), Stllaborius (Wilm. 1913, Pomm.) (cf. Lat. lābor,?), Oscan Slabio-. In Latin the t of stl- (or c, for b became cl), § 105) would be dropped, as it is in the name Foslius (cf. Fosculius, Fustules), C. I. L. ii. p. 139 (cf. for(c)itis, § 157), leaving sl-, which would become *ul- (see above), then l-.

§ 151. Sibilant before voiced consonant in middle of word. Lat. audio for *aus-dio, from *aus, a byform of avris; Lat. pēdo from I-Eur. pezd- (M. H. G. fīst, Pruss. peisda, 'podex') with o-grade of root in pōdex for *pōs-tex; Lat. sūdo for *si-sdo from the weak grade of the root sed-, 'to sit,' with i-reduplication (ch. viii. § 9); Lat. sūdas for *sus-das from the root sau-, 'to dry' (O. Ind. šu:, Gk. ἄος, Lith. saušas, Engl. sear); Lat. mālus for *mas-lus or for *mas-dus (§ 111) (Engl. mast); Lat. dūmus (O. Lat. dusmus), diūmetum, dummetum in the earlier spelling, e.g. in Virgil MSS. (see Ribbeck's Index) for *duesnetum (cf. O. Ir. doss, 'a bush') (the dialectal name Dusmia is found on inscriptions, Eph. Epigr. viii. 128. 820, both from Teate Marruc). Lat. cómis (cosmis on the Dvenos inser.) Lat. primus for *prīmus (cf. pricus, pristinus, Pelign. prismo-); Lat. pōmerium for *pōs-meriium (Varro, L. L. v. 143; cf. Paul. Fest. 327. 13 Th.); Lat. prētum for *pre-tum (cf. *presi: a Latin *preso must have existed beside prerno, as Gk. τρόπιος beside τρόπω); Lat. quādus for *mas-lus (cf. quāsitlus; Lith. kāszius, O. Sl. kōči); Lat. cūimus for *cāmus (cf. ccusus, Osc. casmar, an old man); Lat. fānum for *fānnum (cf. Osc. fisna-, Umbr. fesna-, from stem *fesnā-; on ā-č, see § 54); Lat. fēs-tus, fēriae from fēs-iae, Osc. fisnia-); Lat.
pōne for *pos(t)-ne; Lat. pōno for *pos(o)no, a compound of pō-, a byform of ab, ap- of aperie (cf. O. Ind. āpa, Gk. ἄρο), and sino [cf. the P. P. P. po-stūs, and Pft. Ind. originally po-śvi, then by false analogy of pos-itus, posui (ch. viii. § 39)]; aēnus, aēnus for *ays-no-, Umbr. ahesno-, and so with many stems in -ino-, -ino-, -olo-, &c. In some of these examples the sibilant is a development from an earlier group of sounds, e. g. from sl in pūnitum, pōne, from s(i) in pōno; similarly from (x) s, x in lūna, written Lūnā on an old Praenestine mirror (C.I.L. i. 55), for *lux-na (Zend raoxšna-, ‘shining,’ Pruss. lauxnos, ‘stars’); sēnī, sēmenstris (cf. ses-ceni) for *sexni, *sex-menstris; tēla from texo, &c. (other examples in § 16a; (2) ns in (h)ado for *anslo (O. Sl. achatí, ‘to be fragrant’); pitum from pīno. The older spelling showed a double consonant in these cases. Thus relātura, the carrying trade, for *rex-lātura, from reho, was probably spelt relātura by Varro in a passage (R. R. i. 2. 14) where he connects the word with vīla, the rustic form of vīilla; a sibilant which came at a later time to stand before a voiced consonant was similarly treated, e. g. dīvello for dis-relo, dīmota for dismota (S. C. Bach. C. I. L. i. 196), dīmitte (‘dismitte’ non dicas, Caper, 97. 7 K.), di-numero, di-lufo. In the same way the form ē arso from ex in collocations like t-relo, t-moreo, t-mitto, t-numero, t-lufo (see ch. ix. § 29); videōn for vidēs-ne was shortened to vidēn (ch. iii. § 42). Cāmillus (Camelio on old Praenesteine epitaphs, C. I. L. i. 74; 1501 a) was derived by the Romans from a Greek (or Etruscan?) καμύλος, meaning a servant of the gods (see Varro, L. L. vii. 34; Maer. ii. 8. 5: Paul. Fest. 44. 33 Th.; cf. Virg. Aen. xi. 542). Varro refers Cāmēna to an earlier Casmena, which he connects with cāmen (L. L. vii. 26). How Casmillus and Casmena (for the word ever existed in this form) failed to become *Cāmillus, *Cāmēna is not clear. The group res became rē (through *rērē, for rs becomes rr), e. g. hordeum (cf. O. H. G. gerstā, Germ. Gerste); tardus (Lith. strādas, O. Ir. truit, Engl. throstle). The I.-Eur. prototype of custos (Goth. huzid, Engl. hoard), hasta (Goth. gazds, ‘a sting,’ Germ. Gerte, Engl. yard, O. Ir. gat) may have had sth-, not-zdh-.

Quāsillus from *quas-los (class. quābus) shows that sl remained later than the change of intervocalic s to r (§ 148). Dusmus Adj. occurs in Liv. Andronicus (end of third cent. B.C.) (Trag. 39 R.) dusmo in loco. Plantus’ vidēn for vidēsne, ain for aines, &c. shows that the law was operative in his time.

§ 152. Sibilant before r in middle of word. Lat. cērēbrum for *cerēbrum (O. Ind. širas, ‘the head’); Lat. crēbro for *crāsro (Lith. širszā, O. Sl. sršení); fibrā for *fīsra (cf. fibum for *fīšum, Lith. įšla, ‘a sinew’); Lat. cēnēbrae for *tenēsrae (O. Ind. tāmisra, from tāmas, ‘darkness,’ Germ. Dämmerung); fūndbris for *funds-ris.

§ 153. Assimilation of sibilant to preceding r, 1. Lat. farreus for *farseus (Umbr. farso-, cf. O. Sl. brašino, ‘food’; Goth. barzieins, ‘made of barley’); Lat. torreo for *torseo (O. Ind. ṭṛ-, Gk. τρέπουατ), Lat. ferre for *fer-se; Lat. velle for *vēlse; Lat. erro for *erso (Goth. aīrjan, ‘to mislead,’ Germ. irren); Lat. garrio for *garsio (Lith. gāšas, ‘noise’); Lat. porrroom from L.-Eur. *pr̩so- (Gk. πάρον); Lat. terrunecius for *terse-, older *trisse- (Gk. τησις). This rr from rs was kept when s was used as the final reduced to r, e. g. ter (scanned as long by position in Plautus) (ch. ii. § 133), far, Gen. farris. Before t the s kept its place, and the r was dropped, e. g. testamentum for *tersta- from older *trista- (Osc. tristamento); tostus for *tortus.

An s (ss), arisen out of an earlier ts, &c. was not assimilated, e. g. versus for vertus, rursus and reversus for *revertus, ars beside far. Latin rs was
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, intrusum, prosa, &c. (see ch. ii. § 129).

§ 154. Assimilation of preceding dental to the sibilant. Lat. suāsi for *suāsāsi from suādeo; concissi from concitātiō, &c.; pāssum for *pāt(ē)cum. Similarly in the final syllable, hospes for *hospets, milēs 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. pedettris for *pedet-tris from pedes, Gen. peditis, assestrix Fem. of assessor, and perhaps at the end of a word, e.g. eft, 3 Sg. Pres. of ēdo. But in other cases tt became ss, e.g. usus, older issus, from uto (older uto, őctor) for *ut-tus, ősio for *ut-tiō, *oit-tiō (Osc. oittīn ‘usio,’ beside Pel. oisa ‘usa’ is best explained as *oit(i)tions); so fāssus from fāteor, sessus from ēdeor, morsus from mordeo, perculsum 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. spargo, 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 mertat for mersat (57. 16 Th.; cf. 89. 26); Quintilian (i. 4. 14) says: ‘mertere’ atque ‘pultare’ diecibant; and Nonius (179. 4 M.) quotes from Varro tertus for tersus, and from Accius mertare for mersare. Exfult, explained by Paul. Fest. 57. 16 Th. as exfusī (of cons-ful.me, fulūlis, fulūlis) has been referred to *fūtus, P. P. P. of a verb *fuo, to shake (O. Ind. dhū-); if it comes from fundō it must represent an older *fud(i)tus, a byform of *fud-tus as ali(i)tus of alt-us; so mattus, drunk (the Romance forms attest tt) for *mad(i)tus, like adgrettus (§ 109). Estis, este, &c. from ēdo, to eat, must be due to the analogy of ānā-tis, ama-te, &c.; so com-cusus beside conessus. Féranto, &c. for *feront-tōd (ch. viii. § 57), rehemen-ter, if for *rehem-ter (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 *dic-so (cf. di-di-c-ti, sec-cēni for *sex-cēni, *seco-cēni. Similarly pst becomes st in ostendo (but O. Lat. obstinat) beside obstrīdo, obstīno.

As rs became rr, and ls became ll, so rs, ls before a consonant become r, l, e.g. hordēum for *horsēdem, aīnus for *alsnus (Lith. ėkšnis), perna, the ham, from I.-Eur. *pēršnā, ‘the heel’ (Gk. πέριπερα, Goth. fairzna, O. Engl. fyrsn, Germ. Perse; cf. O. Ind. pīrsnī-), but an unvoiced consonant preserves the s at the expense of the r, l, e.g. tōstus for *torstus, pesco for *porsco (O. H. G. forscōn, Germ. forsen), properly for *prksko 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)spel’). It is not always possible to decide whether the consonant was already ejected in what we
call the ‘Indo-European period,’ e.g. mišk-, ‘to mix’ (Lat. miscem, O. Ir. mescaim, W. mysgu Inf., O. H. G. miscu), for *miš-sk-, from the root miš-‘to mix’ (O. Ind. miš-ru-, ‘mixed,’ Lith. sumštai, ‘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 *lu(e)snna (Zend raoxšna-, ‘shining,’ Pruss. launoxs, ‘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, s(e)t, s(e)l, c(e)s, r(t)s or r(d)s, e.g. ultus for *ultus, mulsī for *mulcsi, fortis, O. Lat. fortis (§ 118), tortus for *torctus, torcsi for *torcsi, corculum for *cor-tulum from cor(d), pastum for *pascutum, O. Lat. slis, class. lis for stlis (sclis) (§ 150), nox for *nucst, arsi for *arsdi.

(2) r(g)n, r(g)m, r(d)n, r(d)m, r(b)m, e.g. urna for *arwna (cf. urceus), tormentum for *torqmentum, from torqueo, orno for *ordino (cf. ordino), vermina, gripes (Gk. σπόφος, Paul. Fest. 571. 12 Th.) for *vermnina from verto, sarmentum for *sarhmentum from sarpo.

The first consonant is dropped in groups like:

(3) t(ce), etce for *etce from čdo, disco for *disco (§ 156) (cf. dl- dic-i), asporto for *apsporto from abs (ch. ix. § 12) and porto, ostendo for *opstendo from obs and teno (but obstenātus, O. Lat. obstinet, &c.), Oscus, older Opscus (Obscus) (see Fest. 212. 24 and 234. 29 Th.), ippse for *ispse, ignis for *engnis (I.-Eur. agni-, O. Ind. anũ-, Lith. ugnis, O. Sl. ţgni. See M. S. L. viii. 230), fastigium for *fasstigium (cf. O. Ind. bhršt-, ‘a point,’ Engl. bristle), Tuscus (Umbr. Tursco- and Tursco-).

(4) c(son or g)sn, c(sl or g)sl, c(sm or g)sm, e.g. lūna for *lusna (Praen. Losna) for *lusna, tēlum for *teleslum, āla for *asla, sous właśnie for *sulcesmen for *subtcesmen.

The group nc is preserved in junctus, defunctus, anteclass. quincus, but drops the c in class. quintus, late Lat. defunctus (C. I. L. iii. 2137), santus (v. 8136), nantus (iii. 1635. 4), &c. (see ch. ii. §§ 70, 95), and cf. concoctio miswritten for contione on the Lex Repetundarum, i. 198. 18). The group ncs remains, e.g. planx, lanx

§ 158. Other examples. On the forms cals for *cal(c)s, calx, and mers for *mer(c)s, mers, see ch. ii. § 125; they are like farasi for *faras, fulsi for *fulst, mulsī for *mulcsi. 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 furtus from farcio, O. Lat. tertus (§ 155) from tergo, sortus from sarco. Cf. fulmentum for fulmentum, quernus, for *quercus. The b of *ambé, around, is dropped in am-termini, am-caesa, am-sigétes, &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. inidéparator, indugrédi, ch. iii. § 15). The sibilant is dropped in hordeum for hordéum (O. H. G. gersta), tardus for *tursiá (Engl. throatle; cf. Lith. strázdas), pernia (Goth. fairzna, 'the heol'); O. Ind. páršni,-, áimus (cf. Lith. élksnis for *elsnis) (see § 156); also in inquam, coinquó if these stand for *ind-squam, co-ind-squó, but remains in exta if this stands for ensta (Lith. inkstas, 'kidney'). Like asporta, &c. are suscipio for *sup-s-cipio, astúlit (Charis. 237. 2 K.) for apstúdit (abstúlit). Pecso represents *por-seco (O. H. G. forseón, Germ. forschen), I.-Eur. pr(k)-skól-like *mi(k)-skó-. The group nst remains in monstrum, &c. but becomes st between vowels, e.g. mostellum. Like fastigium is testamentum 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. *dékum) appears in the word for hundred as d-, which is changed to k- (I.-Eur. *kntom for *dkntom, ch. vi. § 76; Lat. centum beside dècem); the weak-grade of the root ŋên- 'to be born,' appears in Lat. gnátus, which in class. Lat. lost its initial g (§ 119). Similarly *látus from the root tel- of tolló, &c., became látus, 'carried' (§ 105), and stlátus, from the root stel- of O. Sl. steljá, 'I extend,' was reduced to the same form látus, 'extended, broad' (§ 146). Other initial consonant-groups avoided in Latin are dr-, cn-, dl-, sm-, w-, 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 hordeum for hordéum 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 Ecthliepsis, 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- lege, al-figare for ad-figare (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 unweakened form of the vowel in verbs like é-neco (older enico), intel-lege, &c. (see ch. iii. § 31). Examples of Assimilation are:
pc, e.g. oc-caeco, suc-curro; pf, e.g. of-ficina (O.Lat. ëpê-ficina), suf-ficio; bg, e.g. og-géro, sug-gero; bm, e.g. omentans (quoted from Liv. Andron. from Festus 218.14 Th., and explained by obmâ-nens, 'waiting'; cf. C. G. L. v. 37. 3 ommentat: expectat), summitto, ëmitto (for ammitto, ch. ii. § 127) (but ëmitto), glâma for *glub-ma from glâbo. 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-nêgo; cf (rather e(s)f, § 157), e.g. efféro from ex-fero; tc, e.g. ac-curro, hoc for *hod-ce; tf, e.g. affero; dg, e.g. ag-gero; dl, e.g. al-luo, pel-luviae, water for washing the feet, lápillus for *lapid-lus; dm, e.g. vâmentum from râdo; dn, e.g. an-nuo, mercènnarius from mercéd-; tp, e.g. ap-pâreo; tq, e.g. quicquam; dr (tr), e.g. ar-rideo; ds (ts), e.g. as-sâdeo; ln, e.g. collis (Lith. kâlnas), but utna had originally a short vowel between l and n (Gk. âlêny), ld, e.g. per-cello (cf. clâdes), but valdé from vâldë, calda from câldâ; ls, e.g. collum, O. Lat. collus (Goth. hals Mase.), velle for *col-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-lâbor, illaudabilis, cor-ruo, ir-ruo, ir-rîtus, con-necto or cónecto, in-mitto, im-mêmor, and similarly the final -m of ëtiam, tan, &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. Engi. eneleven), e.g. còrolla for *corôn-lu, hómullus for *homôn- lus; rl, e.g. Àtellâ (Osc. Aderl-), ãcellus for *agérlus (cf. supellex non 'superlex,' Probi App. 198. 14 K.); rs, e.g. torre for *torreo (cf. Gk. téρsoumai), 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. quâlus (older quâllus) for *quâs-lus (cf. quâsillus), see § 151, on a like treatment of n before s or f, ìb, and on the Assimilation of Mediae to Tenues (e.g. scriptus for *scrib tus), cêt-te for *cêd(i)te), Tenues to Mediae, e.g. ab-duco from ap- (I.-Eur. *ápö), see § 95. In dialectal Latin nd became wn as in Osc. ûpsanno- 'operando-', whence dispennîte and distennîte (Plaut.) (see ch. ii. § 71); on the pronunciation ss for rs (cf. russus for rursus), see ch. ii. § 104.
§ 160. 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 *adcurrire*, *accurrere* (ix. 25 M.):

\[ d \text{ne an } c, \text{ non est quod queras eque labores, } \]

but seems (though the reading is doubtful) to have insisted on the necessity of distinguishing *ad-bitere* (from *ad* and *baedo*) and *ab-bitere* (from *ab* and *baedo*) (ix. 27 M.):

\[ \text{‘abbitere’ multum est } \]

\[ d \text{ siet an } b; \]

(*adsimilis* seems to have been discarded in Latin for *dissimilis*, through fear of confusion with *adsimilis*); he pronounces in favour of *pellicio* (ix. 32 M.):

\[ \text{in praesentio per } \]

\[ \text{‘pelliciendo,’ hoc est inducendo, geminato } l. \]

Similarly Priscian (i. 50. 7 H.) quotes *pelligo*, *pellucet* from Plautus.

The MSS. of Plautus and Terence show great prevalence of Assimilation; Plautus puns on *adsum* and *assum*, *Poem.* 279:

Milphio, heus ubi tu es? Assum apud te ecuum. At ego elixus 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 *Prager philol. Studien*, 1887). In the Herculanean papyri the preposition is generally not assimilated, e.g. ‘adsidus,’ ‘inridentis,’ ‘inilita,’ ‘adfini,’ but ‘imminet,’ ‘imperii’ (*Class. Rev.* iv. 442). The byform *d* of *ab* originated in an assimilated form, e.g. before *f-* in the verb *a-fluo*, to be abundant (cf. *ab-undo*), often confused in MSS. with *af-fluo*, to flow (cf. Nettleship, *Contributions*, s. v. *affluo*), and before *m-, r-, e. g. *a-mitto*, *a-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 *g-, e. g. ac-giuro*), 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-pono*, rarely *ad-pono*, before *r-, e. g. *arripio* and *ad-ripio*, before *s*, e. g. *as-sideo* and *ad-sideo*, *ad-sum*, before *t-, e. g. *at-tribo*; *com-* is assimilated before *t-, e. g. *col-legium*, *col-locor* and *con-locor*, before *r-, e. g. *cor-ripe*, and becomes *conn-* before *c-, d-, f-, g-, j-, n-, q-, s-, t-, r-, v-,* on *ex* see ch. ix. § 39; *in-* is assimilated before *m-, e. g. *im-mitto* (becoming *im-* also before *b-, p-,* occasionally before *r-, e. g. *tr-rue* and *in-rue*, not so often before *l-, e. g. *in-ludo* and *il-ludo*; *ob-* is assimilated before *c-, e. g. *oc-curro*, before *f-, e. g. *of-fendo*, before *g-, e. g. *og-giro*, before *p-, e. g. *op-porior*, and occasionally before *m-, e. g. *ob-manoe*, O. Lat. *om-mutare*; *per-* is assimilated before *l-, e. g. *pel-lliceo*, *pel-lego* and *per-lego*; *sub-* is assimilated before *c-, e. g. *suc-curro* before *f-, e. g. *suf-fero*, before *g-, e. g. *sug-giro*, before *p-, e. g. *sup-po-no*, and optionally before *m-, e. g. *sum-mitto* and *sub-mitto*, and *r-, e. g. *sur-rigui* (contracted *surripui*) and *sub-rigui*; *trans-* often becomes *tra-* before *j-, d-, l-, m-, n-, e. g. *tra-do* (trans-dere attested by Donatus for Terence, *Phorm.* 2, where all our MSS. have *trudere*); before *j-* we find *co-* in *coicio, &c., pe-* in *pejorare*, a later spelling of *perjorare* (see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s. v.) (cf. *peiurri* Plaut. *Truc.* 612 (B))
§ 161. Other examples of Assimilation. If Festus (252. 7 Th.) is right in saying that both *petua and *pesu (Lat., *petua and *pesu were O. Lat. words for *pesu, we must suppose *pesu to be the development of the former, while the latter (from *pesu) would become *pesu (cf. *luna for *luna); annus is most naturally derived from *at-no- (Goth. *ætn Neut., 'a year'). The assimilation of *to a following t was a feature of dialectal (e.g. *la *blatta, *blatta, 'a bug') and Late Latin (see ch. ii. § 95). Like *gliama from *glibo is rumentum (glossed by 'abruptio' Paul. Fest. 369. 12 Th.) from rumpo; like rumentum from *rudo is caementum from caedo. (On the reduction of mm after a long vowel or diphthong to m, e.g. *caementum to caementum, see ch. ii. § 127). For dp we have O. Lat. toppar (see ch. ix. § 7) for *tod-per (on quippe, quippium, see ch. x. § 7). Iacircio is sometimes spelt iacircio (see Brambach, Hiltföhlichen, s. v.). Whether mm became mm, e.g. gemma, or mm, e.g. germen, is discussed in § 80, and whether eaxmen represents *exaigmor or *ex-ago-men in § 116. In the Probi App. (196. 26 K.) we have: amygdala non 'amiddula'; the ga of frigyndus (frigda Probi App. 198. 3 K.) became dd (cf. fridam, 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.') Quælus, for *quæ-lus (cf. quæ-illus, § 148), is in the older spelling quallus, änhelus for *anhenius is anhellus, vêlum for *vexillum (cf. verillum) is vellum, ànla, a pot (later olla), for *auxla (cf. auxilla) is alla, &c.; the Adjective ending -ôsus for *o-went-to- (ch. v. § 65) is in the older spelling -onssus, -ossus (see Brambach, Orth. p. 268, and the Indices to Ribbeck’s Virgil and Studemund’s Apograph of the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus); dümétum for *dusmetum is in Virgil MSS. dummetum, as diminuo is in Plautus MSS. dimminuo [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. penkî, &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. κοσκυλμία), barba for *farba (Engl. beard, O. Sl. brada), querquēra, ague, murmur (Gk. μορμῦρω), ṣūṕa (Gk. ἕποψ), furfur, tintinnō, cēcūmis, turtur, &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, tōg-a with O-grade of root), which is further developed into the stems tōgā- (Lat. Nom. Sg. tōgā, earlier *tōgā, Gen. Pl. tōgā-rum, &c.), tegmen- (Lat. Nom. Sg. tegmen, Gen. tegmënis, 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 -ē, -ē (Nouns and Adjectives of the First and Second Declension). -ē-, -ā-. -ō-, which should rather be called the ę-ō-suffix, since it alternates with ę (e.g. I.-Eur. Voc. Sg. of Masc. o-stems ended in -ę, *ękwē, 'O horse,' Gk. ἤπε, 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. νίμφα), is associated with the Fem. Gender. Hence the ē- and ā-suffixes were used
in Adjectives, e.g. I.-Eur. nēwo-, Masc. and Neut., *newā-, Fem. (Gk. νέως, νέως, νέως, Lat. nōvōs, novom, nova, &c.). Special circumstances have however produced a few instances of Fem. o-stems and Masc. ā-stems. Thus Lat. fūgus, Gk. φυγός 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. *φυγός, youth, φυγάς, a youth). (See ch. vi. § 1.)

Of the many uses of the ō-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-, ‘to produce’ (O. Ind. jānam, Gk. γόνος), from root āgen-, ‘to produce’; (2) in Nomina Agentis, these having the accent on the suffix, e.g. I.-Eur. *τόρο-, ‘a piercer’ (Gk. τόρος), from root ter-, ‘to pierce’; I.-Eur. *πρόκο-, ‘an asker’ (Lat. prōcens, 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. *βρογά, ‘the action of fleeing’ (Gk. φυγά, Lat. fūga), 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 ā, e.g. -io-, -iā-, -tō-, -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 weik-, ‘to fight,’ Lat. vinco) is O. Lat. for per-vicāx, and squālīus, Enn., became squashidus. The Verbal Noun used as Infinitive by the Umbro-Samnite nations was probably a Neuter ō-stem, e.g. Osc. ezum, Umbr. erom from root ēs-, ‘to be,’ Lat. esse; Osc. deicem corresponds to Lat. dicere, Osc. mollaum to Lat. multare; 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. Carina, from *cār(o)n-, flesh, the goddess of the vital organs, to whom a temple was dedicated by Junius Brutus in 510 B.C., Čarda (or Cardea), from *ocardon-, a hinge, the goddess of hinges, nola, ‘a say-no’ from nōlo, in Caelius’ punning description of Clodia (Quint. viii. 6. 53).
§ 3. Latin ò- and ÷-suffixes; other examples. Lat. uncus from *onces (O. Ind. ankás; Gk. ὄνος) from the root ank-, ‘to bend’; Lat. dòsus (Gk. δόλος), perhaps the O-grade of a root del-; Lat. júgum (O. Ind. yugám, Gk. ὕγις, Goth. jük Neut., O. Sl. iго Neut.) from the root yeug-, ‘to join’; Lat. plāga (Gk. πλάγη) from the root plāg-, ‘to beat’; con-riva from riva, to enjoy oneself (e.g. Catull. v. 1; Plaut. Pers. 30 uiusc mecum; so vita Plaut. Trin. 477; cf. Non. 14, 16 M. siciuti qui nunc est in summā laetītīn, ‘vivere’ cens dicimus); parcus from parco; with lengthened root col-lėga (cf. tēg-, rēg-, and cēlēre, if from *lēga, *rēga, *cela, Verbal Nouns from the roots tēg-, rēg-, kēl-; cf. § 23). Of early forms, and occasional coinages, may be mentioned: condus and prōmus from condō, promo, e. g. Plaut. Pseud. 608 condus promus sum, procurator peni; trāha, a harrow, for which Virgil substituted (invented?) the form traea (cf. the note of Servius or G. i. 164 trahēsequē: Epenthesin fecit causa metri, ut ‘navita.’ trahā, a trahē autem vehiculum est a trahendo dictum; nam non habet rotas), from traño, like sēra, the bolt of a door, from sēro, to join; from άιο was formed άιος Locūlius, the god to whom a temple was dedicated in gratitude for the supernatural warning against the attack of the Gauls, 390 n. c.; from pando, Pandya, the goddess of opening, after whom was named the Pandāna porta (Varro, L. L. v. 42), the Oscan name of the goddess being Patana-. Nonius quotes pervicus, stubborn, persistent, from Accius (Trag. 158 R.):

sed pérūico Aiax ānimo atque aduorsābilīs,
derived from pervīco, to be stubborn, persistent, as we may see from the assonance of Ennius (Trag. 408 R.):

peruince pertinācī peruiacā;

cēa and nola, from cēeo and nolo are quoted from Caelius by Quintilian (viii. 6. 53): quadrārīam Cītemestram, et in tricīlinio coam, in cubiculo nolam; so perhaps condē sus, for sus cēm fētu, explained by Paul. Fest. (40. 28 Th.) quae cum omni fētu adhibebatur ad sacrificium; Domī-diuc, Prō-nūba (an epithēt of Juno), Jugā (another epithēt of Juno), Luva, Vica Pota, noctē-liucā, sangui-sōga. Scība 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) -yō-, -yā- (by some written -oyo-, -oyo-), 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. mēdius from I.-Eur. *mēdishyo- (O. Ind. mádhya-, Gk. μέθυς) is, unlike the O. Ind. and Greek forms of the word, a trisyllable. The weak grade of I.-Eur. -yō-, *yō- (or -yē-, -yē-, § 2) seems to have been -i-, -i-; e. g. Goth. brūks, ‘useful,’ for *brükēs, I.-Eur. *bhrūg-yi-, *bhrūg-yō- (-yō-), from the root bheurgⁿ-, ‘to use, enjoy’ (Lat. fruor); Goth. hairdis, ‘a herd, shepherd,’ for *hairdis; and this opened the way to a confusion of i-stems with i-stems. Another byform seems to have been -iyō-, -iyā-, e. g. O. Ind. trt-īya-; ‘third,’
Hom. Gk. προθυμ-ις, a form which would in Latin shorten the i before the following vowel, and become identical with I.-Eur. -ια.

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*-ια-, 'requiring help or company' (Lat. sōcins; cf. O. Ind. sāciya-, Gk. α-σοσητήρ from ἄσσω-) from the root sēq-ις, 'to accompany' (O. Ind. sac-, Gk. ἔπομαι, Lat. -sequor). Similarly Latin exīnius in the sense of exitus (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. pīṭriya-, Gk. πάτριος, Lat. patrīus) from the noun *pāter- (I.-Eur. pitār-, Gk. πατήρ, Lat. pāter); Lat. somnium (O. Ind. svāpnyam, O. Sl. sūn'je, sūn'je) from somnus, stem *somno- (O. Ind. svāpnas, O. Sl. sūn'); 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. *mādhyo- (O. Ind. māḍhya-, Gk. μέ(ο)ρας, Lat. mēdius); I.-Eur. *ālyo- (Arm. ail, Gk. ἀλλος, Lat. ālius, Goth. aljis); Gk. δεξιός has this suffix, while Lat. dexter (Gk. δεξιότερος) has the -tero- suffix, which has the same force (§ 16). So in some Ordinal Numbers, e.g. Lat. tertius (cf. O. Ind. trīṭya-, Goth. þridja, O. Sl. treti'ji, 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. Διο-κράτης, son of Διο-κλῆς, Teut. Walt-bert, son of Wald-ram), the Italic stocks employed simple stems with this IO- suffix, e.g. Lat. Lācius, Statius, &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. Ζευγλᾶς, for the more ceremonious Ζεῦς-ιππος, &c., Λεύκις 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. -is), in Latin characters -is, in Gk. -ις: (2) -iyo-, in Patronymics derived from praenomina in -yo-, e.g. Statiiis, a patronymic from the praenomen Statis (stem *Statyo-). This suffix is in Oscan characters -is, in Latin characters -ies, in Gk. -ις. To these we may add a third variety, -iyo-, apparently the unshortened form of -yo-. This is used in ceremonious language on inscriptions bearing the names of magistrates, &c., and is written -is, Gk. -εις, e.g. Viúniís, 'Αβδεις, both quaestors. How far Latin spellings like Clodeius, Publieus, Vareius, if they are genuine Latin forms and not dialectal, may be distinguished from the normal forms Clodius, Publius, Varrius 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 i would be shortened to i. Thus Osc. Bovaiano- was in Latin Bovianum through *Bovíanum from *Boveianum; Osc. Púmpaiians is Lat. Pompeianus; Osc. Maraio-, Falisc. Mareio-, is Lat. Marcus (cf. Umbr. pernaio-, 'in front,' postraio-, 'behind,' in Lat. anticus, posticus). Analogous to the Oscan -iyo- as opposed to -iyo- is perhaps the Latin use of the full ending -ius, as opposed to the shorter -is or -i (with -i- 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. pínso and pinso, ch. viii. § 15), so it is added to Nouns. O-stems either drop their final vowel before it, e.g. somn-ium, or show -eyo- which became -xo- (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* (A-stem), *cornu*s (U-stem), *vitellus* (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 -toria- corresponding to Greek -τηρω-, e.g. *auditi-torium*, ‘the place of hearing;’ *deversorium* for *devert-torium*, ‘a lodging-place,’ *sculp-torium*, ‘an instrument for scratching’ (Martial xiv. 83). (Cf. Gk. βουλευ-τήρων, ἔργασ-τήρων, both indicating place, καυσ-τήρων, ‘instrument for burning,’ κρυ-τήρων, ‘means of deciding’). (On Fem. -toria in Late Lat. see Rönsch, Collectanea, p. 197.) Similarly we have *mönium*, *mōnia* from MEN-stems, e.g. *ālīmonia* and *ālīmonium* (cf. *ālīmentum*), *ālōmonium* (on the spelling, see Nettleship, Contributions, s.v.) from *flamen*, an ending extended to *tristē-monia, Sancti-monia, &c*. The Adj. ending -ārius (from ὁσιος, 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. *mānnaŭum*: ἔγχειριδίον (Gl. Cyrill.), ὀκλίνιμ (ib.) A common ending of Abstract Nouns is -itia (often -itiae), e.g. *laetitia* from *laetus*, like *militia* from *miles* (see also YE-stems, § 51), -itium, e.g. *servitium, flāgītium, lānītium*. From N-stems we have, e.g. *cōlōnial*, in O. Lat., ‘a dwelling-place’ (Plaut. *Anl. 576*: ut commutet coloniam).

-ārio- and -āri-, -ālio- and -āli-. Caper (p. 103. 9 K.) approves the old form *vinarius*:

Vasa istaece vinaria sunt, vinaria ecella:

Vulgus adhuc retinet de priscæ verba loquella; and similarly *atramentarium* (p. 108. 3 K.); but Probi Appendix (p. 198. 7 K.) primipilarius, non ‘primipilarius.’ (For other examples of -arius, -ālius, see Rönsch, Collectanea, pp. 196, 208; Neue ii3. p. 158.)

Other examples of IO-stem Compounds. From *jūs* and *āgo* was formed *jūr(ā)-gium*; so *titillium*; from *āco*, *jugūlicium, inīcūlicium*; from *ēco*, *ōmītimium, ectlītium, inītium* (cf. § 77); similarly *praemia* from *ēma*, *incudium, suspūrium, discūdium, commūbium, subsidium, ædlīcium, lectūcētium, stillī-cētium, obsēquium* [wrongly declared (Cicero ap. Quint. viii. 3. 35; but cf. *Lael. xxiv. 89*) to be a coingage of Terence, for it is used by Plautus (*Bacch. 1082*) and Naevius (Don. ad Ter. *Andr. i. 1. 40*)] and *excēquiae, excūbiae, suppētiae, vindēmia* from *vinum* and *ādeo, inēcia* from *cāra*, &c.
§ 5. -ÜØ-, -UÅ-. 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, fūnus (cf. fūs-cus), at the time when s after vowels became r in Latin. An original -āwō-, -ēwō-, -ōwō- would also become -ūō-, and in time -vō- in Latin (ch. iii. § 24, p. 174), so that the exact origin of the Latin suffix -ūo-, -vō- is often doubtful. Another element of confusion is that the weak grade of the I.-Eur. suffixes -wō-, -ūwō- (-wē-, -ūwē-, see § 2) was ū, which opened the way to these stems coalescing with ū-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, rēvus, &c. Greek Verbal Adjectives in -tēos for *-tēs-, with Gerundive force, e.g. dōwktēos, requiring to be pursued, capable of being pursued (cf. O. Ind. kārtva-, kārtuva-, ‘requiring to be done’), are in Latin represented by formations in -uns, e.g. caeduns, excīpuns, praecīpuns, conspicuns, while another class of Verbal Adjectives, denoting state or condition, end in -tīvus, e.g. nātīvus, caplīvus, vōlīvus. These Adjectives in -tīvus seem to be derived from Verbal Nouns with a TIO-suffix or a TI-suffix (cf. furīvus from *furlī-, a stem seen in Adv. furītum, ch. ix. § 4; sēmentīvus from sementis, Late Lat. sementivum, Rönsch, Collect. p. 209), though some have tried to connect them with Sanskrit Gerundives in -tavyā-, e.g. O. Ind. kartavyā-, ‘requiring to be done’ (See Thurneysen, Verba aus -io, p. 41; von Planta, Gramm. Osk.-Umbr. i. p. 169), while Verbal Adjectives of the same sense in -īvus, e.g. rēcīdīvus [cf. cādīvus (morbus), ‘the falling sickness,’ in Gaulish Latin, e.g. Marc. Emp. xx. 93], sub-sēcīvus, O. Lat. vocīvos from vocare (classical vācare), may come from Verbal Nouns with an IO-suffix. The forms icīdīvus, vācīvus are not phonetic developments of these, but follow the analogy of Gerundive Adjectives like caeduns, excīpuns, &c.

*laiwo-, 'left' (Gk. λαῦο(φ)ός, O. Sl. левǔ), Lat. laevis, probably connected with Engl. slow, from Teut. *slaiwa-. Similarly Lat. calvis (O. Ind. kula-) ; Lat. scaevus (Gk. σκαυφός) ; Lat. clivus (Goth. hlaiw Neut. ‘tomb,’ O. Engl. hlāw, hlāw, ‘hill,’ esp. ‘grave-hill,’ Sc. law) from the root klei-, ‘to lean, slope.’

The thematic vowel is inserted in I.-Eur. *widh-o-wo-, ‘unmarried, widowed’ [O. Ind. vidabhya-, Gk. ἠδώδος; cf. Goth. viduvō (n-stem), O. Sl. vidova, ‘a widow,’ O. Ir. fēdb, W. gweddw]. Lat. vidivus, from the root weidh-. ‘to separate,’ of Lat. di-vīdo, &c.

§ 7. Latin Verbal Adjectives in -eus, -ivus, -tivus. Relicusus (rather relicusus) is a word of four syllables in Plautus, and indeed in all the Republican literature, though it afterwards became religusus and finally reliusus; similarly delicusus, &c. (see Bersu, the Gutturalen, p. 59). This ending -eus (-ivos), indicating state or condition, is seen in continuus, ingēnīus, assīdīus (whence the Adverb assīdīus, for the sake of a pun with which Plautus coins the form accelerō, Truc. 422), exigius, ambigvus [though we find other Compounds like prōdigus from āgo (prodigius) in the Comm. Lud. Saec.], indīgus from āgeo with the O-suffix]; from first conj. verbs we have ārīus, irrigvus (irrigvus Cato), vīcivus (vivīcivus Plaut.) ; from ineo we have Intr. Derivative IO-stems from these are e.g. reliquus, deliquium. Examples of Adjectives, &c. in -eus, derived from nouns, are ; annus from annus (O-stem), Minerva for *menes-ă (cf. O. Ind. manas-vin-, ‘intelligent’) from *menes-, ‘intelligence’ (O. Ind. mānās-, Gk. μήσος), a quadrisyllable in Plautus (ch. iv. § 148), strēninus (cf. Gk. στρήνος, health, Engl. stern, Pruss. sturnawiskan, ‘earnest’), patrīvus from pāter (R-stem). Another example of a Gerundive Verbal Adjective in -eus is pascuus, fit for pasture, intended for pasture, with which Plautus contrasts ārīus, fit for ploughing (Truc. 149):

non ārīus hic, sed pascuus ager est;

(cf. Cic. de Rep. v. 2. 3 agī arvi et arbusīt et pascui), whence arvum, with O. Lat. aruca Plur., a field for ploughing. Of Nouns and Adjectives in -ivus, -īva, which some would make Derivative IO-stems of Adjectives in -eus (reicivus from recidivus; but cf. deliquium, reliquus from delicivus, reliusus), examples are : internēcivus (cf. internēc and internēcium) from nīcēra, subsīcivus [cf. i(n)sācium, senisācium] from sīcēra. (Subsīcivus denotes what remains over and above a division of land, &c., hence subsīcivus ager, spare land, subsīcivus tempus, spare time, whence the proverb subsīcivus operis, Cic. de Orat. ii. 89. 364). Another word often confused with this last, viz. succivus, from succēdo, shows the more usual mode of derivation, from a Verbal Noun Tl- or TlO-stem (cf. succēdiō), like passivus, fūgītivus. Līxivus, whence the derivative IO-stem līxivus, comes from līxīvus, derived from līxra, water, lye, *lēxare (Ital. lessare), to boil, words connected with the root wleiq of Lat. līgnor, O. Ir. fiuch, ‘wet’ (see Class. Rev. v. 10). The O. Lat. word sonicīus (Paul. Fest. 409. 6 Th. ‘sonivio,’ sonanti) used in the augur’s phrase sonicīvum tripudium (Serv. ad A. iii. 90 ; cf. Fest. 422. 19 Th.), will, if the second syllable is long, be similarly related to sināre, as līxivus to *lēxare, subsīcivus to subsīcare, &c. [Nīcivus, Plin. Phaedr., &c. from nūco, I.-Eur. *nōkēyō (ch. viii. § 23), has been compared to O. Sl. chodi-vǔ, ‘wandering,’ from chodi-ti, ‘to go,’ ljubi-vǔ, ‘loving,’ from ljubi-ti, ‘to love’).

The I.-Eur. suffixes -tūw-, -tвw-, or -tūw-, -tвw-, closely connected with the Verbal Noun suffix -tu- (§ 47), are frequent in O. Ind. and Slav. (e.g. Y 2
O. Ind. kár-tuva-, kár-tva-, ‘requiring to be done,’ kár-tva-m, ‘a task’; cf. Gk. -re(φ)os of διωκ-τής, &c.), but hardly appear in Latin; e.g. mor-tuus (O. Sl. mrti-tvūj); Fā-tuus another name of Faunus, the god of prophecy, derived from fū-ri (but fītuus, foolish, with short a, means literally ‘gaping,’ from fū-tiscor, &c.). In mātuus the t belongs to the Verb-stem (cf. Lett. meentī, ‘to exchange,’ Goth. maipms, ‘a gift’).

§ 8. -NŌ-, -NA-. The I.-Eur. suffix -nō-, Fem. -nā-, seems to vary with the higher grades -cnō-, -cnā-, and -ōnō-, -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. impleōs); while of Verbal Nouns formed with this suffix we have, e.g. dōnum (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. sāpna; cf. Gk. ὑπνός, O. Sl. sūn). An N-stem which passes into the O-declamation shows this suffix; thus rēgnum (ch. ii. § 144) may be from stem *rēgen- (cf. O. Ind. rājān-, ‘rule’). The suffix is preceded by s in lūna for *hluna (cf. losna on an old Praenestine mirror, C. I. L. i. 55) ( Zend raxšna-, ‘shining,’ Pruss. lauxnos Pl., ‘stars’). In Greek we find some Adjectives of Time in -ivos, derived from a Locative Case ending in -i, e.g. χειμερ-νός (Lat. hibernus for *himrī-no-, ch. iv. § 77), ἀπινός (Lat. vernus), ἐσπερί-νός (cf. Lat. vesperrna), &c. Adjectives in -nus in Latin like fāgnus, juncinus show an I.-Eur. suffix -nō-, denoting material or origin, e.g. Gk. φύγ-νός, made of beech-wood, βύβλινος, made of papyrus, &c. In Latin, owing to the weakening of vowels in unaccented syllables, -nus may represent an older -ānō-, -ēnō-, -ōnō-, &c., as well as -ānō-; and, owing to the syncope of such vowels, -nus may represent the same formations. It is however often possible to distinguish between original -no- and original -ino-, &c.; thus pōpulnus, 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
§ 8. NOUN AND ADJECTIVE STEMS. -NŌ-, -NĀ-.

The suffix -īvos in Greek, denoting species, occurs frequently with names of animals, e.g. δελφακ-ιν from δελφαξ, κορακ-ινος from κόραξ; and similarly in Latin we have bōvinus, ēquīnus, suīnus (Goth. sv-ein, Engl. swine, O. Sl. sv-inu), fibrīnus (O. H. G. bibir- in; cf. Zend bawr-aenīş, Lith. bebr-īnis), &c., the feminine often being employed with ellipse of oōro, as vītālīna, veal, suīna, pork, &c. Latin -īnus is often due to the addition of the NO-suffix to IO-stems, e.g. Lātinus from Latīnum (though, when the suffix -ino-, and not -no-, is added, we have -īnus, e.g. āliēnus from alius, lāniēna from lānius, with the same dissimilation of the i- and e-vowels, as in piētas instead of *piēitas, mēdietas instead of *mēlitas, &c., Engl. ‘yet,’ ‘yes,’ for ‘yet,’ ‘yis’), or to I-stems, e.g. mārinus from mare, piscina from piscis, omnīnō from omnīs. It is often seen in the transference of an ION-stem into the Ō- or Ā-declension (cf. § 55 on ērūlōnus beside cērulō). e.g. in names of gods like Jugātinus, ‘qui conjuges jungit,’ from jūgātio, Potina, the goddess worshipped when a child first took milk (Non. 108. 17 M.), from pōtio, &c. Lat. -īno may also represent an earlier -aino-, &c., for ai in the unaccented syllable, became ei, which passed into i, but Osc. deīv-ino-, &c. proves an original -ino- for deīvinus, &c. The suffix -tīnus of div-tīnus, cras-tīnus, prīs-tīnus, &c., corresponding to the O. Ind. suffix -tana-, -tana- used to form Adjectives from Adverbs of Time, e.g. divā-tana- and divā-tāna-, ‘daily,’ nū-tana-, nū-tana-, ‘of the present time,’ pra-tā-, ‘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, gigno, &c. The -gnus of iligēnus, siūlīgnus, lārīgnus 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 ilīc-is, salīc-is, larīc-is, and was by their analogy extended to other tree-adjectives like abīgnus from abīēs, Gen. abiēl-is [ferrūgīnus (cf. aurīgīnus, fulūgīnus) adds the O-suffix to the stem of ferrūgin-īs]. Similarly -ānus, the ending of Adjectives formed with the NO-suffix from Ā-stems, e.g. silīvānus, 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. lacturnus (and *urnius, e.g. Plaurusinus); while ES-stems give -ēnus; e.g. ahenus, Umbr. ahesno- from aes, I.-Eur. *aues-; venēnum, lit. 'philtre,' 'love-potion,' for *vēnēs-no- (cf. Venus); ęgēnus (cf. ēges-ēnas), &c.; we have -ūna from a U-stem in lācūna. A common use of the NO-suffix in Latin is to form Distributive Numerals, e.g. quāterni, bīnī, trīnī, ternī (see ch. vi. §§ 59, 61, 63).

§ 9. I.-Eur. NO-suffix. I.-Eur. *oi-no-, 'one' [Gk. ὁν, the ace on dice, (though olos, Cypr. ollos, alone, has the WO-suffix, like Zend aeva-, āva-), O. Ir. een, W. un, Goth. ains, Lith. vēnas, O. Sl. inū, Lat. ānus. Similarly Lat. cānus for *cansus (cf. cuscus), Osc. casinar, an old man; Lat. urna for *urnus (cf. ureus); Lat. quernus for *quercus; Lat. agrus (Gk. ἀγος for *dāβ-ros, O. Ir. uan, W. oen; cf. O. Sl. jagn). Lat. grānum from root ĝer-, 'to rub down, wear out' (O. Ind. jirnā, 'rubbed down,' Goth. kaurn, 'corn,' O. Sl. žrino).

§ 10. Latin -nus. Other examples are pāter-nus, māter-nus, from R-stems; alter-nus, infer-nus, exter-nus; prōnus from the preposition pro, as Osc. amno-,'a circuit,' from the preposition am-(Lat. ambr-), Osc. com(ō)no-, Umbr. cumno-, corresponding to the Latin comitium, from the preposition com; māter-nus from materias (in- probably); from U-stems tribānus, (cf. pēcānia). The suffix -ēno-, -ūno- appears in O. Lat. Duēnus, bènē (cf. bēnignus, bellus for *ben-lus), O. Lat. duonus, bōnus from the same root as O. Ind. ďūvas-, 'honour.' From sārcio we have sārcina, from pango (compāges), pāgina, for ango, angīna, from sto, destīna, a prop (cf. destināre, like lancināre, &c., ch. viii. § 10).

§ 11. Latin -īnus. From Ā-stems, names of animals, we have āqūlīnus, formīcinus, noctūrinus, mustērinus, cūlibīnus, ēpīrīnus, &c., and from names of persons, Agrippina, Jūgurthinus, Messēnus, Sībylīnus, &c. Other examples are: from O-stems, dīr-inus, vicīnus; from an R-stem, sōbr-inus (for *sōbr-inus from sōrīr, I.-Eur. *swēsor-); from U-stems, gēnīnus dens, from *genus, the jaw (Gk. ἴδνυς); verūna from vērī; from Verbs in -io, officina, fodīna. (For a list of Nouns in -ina, see Rönsch, Collectanea, p. 199).

§ 12. Latin -ānus. (See A. L. L. i. 177.) From town-names of the first declension we have Rōmanus, Cōpianus, &c. Names of persons in -ānus are usually derived from place-names, and often preserve the names of lost towns; e.g. Apsicūlanus points to a town *Apsicūla (Eph. Eii. Epigr. ii. pp. 25-92). Derivative Adjectives from the fem. of ordinal numbers show -ānus, e.g. undecimānus from undecima, sc. léga, colons. So decimānus from decima, sc. pars, the tenth part, tithe, e.g. ager decimānus, land paying tithes, an adjective which somehow acquired the sense of large, huge, e.g. decimānus seōta, decimānus flactus, decimānus ova, 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 -īnus, properly affixed to ā-stems, e.g. Oktōinianus from Oktōvia, sc. gens (the cognomen of a person who had passed by adoption from the gens Octavia to another
§ 13. -MÉNÔ-, -MÉNÄ-. Other grades of this suffix were -mônō-, -mōnā-, and -mnō-, -mnā-, &c. In Latin -mēno- and -mōno- would both become -mīna- or (by Syncope) -mīno- (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. bhāra-māna-, Gk. θεφό-μενος); and although the Pres. Part. Passive was lost in Latin, traces of this formation remain in the 2 Pl. Pres. Ind., e.g. légimini for legimini estis (while legimini, 2 Pl. Pres. Imper., may equally stand for the Inf., Gk. λέγεμεναι, used in Imperatival sense; see ch. viii. § 81). āllumnus, δ θεφόμενος (sometimes a nurse, as in the Ciris, 441: communi alumnæ omnibus, of the earth), fē-mina from the root dhē(y), 'to give suck;' Vertumnus, the god of the changing seasons, from verto, Volumnus, the deity who guarded new-born children, from vīlo, *calumnus (cf. cūlāmnia) from calu-or, culvor, to deceive. Analogous, but irregular, formations seem to be O. Lat. pilumnoe poploe, from pilum, a javelin, used of the Romans in the Carmen Saliare (Fest. 244. 24 Th.), like classical pilāni, and the names of deities, Pilumnus, from pilum, a pestle, Vitumnus, 'per quem vivescat infans,' from vīla, &c. We find -mo- (from an earlier -mno-?) in Umbro-Oscan Imperative forms like Umbr. persnihilnu 'supplicato,' Osc. cesanur 'censeror'; cf. Lat. praefāminō, antestāminō (see ch. viii. § 60). Sometimes the suffix is used in the transference of a MEN- or MON-stem into the ò- or ā-declension, e.g. cōlumnā, beside cūlūmen (cf. columnella for cōlummen-la), terminus, beside termen and termo (quoted by Festus, 550. 22 Th., from Ennius, e.g. Α. 591 M.: qua redditus termo est).

The ending -mnus in Latin often arises from the addition of the suffix -no- to a stem ending in a labial consonant, e.g. som-
§ 14 -MÓ-, -MĀ-. This suffix was used to form Adjectives (e. g. Gk. φύξιμος, from φύξις, λύσιμος from λύσις) and Nouns, especially Masculine nouns, but sometimes Fem. (e. g. Gk. Abstracts in -μός like αν-μός, λοι-μός). Examples are I.-Eur. *dhümós (O. Ind. dhúmás, Gk. θύμος, Lith. dúmai Pl., O. Sl. dymū), Lat. fūmus, from the root dheu-; I.-Eur. *gh²ormós, *gh²ermos (O. Ind. gharmás, 'warmth,' Arm. jerm, 'warm,' Gk. θερμός, Engl. warm), Lat. formus, from the root gh²er-.

It was also used to form Superlatives (with Comparative in -cōro-, ch. vi. § 52), e. g. Lat. summus for *s-np-mo, with Comp. s-öpero- (O. Ind. upamā-, with Comp. āpāra-; cf. O. Engl. yf(e)m-est). In Latin pulcerrimus for *pulcerisimus, *pulcrēsimus, it is affixed to the Comparative suffix -is- of māgis, &c. The more usual Superlative suffix however was -temo- (-tēmo-) (with 'Comparative' in -tēro-, ch. vi. § 52), e. g. Lat. in-timus, with 'Comp.' intero- (O. Ind. án-tama-, with 'Comp.' án-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. mārtilimus, 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 -tēmo- 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. pal-ma (Gk. παλα-μη, O. Ir. lā-m Fem., O. Engl. fol-m Fem.); Lat. culmūs (Gk. κάλα-μος, O. Engl. healm, Lett. sal-mūs, O. Sl. sla-ma Fem.); Lat. dāmus, O. Lat. dūmus Adj. (Liv. Andr. dūsmo in loco) (cf. O. Ir. dōss, 'a bush'); Lat. timus (O. H. G. tīm, Engl. lime).

(2) Of the Superlative suffix, (a) alone: Lat. minimus, brūma from brēvis for *breghu- (cf. Gk. βραχύς); Lat. infimus beside inférus. (b) With -is-: cēlīsimus, fēcillīmus, simillīmus, &c.. The suffix -temo- (-tēmo-) has its original sense in finī-timus, legī-timus, aedī-tumus, a temple attendant, which was changed in Varro's time to aedī-tumus, through a false reference of the word to tēuer (Varro R. R. i. 2. 1) ab aeditimo, ut diere didicimus a patribus nortris, ut corrigimur a recentibus urbanis, ab 'aedítulo'; cf. Gell. xii. 10). Ultimus (Osc. últīmō-) is Superl. of ulterior, cētīmus of celerītor, &c.

§ 16. -RŌ-, -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-iru-, Gk. ἐ-ρυθρός, O. Sl. rūdrū; cf. O. Scan. rōdra Fem., ‘blood’), Lat. rūber; I.-Eur. *agro-, ‘a field,’ from the root aģ-ī-, ‘to drive’ (O. Ind. ājra-, Gk. ἀγρός, Goth. aksen), Lat. āger. In Latin the ending -rōs (and -rōs, § 40) became -er, as is seen in these two examples [cf. ch. iii. § 15 (8)]. The suffixes -ērō and -tērō, which in Latin might through Syncope lose the ê and appear as -ro-, -tro- have been already mentioned as Comparative Suffixes, corresponding to Superlatives in -mo- (-mмо-), -tмо- (-tম০-). Their original sense however was rather that of likeness, of equal than of greater degree, e.g. O. Ind. vatsa-tara-, 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. θηλυτερος, ἀγρότερος). Latin nouns like fāliaster, matraster, patraster have this suffix with a prefixed -as- (see Ascoli, Suppl. Arch. Glottl. i), while in māgi-is-ter, mēnis-ter, the Comparative sense belongs to the suffix -is-, not to the suffix -ter; citer, 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. brēviter (see ch. ix. § 2); though some have explained -iter as the noun ĺter, a way, so that brev-iter would correspond to the German adverb kurz-weg. It is used in Possessive Pronouns in Latin, e.g. vester, as in Gk., e.g. ὑμετερος, and in various pronounal and locative Adjectives, with the sense of ‘like,’ ‘in the direction of,’ e.g. al-ter, i-terum, sūp-erus, 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-ī-, ‘to make’ (cf. Lat. Cerus, creare, &c.), e.g. lūdi-ter, or stands by assimilation for -clo- (I.-Eur. -tlo-) when an l precedes, e.g. invōlā-trum 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, -dhrō-, is used in the same way, though in Latin it affects also the Feminine gender, -bra for *-frā, *-dhrā (ch. iv. § 114), e.g. tērēbra, a gimlet, borer, from tērō, to bore; crībrum, a sieve, from cerno, to sift. Latin -ōrus, of honōrus, dēcōrus, cānōrus, ōdōrus, &c. stands for -ōso- (§ 74); we have -erus 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. spōrū); Lat. vir (O. Ir. fer, Goth. vair, Engl. wer-wolf; cf. O. Ind. virā-, Lith. vyras); Lat. tēnēbrae for *tēmes-rae (O. Ind. tamis-ram, tāmis-rā, O. H. G. dinster); Lat. cāper (Gk. sāpos, O. Engl. hæser); Lat. māter (Gk. mēs-pōs); Lat. plē-rus, gnā-rus, in-tēger, glāber for *gladhrō- (cf. O. Sl. gladuki, ‘smooth’), cērbum for *cres-rae (cf. O. Ind. āiras-, ‘head’), mātā-rus (cf. pēnāria). (On Fut. Part. in -ārus, 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 -āmus like māritimus, finītimus: e.g. camp-o-s-ter, silve-s-ter, &c. which take *-es by the Analogy of Neuter ES-estems (cf. Gk. ἐπερ-τερός, &c.); *ovases-ter for *oavē-tri-, *pātesta for *pēdi-tri-; *pūlaster for *poluād-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. pēdāaster, of which Plautus uses the Diminutive in the sense of ‘bag-rag and bob-tail soldier’ in Mil. 54:

at pēdāstelli quia erant, siui uiferent,

Antōniaster (Cic. fragm. orat. pro Varena, 10); Ølaster, wild olive, and similarly øpiastrum, wild parsley, &c.; fliaster, a stepson, mātrastra, a stepmother, pāstraster, a stepfather; surdaster, with other Adjectives indicating bodily defects, such as calvaster, claudaster, and the diminutive rāvastellus from rāvus, grey (\(\text{v. i. grāvastellus};\) cf. Gk. γράφω?) in Plaut. Epid. 620. Derivative Adjectives show -ast(r)imus, e.g. mediastinimus and mediastinus, oleastinus, fliastinus. (On these formations in -aster, see A. L. L. 1. 390.)

(2) Attached to Prepositions, &c.: Lat. sūpero- (O. Ind. úpāra-, Gk. ὑπερός, O. Engl. ufer-ra with -ra for Goth. -iza), sūper- and sub-ter; Lat. inter-ter (O. Ind. āntara-, Gk. ἑντέρος, the entrails, O. Sl. āntr Neut., ‘the liver’); Lat. exter (O. Ir. echtar), postero-, postrā-alii, contrā, prēter (ch. ix. § 2). Other locative words are cē-ter (Goth. hi-dre, ‘hither’), Δex-ter (Gk. δεξί-τέρος), sin-is-ter.

(3) Forming Pronouns: Lat. û-ter, Osc. pōtoro- (cf. O. Ind. katarā-, Gk. πότερος, Goth. hvājar, Lith. katrās); ùtērum, for another time, again, from tēro-, other (O. Ind. ùtara-, ‘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 iūlius, another (of many). The Possessives ‘our,’ ‘your’ take -tero- in Latin, nos-ter, res-ter, and Greek ήμε-τέρος, ήμε-τερος, but -éro- in Teutonic, e. g. Goth. unsar, Germ. unser.

§ 19. I.-Eur. -tro-. Lat. drā-trum (cf. Gk. ἄπο-τροσ, Arm. arōr, Ir. arathar, W. arad(r) from aro (aratus); spectrum from spēcio (spectus); rūtrum from rūo
§ 20. I.-Eur. d-hro-. The Greek and O. Ir. cognates of Lat. terēbra show the suffix -tro- (Gk. τρέτρον, O. Ir. tarathar Neut.) ; so O. Ir. criathar, 'a sieve,' for *kreitron (cf. Lat. polēbra and palpeepra). Other examples of Lat.
-bra are dolē-bra, from dolēre, whence the name (originally a nickname) Dolē-
bellâ, lit. 'a place for hiding,' from lateo, verē-bra from verēre, pelē-bra from pelio, to allure (cf. κήλη-θρον from κηλέω). Examples of Lat. -brum are
flâ-brum from flâre, O. Lat. polôbrum (quod Graeci Χρέβον, nos trullum vocamus, Non. 544. 20 M.) from *pô-lo in the sense of ab-lo (cf. ch. ix. § 12),
dēlōbrum, ventīlē-brum from ventīlē-re. (On the possibility of referring all these forms to the suffix -dlo-, see § 26). Latin -bro-, -bra also represent an original -s-ro-, -s-râ- (ch. iv. § 152), e.g. lēvēbra (O. Ind. tāmīsra- etc.) from *temis,
*temus darkness (cf. tēmēro), cērēbra (cf. O. Ind. šīras- 'the head'); and some would explain terēbra, &c. as *teres-râ, from the Verbal Noun-stem teres-
seen in Inf. terere (§ 71).

§ 21. -LÖ-, -LĂ-. 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. thistle, is a Diminutive. Latin examples are
leviulus, a picker, from lego, pensūlus, hanging, from pendo, pendeo, vincūlum, a bond, 'an instrument for binding,' from vincio, mensula, 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 -clo- (e.g. Gk. νεφέλη, Lat. nūdīla), from -ulo- (e.g. Gk. παυκλός, O. Ind. bahukā-), &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 -clo-, -ulo-, &c., though in words like exēplum, &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. aurul-cō-la, formed by adding the
Diminutive Suffix -la to the Diminutive Suffix -co- (§ 31), in classical Latin auricula, became auricla, õricla, whence Ital. orecchia and orecchio, 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,' cūtī-clum (cūtīculum), '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. vēhīculum, pērīculum, but corcūlum, uxorcula.
The suffix -dhol- (in Latin -dīlum) 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-crump, 'a place for walking,' &c. (ch. iv. § 84). Beside Neuters in -bīlum we have Passive Adjectives in -bīlibis, with much the same sense as the Passive Adjectives in -lis, e.g. āgī-bīlis, that can or ought to be driven, from āgo, like āgīlibis, '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. bībulus from bībo, creūdālus from creō, trūmīlus from trūmō, garrībīlus from garrīo, emūmīlus from emīneō, pūbīlus from pādeo. With a passive sense they become I-stems in Latin, and indicate capacity, suitability, &c., e.g. āgīlis (O. Ind. ajārī-), 'easily driven,' nimble, from ago, to drive, dēcīlis from dēcoeō, frāgīlis from frango, vivīlis from bībo. This -li- 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 -li-, e.g. hūmīlis (Gk. χαμαλός) from hūmus, herbīlis from herba, sīmīlis (Gk. ὁμαλός) (on these see § 40). Active Verbal Adjectives in -lo- are used in O. Sl. in the periphrastic perfect tense, e.g. zna-lu jesni, 'I have known,' lit. 'I am acquainted,' from znati, 'to know.'

§ 23. Nouns denoting the Agent or the Instrument, e.g. Lat. figūthus, a potter, from fingo; tēgūla from tēgo; vīgūla from vīgo (unless these are Diminutives of *ēga, *īga; cf. col-ēga; cf. § 3); cīpīlus from cīpio; spēculum, a place of outlook, and spēculum, a looking-glass, from spēcīo, to look; torcūlum (with Adj. torculus), a wine-press (later torcular), from torqueo; cīngūlum and cingulus, a girdle, from cingo; jācīlum, (1) a javelin, (2) a throw-net (rete iaculum, Plaut. Truc. 35), and jāculus, a kind of snake, from jācio; sella for *sed-la (Lac. Gk. ἱλλά) from sīdeō; grattae from grādiōr; pilum for *pinshum, a pestle, from pinso.
Often we have the terminations -slo-,-sla-, e.g. -āllum for *ans-lum, from ans- (cf. O. Sl. ąch-ati, ‘to be fragrant’), a byform of the root an-, ‘to breathe’; pāthu for *pax-lus (cf. Diminutive paxillus), from pango; vēllum, a sail, for *exclīrum (cf. exzillum), from vēho (cf. O. Sl. veslo, ‘a rudder’). Nouns in -īla may be derived from Neuter es-stems (e.g. quīrīla for *queres-la, sēquīla for *seques-la) or may have had originally ē (e.g. cl-āndīla, a glow-worm, from candeo, candēre, like Gk. μυρμός from μυρμα). These nouns in -īla were in Late and Vulgar Latin confused with Diminutives and became quērīla, sēquīla, &c. (see ch. ii. § 130), just as camēlōs became camēlīthus, cucūlōs became cucūlīthus, anquīfa (A. L. L. viii. 442) became anquīlla. We have -rum for -hum by dissimilation of l in scalp-rum from scalpo, &c.

§ 24. Diminutives. Lat. cistula; auxilla from aula (olla) for *aux-la; porculus (Germ. Ferkel); servulus; filūdus; trācula; lactucla from lactēca; bovāc-ulus; misellus (occasionally misērulus); ītella (Osc. Aderlā); asellus from āsīnus; gemellus from āzīnus; lapitātus from lūpīdātus. Sometimes this termination is added a second time, e.g. cistella from cistula; oellula from olla; porcellus from porculus; ascellus from asellus; gemellus from gemellus. Sometimes it is added to the Diminutive suffix -co-, e.g. olli-cu-las, serci-cu-las, cor-cu-lum, lēgian-cu-las, cānī-cu-las (cf. fēbrī-cu-las, méla-cu-las, āpī-cu-las, va-lī-cu-las, diē-cu-las, corpus-cu-lum, arti-cu-lus. The Diminutive retains the Gender of the simple Noun, unlike Greek Diminutives in -kós, which are Neuter (A. L. L. iv. 169). This suffix -cu-lus gives to Adjectives the sense of ‘somewhat,’ e.g. melītus-cu-lus, ‘somewhat better,’ and other Comparatives like plus-cu-lus, majus-cu-lus, &c.; also grandī-cu-lus, sīcilī-cu-lus, ēcī-cu-lus, &c. With the Diminutive suffix -(ē), familiar or pet names are often formed in I.-Eur. languages, e.g. Gk. ὑπαρχέω, the familiar form of ὑπαρχεῖν, Goth. Vulfs-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 ānus, Dim. of ānus, a large ring, e.g. Plaut. Men. 85 anum lima praeterunt) 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 ādīcescens in Plautus, but in Terence is hardly distinguishable. Diminutives were a feature of Vulgar Latin, as we see from the forms censured in the Probī Appendix: jugerun non ā junglēsus (197. 29 K.); catulus non ā catellūs (198. 2); auris non ā orikula (198. 11); cf. Ital. orecchio, Fr. oreille); fac non ā faça (198. 23); nepitis non ā nepitica; anus non ā anuclea (199. 1); mergus non ā mergula (199. 7). The ending -illus, as we have seen, may denote a Diminutive of a LO-Diminutive, e.g. ānēllus (on -ell-, see ch. iv. § 10), Dim. of ānus, or the Diminutive of a Noun with a RO-suffix, e.g. ōgellus from ōgro- for *agro-lo- (ch. iii. § 15. 8), or of a Noun with ē in the penult, e.g. fēmella from fēmīna (earlier -mena). Similarly we have -illus for -īd-hus in lapillus, -ēlla for -ēna in catella, -īlum for -īn-hum in rīlhum, -illus (older -illus) for -ēn-hus in homellus, -ōlla for -ōna in cărilla, -illus for -ān-hus in Inellus, -illus for -ān-hus in Hispālūs, &c. (cf. nitellula and nitellla).

§ 25. Neuters formed with the Suffix -tlo-. Lat. discerniculum (‘acu quae capillos mulierum ante frontem dividit; dictum a discernendo,’ Non. 35. 29 M.); pūcēlm (pūcēulum), ‘a means of appeasing the gods,’ a victim, then ‘a sin for which the gods must be appeased,’ from pūdre; receptāculum from receptāre; paxicula, a mallet, from pātre; sediculum from sædes (‘sediculum’
§ 26. The suffix -dho-. Lat. lātūbum, 'a place for hiding,' from lātus, verdābulum, 'an instrument for hunting,' a hunting-spear, from verūrī; vecēbulum (quod nunc vehiculum dicitur, Non. 54. 26 M.); conciliābulum (locus ubi in concilium convenit, Paul. Fest. 27. 9 Th.); cf. fābula, stēbula. We may have -brum by dissimilation of l-l in lāvā-erum, 'a place for bathing,' from lavāre; impūlērum from inmolō, &c.

§ 27. -TŌ-, -TĀ-. This I.-Eur. suffix was used to form (1) Verbal Adjectives, which in Latin and some other languages have the function of perfect participle, passive, e.g. gēnī-lus from the root ḡen-, while with the negative particle prefixed they may express incapacity, e.g. I.-Eur. *nēmrto-, 'incapable of being killed,' immortal (O. Ind. amīta-, Gk. ἄμφορος); (2) Ordinal Numbers, and when added to the Comparative suffix -is- (§ 76), Superlatives; e.g. I.-Eur. *sēkstō- (O. Ind. ṣaś-thā-, Gk. ἕκτος, Goth. saihsta, an N-stem), Lat. sextus; I.-Eur. *ōkis-to- (O. Ind. ḍaś-īṣṭha-, Gk. ὥκιστος). In Latin this formation of Superlatives is not found, but another, e.g. őcissimus (ch. vi. § 54). Abstract Nouns in -tā- 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. γενετής, ἵπποτής (cf. Lat. ēques from an earlier Abstract Fem. *ēquīla?), though the suffix in Latin was ousted by -tās, -tūdo, &c. (§ 67). I.-Eur. -to- is often seen added to the MEN-

\footnote{1 Lat. jüventa seems to be a formation on the analogy of sinēcta (sc. aetas), for juventās is the form used by the oldest writers, both in the sense of 'period of youth' and 'a number of young men.' (Fleck, Jahresr. Suppl. 1891.) We have actāta iuventa on an inscription (C. I. L. i. 1202).}
suffixed (§ 54) in neuter nouns, e.g. Lat. cognō-men-tum beside cognō-men, such forms being apparently the Neuter of Participles or Verbal Adjectives, formed not from verbs but from nouns, e.g. *cognō-mentus beside cognō-miōnātus, like scelestus beside scelestus (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. -ματα, e.g. στρόματα (Lat. strāmenta), κασσωματα (cf. Lat. assūmenta).

§ 28. Participles in -tus. The weak grade of the root is used with L.-Eur. verbal adjectives in -to-, and the suffix is accented, e.g. L.-Eur. *klō-tō-, ‘heard, heard of, famous,’ from the root *klō-, ‘to hear,’ [O. Ind. śrūtā-, Gk. κλήτος, which perhaps retains the old sense of ‘heard,’ ‘loud’ in such Homeric phrases as κλήτω μήλα, O. Ir. cloth, from *klēto-, O. H. G. Hlot-hari (from O. H. G. hari, Germ. Heer), the name Lothair, corresponding to Greek Κλωτός-αρας; cf. Zend srēta-, 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. κοίη from κεῖμαι, οὕτως from οὖμ, &c. In Latin -sus replaced -tus when the verbal stem ended d or t (ch. iv. § 155), e.g. salsus from salō for *saldo; occasionally the P. P. P. took -sus when the Perfect Ind. had -si, e.g. tersus from tergo (Perf. Indic. terst), 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 strāitus (from the root ster-, O. Ind. stṛta-, Gk. στρωρός, O. Sl. -strītū); mulētus from the root melē- (Lith. mištas); com-mentus from the root men- (O. Ind. matī-, Gk. αὐτομαρτός, Goth. munds, Lith. miūtas, O. Sl. meťū); Lat. gnutus from the root ēnn-, *gnā- (O. Ind. jātū-, Goth. -kunds); Lat. sūtus for *sūto- (O. Ind. syūtā-, Gk. νεοκάττωρος, Lith. sūtūs, O. Sl. šitiū; Lat. gnōtus (O. Ind. jātātū, Gk. γνωρός, O. Ir. gnāth); Lat. junctus (cf. O. Ind. yuktā-, Gk. γυκτός). The different treatment of the stem vowel before the suffix is exemplified by ēmātus, ēmītus from first conj. Verbs; viētus, viētās, exercetus (but ar(e)citus), mūnātus (but Monētā), mūlētus from second conj.; altūs and altus, cultūs, factūs (but fāctūs) from third conj.; finitus and 体育馆 from fourth conj. (On these Verb-stems see ch. viii.); aēgrō-tus, aēgrī-tus, inclī-tus, citūs and cītus. Words like pātā, ‘armed with the pīum,’ barbatūs (O. Sl. bradatī), aurītus, cīnītātus, do not of course imply the existence of verbs, *pālare, *barbare, *aurīre, &c. Of similar formations from Noun- or Adjective-stems examples are: Lat. libertus beside libērātus; onustus beside onērātus; sīnēctus 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’ (arbūstus sive silvestris, Columella), &c. (Arbōretum is a quasi-participle from *arboreo, arboreo-, like ōcītum from occasio; so nūcītum, pīnī-tum, ulīcītum. The -ōtum of illicītum, &c. and the -tum of sālīctum, &c. were extended by false analogy, e.g. bācītum, vīrectum). For a list of Adjectives in -estus, -ustus, -ūtus with this sense of ‘provided with,’ see Rösch, Collect. p. 217, and cf. Plaut. Capt. 392: qui me honore honestiorem semper.
§ 29. Abstract Nouns in -ta (-sa). The Fem. of the Participles répulsus, deprensa, &c. is used in an abstract sense: repulsa, 'defeat at an election,' deprensa, 'genus militaris animadversionis, castigatione major, ignominia minor' (Paul. Fest. 50. 30 Th.). These Abstracts must be distinguished from Concretes like torta (so. placentia), a roll, expensa (sc. piccinia), a sum expended (for a fuller list, see Rösch, Colled. p. 195). The Fem. Abstract *equila, 'horsemanship,' seems to have been made a Mas. Concrete in O. Lat. with the sense also of 'a horse'; thus Ennius (A. 249 M.), describing a charge of cavalry and elephants, says:

\[
\text{denique ui magna quadrupes eques atque elephanti proiciunt sese},
\]

a usage imitated by Virgil (G. iii. 116):

\[
\text{equitem docuere sub armis}
\]

insultare solo et gressus glomerare superbos,

and commented on by Aulus Gellius (xviii. 5; cf. Non. 106. 24 M.).

§ 30. Neuters in -mentum. Other examples are augmentum beside augment (poet.): fundamentum beside fundament (poet.); intermentum beside tegumen, tegimen, tegmen; cogmentum beside cognomen; terminum and trimentum beside térimen; 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; vestitum, from vestio; caementum for *caed-mentum (ch. iv. § 161) from caedo; jugumentum (et paries, C. I. L. vi. 24710), and jugamentum (Cato); jumentum from juo, according to Augustine, Quaest. in Heptal. iii. 2 and v. 38; mōmentum beside mōmen (poet.) from mōceo. Nāmen, crīmen, culmen (cf. cūlāmen), &c. have no byforms in -mentum; implementum, incrēmentum, mōnumentum, &c. have no byforms in -men.

§ 31. -KŌ-, -KĀ-. I.-Eur. -ko-, the -y of Engl. 'stony,' 'angry,' &c., is rarely -ko- (with palatal k), e.g. I.-Eur. *yūwnko-(O. Ind. yuvaśa-, O. Ir. ōac, W. iuane, Goth. juggs), Lat. jūvencus, but usually -ko- or -qko-. It is used as a primary suffix, e.g. cascus (cf. cānus for *cānus, Osc. casuar) fuscus (cf. furcus for *fuscus), but mainly as a secondary suffix employed in the formation of Adjectives from Adverbs, e.g. anticus (of place), antiquus (of time) from ante (cf. O. Ind. antikā-), Nouns, e.g. bellicus, civicus, and Adjectives, e.g. O. Ind. nāgnaka-, 'naked,' beside nāgnā-, 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
niger, òvicula (O. Sl. ovica), [allicare and nigricare are Verbs with the Diminutive KO-suffix (ch. viii. § 33 (7)), (cf. hòmun-ci-o and homun-ci-lus, ñëneca, Non. 17. 18 M., senecio and seniculus), as in Gk. by -σκο- of παιδόκος, &c. We also find it preceded by i, e. g. εἰρων-ικός, Lat. histrión-icus (without the vowel we should have had *histrinuncus), often -tico-, e. g. rus-ticus, herba-ticus, erra-ticus after the analogy of Participle-stems in -to- (§ 28); by i, e. g. Goth. máltiegs, ‘mighty,’ Lat. àmícus, púdícus (i not e is attested for mendícus by Plaut. Réu. 1305; see ch. iv. § 34); by à, e. g. mórícus. 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. glanách, ‘fairer.’

In Latin the -ko- and -qüo- suffixes seem often to have been confused, e. g. antícus and antiquus, tesa or tusqua, lit. ‘dry places,’ for *térsc-, from the root ters-, ‘to dry’ (cf. torreo, Gk. tépsomai), and, as in Greek, &c. there are often byforms of the Consonantal declension, e. g. ùlúx, &c. beside merácus, félix, &c. beside pudícus, &c., like Greek ἰλιξ and ἱλίκος, μεράξ (O. Ind. maryaká-). For -ícus we have -ícius in aedíli-cius, tríbúni-cius, patrícius, adventícius, commendúli-cius, &c.; for -íceus we have -íceus in herbáceus, gallínaeús, árvindínaeús, &c.

§ 32. Adjectives with the KÔ-suffix. From the adverbs ré- and pró- we have vici-prícus, while prócul adds the a- (li-) suffix to *proncus (O. Sl. prokú) (Rhein. Mus. xliii. 402); posticus is the opposite of antícus; pró-cus (cf. prímus (for *pré-mus). From the numeral unus we have unicus (Goth. ainahs, O. Sl. inokú; cf. O. Ind. dvika, Gk. δίσος for δύως). From nouns: patricius (cf. patricius); hosticus, used in Plautus like hostílis (hostica manus, Capt. 246); hostílis manus, Capt. 311; eúceus (beside civile). (Cf. Porph. ad Hor. C. ii. 1. 1 adtende autem non ‘civile’ sed ‘civicum’ dixisse antiqua figura, illi enim ‘civica’ et ‘hostica,’ deinde ‘civilia’ et ‘hostilia’ dicebant. denominationes autem hae fere liberae sunt apud doctos). Other noticeable forms are òdúceus, manúdúceus (cf. fidúc-ia from *fidúceus, and pannácia); lingúlúca, verbiálica; húleus, pélíceus from hiare and petere with the (diminutive ?) LO-suffix. (For a list of Nouns in -ícius, e. g. verrucá, a wart, in O. Lat. a hill (Cato ap. Gell. iii. 76; Quint. viii. 3. 48 and viii. 6. 14), from the root wers- of Lith. virszus, ‘the top,’ O. Ind. varšman, ‘a height,’ see Stolz, Beiträge, p. 6, who points out the connexion of this ending with the ending -iago, e. g. Verrágo, a Volscian town in Latium.) A gloss has: manubrium, quod rustici ‘manicum’ dicunt (C. G. L. v. 115. 17; (manico- in Romance, e. g. Ital. manico, Span. mango, Fr. manche); Paul. Fest. quotes odentica ‘mall odoris loca’ (223. 4 Th.).

§ 33. Adjectives in -ícius. Denominatives (i. e. derivatives from Nouns Z
or Adjectives) have -i-, e. g. patricius from pater, natalicius from natalis; Derivatives from P. P. P. in -to (Vb. Nouns in -tio-, -ti-) have -i-, e. g. dediticius from deditus, insiticius (cf. insitticus) (also nivicius). (For a full list, see A. L. L.V. 415.)

§ 34. Suffixes ending in -i (Nouns and Adjectives of third Declension). -I-. In the declension of these stems i varies with ei and oi (see ch. vi.). The І-stems are often confused with IO-stems (§ 4), with І-stems (§ 51), and with YE-stems (§ 51). Examples of the primary suffix -i- are Lat. anguis (Lith. angis, O. Sl. qži, Arm. aúj), and another I.-Eur. word for a snake, *,eghi- (O. Ind. áhi-, Zend aži-, Arm. iž, Gk ξίς).

Neuter І-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. ákši, akšnas Gen., 'the eye,'ásthi, asthmás Gen., 'a bone,' which may have led to a confusion of І- and N-stems in such words as I.-Eur.*akši-, 'an axle' (Lat. axis, Lith. asžis, O. Sl. osí; but Gk. ἀξιόν). 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. exsomnus from somnus, O. Ir. essamin for *exomnii-, from omnun (*omnno-), 'fear,' though we often find in the early Latin literature the O-stem, e. g. inermus, 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 І-stem case-suffixes, e. g. pūl-і-bns, fērent-іum, &c.; and a stem-suffix ending in ë or ū passes readily, if it be an adjective, into an І-stem, e. g. simēlis (Gk. ὁμαλός), hūmēlis (Gk. χθαμάλος), nāvis (I.-Eur.*nāu-, O. Ind. nāús, Gk. ναῦς), brēvis (cf. Gk. βραχύς), lēvis (cf. O. Ind. rághus, Gk. ἔλαχυς, Lith. lenguris). The Greek loanword hīlērus (ἴλαρός) is also hilaris by the time of Terence.

§ 35. Other examples of І-stems. Lat. ensis (O. Ind. aši-); Lat. trādis from trādo (root treud-, Goth. us-priutan, 'to trouble,' Engl. thrust, threat, O. Sl. trudu, 'toil'); Lat. rūdis, unworked, rude, originally of metal, from the root reudh-, 'to be red' (cf. raudus, unworked metal, ch. iv. § 41); ūbris, continual, from jungo; Lat. scōbīs from scōba; Lat. māre (O. Ir. muir Neut., for *morí, O. H. G. meri Neut., Germ. Meer Neut., Engl. mere).

§ 36. Adjective IO-stems from O-stems. Other examples are: O. Lat. substīmus, e. g. Enn. Trag. 2 R. deum sublimas subices, Lucr. i. 340 sublimaque caeli (see Munro's note); O. Lat. stěritus, e. g. Lucr. ii. 845 sonitu sterila (cf. Paul. Fest. 463, 1 Th. 'sterilam' sterilem). Greek ἀστερόπος had the same tendency to the I-declension in Latin as Greek ἴλαρός, for Caper gives
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a caution against the form austeris (p. 168. 4 K.). Nonius (494. 26 M.) quotes pönis from Varro (Men. 391 B.). On O. Lat. foertus, see ch. viii. § 92.

The Noun torris from the root ters- (Gk. τέρσμα; cf. Lat. torre, ch. viii. § 29) was in O. Lat. torrus (Nov. 15. 22 M.; Serv. ad Aen. xii. 298 'hic torris'... ita nune dieimus: nam illud Ennii et Pacuvii penitus de usu recessit ut 'hic torrus, hujus torri' dieamus), 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 Lucetius iii. 917 (MSS. torret) is doubtful (A. L. L. viii. 587). On hilarus beside hilaris, see Neue, ii 3, 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. āgni-, Lith. ugnis F., O. Sl. ognī M.), Lat. clūnis (O. Ind. śrōṇi-, 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-, Mānes, 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 *crisnis (cf. Lat. crista), pönis 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. *qʷrmi- (O. Ind. kīmi-, O. Ir. crui, W. pryf, Lith. kirmi) is not quite clear. Latin Adjectives in -nis like ĭvermis, 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. õbris, a hill (in Umbrian, &c. used of the citadel) (Gk. ὀκρός, a point, ὄρος, a hill; cf. O. Ind. ášri-, but also Gk. ὄρος), Lat. tālis, quālis (O. Sl. toli Adv., kol Adv.; cf. Gk. τῆλι-κός, τῆλι-κός); 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. săcres, used of animals for sacrifice (e.g. Plaut. Rud. 1208 sunt domi agni et pórci sácres) beside sácer (cf. Mānes beside O. Lat. mānus, good), sǐmīlis (Gk. ὁμαλός), hūmīlis (Gk. χαμαλός). 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. *vitālis from *vīta, ālāris for *alālis (?) from āla, so that the Greek Adj. δαφυλής, when borrowed by Latin, assumed the form dapsīlis. Dialectal examples are Osc. luisarifis, 'lusaribus,' Sab. Flusare 'Florali,' while Osc. Fiususiis 'Florariis' has -āsio- (Lat. -ārio-, § 4).

§ 41. Other examples of Latin -li-, -ri-. uter, a skin, for *ūd-ri-, beside uterus (O. Lat. uterum); ācer, sharp (cf. Gk. ἀσπος). Verbal Adjectives in -lis are, as we have seen (§ 22), byforms with Passive sense of Active Verbal Adjectives in -lus, e.g. āgilis, 'easily driven,' bibilis, 'easily drunk' (beside bibilus, 'easily drinking,' inclined to drink), dōcilis (like dōcibilis); sometimes formed from the Perf. Part. Pass., e.g. fictilis, fissilis, flexilis (and flexibilis), hāmātilis et saxātilis (Plaut. Rud. 299), missiliis. The ending -ālis of actūlis has I.-Eur. i, not ei, to judge from old inscriptions, e.g. C. I. L. i. 61 aidilis (cf. ib. gr.). This -ālis (proper to I- and IO-stems) as well as -ālis (proper to Ā-stems) is often extended by analogy; e.g. ānālis (for *anālis) by analogy of sēnilis; vernilis is from verna, vernilis from ver; from libra, a pound, we have librālis and librālis; from scūra, scūrālis; from manu not *manulītis, but manulītis (so dorsulītis from dorsō-). Examples of -ālis are fidēlis from fidē-, crādēlis (cf. Lānē-lemus, contīmē-tiu) as well as patrēlis and matrēlis. Like tribilītis (from tribu-), idēlis (from iād-), is idēlis. From O-stems we have puēritis, virilis, hūrilis, serēlis, &c.; annilis, fātilis, &c.; from Cons.-stems cōpilālis, virgīn-ālis, hospitālis, jāvēnālis and jāvēnālis, &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. πιστός and πλοτις. 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. mäti- and máti- for I.-Eur. *mṇ-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. mentiōnem, 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. rahjō (Lat. rātio), Gk. δωρίς (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 *mṇtī- became mens in Latin and from the root bher-, the Noun *bhrītī- became fōris, while from méto we have messis for *met-tīs, from the root wes-, vestīs, from sātiāre, sātīās, &c., forms whose common formation has been obscured past recognition. A similar
explanation 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 raptim, furtim, &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. agricola, 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. jüventās beside jüventa (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. nōrtās (Gk. νεόρας), Lat. unītās (O. Ir. oentu), Lat. jüvenūs (O. Ir. őitiu). In Latin, in addition to -tāti- (-tūt-), which is much less in use than -tāti- (-tūt-), we find a form augmented by an N-suffix, -tūdo, Gen. -tūdinis, e.g. servītūdo beside servītūs, hilarītudo (so in Plaut., not hilaritas), beātītudo, which (with beātītas) was a coinage of Cicero (Quint. viii. 3. 32).

§ 43. Other examples of the suffix -ti- in Latin. Latin vectis, a lever (cf. vector), from vēhō; Lat. vītis from the root weid-, 'to plait, weave'; Lat. messis (cf. messio) from mēto; Lat. fors (O. Ind. bhṛti-, O. Ir. brith, Goth. ga-baurj, O. H. g. guburt, O. Engl. gebyrd, 'fate') from fōr; Lat. mens (O. Ind. māti- and māti-, 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 *gauntio); Lat. mors (O. Ind. mṛtī-, O. Lith. mirtis, O. Sl. su-mriti) from mōrōr; Lat. dōs (O. Ind. dāti-, Lith. dūtis, O. Sl. datī) from root dō (cf. dātio, Gk. δοθήν) so Lat. cōs beside cūtus (ch. iv. § 54); Lat. ars (O. Ind. rīti- means 'attack'); Lat. pars (cf. portio); Lat. grātis beside grātus; Lat. quietis beside quītus (inquies for inquietus 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 arraying oneself, then the raiment itself.

§ 44. Examples of Lat. -tiōn-. Lat. vītio (cf. O. Ind. vitti-, O. Sl. -visti and vēstī) from the root weid-, 'to see, know'; Lat. ventio (cf. O. Ind. gātī-, Gk. βατίς, O. H. G. cunft, Lith. -gimtis) from the root gēm-, 'to come'; Lat. sātio (cf. Gk. ἁτίς, Goth. sēs, 'seed,' Lith. sētī) from the root sē-, 'to throw, throw seed'; Lat. con-dātio for *con-dātio (cf. O. Ind. -hiti-, Gk. ἴδως, Goth. -dejās, 'a deed,' O. Sl. -dētī) from the root dhē-, 'to put, place'; Lat. ād-eptio for *ad-āptio (cf. O. Ind. āpī-) beside aptus; Lat. ex-plētio (cf. O. Ind. prātī-, Gk. ποτός), beside ex-pletus; Lat. nōtio for *gnōtio (cf. O. Ind. -jūtī-, '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. ἕμαλδος), hūmīlis (Gk. χαμαλός), appears in an adjective like fortis, in O. Lat. fortus (Paul. Fest. 73. 9 Th. horectum et foretum pro bono dicebant), originally a P. P. P. from the root dhergh-, 'to establish' (O. Ind. ḍṛghá-, 'established, firm'). The older spelling fortis occurs in the clause of the XII Tables quoted by Festus (524. 15 Th.), which provided: ut idem juris esseat Sanatibus quod Foretibus, the Sanates being allies who had revoked but had returned to their allegiance, 'quasi sanata mente,' the Fortes being those who had never broken faith [cf. Paul. Fest. 59. 26 Th. foretis (MSS. forctes), frugi et bonus, sive validus]. The word Sanates shows a similar transference to the I-declension of the P. P. P. of sīnare, and throws light on the termination, -tis O. Lat. -ātis (see ch. iii. § 16), which indicates the country or the party to which one belongs, e. g. opilmates, infimālis (Plaut. Stich. 493), Arpīnates.

§ 46. Other examples of Lat. -tāt(i)-, -tūt(i)-, -tūdin-. 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-, -tūtii- were the suffixes used, e. g. Gen. Pl. civitatum and civitātium. In O. Ind. -tātii e. g. sarvātāt-, 'completeness' (e. g. sarvātāti-), which is rarer than -tāti- in Greek only -tāt- is found. Other Latin examples of -tās (see A. L. L. viii. 321) are suaveitas (Gk. σαυώρης), commūnitas (Goth. gamaindūs), bonitas from bonus, libertas from ēber, civitas from civis, ēberitas from ēber, fāculata and fāculitas from fācilis, vōluptas from vōhip(c), tempestatas from tempus (cf. tempērit), vōnuntas from vilens. Examples of -tās: sēnectus from sēnec, virtus from vir; O. Lat. tempestus (Varro L. L. vii. 51 libri augurum pro tempestatē 'tempestatem' dicient supremum augurii tempus). Examples of -tūdo: altitud from altus, lātitud from lātus, sollicitudo from sollicitus.

§ 47. Suffixes ending in -ū (Nouns of fourth Decl.). -Ū-. In the declension of these stems ī 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. *plū-, 'broad' (O. Ind. prēthū-, Gk. πλατύς, Gaul. litu-). They formed their Nom. Sing. Fem. in -wī, e. g. *swādu-, 'sweet,' with Nom. Sg. Masc. *swādūs (O. Ind. svādūs, Gk. ἱδος), 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 *tnu- 'thin' became ḫūnni- by influence of the fem. *tṇwī); thus suāvis for *suādvīs, lēnus (O. Ind. tanū-, Gk. τανύ-γλωσσος,
O. Sl. tůně-kůj), ḭēvis (cf. O. Ind. rāghu-, Gk. ἐ-λαχῦς, O. Sl. lígū-kůj), brēvis (Gk. βπαχῦς), grāvis (O. Ind. guṟa-, Gk. βαπῦς, Goth. kaurus). Of nouns with the U-suffix examples are I.-Eur. *peku- (O. Ind. pašu- M., Goth. faihu N., 'property,' O. H. G. fihu, O. Engl. feoh, Germ. Vieh, Engl. fee), Lat. pēcū and pecūs; Lat. lūcus (O. Ir. loch, a Neuter U-stem); with the rarer NU-suffix, Lat. cornu and cornus, mānuś, pīnus. The -ru- of Gk. ōdāρv is augmented by the suffix -mā- in Lat. dacrūma, lacrūma. 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. ětum but ýtvā, from the I.-Eur. root ěi-,' 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 ěti, O. Sl. viděť iděti), and the second Supine is another case (ch. viii. § 88) of a similar stem. Occasionally these Abstract Verbal Nouns become concrete, e.g. Lat. māgistrātus, a magistrate. In Greek (they are mostly confined to the Ionic dialect) they are feminine, e.g. ἀπρῦς, a fitting; a connexion (Lat. artūs, M., a limb) (cf. O. Lat. metiū F.).

§ 48. Other examples of U-stems in Latin. Lat. gēnu (cf. O. Ind. jānu, N. Gk. γαῦν 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. senateis shows the same Gen. Sg. suffix as an O-stem (e.g. sakarakleis 'sacraculi'), 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. Baech. 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 senātus is the Genitive form. Nuṇa for nūna, sōcra for socra, forms censured in the Probi Appendix (198. 34 and 199. 1 K.) occur on late inscriptions (nuṇa, C. I. L. viii. 2604. 4293, &c.; nūna, v. 2452; socra, i. 530, 2936; iii. 655; viii. 2906, 3994; xiv. 526, &c.; socra, iii. 3895, vii. 229, &c.) and nūra, sīcra or socra are the prototypes of Ital. nuora,
suocera, Span. nuera, suegra, &c. On Greek inscriptions the only fourth Decl. Nouns found are 
dius, tribus, and the forms used are Nom. Pl. eldelta (Idée), Gen. Pl. eldevon (second cent. B.C., but later eldevon) AbL. Sg. trebou (see Eckinger, p. 134).

Densus is declined only according to the second Decl. in Plautus and till Sulla (see Langen, Anal. Plant. ii. p. 5). Quintilian (i.6.5) mentions it as a word about whose declension there might be doubt. We find in the older writers hensus (Varro, Mon. 422, 531 B.; the gender of hensus is Mas. in O. Lat., see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), lectus (fourth Decl., Georges s. v.), somns (fourth Decl., Georges s. v.), and in a quotation from a Law of Numa (ap. Fest. 212. 17 M.) occurs the form Jami Dat. Sg.: Jami Quirino agnum marem caedito. Priscian, discussing the interchange of second and fourth Decl. forms (i. p. 256 H.), mentions the variants fastus and fastus in Hor. C. iii. 17. 4, cibus Gen. Sg. (doubtful), arci Gen. Sg. (Cic. Deor. Nat. iii. 20. 51; arcus is Fem. in O. Lat.), as well as the parallel forms specus and specum, penus and penum, fico and ficu, &c. For statistics of the O- and U-declension of such words see Neue, P. pp. 509 sqq. Names of trees like laurus, fagus, &c. show this uncertainty (Varro L. x. ix. 80 ali dicent cupressus, ali cupressi, item de fieis platanis et plerisque arboribus), an uncertainty perhaps due to the rarity of fem. O-stems (e.g. fagus, Gk. φύγος F.) in I.-Eur. (see ch. vi. § 1. p. 369).

§ 50. Other examples of -tu-stems. Lat. ebus from edo (O. Ind. attu-, Lith. ęstı́, O. Sl. jastu); Lat. vitus, the felly of a wheel (Gk. ἐρυς F.); Lat. actus, (1) a driving, (2) a road for driving (Paul. Fest. 13. 17 Th. iter 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. fetus, a brood (cf. Gk. τροφή, e. g. Soph. O. T. 1); O. Lat. metus F., e. g. Enn. A. 526 M. nec metus uila tenet.

§ 51. The Suffixes -yē- (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 -yē-, e. g. Lat. tempēries from the ES-stem tempus, or -ī-, e. g. O. Ind. dātrī, fem. of dātār- (in Latin with c added, e.g. dātrī-ca, stem dātrīc-, cf. Gk. αἰλητῶ- with added dental and short i), or -yā-, e. g. Lat. tempera (cf. Gk. ἀληθείᾳ for *ἀληθεω-γά, ἀντιέρα for *ἀντερ-γά). How far these differences are due to a variation of -yē- with -ī-, as in the Optative, e. g. Lat. siēs, sēlis (ch. viii. § 55), or to a confusion of Ī-stems (thus O. Ind. naptī-, Lat. neptis, may be an Ī-stem corresponding to the Ú-stem, O. Ind. svastrī-, Lat. soerus, O. Sl. svekry), has not yet been satisfactorily determined. It is possible that the ē-vowel of Latin and the Balto-Slavic languages (e. g. Lith. žem-ē for *zem-ė-, 'land,' O. Sl. zem(l)-ja- for *zem(l)jē-, whence the name Nova Zembla, connected with Lat. hensus and Gk. χθων) may be a modification
of an original ā under the influence of the preceding y-sound (cf. Vulg. Lat. Jannarius for Iannarius, 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, scabies, perniciës, and permīties [in facies, spēcies the i (y) appears also in the Pres. stem].

Other examples of these suffixes are: of U-stems, O. Ind. svādvī, Gk. ἴδεια for *ofādēf'üa (cf. Lat. suavis M. and F., § 47), fem. of I.-Eur. *swādu-; of N-stems, O. Ind. yūnī, fem. of yūvan-, 'young' (the Plautine invenix, Mil. 304 points to Lat. jūnīc being rather a contraction of a stem *yūwenr- than a direct development of the stem yūnī-), O. Ind. rājñī (mod. Ranee), fem. of rājan-,'a king'; of NT-stems, O. Ind. bhāranti, fem. of the Pres. Part. bhārant- (Gk. φέρουσα for *φερούτyά; cf. Lat. praesentia, &c.).

Other fifth Decl. stems are suffixless, e.g. rē-s (O. Ind. rā-s, rāy-ās Gen. from the root rēi- (ch. iv. § 47) 1; dīēs 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 ĕ-suffix as is seen in verbs like cātē-facio, candē-facio [ch. viii. § 33 (9)], e.g. fām-ĕ-s (cf. Gk. é-χαύ-η-ν from χαύω for *χαύýω), which is really a fifth Decl. noun like fūl-ē-s (cf. Gk. é-πιθ-η-ν). Another noun declined according to the fifth Decl. is sordēs, Abl. sordē, Lucr. vi. 1271, Gen. Pl. sordērum, Plaut. Poen. 314 (cf. sordeo). So from *ōleo, to grow, prōles for *pro-ōles, sub-ōles, ind-ōles (cf. ol(ē)-facio from oleo, to smell); from luo lues, from struo strues from ruo rues ['rues' ruina, C. G. L. iv. 281. 5; cf. lue rue, 'luem ruem' (?) on the Carmen Arvale]. Against the association of lūbes with lūbē-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. śphāyātē, '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.: spēro, si spēres quiuquam prodesse potiss. sunt (cf. 119 M.). With the variants spēs and spēres, compare vis (Nom. Pl.) and vires.
contāges (tāngo), propāges and compāges (pāngo), rūpes (rūmpo). The cognates mūles-tus, Gk. ἔδως, ἔφος have suggested the reference of mūles, sēdēs, nūles (though the ā is difficult to explain) to ES-stems (§ 71), with the same -ēs that we see in Gk. ἀληθής from ληθός, Dor. λάθος (cf. εἰλαθοῦ). But perhaps a better explanation of sēdēs is to regard it as a Plural of an I-stem sēdis, used as a Singular (cf. O. Ind. vāyas, 'a bird,' properly 'birds,' and for the long vowel Gk. ὑνυς, &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. nubs, Liv. Andr.), saeps, Cic. (cf. prae-saepe Neut.), vātis (cf. O. Ir. faith for *wāti-), vēbis, clādis, aedis (O. I. L. i. 266. 30), caedis, molis, sedis. 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 -eus, a byform of the Nom. Sg. suffix of I-stems. Plēbēs has been called an ES-stem like πληθος, but it is more persistently declined after the fifth Decl. (cf. plebeius), 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 requiē Abl., requiem Acc. from requiēs, -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 sordium in late Lat. Cicero (Top. vii. 30) says that specierum, 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 adīp- F. implies a Nom. Sg. adīpēs.
 dici possit, ‘specierum’ et ‘speciebus’ dicere), and so prefers *forma* to *species* as a translation of the Greek *είδος*. Yet *specierum* and *speciebus* are common in late authors, e.g. Apuleius, and Priscian (i. 367; 23 H.) quotes *facierum* from a speech of Cato. Quintilian (i. 6. 26) expresses the doubt felt about the declension of *progenies* and *spes*: quid progenies genetivo singulari, quid plurali *spes* faciet? (For statistics of fifth Decl. forms, see Neue, i?, pp. 370 sqq.) And the use of *-iēs* itself in the Nom. Sing. seems to have been a matter of gradual extension. Plautus has *facies*, *permutis*, *māteris* (but *materiam* on the Sententia Minuciorum of 117 B. C., *C. I. L. i. 199*), *sectūties*, *vastūties*, and possibly *caesūries*, *intūbies*, *intemperies*, *rubies* (but *effigia*, &c.), to which Terence adds *mollitīties*, Lucretius *nōtilites*, *spurtīties*, &c. These *yē*-forms are generally confined to the Nom. Acc. Sg., while in other cases *y-i*-forms are preferred, e.g. *intemperia* Nom. Pl., *materiae* Dat. Sg., *luxūriae* Dat. Sg., *molliitis* Abl. Pl., in Abl. Sg. *barbōriā*, *Poen. 598*, *mollitiā*, *Vidul. 35*. Still Plautus adheres to the fifth Decl. type for *facies* (Nom. Gen. Acc. Abl. Sg.), and apparently *āciēs* (Acc. Abl. Sg.), *permutis* (Nom. Acc. Abl. Sg.), *species* (Acc. Abl. Sg.), though he does not use these words in the Plural, Pliny (ap. *Charisius*. p. 118. 15 K.) allowed *plūnīties*, *luxūries*, *mollitīties*, but not *āmīcīties* (*amicitiem*, Lucr. v. 1019), ‘because the Plural is *amicīliae*’, while *Charisius* (p. 57. 3 K.) confines *cānīties* to poetry, and makes *canitia* the proper prose-form. (For fuller statistics, see Neue.) The -tīē-stems are found also in Umbr., e.g. uhtretie ‘auctoritate,’ kvestretie, ‘in the quaestorship.’

§ 52. Other examples of Latin Fems. in *-i-, -īc, &c.* Latin *cornīx* (cf. Gk. κορώνη); *gēnītīx* (O. Lat. *jānitri*, Gk. γενετήρα); from *mēdeor* comes *mērēlīx*, but from *mēdeor* the name of the deity *Mēdīrina*, whose festival, the Medirima, 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*; *novō veteri morbo medeor; cānīcula* (cf. *O. Ind. śunī*); *clāvis, -im Acc., -ī Abl.* (cf. Gk. καλή, stem καλ-δ-).

§ 53. *-yē- and -ī-.* *Acisculus*, a small pickēxe (there was a Roman family-name Valerius Acisculus), has been referred (with supposed *i*) to *āciēs* (*Rhein. Mus. 1891*, p. 256); the Probi Appendix (p. 198. 12 K.) censures a large number of forms in *-is* beside forms in *-es*, e.g. *vatis* beside *vates*, and among them *fācis* for *facies* (cf. *faciūregium* *Isid.* beside *faciēregium* *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-bibus Adj., but bibō 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 Στραβων); 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 āi 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. ἀκμόθετων, stithy, compounded of ἀκμων and τιθημι, and why an N-stem in one language often corresponds to an O-stem in another, e.g. Gk. αἰὼν to Lat. aevum (also explained as *aiwōn), Goth. ga-juk-a (N-stem) to Lat. con-jug-us (O-stem), or in the same language, e.g. Lat. ĭānio to Lat. lānus, incubō to incubus. In the declension of these Masc. N-stems, n varies with en, on, ēn, ōn, &c., yen also with ĭn, and wen also with ūn. They are sometimes transferred by the addition of -o- or -ā- into the O- and A-declension, e.g. Lat. ĕpulōnus beside ĕpulo, 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. nēšāni from nī-), e.g. O. Ind. vid-mán-ē, Hom. Gk. το-μεν-αi (perhaps Lat. 2 Pl. Imper. Pass., e. g. lēgimēni, is a similar Infinitive form with Imperative sense; see ch. viii. § 8 i). 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,
jugmentum and jugumentum, augmen-tum, sūmen from sūgo, and see ch. iv. § 116 on agmen and exāmen). Their byforms with -mentum in Latin, e.g. alimentum, 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-, -yen- (-tien-) in Lat., Celt., Teut., e.g. Lat. āsū-cāpīo, captio have become fem. by the analogy of other abstract nouns. They sometimes appear as Ā-stems with the ending -īna, -īna, e.g. Polīna, the goddess worshipped when a child first drank (Nom. 1008. 15 M.) from pōdio, Statīna, 'statuendi infantis,' officīna (ōpī-fīcīna Plaut.), rāpīna, ruina (cf. § 8).

§ 55. Masc. en-stems in Latin. Lat. lūn, Gen. lūnis shows -īn, and poećīn, Gen. pectīnis (Gk. πρηκίς for ἔπρατος) shows -īn, but the usual form is -ō in the Nom. Sg., -ōn- or -īn- (with ē for older ẽ or ę) in the oblique cases, e.g. ēbī, Gen. ēdōnis from the verbal root ed-, 'to eat,' ēbō, Gen. homīnis from the noun-stem humō-, the ground. The Fem. ād, Gen. carnis, 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. mainās carnis senatūris tangumnd, which would be in Latin, 'maximae partis senatūris sententia.'; and originally the word seems to have been a Verbal Abstract (Nomen Actionis), 'the act of cutting or dividing,' whence the feminine gender. (On the variation of gender in cardo, margo, cūpīdo, grando, ūrgo, farrīgo, see Neue, 2. p. 654; Abstracts in -go, like ōrgo, are fem., and Nouns indicating defects or ailments like farrīgo, aerūgo, cālūgo, prūrīgo.

Nouns in -ō, -ōnis Gen., used of persons, belong as a rule to plebeian or colloquial Latin and express contempt, e.g. ālō, bībō, Cāpīo, Nāso; in the earliest period they are derived only from Adjectives, e.g. strābō, but later from Nouns and Verbs, e.g. commōtō from mōles, lānō from lānis, erro from errare, sātūriō from sātūrire. The more respectful formation was in -ōnus, e.g. patronus (but sātārō always on Greek inscriptions, as early as 150 B. C., Eckinger, p. 135; Paul. Fest. quotes O. Lat. epolonus for ἐπόλο (55. 15 Th.), centōrionus, curiosus and dēcūrionus (34. 36 Th.); so Dor. Gk. Aērā became Lātona. (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.).

-ō. 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. ūdhār, 'the udder;' ūdhānas 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 ụ-lūn-ēr-is, jēc-ūn-ēr-is, and jēc-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. ās-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 Nominata [with fem. in -(t)re, -(t)ria, &c., § 51]. This -(t)er-varies with -(t)or-, -(t)or-, -(t)or-, &c., e.g. Gk. πατήρ, Acc. πατέρα, and φάτωρ, Acc. φάτορα, Gk. δοτήρ beside δώτωρ, βοτήρ beside βώτωρ, &c. The Nominata in Latin show -tör-, e.g. actor, Gen. actōris (Gk. ἀκτωρ, -όρος and ἐπ-ακτήρ, -ήρος). Abstracts in -or, -ōris Gen., often connected with Verbs in -eo and Adjectives in -ūlis (e.g. cūlor, beside calceo, calūdis), are not R-stems but S-stems, and had in O. Lat. -ōs in the Nom. Sg., e.g. calos, 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. piéter [O. Ind. pītār-, Arm. hair, Gk. πατήρ, O. Ir. athir, Goth. (rare) fadar]; Lat. māter [O. Ind. mātār-, Arm. mair, Gk. μήτηρ, O. Ir. māthir, O. Engl. mōder (in Goth. aîpēi, 'mother,' atta, 'father') O. Sl. mater-]; Lat. frīter (O. Ind. brātār-, Arm. e Bair, Gk. φατωρ and φάτηρ, a clansman, O. Ir. brāthir, 'a brother,' W. brawd(r), Goth. brōjar; cf. O. Sl. b rātrū); Lat. swīr (O. Ind. svāsar-, Arm. k'oir, O. Ir. siur and fiur, Lith. sesā; cf. Goth. svīstar, O. Sl. svěstra); Lat. lēvir better *lauēvir, for *lauēver by Anal. of vir (I.-Eur. *daiiver-, O. Ind. dēvār-, Arm. taigr with g for w, Gk. δαήρ for *daiνήρ, O. Engl. tācor, O. H. G. zehhur; cf. Lith. dēver-is, O. Sl. dēver-i).

§ 60. Latin Nomina Agentis. Lat. praetor for *praē-tor (O. Ind. pura-ētār-, 'he who goes before,' 'a guide'); junctor (O. Ind. yōktār-, Gk. γενετήρ) (cf. junctus); con-dātor for *con-dātor from the root dhē-, 'to put, place' (O. Ind. dhātār- and dhātār-, Gk. θερή (cf. conditus); yōder (O. Ind. pātār- and pātār-, Gk. ποτήρ) (cf. pōtus); gēnitor (O. Ind. janitār-, Gk. γενετήρ and γενέτωρ) (cf. gēnitus) with Fem. gēnētrix (O. Ind. jānitrī, Gk. γενετερίας) (on e see ch. iii. § 19); textor (O. Ind. tāśtar-, 'carpenter') (cf. textus); šōr (O. Ind. attār-, Gk. ἀμῆστήρ) (cf. šesus).

§ 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-ēt-) 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. vištva-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. Santes, beside sanati, forctis (class. fortis) beside forctus (§ 45). It has further been suggested (§ 29) that nouns like ēquēs, Gen. equētis, may be connected with Greek formations like ἵπποτης, the fem. Abstract *equita, horsemanship, becoming masc. ēquēs, a horseman, just as antistīta fem. is related to antistes masc.

Again Feminine t-stems like tēges, Gen. tegētis, a mat, lit. 'a covering,' sēges, Gen. segetis, 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 possess int 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 by stems like Gk. νυκτ-, Lat. nocti-. But Greek nouns like κέλης, -ητος, a horse, lit. 'runner,' from the root kel-, 'to run, go quickly' (O. Ind. car-, cf. Lat. celer), and adjectives like ἀργητ- and ἀργετ-, bright, from the root arg-, 'to shine' (O. Ind. arj-; cf. Lat. argentum), rather point to by-forms in -t, beside the usual Pres. Part. stems in -nt, just as Greek compounds like ἄγνως, -άτος, (1) unknowing, (2) unknown, beside ἄγνως and ἄγνωςτος, πρόβλης, -ῆτος, a headland, beside πρόβλητος, 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. terētis, from tēro; hēbes, Gen. hebetis; ûes, Gen. ûitis, with the sense of alātus; tūdes (cf. tūdiāt累), an old word for a hammer (Fest. 330. 30 Th.; Paul. Fest. 53r. 12. Th.), from tūnā, is a rather doubtful form; and the origin of L.-Eur. *nēpot- (O. Ind. nāpāt-, M. Ir. niae, Gen. niath, W. nai; cf. Hom. Gk. νειόδες), Lat. nēpis, with its cognate *nēpti (O. Ind. napt-, Goth. ni(f)jigs, 'kinsman,' O. Sl. ne'p(1)čiži-, 'nephew,' &c.), Lat. neptis is not clear. The termination -es was much in vogue
in the earlier period, e. g. caelēs, -ītis, cīrces, -ītis. From it were formed Abstract Nouns in -ītus, -īties, &c. (see §§ 4, 51) (cf. axītiosi, Paul. Fest. 2. 34 Th.: a. factiosi dicebantur, cum plures una quid agerent facerentque, from axites id. 3. 1 Th. a. multieres sive viri dicebantur una agentes. The adj. axītiosus is quoted by Varro, L. L. vii. 66 from the Astraβa of Plautus:

axītiosae annónam caram e uili concinnánt 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 (φέρωντ-ος, φέροντι for *φερωντι, &c.) and other languages; and O. Lat. forms like flexuntes (?), as well as the classical enuntes 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 ð (but see ch. viii. § 90). These Participles have often become adjectives and nouns, e.g. Engl. friend (Goth. frijōnds, lit. ‘loving’), fiend (Goth. fijands, lit. ‘hating’, Germ. Feind), Gk. ἄρχω, Lat. rudens, sometimes with transference to the O-declension, e.g. Lat. ventus (Goth. vindis) beside the Participle, O. Ind. vánt-, Gk. ðeis for *ἄεις.

§ 64. Other examples of Lat. -ent. Lat. ãgens (O. Ind. ãjant-, Gk. ἀγων); fêrens (O. Ind. bhârant-, Gk. φέρων, Goth. bairands, O. Sl. bery); rudens (O. Ind. rudânt-), (r) ‘roaring,’ (2) ‘a rope’; vēhens (O. Ind. vâhant-, Goth. gavigands, Lith. vēkas, O. Sl. vezy); benevôlen is often a Noun (cf. benevôrens) in the Comedians, and is closely connected with the Adjective benevolent, so that benevolent and benevolenter have taken the place of the Comparative and Adverb of the latter, as magnificientior, magnificientissimus supply a Comparative and Superlative to magnificus. Other Nouns are pârens (beside the verb pârio), serpens, ādûlescent; other Adjectives, ãiûquens, sâpiens, invîcens. The addition of the ya-suffix, which forms the fem. of these participles in Greek (e.g. φερόντα for *φερωντα) forms Abstract derivatives in Latin. e.g. benévōlentia, praesentia, eloquentia, all of these first used by Terence), confîdentia, mātítentia, pātîentia, sâpientia, polîentia, &c. (all used by Plautus), sententia (beside the verb sentio). On the rare ending -entium, e. g. silentium, see Rösch, Collect. p. 208. Fluēntum and cruentum probably originated in Neut. Pl. fluenta, cruenta (cf. silenta loca Laev.), a formation like Gk. φέρωντα, &c. The ending -entus of opûlentus (beside opulens), viðentus (and viðens), tricûlentus, esculentus, virûlentus, &c. comes from an Adj.-stem in -io (-ii § 21); cf. gracîlentus (the o of vívîlentus, sommîlentus) has been explained by ‘popular etymology’ from vínī lentus, sommû lentus; see ch. iii. § 21).

§ 65. -WENT-. This suffix, like our ‘-ful,’ added to Noun-
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stems to form Adjectives, with the sense ‘possessed of,’ ‘abounding in,’ and occasionally ‘resembling,’ e.g. O. Ind. agni-vánt-, ‘provided with fire,’ χαρίεις for *χαριέφειτος, possessed of grace, graceful, στονόεις (Corey. στονοέσαν, Acc. Sg. Fem.), woeful, is in Latin augmented by the TO-suffix, e.g. δόλος (Gk. δολείεις) for *δόλο-ventus from *dolo-went-to- or *dolo-wnt-to-, nivósus (Gk. νιφόεις). In O. Ind. it was often added to the P. P. P. TO-stem, e.g. ῥτα-vant- from ῥτά-, P. P. P. of ῥ-, ‘to do,’ and came to be used in the sense of a Perfect Indicative (with omission of the Substantive Verb), e.g. sa tad ῥτα-βάν, ‘he has done this.’

§ 66. Other examples of Lat. -ösus. Lat. virosus (cf. O. Ind. viša-vánt-); virosus (cf. Gk. ὀίβοιασ), (1) full of wine, (2) like wine; διαδείναρασ, like a dead body. From U-stems, -osus, e.g. astenosus (but fastosus, and from the stem mont-, montósus), but from I-stems -osus, e.g. piscosus (Virgil’s rendering of Homer’s ἵππεις), (but bliosus). Inciosus (from inciuria) produced círosus (instead of *círisus); calamítósus stands for *calamítósus (ch. iii. § 13, p. 176). On the change of *aciovssus to -ossus (cf. retrorssum, retrósum from retróversum, &c.), see ch. ii. § 53. The older spelling is -ossus, -ossus (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 ‘formidulousus’ dici potest et qui formulat et qui formulatur, ut ‘invidiosus et qui invident et qui invidetur, ut ‘suspiciosus’ et qui suspicatur et qui suspectus est, ut ‘ambitiosus’ et qui ambit et qui ambitur, ut item ‘gratiosus’ et qui adhibet gratias et qui admittit, 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 lāpis (cf. Gk. λέπασ?), mercēs, hērēs, nor to trace the passage of original D-stems into other stems. The -aβ- of Gk. χοράς, a reef, ‘like a hog’s back,’ πελεύς, a wild dove, has been declared to be the first part of the Latin -astro- (for *-ad-tro-) of poétaster, ‘like a poet,’ òleaster, ‘a wild olive,’ &c. Lat. -édula occurs in names of birds, &c., e.g. ficédula (and ficēlla?), a beecafico, acrédula, querquédula, nutritėula and nutritēla (cf. alcédo); Lat. -edo in names of ailments like frigēdo, ῥήθεδο, grāvidia and gravídó) resembles the -ηδῶν of Gk. ἀχθηδῶν, χαρηδῶν. Lat. -dus of Adjectives beside Verbs in -eо and Abstract Nouns in -or, e.g. pallidus (beside palleo and pallor), splendidus (beside splendo and splendēo and
splendor), squālīdus (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 laundādus, &c. has been similarly explained (laundādus, ‘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. errābundus, pūribundus, fūribundus, gēmēbundus, mōribundus, lasēvibundus (-īb- probably) and -cundus, e.g. jācundus, rūbācundus, vērcundus, fācundus, irācundus. (On these also, see ch. viii. § 94.) The termination -tūd-, Gen.-tūdīnis, 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 ō-stem.

§ 68. Other examples. Lat. pēcus, -ūdis beside pecus, -īris; 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. ἄλωπηξ (O. Ind. lōpāsũ), Gk. μεῖραξ (O. Ind. maryakā-), Gk. νέαξ (O. Sl. novakā), 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. ἑνος, O. Ir. sen, Lith. sēnas, &c.). Latin Adjectives in -āx express tendency or character, e.g. libāx, dicāx, ῥάπαξ, pervīcāx (O. Lat. pervicus); of adjectives in -īx we have fēlīx from *fēla, Gk. θηλὴ, the breast, perniāx (properly of horses, &c. L. L. L. viii. 453) from perna; -trīx is the fem. ending (O. Ind -trī, Gk. -τριά) of Masc. Nomina Agentis in -tor, e.g. gēnētrīx (O. Ind. jānitri, Gk. γενέτειρα, § 51); -ōx appears in the derivatives from Adjectives, fērōx (from fērus), sollōx (from sollus), utrōx (from *utro-; cf. ōlīum), and in vēlōx, cēlōx, which suggest connexion with őcior. We have O-stem Adjectives with -ācus, e.g. mērācus, and -īcus, e.g. mendīcus, āmīcus (§ 31), and Ā-stem Nouns with -īca, e.g.
lectica, and -ūca, e.g. lactūca (§ 32). The Latin termination
-īgo, in names of ailments, e.g. vertīgo, dépētīgo, impētīgo, cáligo,
may be due to the addition of an N-suffix to Adjectives in -īx,
*vertīc-u-., *calic-u-, &c., and the somewhat similar -ūgo of
ferrūgo (cf. rōbīgo), aevīgo, lānuñgo, and in names of plants, e.g.
mollūgo (-īgo), aspērūgo may similarly represent -ūc-u-, the c
becoming g before n by the phonetic law of Latin (ch. iv. § 119).

§ 70. Other examples. Lat. pālēx, -īcis, a flea, but pulegium, fleabane; Lat.
lātēx, Pl. latices (but Gk. λάταγες; cf. Gk. ὑφρυ- but O. Ind. vartaka-); Lat.
vertēx from verto; Lat. verecē, a weather; Lat. nātrīx, -īcis, a watersnake (O. Ir.
nathir, nathrach Gk.).

Words like aureax (a. auriga, Paul. Fest. 6. 27 Th.), aurīfex, &c. do not show
the Guttural suffix, but are Compounds of ago, facio (§ 78).

The number of words ending with -s that indicate parts of the body is
noticeable, e.g. calx, faux, cœxandix, cervix (or rather cervices Plur., for the Sing.
was a poetical usage; cf. Varro, L. L. viii. 14 and Quint. viii. 3. 35), matrix,
pantex, pōlēx, also bodily marks, e.g. varix, vībīx, famex, &c.; bird-names in -ix
are, e.g. cornīx, coternīx, spistentīnīx. Adjectives in -īx from second Conj. Verbs
are audax, tēnax (cf. vētīnāculum), mordax, &c.; from 10-Verbs cūpāx, officax,
perspicax. With fallax cf. falla, O. Lat. for fallācia; with dīcax cf. dīcā-re beside
dīcēre; with cūpax, oc-cūpā-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. *gēnos Nom. Sg.,
*genes- in Oblique Cases, from the root ēn- (O. Ind. jānas,
Gk. γένος Nom., γένε(σ)-os Gen.), Lat. ēnus Nom., gēnĕr-is for
*genes-es Gen. These Neuter-stems became adjectives by trans-
ferring the accent to the suffix and substituting -ēs for -ōs in
Nom. Sg. Masc., -ēs in Nom. Sg. Neut., e.g. Gk. εὖ-γεῖνς
Masc., -νές 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 tennus
Neut. (Gk. τένωσ, a string), from the root ten-, ‘to stretch’; tēpor
Masc. for *tepōs (cf. O. Ind. tāpas 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. vivĕre Loc., O. Ind.
jivasē 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,
-ōris (but cf. tempěri, tempes-lēvus); ōnus, ōnustus (but cf. oneris, onerare); Velius Longus (p. 73. r K.) calls attention to the discrepancy between faenoris and faeneratorem, fāchornis and factenerous. We have the O-grade of the root, e.g. in mīdes-tus (by analogy of the O-stem mīdes) from *modes-, from the root med-(but Umbr. mers for *med(o)s Neut., the right, the due, is normal), foedus [also fidus, i.e. *feitōs, to judge from Varro L. L. v. 86 per hos (Fetiales) etiamnunc fit foedus quod *fidus’ Ennius scribit dictum; cf. Paul. Fest. 64. 3 Th. fidustā a fide denominate, ea quae maximae fidei erant] from the root theiehdh-, pondo- by analogy of pondo- (Abl. pondō) from pendo. Minervā was in earlier times *Menes-ua (§ 7), a derivative of the Neut. stem *mēnes- (O. Ind. mānas-, Gk. μήρος), from the root men-. From other than E-roots we have, e.g. ὤνας (O. Ind. ṣpas and ṣapas, ‘work,’ especially a ‘religious performance’). The ending -nus is seen in fācīnum (cf. Gk. δάντος), &c. Tho -r of rōbor (O. Lat. robus, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) may be due to the Masc. byform rōbor (cf. O. Lat. robosum Acc., quoted by Paul. Fest. 11. 20 Th.); cf. cālor Neut. (Plaut. Merc. 860). The weak grade of the suffix, -s, is seen in the derivative O-stem O. Ind. vats-s-ā for *wets-s-, ‘a calf,’ lit. ‘a yearling,’ from *wetos, ‘a year’ (Gk. Φιέρος), &c. Other examples are Vēnus (originally Neuter and meaning ‘glamour,’ like O. Ind. vānas-; cf. vānēnum for vēnes-num, properly ‘a philtre’); taurus (Gk. στήξας and τίρπας).

§ 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. *vētōs (Gk. Φιέρος, a year) used in apposition as a predicate (cf. Hom. Gk. παπά, Lat. über, &c.). The ordinary way of making an Adjective from a Neuter S-stem was by adding the suffix -o- (§ 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 vetustor was the Comparative in vogue (cf. Varro, L. L. vi. 59 a vetere vetustius ac veterrimum), ōnus-tus, scōlēs-tus, funēs-tus, jīs-tus. Perhaps another way was to add the suffix -o-, e.g. O. Lat. seclērus, and perhaps fūnērus (beside funereus) (see Fleck. Jahrb. 1808, p. 676; both forms are doubtful) (cf. décorum from décor, § 74). The verb used by Ennius (Ann. 16 M. cum ueter occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo) and Accius (Trag. 48r R.) may be of this formation, or of the third Decl. like pūber (beside puēbēs Adj.) and the Compounds dégēnēr, bircorpor, &c.

§ 74. Masc. (and Fem.) ES-stems. The usual termination is -or Nom., -ōris Gen. (older -ōs, -ōsis), e.g. décor (beside decus; with Adj. decōrus, O. Lat. decōren Accus.; cf. indecōrem beside indecōrum); amōr (O. Ind. āras Neut.; with Adj. angustus); hōnor (with Adj. honestus); arbor F. (with Adj. *arbustus, cf. arbustum, § 28); paeotera is Vulg. Lat. for paeotores (C. G. L. iv. 270. 4 ‘paeotera’ aurium sordes). The -s remains in flōs [like Flōra F. beside flōs M. is aurōra beside I.-Eur. *ausōs (Gk. άυρα F.);] while some have found -ēs in the Fem. nouns sēdēs, beside I.-Eur. *sedēs (O. Ind. sādas, Gk. ἑδώς), pēdes (Gk. παλάβος), and perhaps aedēs beside aedēs (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) (O. Ind. ēdhas, Gk. ἅδος) (but see § 51). These Masc. Nouns in -or are widely used as Verbal Abstracts, connected with Verbs in -eo and Adjectives in -idus, e.g. pallor (palleo, pallidus), timor (timeo, timidus) (see § 67; and for a list of examples

1 Plaut. Cocc. 200 immodestis tuis modereris moribus.


§ 75. Other S-stems. Lat. cœbrum for *ceresrum points to an S-stem like O. Ind. širas-, 'the head,' Gk. képas, a horn; Lat. têmirae for *tenesvae (cf. O. Ind. tâmis-râ beside tâmas, 'darkness'; cf. Lat. têmière, lit. 'in the dark'); Lat. cênis M., sometimes F., resembles Gk. κῶνις F. in its termination; Lat. fâr, farris Gen. for *fârs, *faris has a derivative fârina for *farisna, Fem. of an Adj. *farisnus (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., -iōris Gen., -ius Nom. N. (older -iōs, -iōsis, -iōs), e.g. suāvior, suāviōris, 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-iyān, Gk. ἥδων, Acc. ἥδιω for *ήδωνα, Goth. sutiza for *sut-izēn-, Lith. sald-ės-nis, &c.), but it is certain that the weak grade -is- was prefixed to the suffix -tō- (-thō-?) to form Superlatives in various languages (O. Ind. svād-īṣha-, Gk. ἡδιστος, 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. óc-ior, O. Ind. āś-iyas-. Gk. ὥκ-ἰων from a Positive stem *ōku-), but we have also in Latin, e.g. tēnu-ior, suāvior for *suadv-ior, aspèr-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-spe, 'seer of birds,' from the root spek-, 'to see,' parti-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. σκώβ, 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-spex), or in different languages. e.g. O. Ind. nāū-, Gk. nās beside Lat. nāv-i-s, O. Ind. úd-añc- beside Gk. τοθ-αξ-ό-ς, Lat. próp-ingn-o-s. The Latin Inf. Pass., e.g. ἔγι, seems to be a case of a suffixless Verbal Noun (cf. O. Ind. nir-ájē, drē, Inf. of ἄρ- ('to look'), just as the Inf. Act., e.g. ἕγε, 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 junco, con-jux (cf. O. Ind. sā-yuj-, Gk. συ-μγε) and con-junx (O. Ind. yùnj- beside yuj-); from fācō, artifex, carnifex, ὥψ, &c.; from cópia, manœces, auces, forces for *formi-cœps, prinœces, &c.; from dieco, jūdæx, vindœx; from sādeo, diœces, réœces; from eino, corniten, ùœciten; from θηγ, βημ, auœxes, &c. Beside these we have often O-stems, &c., e.g. jūri-dicas beside jūri-tex, proœt-iœps beside réœm-ex, O. Lat. hosti-capas (hostium captor, Paul. Fest. 73. 10 Th.). *urbi-capœ Voc. (Plant. Mūl. 1055) beside auœces, &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, *aci-cap(os), &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 réœx Nom. with Gen. rég-is, &c.), e.g. praœx beside praœœcaus and praœœquœs, cohors for *cohœtis from hortus. The Feminines add a, e.g. exti-spic-a, fidœ-cin-a.

§ 79. Latin Independent suffixless stems. Lat. réœx (O. Ind. rāj-, O. Ir. rīg Gen.) from the root ré-, of régo; lēc from lēgo; réœs Nom., pīl-Is Gen. (cf. O. Ind. pad-, pād-am Acc., Dor. Gk. πως Nom., πῶσ Gen., &c.; fur for *fur (ch. iv. § 16) (Gk. φυρ) from the root bher-; vēs (O. Ind. rās); hiem (Zend zyā, Gk. χεών); ὲς, the mouth (O. Ind. ās-); mus (O. Ind. mūs-, Gk. μῦς, O. H. G. mūs); dic-is Gen., in the phrase dicis causa, for form's sake (O. Ind. dīs, 'direction') from the root deik-, of dieco; nēx (Gk. νῆα Acc.); saλ (Gk. ᾅς); sūs, sūsus Dat. Pl. (Gk. ἵς, O. H. G. sü); dūx from dūco; prēœ-es Plur. from root prēk-, 'to ask'; vēœ (O. Ind. vāc-F.) beside vēco. (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. sēnāl-us consultum, patres-fāmilium, jūris-jūrandi, 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. gūr-gara-), or more usually the first, e.g. ci-cindē-la, a glow-worm, while Lat. gur-gūl-iso, the throat, quer-quer-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-familiarum), jūrī-dicus (contrasted with jūris-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 *ulō-ger by Greek ἄλο-tópos, &c. from ἄλη (§ 82), though, so far as the Latin form goes, it might equally well have been *alū-ger, *alē-ger, &c., while in forceps for *formī-ceps the vowel has been suppressed altogether by Syncope (ch. iii. § 13), in arcūbii for arcī-cubīi by Dissimilation (ib. p. 176). O 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 A-stems. In Latin post-tonic ō (like ā and other short vowels) became, as was shown in ch. iii. § 18, ā before labials (later ē), and ē before other single consonants (except r), so that ē is the ‘Composition-Vowel’ of Latin as o of I.-Eur. (cf. Unomammia Plaut., Ōinu-mama on a Praenestine inscription, ūni-mamma, an Amazon).

The second part of a Compound is often scarcely to be distinguished from a suffix. Thus the second part of imbrī-dus (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. fabā-ginus with fabā-ceus, fabā-tus, fabā-rīus, fabā-līs; imbrī-dus with imbrī-cus). For these laws with suffixes, laws often disturbed by the influence of analogy, e.g. ānīlīs (from ann-) for *anulīś by analogy of sēnīlīs (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’ vulgar, 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 κυρταῖχες in Latin (Quint. i. 5. 70 sed res tota magis Graecos decet, nobis minus succedit: nec id fieri natura puto, sed alienis favemus, ideoque cum κυρταῖχες mirati simus, 'incurvicervicum' vix a risu defendimus, alluding to Pacuvius' line:

Nērei repāndirostrum incurvicervicum 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. silvi(frāgus, used by Lucretius, who however complains that the 'patrii sermonis egestas' prevented him from reproducing the Greek compound όμοιώμεα, 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 Karmadhrāraya formed of Adj. and Noun, and Dvigu formed of Numeral and Noun), Ayyayibhāva 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 perenni-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, jūriādictio (contrast jūriā-dicus), the last being, as we have seen, rather Word-groups than Compounds; cf. parcē-prōminus Plaut., lēnē-vōlus, paen-insīla (contrast
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Um-densis, solit-citus), &c. Of Possessive Compounds (Sanser. Bahuvarhi) examples are angui-pes, 'possessing a foot which is a snake,' 'snake-footed'; pddo-r-color, 'possessing the colour of shame,' 'shame-coloured,' sicc-oculus, 'possessing dry eyes,' 'dry-eyed.' Of Determinatives with first element consisting of (1) a governed Noun (Sanser. Tatpurusha): vilhi-salor, 'planter of the vine,' arti-fer, aqui-lex; (2) Adjective qualifying a Noun (Sanser. Karmadharaya): O. Lat. albo-galerus, the white cap of the Flamen Dialis, sauci-saviiatio Plaut., vive-radius Cato, lati-clavus (the Adj. contrary to rule follows the Noun in Pliny's equifer, a wild horse; cf. orifex, 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-ovi-taurilia (but not *su-ovi-tururus), a sacrifice of a swine, a sheep, and a bull, stru-fer(c)tarii, 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 vinci-pes by false analogy of undi-pes, whose first element he conceives as a verb, 'qui pedes nudat' (de Pall. 5 quem enim non expediatus in algore et ardore rigere nudipedem?), and Verti-cordia 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. affatim (from ad fatim), denuo (from de novo), Juippiter (from *Ju-pater, Voc., ch. vi. § 32). From the group per noctem has been formed the Compound Adj. pernox, much as méri-die [a single word like O. Lat. diequinte or diequindi, ch. iii. § 12a (9)], which is only found in this form in the earlier writers, gave rise to the Compound Noun meridies; from Sacra Via we have the derivative Sacravienses, from quaarta decimia (sc. legio) the derivative quartadecimani (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 -or is like ῥοδο-βάκτυλος ('Hót), 'Rose-finger.
phrase 'to get at'). *Holusatrum* differs from a word-group by the fact that the first element remains undeclined in *holusatri* 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. ἑκατώμ-πέδος), beside *centi-pēda* (but see ch. vi. § 76), while the reverse is seen in the forms *multī-modīs* (for *multis modis*), *omnī-modīs* (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*:

- *Uaniloquidorus Uirginesuendonides*
- *Nugiepiloquides Αrgentumextenebrōnides*
- *Tedigniloquides Nūmosexpalpōnides*
- *Quodsemelarripides Nūmquamerōpides*: ém tibi.

*Cāraelium* may stand for *cav(um) aedīum*, *domnaedīum* Accus. for *dōmin(um) aedīum*, as *ānīmadverto* for *anim(um) adverto* (ch. iii. § 52) (*ānīmaequitās* has similarly been referred to *anim(i) aequitās*); Lucr. uses *ordiā prima* for *primordiā*; and *summopere*, *magnopere*, &c. represent *summo opere*, *magnō opere*, and the like. Greek compounds like ἀρχηγό-χειρ (with a Superlative as first element), ἀνέρ-χειρ (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-ōcūlus, sometimes add a suffix (on ὁπίφικα, &c. beside ὁπίφεξ, &c., see § 77). Compound O-stem Adjectives, as we have seen (§ 34), tended to become I-stems, e.g. O. Lat. *īnernus*, class. *īnermis*; and Compound Nouns (and Adjectives) affected the IO-suffix, e.g. *lātīclāvium* beside *lāticaclāvus* (so the Vulgar Compound formed from the Word-group *terrae mōtus* assumed the form *terrīmotium*, 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. *transmārīnus* from *trans mare*, like *marinus* from *mare*, *dūbingēniōsus* 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, *aedificius or *aedifix; so that Scaliger's law (see above) is not violated (cf. Gk. *oikodo:mêo, &c. from oikodó:mos); so *navigare from *navigus, *opusuliari from *opusulûs (like philosophari from philosophus). (On these Deriv. Verbs, see ch. viii. §§ 21, 33.) Bêñfícius, mûlfacio, &c. are really word-groups, and so are cûlefacio, arefácio, &c. (cf. *facit ârê Lucr.). Crédo comes from an I.-Eur. word-group (O. Ind. *träd dadhâmi, 'I set the heart to,' see ch. viii. § 27). Compound Adverbs like dêrêpentê, dêsûbitê are discussed in ch. ix., and also Compound Prepositions like Vulg. Lat. âbaunte (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-gîu-io, throat (O. Ind. gâr-gar-a-, 'whirlpool,' Gk. γαρ-γαρ-ε沃, uvula, γλφ-γερ-ο>s, throat, O. H. G. quer-chal-a and quer-ch-a, Germ. Gurgel); bal-bal-us (O. Ind. bal-bal-â-karômi, 'I stammer,' Gk. βάρ-βαρ-ο>s); quer-quer-us, cold, shivering (frigidus cum tremore, Paul. Fest. 343. 5 Th., who quotes from Lucilius febris querqueru, the ague) (cf. Hom. Gk. καρκαίπο), has reduplicated form like other words for trembling, shivering, such as Germ. zittere from *ti-trô-mi; can-er (cf. O. Ind. kar-ka-ta-a, Gk. καυ-κάυ-ο>s); mur-mur (O. Ind. mar-mar-a-, Gk. μοπ-μοπ-ω, Lith. mûr-mû-­mi); ta-ta, like mamma, children's words mentioned in Martial's witty epigram (i. 100):

'mammas' atque 'tatas' habet Afræ; sed ipsa tatarum
dici et mammârum maxima mamma potest,

and found on children's epitaphs, e.g. C.I.L. vi. 2580â… destinuitius. Vitilla mea, miseram mammam tuam (cf. ch. ii. p. 118 n), qui-squî-tae, shreds of leather, &c. (Gk. κο-σκυλ-μâra) (Caec. Com. 251 R. quisquillas uolantis, uenti spolia); fibér (the I.-Eur. name was *bhe-bhr-u-, O. Ind. ba-bhr-ê, 'brown,' O. H. G. bi-bar, 'a beaver,' Lith. bê-br-u-s, O. Sl. be-br-û). Reduplication is common in onomatopoeic words, e.g. ci-citius (cf. Gr. κόκκυσ, Lith. ku-kûtí, 'to ery cuckoo,' &c.), ãp-ãp-ò (cf. Gk. ãp-ôf), ãl-ãl-à (cf. O. Ind. ãl-ãl-à, Gk. ãl-ãl-è), ãf-ãf-à. The Latin tendency is to assimilate the first to the subsequent syllable, e.g. cin-cîn-nus (Gk. κι-κυ-νôs) (cf. mô-môrî- for earlier mô-môrî- &c., see ch. iv. § 163). Often a reduplicated Noun is a derivative from a reduplicated Verb-form, e.g. ci-cînde-la from *ci-cînde-a, a reduplicated form of cadere, like Gk. di-ðox-ê from di-ðôxka, ke-krâ-g-ûs from kî-krâ-g-à. (On these reduplicated Verb-forms, see ch. viii. § 9.)

§ 82. Û-stems show sometimes Û, but usually Õ in I.-Eur. compounds,
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(e. g. Gk. ἰσχ-φόρος and Νυκτ-μαχος, O. Ind. urvarā- jit- and ukhā-chīd-, Lith. sziksznō-sparnis and galvā-raisztis, Gaul. Teutō-bōdīlācī, Goth. airjā-kunds), so that Lat. i of tibi-cen, aīi-ger, &c. must have been originally o. The long a is probably seen in fābā-ginus, òlō-ginus, as before suffixes like Romā-nus, òlāris. Stems in -ā seem to show a similar divergence of forms, tūbī- cen with i for iō (§ 4), and before a suffix viā-īcus.

§ 83. O-stems appear with -ō in Gk. ἵππο-δαμος, Gaul. Dēvo-gnāta, Eporedia, Teut. Austro-valdus, &c., so that Lat. i of belli-ger, magnī-ficus, earlier a before a labial, e.g. magnī-ficus, is probably a weakening in the unaccented syllable of original ò. O. Lat. spellings (mostly before a labial), like Úno- mammia (Plaut. Curc. 445; cf. Oinu-mama, an Amazon, on an old Prænestine cieta, C. I. L. i. 1501), sessento-plāgus (Plaut. Capt. 726), albo-gālērus (Paul. Fest. 8. 6 Th.), Ahēno-barbus may thus be genuine relives of the oldest spelling, though late compounds like mālō-grānātum must be imitations of the Greek. Before a vowel this -ō is elided in Latin (as in Greek, &c., e. g. ἱρρ-αγο-γος), e. g. magnō-anīnus, aequā-anīnītus, forms like multi-angulus being late. Lat. -IO-stems show -iē- for -ii- by Dissimilation (ch. iv. § 13) before a suffix in sīcic-tus, anxe- tus, &c., but -i- in Lucilius, &c. (cf. hosti-īs from the I-stem hostī-). Like sessento- plāgus, &c. is O. Lat. söcio-frāvōrus or sociō-frāvōlus in Plaut. Pseud. 362. (The Palatine MSS. have o, the Ambrosian Palimpsest u.) Latin ro-stems show -ēr- by rule [ch. iii. § 15. (8)], e. g. sacer-dōs, but sometimes -ri-, e. g. sacri-fex, after the law by which -ri- became -ēr- had been forgotten.

§ 84. I-stems had i in I.-Eur. compounds (e. g. O. Ind. tri-pād-, Gk. τπίνοσ, Gaul. tri-garanus, O. Engl. pri-fete, Lith. tri-kōjis, O. Sl. tri-zabū), and so Lat. tri-ānimium, tri-gānīnum, though by rule -ri- [at least unaccented -ri-, ch. iii. § 15. (8)], became -īr- in Latin, e. g. ter-geminus, and before a labial i was by the older spelling properly ù, e. g. āērīfūlōs Cato (R. R. xxxii. 1), as before r it was ē, e. g. legerūpa Plaut. Before a vowel this i (now become y) might be dropped, e. g. fun-ambulus (coined by Messalla to express Gk. σκονοβάτης, Porph. ad Hor. S. i. 10. 28), from *funy-ambulus, stērm-ermis for *stermysmis.

§ 85. U-stems had originally ū (e. g. O. Ind. svādu-rāti-, Gk. ἦνο- [F]ερπν, Gaul. Catu-rīges; O. H. G. Hadu-mar, Lith. virszū-kalnis), so that the older spelling māni-stēs preserved the earliest form (class. mānī-stēsus). From diphthongal U-stems we have nau-fraug (see ch. iv. § 46), bā-caāda beside bōv-cidium, bu-star and bo-star, an ox-stall (ch. iv. § 42), jā-glauna (Gk. Δος Βάλανος) (Macr. iii. 18. 3). Dies-pitris (C. I. L. xi. 3259), Dies-pitri Arnob. ii. 70 (cf. Dies-pitren, Macrobi. 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 holeri-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. ἀρμ-θενός, stithy, from ἀρμων, Lat. hōnī-cūs, from homō (cf. Goth. guma-kunds, 'of male sex'), or in the second, e. g. Gk. ἄμαμος beside ὀμαμων. We find also Ṋ in Gk. οὐμα-κλυρος, so that the en of Lat. nomen-clator, &c. was originally ọ; also the 'Composition vowel' -ō- added to the stem, e. g. Gk. φεν-ο-βλαβής, Lat. imāgin-ī-ter.
§ 87. R-stems, like N-stems, take the weak grade of the stem suffix before a consonant, r (e.g. O. Ind. pitr-
ṛvāṇa-, Gk. τετρά-
γος, Goth. brōpru-
lubō), before a vowel, r (e.g. O. Ind. pitr-arthaṁ, Gk. πατρ-ανύμος), and often add the 'Composition vowel' ō (e.g. Gk. πατρο-
φόνος). Since Latin -īr- (for L-Eur. -rī- (for L-Eur. -rō-) would generally become in the unaccented syllable -ēr-, it is not easy to decide on the origin of -ēr- in each case. For patri-
cidā, patri-
ces, &c. we should expect *patercida, *patercus; cf. acertus on the Aes Italicense. (C. I. L. 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-frangēdūlus, piē-d-i-sēquus, rēg-i-fōgium, may have been original i. It may also have been the ō, which is often used as 'Composition vowel,' with these stems, in other languages [e.g. Gk. δρακόντ-δ-μαλλος, νυφ-δ-βολος, Gaul. Carant-o-magus, Cinget-o-rīx (lit. 'king of warriors'); cf. O. Ir. cing, 'a warrior,' from cinjim, 'I march'). Before r we should have ę, e.g. τεγόρίφα (Plaut.), and before a labial ū (ū) in the older spelling (see ch. iii. § 18).

§ 89. S-stems. The S-stems, like other consonantal-stems in Latin, often show ī, e.g. mār-
i-
cūlus, jār-
i-
dēcūs, whether the i of I-stems or the 'Composition vowel' ō it is not easy to decide. But we find also the normal stem, e.g. mūs-cīpula (cf. Gk. μῦρ-φόνος). The ES-stems took -ēs- in L-Eur. compounds [e.g. Gk. σακερ-φόνος (the poetical form), Goth. sigis-
laun], and so before suffixes in Latin tempes-
līcus, hōnes-tus, &c., though -ēs-, by Analogy of the Nom. Sing., is found in ūnus-tus, &c. In Latin compounds the stem suffix is either displaced by ī [the ō of Gk. ἵππο-
νός (the prose form), ἀληθ-
δ-μαντις, &c. O. Sl. čudo-
točinū], e.g. foed-
ē-
frīgus, or augmented by it, e.g. foedē-
ri-
frīgus, hōnūr-
i-
līcus (cf. O. Sl. čudes-
ō-
točinū, Goth. aiz-
a-
mīja).

§ 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-0-, the suffix denoting material (§ 4), e.g. Fr. ferrin, ivoirin, has acquired in Italian and Portuguese a Diminutive sense, e.g. Ital. tavolino, Port. filinhó; -ūco- has taken the sense of large size or inferior quality, e.g. Ital. corpaccio, acquaciu. 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; -ia (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. pour-
boire; Bahuvrihi Compounds like Fr. rouge-gorge; Drandva 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 duo (§ 59), octō (lit. 'two sets of four'), and in the Pronoun form ambō (ch. vii. § 29). (On vi-ginti, 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.
'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. πατρ-ός). 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. πατεπος on the analogy of πατερα), Lat. patr-em on the analogy of patr-is), 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-en) may be due to a former declension with the stem pōlen-in the strong, and the stem poln-in the weak cases. [The variations homēn-, e.g. hōmēnis, hemōn-, e.g. O. Lat. hēmōnem (Paul. Fest. 71. 18 Th.), and homē(n)- have been similarly explained.] The appropriation of different stems to different cases leads to what is called Heteroclite declension; thus .CONNECTED { Iter'- is the stem appropriated to the Nom. Sing., ìlînër'- the stem appropriated to the other cases in Latin [so sēnēc- (ch. v. § 69) Nom. Sg., but sēn(i)- in the other cases, sūpelleg-, for super-leg-, a suffixless stem (ch. v. § 77) in the Nom. Sg., supelctili- for super-lectili- (an Adjectival LI-stem, ch. v. § 40) in the oblique cases]. Lat. fēmūr Nom., fēmīnis 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 rēi-, fidēs stem fid-ē-, 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 civitātium, fōrentium, 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. sōrōr), and in Roumanian we see the Dat. Fem. in roase Dat. (Lat. rōsae) beside roasā 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. *pulvus* for pulvis), Ital. serpe (Vulg. Lat. *serpi-* 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. φυγος, *fagus*, 'a beech'), names of fruits were Neuter (e.g. O. Ind. āmrām, 'mango-fruit,' beside āmrās, 'mango-tree,' Lat. mānum beside malus) (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. navī F., Gk. ποταμός M.), just as the names of the months, winds, &c. in Latin are really Adjectives agreeing with mensis, ventus (e.g. Jānuāris, Februāris, Martius; Auster, Caurus, Fāvōnius). 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 agrīcōlā, 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. ὀδός, κέλευθος, λίθος, ψηφός, and names of trees like φηγός, &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 fūgus is treated like a U-stem (fourth Declension) in the Culex, l. 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), cólus (Gk. πόλος), nārus (Gk. νῶς 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 cóllus (I.-Eur. kolso-, Germ. Hals M.), and útērus, 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 dīs has been ascribed to the analogy of nov.

² O. Slav. domū 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.) enunciates 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 intereunente 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 prātum, but Ital. tempora 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 Ā-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 Ī-suffix, e.g. I.-Eur. *nēpti F. beside nēpot- M. (Lat. neptis beside nēpōs.) (On the Ī-suffix, see ch. v. § 51, and on other feminine formative suffixes, as in Lat. gall-īna beside gallus, rēg-īna 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 'Hōś, 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 fertens, where fertens Neut. may represent an older *ferent (ch. iv. § 105), and in vētus, which was probably originally
a noun (Gk. ἀφρός, § 55), but also in Adjectives like *audax* (facinus audax, Plaut.), *dives* (dives opus, Ovid). It is to be compared with the extension of Derivatives in *-trix* (properly feminine, e.g. victrices lauros, Virg.) to Neuters, e.g. victricia arma, Virg., though *victrix* Sing. is not used with a Neuter Noun till Late Latin (see Neue, ii³, p. 40; and cf. below, § 16). The distinction in RI-stems¹ between the Nom. Sg. Masc. in *-er*, and the Nom. Sg. Fem. in *-ris* is not always found in the earlier authors (e.g. Ennius has *sonnus acris*, A. 400 M., and *acer hiemps*, A. 471 M., and Virgil himself has *alacris* Masc., A. vi. 685), and is not rigorously enforced even in classical Latin, e.g. *mediocris* Masc., *illustris* Masc. (see Neue, ii³, p. 15). (On the Romance declension of Adjectives, e.g. Ital. buono M., buona F., Span. bueno M., buena F., O. Fr. bon, bone, &c., see Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Gram.* ii, p. 75.) (On the Pronominal declension of certain Adjectives in I.-Eur., see ch. vii. § 29.)

§ 2. Nom. Sing. I. Masc., Fem. Ā-stems took *-ā* in I.-Eur. (e.g. O. Ind. ā́śvā, ‘a mare,’ Gk. χόπα). 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. ū, 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)². O. Lat. *hosticapas* (hostium captor, Paul. Fest. 73. 10 Th.), *paricidas* quoted from the Laws of Numa (Paul. Fest. 278. 10 sīqui 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. *hūrān*). They are often RO-stems in Late and Vulgar Latin, e.g. Vulg. Lat. *ālēcēr*, 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 a-stem when used as a masc. Concrete, e.g. *veaulās, a youth, from *veaulā, youth, though the usual practice in Latin is to retain the ordinary Nom. form, e.g. agrī-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. bhāranti, Pres. Part of bhṛ-, 'to carry,' naptī, Fem. of nāpīt-, 'grandson,' in Greek -iā, e.g. ἱφθοῦρα for *φιθοῦρα, show in Latin -ia, e.g. praecentia, possibly also -ēa, e.g. *ferentēs which became ferens, neptis (older Lat. -ēs?). Beside -ia (first Decl.) we find -iēs (fifth Decl.), e.g. mātēr-īes beside materia. The exact relation between O. Ind. -ī, Gk. -iā, Lat. -ia and -iēs has not yet been determined (see ch. v. § 51).

Ō-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 *lupos, *tauros (ch. iv. § 19). In RÖ-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 *agro-s (Gk. ἄγρος), Umbr. ager; even when a short vowel precedes, we find, e.g. Lat. sōcer (in Plautus socērus) for *socēros, *socēros (I.-Eur. *swēkuros), vir 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 svēczius, '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. ōvēs (O. Ind. ávi-s, Gk. ὄ(F)i-s, Lith. avis), mānūs (O. Ind. svādūs, 'sweet,' Gk. ἑός, Lith. sūnūs, 'a son'), vīs (Gk. ὦς), sūs (Gk. ὦς), rēs (O. Ind. rās), mīlēs for *miletes (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. δου-μενής) or -ōs (e.g. I.-Eur. *ēusōs, Hom. Gk. ἔως; cf. O. Ind. uēs), and so in Latin, e.g. pūbēs, hōnōs M., later honor, tōnor M. (beside tonus N.). But N-stems, which in I.-Eur. showed (1) -ōn, -ēn, (2) -ō (-ē),[e. g. (1) Gk. κῶν, πομῆν, (2) O. Ind. śvā, 'dog,' O. Ir. cū, Lith. szū], show -ō in Latin, e.g. hōmō, rātiō, uīrco '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,
(2) O. Ind. mātā, dātā, Lith. motē and motē, sesū, 'sister'], but display only the first formation in Latin, e.g. mātēr, dātōr, sōrōr (in O. Lat. *matēr, datōr, sōrōr; see ch. iii. § 49). So in Umbrian karu, 'a part' (Lat. cūrō), with u as equivalent of Lat. ō, but in Osc. statīf, statio, fruktatiuf, fruitatio, úttīuf, utitio' with -f for ns, the ns being perhaps a re-formation just as carīns sometimes replaces carō in Latin (Prisc. i. p. 208. 19 H.). Umbro-Oscan R-stems form their Nom. like the Latin, e.g. Umbr. ars-fertur, Osc. censtur 'censor' (both with u, the equivalent of Lat. ō).

§ 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 [aquilā, Enn. A. 149 M. is a case of metrical lengthening of a short syllable before the penultimate member caesura; copīā, Plaut. Mīl. 1226 shows 'yllaba anceps' at the end of the hemistich; familia, Trin. 251 is a proceulematic (familītā) representing an anapaest, and so on]. The only genuine instances are Greek words with -ā, which are long in later poetry too, e.g. Nēmeā (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.), Aeneā (Qüint. i. 5. 61 ne in a quidem atque s litteras exire temere masculina Graeca nomina recto casu patiēbantur, idōque et apud Caelium legimus 'Pellā cincinnatus' et apud Messalam 'bene fecit Euthia,' et apud Ciceronem 'Hermagora,' ne miremus, quod ab antiquorum plerisque 'Aeneā' ut 'Anchisā' sit dictus), and similarly in classicall Latin poētā, nautā, bibliopōtā, &c. (cf. Atrīdā, Propert. ii. 14. 1; Marsyā, Hor. S. i. 6. 120; and for other instances see Neue, Formenl. ii. pp. 31 sqq.); though they usually in the classical literature retain -ās, -ēs, just as Greek Noms. in -η retain η, e.g. Andrōmāchē, or take the Latin suffix, e.g. epistūlā. Hosticēpas, quoted by Paul. Fest., is a strange form. Compounds of ὕπω usually show -eōs, e.g. mānī-eōs, while Plautus has urbī-eīpēs Voc. (Mīl. 1055). Parīcīdas (i.e. parrīcīdas, for the double consonant was not written double till Ennīus' time, ch. i. § 8) is indeed in the Republican and Classical period an Ā-stem (e.g. parrīcīda Voc., Plaut. Pseud. 362; but adjectivally mārī-cīda homo Voc., 'you coward,' Epid. 333); however, if these Masc. Ā-stems originally took -as 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 lēgīrūpa (better lēgerūpa, ch. iii. § 20) Nom. Sing. with its last syllable elided:

lēgerūpa, in pudēns, in purus, inuereundissimus,

where lēgerūpa, originally 'the act of law-breaking,' a fem. Abstract, then masc. and Concrete, 'a law-breaker;' cannot have been written by Plautus lēgerupas (ch. ii. § 137). The names on Oscan inscriptions (Map)as (Zv. i. i. i.

1 agoē in Enn. A. 567 M.: multa foro ponet et agoēa longa repletur, is not a certain example. The Greek word seems to have been ἄγων, and one MS. reads ponens agoeqae.
§ 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. séve-rus, súmar-rus, mátt-rus, nor in these tribrach words húmér-s, númér-s, útr-rus. Plautus has the tribrach stem sócér-o-(L.-Eur. *sévëkùro-, O. Ind. svásúra-, Gk. ἱφώς, Lith. sësziùras) 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. pu réa, 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 puer was originally an O-stem, for the cognate Greek word is παύρος, 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. Pan. ii.:

primá incédit Cérrēris Prosēripina puer,

while the curious compound slave-names Marcipor, Gaipor, Quintipor, &c. are I-stems, Plur. Marcipores (e.g. Plin. xxxiii. 26). Inférus, with súpérus, is used in Livius Andronicus’ translation of the Odyssey (at least in the later dactylic version of it):

inferus an superus tibi fert deus funera, Ulīxes?,

but infer and super by Cato (R. R. exil. i. ubi super inferque uicinus permittet), like citer (Cato, Orat. fr. lxii. p. 65 J.). Of compounds ending in Verbal Adjective in -rus we have always mārī-gérus (e.g. Plaut. Capt. 966), prīt-pérus, (júmī-pérus is by some explained as jun(on)i-pīrus, ‘Juno’s pear,’ like jā-glans, ‘Jove’s acorn,’ by others is derived from *júrus, cf. jun-cus, and pārio), but the normal usage favoured -er, -er, &c. (for details, see Kühner, Lat. Gram. i. pp. 278 sqq.). All this points to -er having originally been substituted for -ros only when a consonant preceeded, e.g. áger for *ag-ros. After the vowel i we find -ros curtailed to -r in vīr (but pīrus beside pīrum); after the vowel u, in sātīr (as early as Plautus; see A. L. L. v. 34), although volūrūs (class. cultur, -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 ‘teturus,’ aper non ‘aprous.’ In the Umbro-Oscan dialects -los was similarly changed to -el, e.g. Osc. famel, apparently for fām-lo-, ‘a dweller’ (cf. Osc. faamant, ‘he dwells’) with the same formation as Lat. fīgūlus, stem fīg-lo- from fīgo, &c. (ch. iv. § 51). But this was not the Latin usage, e.g. fāmulus, bibī tus, masculus, &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
reddidit, ut summo regno famul olimus esset,
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in which he is imitated by Lucretius, who echoes the rhythm of this passage (iii. 1035):

Scipiadas, beli 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. *figul non 'figel,' mascel non 'mascel'); but the usual Vulgar Latin form *masculus* is mentioned in the same treatise (197. 20 K. *speculum non 'speculum,' mascelus non 'masculus,' vetulus non 'veclus, vernaculus non 'vernaculus,' articulus non 'articulus, baelus non 'baelus,' angulus non 'anglus,' jugulus non 'jugulus.') (On the curtailing of *-rīs and -īs, see ch. iv. § 13; the restriction of *-er to Masc., -rīs to Fem. Nom. Sing. is not observed in the older literature; e.g. Ennius has somnus aeras and aerc hiems; cf. § 1, p. 371).

§ 5. YO-stems. The -is of the Nom. Sing. of Oscan YO-stems, e.g. Pakis, Lat. Pācius (-is would be syncope in Oscan, e.g. *cers, Lat. cēcis), is perhaps indicated for Latin by the occasional spellings with *-is* on Greek inscriptions, e.g. *Elius* (Lat. *Aelius*) (I.L.S. 928, Ostia, very late), *Perpōνius* (Lat. Petronius) the usual Greek transcription, however, is -is. (Neither *-is nor -īs is found till the beginning of the first century A.D.; see Eckinger, *Orthographie* p. 56). *Alīs* (if we may infer this quantity from *ālād, Lucter. i. 265, &c.) may have its final syllable shortened by the Law of Breves Brevia-antes, like *cēcē, hārēc, &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 ceremonious form, *Marcus, Postumnus,* while the secretaries' names have the *īs-ending, Cnāuli, Valerī, Minuci.* Ritschl in a paper entitled 'De declinatione quadam latina recondito' (Opusc. iv. 446) has collected a large number of these proper names with -is or -i Nom. (less certainly *-is Gen., *-i Dat., *-im Acc.) from Latin inscr. The form *alīs,* quoted from the older writers (e.g. Catull. ixv. 28) by the grammarians (see the passages mentioned by Ritschl, ib. p. 452), may have been specially used in collocations like *alīs alīum* (so in the Vulgar Latin of the Itala; cf. C. I. L. ii. 2633, of 27 A.D.: *eique omnes alius alium ... receperunt*), *alīs ëlībī* (e.g. Sallust *frāg. 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 outsting of the second Decl. suffix *-ārius* by the third Decl. *-āris* (ch. v. § 4), and in the remark of Caper (112. 2 K.) that *vāles* (an I-stem, like O. Ir. faith for *wāti-, Gaul. eōrēs Plur.) was in O. Lat. *vatus.*

§ 6. I-stems. The -is of the Nom. Sing. of I-stems is syncope in the Umbro-Oscan dialects, e.g. Osc. *cers* (Lat. *cēcis*), like the -ōs of the Nom. Sing. of O-stems, e.g. Umbr. *emps* (Lat. *emptus*), *Icūnis* (Lat. *Igūinus*), Osc. *hārz* (Lat. *hortus*), *Bantis* (Lat. *Bantinus*), and the -ēs of the Nom. Plur. of Consonant-stems, e.g. Osc. *mēddēcē* for *med-dīk-ēs Nom. Plur. of medīx, censorīr for *censor-ēs, Lat. censorīrēs.* We have seen (ch. iii. § 16) that it is very difficult to prove a similar treatment of -ēs 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 *āx, Gen. vēgis, ēr, Gen. lēgis, &c.* Like *rōs,* however, *-rīs was reduced to -er in Latin as in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Lat. *āer for aēris, Umbr. paeer for *pae-
ris, 'propitious,' connected with Lat. pāx. Ennius, who coined fāmil after the type of the Oscan famel (§ 4), used debīl (Voc. Sing. ?) for debīlis (A. 341 M. debil homo), perhaps after Osc. aidil (Lat. aidiīlis), &c. Nouns with Nom. Sing. in -i (consul, praetul, erat, pugil, vigil, mūgil, &c.) are declined as Consonant-stems in Latin (Gen. Plur. consul-um, pugil-um, vigil-um, mūgil-um) (see Neue, Formenl. F. p. 153), though the line between Nouns in -i and Adjectives in -is, e.g. debīlis, is, as might be expected, often passed over. Thus Juvenal, (x. 317) has mugīlis (but Mart. Cap. iii. 294 si 'mugīlis' esset ... 'mugilium' faceret.) For vigil, pugil we should expect *vigilus, *pugilus, like vībūlis, fīgūlus (ch. v. § 22), or with adjectival i (ch. v. § 34) *vīgīlis, *pugīlis, although -īlis has properly a passive sense, e.g. bībūlis, 'drinkable, easily drunk,' āgūlis, 'easily moved,' hābilis (whence debīlis 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 -ēs, e.g. oānēs F., the O. Lat. form which had been replaced by conēs by the time of Varro (L. L. vii. 32). The -ēs of ambēgēs, &c., we have seen to be really the -ēs of the Nom. Plur. of I-stems, viz. -ēyes (e.g. Lat. trēs for *trēyēs, O. Ind. trāyas, Cret. Gk. τρίες for *τρήeyes, O. Sl. trije, &c.) (§ 40); it must not be confounded with an early spelling like aidīlies for aedīlies on a Scipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 31, but aediīlis on another Scipio epitaph, i. 32), where the e (pronounced ë) is merely an expression of the -i-sound in an unaccented syllable, like the third e of Tempestatēbus for Tempestātībus (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 plebēs, if an ES-stem by origin like Gk. περι-πληθύς (beside πλήθος) (ch. v. § 74), should have made its Gen. Sing. *plebēriā, but was led by the analogy of canēs, &c. into taking a Gen. pleb-īs, as on the other hand the analogy of stems like rēs, Gen. rēl, rēī supplied the Gen. plebēti, plebēti; and the tendency of Vulgar Latin to replace every Nom. Sing. -ēs by the more familiar -is was perhaps the cause of the forms austēs, plebēs, ratis, tabīs, nubīs, subolīs, vulpīs, palumbīs, lavis, veprīs, famīs, cladīs, proliis, censured in Prob. App. pp. 198-9 K. For the late byform molīs (an ES-stem, cf. mōlūs-tus), see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v., and for other examples, Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 654. Beside plebēs, nubēs, cautēs, saepe, we have plebēs, nubēs (used by Liv. Andronicus, according to Servius ad A. x. 636, and frequent in the Itala), oēs, saepe; also trābēs for older trābes (Varro, L. L. vii. 33 sic dictum a quibusdam ut una 'canes,' una 'trabes' ... cujus verbi singularis casus rectus corrupitus ac facta trābes.) (On these Noms. in -ēs, see ch. v. § 51.) O. Lat. sortīs (class. Lat. sors) and the like are discussed in ch. iii. § 16; messīs of Plaut. Rud. 763 (AP) is changed by editors to messīs.

§ 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. honēs-tus), plebēs (cf. Gk. πληθός). As Adjectives (cf. Gk. περι-πληθύς beside πλήθος, ψευδός beside ψευδός) they show -er in pūber (also pubēs, -ēris Gen., inpūbēs, -ēris Gen.), dē-gēner; -or in con-cōlor, bi-corpor (ch. v. § 73). The -os of honōs, lābos, cōsōs, viōpos, &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. I. 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 pecēn M. (Gk. κτέις M. for *πτέρος, Gen.
§ 9. Diphthong Stems. I.-Eur. *nāu-s (O. Ind. nāu-s, Gk. ναῦ-ς) is Latin nāvis; I.-Eur. *gōōs (O. Ind. gāu-s, Gk. βοῖς) 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)yāu-s, Gk. Ζεύς) has in Latin the sense of ‘day’ the Nom. dē-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. Jāni-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., Ἀπόλλων Gen.’ Mar. Sacerd. 473. 1 K.), and tell us that in the old liturgical books the word was declined Juppiter Nom., Juppitrīs 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 eista (C. I. L. xiv. 4105), also [Dic]specter (Bull. 1887, p. 323), Diespiter (C. I. L. i. 1500); and in Plautus, &c. Diespiter is not unknown (see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s. v. Juppiter). Dies is like the Accus. diem. For the Nom. we should expect *dīōn (Gk. Ζεὺς), with ēn from ēn, which would become in Latin diēs (cf. nā-diūster-tius?).

§ 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 -n, NT-stems -nt, &c. So in Latin, e.g. jūgum (older jūgōm). (I.-Eur. *yūgōm, O. Ind. yugām, Gk. γυγώς, mēle (older *mīlī; see ch. iii. § 37) (cf. O. Ind. śūci, ‘pure,’ Gk ῥόπο); nōmen with -en for I.-Eur. -n (O. Ind nāma; cf. Gk. ὄνομα); ōrens 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. hṛd; cf. Gk. κόρα for *κόρα). U-stems have in I.-Eur. -ū, e.g. *mēdhū, ’mead,’ *swādā, ’sweet’ (O. Ind. mádhū, svādū, Gk. μέθη, θόδ); and similarly Latin Neuter Nouns have -u, e.g. pēcn, cornu (U-Stem Adjectives passed into the I-declension in Latin, e.g. suāve; 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
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details, see Neue, Formentl. i². 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 scansion. 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 *fēlić (cf. allēc N., allēx F.), du-plex for *dī-plex (Umbr. tu-plak) (cf. above, § 1, p. 370).

§ 11. O-stems. We find -um lost in nihil, nil, from nihilum, a compound of nē and hīūm (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 nihil 'nōn hoc est on the one hand, and nihilum dīcit on the other, the 'doublets' nihil and nihilum would come into use, and no doubt existed for a long time side by side till the less cumbrous nihil, nihil ousted its rival. Similarly nōn for no-cenum, like our 'nought' for 'ne-aught,' o being substituted for a (older ec) because of the monosyllabic form or the unaccented character of the Construction (but see ch. x. § 18). The Umbro-Oscan neuters have -ēm, Osc. saka-rakkūm 'sacraulum' ('a shrine'), dunum 'dōnum,' Umbr. esonum, a sacrifice.

§ 12. I-stems. Final é is dropped by Synecope (cf. ch. iii. § 36) in Neuters like facul, an O. Lat. form of facile, e.g. Accius, Trag. 460 R.:

\[\text{érat istuc uirile, ferre aduōrsam fortunām facul,}\]

volup, Neut. of a lost Adj. *volupis, e.g. Plaut. Cas. 784 fācīte nostro animō uolup. (On the question whether volupest is rightly divided into volup est or into volup est, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). Similarly the old Nom. lacē, with the I-stem form (e.g. Plaut. Bacch. 19. 1134, Men. 1089, Mīl. 240) became lac (Plaut. Truc. 903 (?), Varro, L L. v. 104), classical lac (see Georges s. v.).

§ 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. opōs (C. I. L. i. 52), honōs. In course of time Neut. -ōs sank to -ūs, ōpus (see ch. iv. § 20), Masc. -ōs became by Analogy of the oblique cases (hōnōr-ēs, hōnōr-em, &c.) -or, 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: vetustissimi etiam neutrum in or finiebat, et erat cadem terminatio communis trium generum, thus hinting that the justification of this usage was the Analogia of Adjectives of one termination for Masc., Fem., Neut., like andās, felix. And it is possible that a Neuter in -ār (older -ār like rōbur (robor Acc., Varro, R. R. iii. 7, 9) took -r for -s in the Nom. from the oblique cases robūr-is, robūr-i, &c., for Catō (R. R. xvii. 1) uses the form robūs, or from an Early Latin Masc. byform [if we may trust Paul. Fest. i. 20 Th. 'robesem' 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 -ās), a Masc. ES-stem in -ār (older -ār, -ās), e. g. tēmus N., tēmor M., dēcus N., dēcor M., frēgus N., frīgor M. The -as, 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. facinus audāx, Aul. 460 (so Ter. Phrmn. 233, &c.), duplex (sc. aurum), Men. 546, sagax nasum, Cure. 110, and occurs in the ancient phrase quod bonum faciam felix fortunamque sit. (For examples, e. g. dives opus, Ovid, pondus ineris, Cic., see Neue, ii. p. 22). Similar is the extension of the suffix -tric-, properly fem., to neuter Adjectives, e. g. victrix arma, Virg. A. iii. 54 (though victik Sg. is not used as neut. till Late Latin). [Does concept of the XII Tables (ap. Fest. 556. 27 Th. tignum inunctum aedibus uinea et concept 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. raūkos), and similarly in the Umbro-Oscan languages, e. g. Umbr. tutas, later tolar '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 āi (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. ἀρπεῖδαι like Aἴλαοο, and it has been suggested that Lat. -āi began in Masc. Nouns such as agrīcūla, advēnā, &c. (§ 2), and took its -i from the Gen. of the second Decl. Similarly fifth Decl. stems show -ēi, later -ei, -i, e. g. fēlēi O. Lat., fēlēi class., rēi, rēt, and rēi in the Dramatists, ilī, Virg. A. i. 636, also (like -ās from Ā-stems), O. Lat. faciēs, dieś.
O-stems, which in Umbro-Oscan show the I-stem suffix, have in Latin, as in Celtic, a long i-sound, e.g. Lat. nātū, vīrī, Gaul. Ate-gnati, O. Ir. eich for *eci, '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. -i 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. ocer, of the citadel (Lat. οχρίς), a suffix extended to consonant-stems and even to O-stems, e.g. Osc. carneis, of a part (Lat. carn-is), sakarakleis, 'of a shrine' (Lat. *sacrāculī). But in Latin the consonant-stem suffix has enforced itself on the I-stems too, e.g. partīs like reg-īs (cf. partus like Castorūs, 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. castroves '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. ὁ for I.-Eur. ou). 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 senatūs is the proper Gen. of sēnātus. Occasionally the Dramatists have -uis, the suffix proper to ū-stems like sūs, socrūs, as -iis, -is to ū-stems like vis (O. Lat. Gen. vis).

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. πουμέν-ος). Latin -ēs, on old inscriptions -ēs, shows the former suffix, while the -us occasionally written on inscriptions seems to be a relic of the latter. To make -ēs a weakening of earlier -us (-os) is an unlikely theory, seeing that -us (-os) of the Nom.
Sg. of Neuter ES-stems, &c., e.g. genus, opus, was not weakened to -es, -is.

The A-stem Gen. -aes (pronounced -es 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). Hedonē (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?)

§ 18. A-stems. (1) In -es. This form is proper to the Saturnian and earliest Epic poetry. Thus exes, Môntas, Lâtomas are quoted by Priscian (i. p. 198 H.) from Livius Andronicus, Terras and fortânas 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 auræ in Virg. A. xi. 801, and in his note on the passage mentions that some interpreted custódias as a Gen. Sg. in a passage of Sallust: castella custódias thensaurorum in deditionem accipieruntur. A relic of the old usage survived in legal phraseology, so conservative always of old words and ceremonies, in the terms pâter fâmilias, mätæ fâmilías, filiûs (-a) fâmilias. But this form is unknown to the conversational language of the Dramatists [Alcâmēnus in the Argument (post Pautine) of the Amphitruo, l. 1, is an imitation of the anteique], and must have been in their time out of use. (A contrary view is stated in Studen. Stud. ii. p. 21.)

(2) In -āi, class. -ae. Dissyllabic -āi is not infrequent in Plautus, and is perhaps found in Terence (Rhein. Mus. 1893, p. 395), while in Lucilius it is allowed in hexameters only (e.g. Tirēsiai; 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):

* attonitusque legis ‘terrai frugiferai,’
* Accius et qui quid Pracuviusque vomunt.

The rarity of the elision of the final -i of -āi, as of -āi [Plaut. Bacch. 307 Diana(i) Ephesiae; Pers. 409 pecuni(a) accipîter, 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. pîus from Chius, pîus (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 aidîlis, &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),
seems to show -ai with -i elided: non aevō exactō vitāt es traditus morti). [For passages of the grammarians referring to this 'Genitive in -ai, see Neue, i., p. 9, e.g. Quint. i. 7. 18 unde 'pictās vestīs' et 'aqua' Vergilii aman-
tissimus vetustātis 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,
i., p. 13. On two bricks of the same year (123 A.D.) from the manufactory
of Flavia Procula we have (C. I. L. xv. i. 1157-8) Flaviēs Proculae and Flaviēs Proculae.
[Of no. 1425 Seiae Isauricēs (123-141 A. D.), but usually Seiae Isauricēs.]

Some would connect Lat. -āt, -ae with O. Ind. Gen. -āyas, Dat. -āyāi (used in
the Brāhamanas for the Gen.) of Ā-stems, the yo f which forms is of doubtful
origin. The derivation of Lat. -āt from an earlier -ais is impossible. The
supposed 'Prosepnai's of a Prænestine 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 Noctes Atticæ. In old copies
(aliquote veteribus librīs) of the History of Claudius Quadrigrarius he found
facies Gen., sometimes with facii added in the margin: meminimus enim in
Tiburtī 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: insipēs opera conquīstit 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.¹

He adds examples of -ii (Nom. -īs), -i (Nom. -īs) from early literature, famī
from Cato and Lucilius, perniciī from Sisenna and Cicero, progenii from Pau-
vius, acii and specii from Matius, luxurii from C. Græchus, and supports the
reading dīi in Virgil, A. i. 636: munera laetitiamque dīi (quod inperitiores
'dei' legunt, ab insolentia scilicet vocis istius abhorrentes). Finally he
summons the authority of the great Dictator for dīe, specie, &c.: sed C. Caesar
in libro de Analogia secundo 'hujus die' et 'hujus speciei' dicendum putat,
and supports this form from an old MS. of Sallust: ego quoque in Jugurtha
Sallustii summae fideli et reverendae vetustatis libro 'die' casu patrio scriptum
inveni. (The passage is Jug. xviii. 3, where two of our MSS. have die, the rest
dīi.) (For the remarks of other grammarians on this point, see Neue, i., p. 375.)

From his account we gather that forms like dīi, specīi, were grammarians'
coinages designed to restore the actual forms dīi, specii to the proper e-type
of stem. At the same time the tendency to Dissimulation, which in the
middle of a word turned i to ī in ātēnus, &c., may have been to some extent
operative in certain collocations of these words, e. g. dīi-festi, dīi-natalis, &c.
[see ch. iii. § 12 a (9)]. The spelling dīi, specīi, &c., in early literature and
inscriptions, may often have represented dīi, specīi, 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, foido (ch. iv. § 34). Gellius mentions (l. c.) the theory of some grammarians that die, specie were Ablative forms used as Genitives, and modern philologists have made them Locatives, like die custodi, &c. (§ 37).

The rule of the grammarians of the Empire is that in the approved Gen. form, dissyllabic -ei, the e is short after a consonant, long after a vowel, e.g. fidēi, ulāi. In Plautus and Terence we rarely find rēi (e.g. Plaut. Men. 494), but usually monosyllabic rē, hardly ever the ceremonious form rē, e.g. Mil. (prol.) 109 magnā rē públicai grátia (post-Platine ?); similarly fīdei is always dissyllabic in Terence and usually in Plautus (but twice fīde); spei is never a dissyllable. (Seyffert, Stud. Pl. p. 25.) (Compare the usage of the dramatists with regard to the Pronoun Dat. Sg. rē, eī, and ē, ch. vii. § 19.)

The normal shortening of e in hiatus (ch. ii. § 143) would be hindered when i preceded, e.g. diei. Of the elision of the final -i of dissyllabic -ei examples (more or less doubtful) are: Plaut. Aul. 68 Malō rei evenisse, Poen. 479 Quoi rēi? Ad fundas uīsecus ne adhaerēsecert, &c. (Other examples of all these forms of the Gen. of fifth Decl. stems, e. g. rābēs in Lucr. iv. 1083):

quodcumque est, rabies unde illae germinā surgunt,
die in Varro, Ep. ad Fāvium: meridiem die natalis, fidē in Hor. C. iii. 7. 4 constantis juvenem fide, see in Neue, l. c.)

§ 20. O-stems and IO-stems. The grammarians tell us that Vālēri, Vergīlii, &c. were accented on the second syllable, that is to say they were accented as if they were contractions of Valerii, &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. pueri Gen. Sg., and of the double symbol ei for a Plural, e.g. puerei Nom. Pl. has been mentioned in ch. i. § 9.

The earliest form of the O-stem Gen. Sg. suffix is -i, e. g. Saturni 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 n. c. In Gallican 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. L. I. 73); IO-stems (with Nom. in -io or -es) have -i, e. g. Acreedini (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 restoration1 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 servemus modumque.

This use of the Gen. of the Gerundive to indicate purpose (cf. Aegyptum proficeiscitur cognoscendae antiquitatis, Tac.) is a genuine Latin construction (see Weisweiler, Der finale Gen. Gerund. 1890), and is found in Umbrian, e.g. esono—... ocer pihaner 'sacrificium areis piandae' (Tab. Ig. vi. A. 18), verfale pufc arsfortur trebeit ouer pihaner 'templum (?) ubi flamen versatur areis piandae' (ib. vi. A. 8).
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

[Chap. VI.

O-stems, -i the actual historical development. Adjective IO-stems have -ii, e.g. patrii sermonis, Lucr. [See Neue, ii. p. 44; fluvii of Virg. A. iii. 702 (Gela fluvi cognomine 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 senátus, but in inscriptions of the latter part of the second cent. B.C. senatú (i. 199, of 117 B.C.; i. 300, of 111 B.C.; i. 547, of 141 or 116 B.C.), (cf. lácii 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. Gallius (iv. 16. 1) tells us that Varro and Nigidius (first cent. B.C.) approved -uis, e.g. senatús, doñatús, a form which sticklers for Analogy defended by the Dat. Sg. senatúi, sinee patri, dедi, caedi had as Genitives patris, ducis, caedis. According to Mar. Victorinus (9. 4 K.), Augustus used domos for domus Gen. (divus Augustus genetivo casu huipus ‘domos’ meae per o, non ut nos per u litteram scrivit. Cf. Suet. Aug. 87). (For other passages of the grammarians dealing with the Genitive of u-stems, see Neue, i. 3, p. 352.) The -uos of senatuos must be the u-stem Gen. with the I.-Eur. Gen. suffix -ós (see below), as the -uis of anuis is the u-stem Gen. with the I.-Eur. Gen. suffix -és. But the -us of senátus, âmús can hardly be derived by the ordinary processes of phonetic change from either; for -uos, -uis would naturally become -vós (-ulis), -vis (cf. míhus, Plant., milvus in class. Lat., mort(v)ūs in Late Lat., ch. iv. § 71).

In Faliscan we have (Zvet. I. I. I. 70) de zena tuo sentienti, where the final -s of zena tus (Lat. senatus) has been dropped before the following initial s. Oscan senatēs shows the same Gen. suffix as the O-stems.

§ 22. Consonant-stems. The frequency of the Gen. -us in S. Italian inscriptions, e.g. Pēněrus, 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), Cērěrus, 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 vēgus (with sociātēs) on a bilingual Greek and Latin inscr. of 81 B.C., Not. Soc. 1887, p. 110], but this Latin suffix cannot have been merely a usage of Italian-Greek patois, like -aes in Gen. of Â-stems. It is found on so early inscriptions as the S. C. de Bacch. (i. 196) with nōminus, and the old Praenestine cippus (xiv. 2892) with Sūliatus, and on various official inscriptions, e.g. the Epistula ad Tiburtis (i. 201, of c. 100 B.C.) with Kastorūs, the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. (i. 200) with hōmōnus, praevāricítōnus, the Lex Bantina (i. 197, of 133–118 B.C.) with Cætorūs and even partus (an I-stem), and may be the correct reading in Lucil. ix. 28 M.: foris subteminus panust. (Other examples in Neue, i. 3, p. 191, such as the soldier’s message of defiance cut on a glass used at the siege of Perusia: L. Antoni calve, peristi C. Caesarus victoria, C. I. L. i. 685).

The Genitive in -os on old inscriptions may sometimes be dialectal with -as for -es (the I-stem Gen., extended in the Umbro-Oscan languages to Consonant-stems), e.g. Umbr. mater, nomner (cf. Ose. mātreis ‘matri’), but is more naturally regarded as -ēs, the older spelling of classical -is (as early as c. 180 B.C., filāmīs, C. I. L. i. 33 (cf. ch. iii. § 18). Examples are C. I. L. i. 49 (Orte) Salutes pocolom, i. 187 (Praeneste) Apolones òdērī, i. 811 (Rome?) [G]erūres.

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 *acē) 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. ἵππος). 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, fāciī, may then be the Genitive form (fāciū for older fāciēi from fāciēii), which was adapted to the dative use on the Analogy of third Decl. datives in -ī (just as the classical fāciēii 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. -ei, Umbr. -e), as in Consonant-stems.

U-stems have -ūi 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 śiv , '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. Ā-stems. Dissyllabic -āī is not found in the Dat. of Ā-stems, but only in the Gen. (terrā frugiferai, Enn. A. 603 M. is, like Virgil's autāi medio, with which Charisius couples it, a Genitive, so correct 'dativo' in Char. 19. 1 K.; utīī sternendaīi, 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 'opoeae'; sed in his non potest divisio fieri, sicut in illis). Gellius (xiii. 26. 4) tells us that Nigidius (first cent. n.c.) approved -āi (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. Dianē (C. I. L. i. 168, Pisaurum), Fortuna (i. 64, Tusculum), Victorie (i. 183, Marsi). Of the 'Datives in -a,' only found on very old inscriptions, most of the apparent examples come from Pisaurum (C. I. L. i. 167-180), where -e (Diane just quoted) was the Dat. suffix of Ā-stems, and may be Genitives in -ēs with omission of the final s (cf. Nom. Pl. matrona Pisaurēs for matronas Pisaurenses, i. 173; so Gen. Sg. Coira pocolo, Eph. Epigr. i. 6), or else a mere dialectal variety, which would prove nothing for the Latin dative. Others, viz. Fortuna (i. 1733, Praeneste); Fortuna (Bull. 1885, p. 62, Signia); Fortuna Diovo fileia primogenia (xiv. 2863, Praeneste); Dianē (xiv. 4182 a and 4184 a, Nemi) are open to similar doubts. The strongest instances are: [M]e[n][u]ra dono d. . . . (Nol. Scav. 1887, p. 179, Rome); In[un]onei Loci[n]a (C. I. L. i. 189, loc. inc.); In[un]one Loci[n]a Tuscolana sacra and [Pa]le T[uscolana sacra (i. 1200-1, Capua) [cf. Faliscan Menerua sacra (Zvet. I. L. 70)].

Examples of -āi are Dian[ai] donum dedit (C. I. L. xiv. 4270, beg. of second cent. n.c.), Men[ervaei donum port- (C. I. L. i. 191), [Inun]onei Loci[nai (i. 813). We have -āi even on inscr. of the Emperor Claudius, e.g. Antoni[i] Augustai matr (Orelli 650).

§ 25. Fifth Decl. Stems. Gellius (ix. 14): in casu autem dandi qui purissime locuti sunt non 'faciel,' uti nunc dicitur, sed 'facie' dixerunt. He then quotes two examples of facie from Lucilius (vii. 9 and vii. 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. -e, as in pru-sikurent 'pronuntiaverint' with the ĕ-grade of root seen in Lat. sēdī, &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, donui, fluctui, &c. in the Dative, and senatuis, donuuis, fluctuis in the Genitive, but gives examples of -u from Lucilius (iv. 8 M.; énum, iv. 9, cf. vii. 21) and Virgil, and clenchs them with the authority of Caesar: C. etiam Caesar, gravis auctor linguae Latinae, ... in libris Analogicos omnia istiusmodi sine littera dicens censent. In Plautus -ui is the usual form, e.g. quaeestui habere, externui, usui esse, and with the force of a second supine, Bucch. 62 quia istae lepida sunt memoratuui, but -u is also found, e.g. Rutil. 294 sunt nobis quaeustu 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. 193). The -e which we find (along with -el) on old inscriptions is -i, 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 -e, later -i, just as the e of ploirume on the Scipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 32 hono oino ploirume coseontient) represents no different sound from the usual -ei, later -i of the Nom. Pl. of O-stems. Instances of Dat. -ei and -e are: Herolei (i. 1503, Rome, 217 B.C.); Martei (i. 531, Rome, 211 B.C.); Hercule (Ann. Épigr. 1890, no. 84, Rome); Hercole (C. I. L. xiv. 2891-2, Praeneste). We have the three spellings of the suffix side by side on a freedman's inscription from the Roman district (i. 1110): Iuno Saepultae Marti, and the two older in i. 638: [D]ionei Victore (Rome, c. 180 B.C.), [Quintilian (i. 4. 17) mentions Dione Victore as an old form], and in xi. 4766 Ioue ... Iionei (Spleotium 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. mātām-am, Gk. μητήρ-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. χαφαν, 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 -ōm, in O. Lat. -om, class. -um (ch. iv. § 20); IO-stems, -iōm, -ium, perhaps also in the
‘familiar’ declension (§ 5), -im; I-stems, -im, which is found in the older literature and in many examples, *turr-im, &c., in the classical period, though -em, the Consonant-stem ending, has usually supplanted it; U-stems, -äm; I-stems, -im (also -iym, e.g. O. Ind. dihiyam, ‘thought’), which in Latin would become -im; Ū-stems, -uṃ, Lat. -u-em, e.g. svem, also -ūm, Lat. -ūm, e.g. so(m). 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. dēgēnē rem from *dēgenes-em; others follow the analogy of Œ-stems, as in the Gen. and other cases, e.g. ple(bem) (ch. v. § 51).

§ 30. The endings -im and -em. We can hardly say that -em arose from -im by ordinary phonetic change, seeing that final -im remains in so many words, e.g. Adverbs in -im like olim, 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 ε 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 pisicim on an old Prænestine cista (Mét. Arch. 1890, p. 303), and the instances from the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus given in Studemund’s Index, e.g. imbrim, Pseud. 102. Sometimes the use of -im indicates an I-stem, e.g. vim, sometimes a Greek loanword, e.g. turr-im (?); it is retained in Accusatives used adverbially, e.g. partim (ch. ix. § 4). [Claudii, &c. (C. I. L. iv. Ind.), if for Claudii(in)im, may be dialectal. On Gk. Απφειν for Απνον Nom. Sg. (I. I. S. 1411), &c.; see Eckinger, Orth. p. 56.]

§ 31. Voc. Sing. 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 Índrā ca, ‘O Vāyu and Índra’; in Hom., Zeus πάτερ, . . . Ηέλιος τε; in Plautus meus ocellus, . . . mi 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. πάτερ, unlike the Nom., O. Ind. pitá, Gk. πατήρ). Ā-stems had a short A-vowel (Gk. δεσποτα, &c.), O-stems -ē (O. Ind. vṛkā, Gk. λύκε, Lat. lūpē) and so on. In Latin I-, U- and N-stems substitute the Nom. form for the Voc., e.g. cīvis, mānum, hōmo (contrast Gk. φίλ, ηχυ, κόνυ); 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. -ér and -ēr, -ār and -or, to judge from scansions in
Plautus like *Merc. 800 Uxór, 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 sink to equē, and would be indistinguishable from the Voc. of O-stems, I.-Eur. *ékwē, Voc. of *ékwos. 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 -ē, § 2), and the Voc. (only in -a, e.g. Šerfia), 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. Vālērī; 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 -īe, but may be the Voc. byform corresponding to the Nom. byform -is (cf. Lith. gaidŷ Voc. from gaidŷs Nom., 'a cock'; see § 5). RO-stems which took -er in the Nom. retain this in the Voc. too, though puĕre, and not puer, seems to be the form always used by Plautus.

§ 32. Other examples. Jā-piter (better Juppiter, ch. ii. § 130, p. 116) corresponds exactly with Gk. Zeūς πάτερ, and might be a Vocative used as a Nominative, just as Homer's νεφεληγερεῖτας Ζεύς, μητεῖτας Ζεύς, 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 Jā-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. (Ep. Epigr. viii. 529) reminds us of Gk. Ὑπερ, &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 operae pretium esse, eadem istae diutius audire, clamantes compugnantemque 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 proferabant antiquissimi, 'O Virgillie, 'Mercurie' decentes, 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 -ā were accented on the paenultima, e.g. Valēri Voc. (like Valēri Gen.). Gellius (xiii. 26) tells us that Nigidius Figulus (first cent. B. C.) wished to distinguish Valēri Voc. from Valēri 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. 395. 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 Plautus and the other writers is voltúri (for which some would read voltúre), ‘you vulturo’ (Capt. 844). Publī Cornelī 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. ii2. 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 -ōd and -ēd (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. jūgō, rectē, final ē being dropped after a long vowel at the close of the third cent. B. C. (ch. ii. § 137)]. In other stems the Genitive ending -ēs or -ēs was used (O. Ind. nāvās, ‘from a ship,’ Hom. Gk. µῆ(F)ός); and in the Greek language this Ablatival use of the Genitive was extended to O-stems too. In the Italic languages on the other hand the Ā-, Ī-, Ū- and Ė-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. aér-īd, Osc. ligud, ‘by law’). The Locative Case in -ē (possibly Instrumental, § 36) of these Consonant-stems competed with this I-stem Abl. not only in Consonant-stems (e. g. aerē and aerē), but also in I-stems (e. g. cīvē and cīvē), so that Varro declares that ove was heard in his time as often as ovi, ave as avi. The confusion of cases was increased by the circumstance that when -d of the Abl. was dropped, nothing remained to distinguish Abl. -ē(d) of Ė-stems, -ū(d) of I-stems, -ū(d) of U-stems from Loc. -ē, -ē, -ū (see § 37), so that the ōvī, āvī 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, bīlī, cīvī, fustī, nāvī, &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 solebant hujusce-modi ablativeum etiam in -e proferre. Of Consonant-stems with -ī we have, e.g. pāricī (MSS. -e), Cas. 140, pūmīci (MSS. -e), Pers. 41, obīcī, 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 Ablatival use of -e (presumably -ē) is the line of the Saturnian Scipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 30, e. 200 B. C.?):

Gnaiuod pātre prognātus fōrtis vir sapiēnsue.

(Cf. aire molaticol i. 181, Picenum); somewhat later are i. 198 (Lex Repet.) māiore parte diei; i. 199 (Sent. Minuc.) de maiore parte; i. 603 (Lex Furf.) mense Flusare (dial. ? Cf. Sab. mesene Flusare). We have -ei, apparently a graphic variety of ē (ch. i. § 9), in the Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B. C. (i. 34, along with aetate):

is hie situs quei nūnum uietus est uirūtei

(cf. ab fontei on the Sent. Minuc., i. 199. 7); -i in the Lex Agr. (i. 200. 23 ab eo hereidiu eius . . . testamento hereditati dedi-
tioniue obuenit, and again: curatore hereidiu), in the Lex Jul. Municip. (i. 206 ubi continenti habitabitur), the Lex Rep. (i. 198. 56 de sanctioni, but also adessint for adessent). These are clearly the later forms of the older -īd of i. 61 airid, i. 186 (S. C. Bacch.) conventiuid, xi. 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 Troiād exibant cápitibus opēritis; C. I. L. i. 30, one of the oldest Saturnian Scipio epitaphs: Gnaiuod pātre (probably -ē) prognātus fōrtis vir sapiēnsue (but Sammio Abl. on the same epitaph), and is persistently written in the S. C. de Bacchanalibus (i. 196) of 186 B. C. (sententiud, conventiuid, exstrad, suprad, equoted, previcaot, pepiicid, faciimen, &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, Ritschel, Neue Excurs, i., and add porad (for class. porro) on a Praenestine cista, Mōl. Arch. 1890, p. 303.] In Oscan the -d remains, e.g. tristaamentud 'testamentō, akrid 'acri, egmad 're' (cf.
Faliscan sententiad), but in Umbrian it has been dropped as in Latin, e.g. *populu 'populo,' *re-per 'pro re,' *ovri-per, vea 'viā' (cf. Pelignian *ōsa 'usā'); similarly with Adverbs in -ēd, e.g. Osc. *amprufid 'improve,' Umb. rehte 'recte;' Cons. stems show the O-stem Abl., e.g. Osc. *lìguit 'lege,' or the Loc. in -ī, e.g. Pelign aetate, Umbr. *nomne.

§ 35. I-stem and Cons.-stem 'Abl.' in -ī and -ē. There is no evidence of an old Cons.-stem -ēd, later -ē, corresponding to I-stem -ād, later -ī. The *dictatore (also *navale, but *marit) of the Columna Rostrata (C. L. 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. i H.) blames for the change of *cīvi, &c. to *cīrē in MSS. of Cicero. The reading of the best Palatine MS. (B) in Plaut. Pseud. 616 is *mīlitē, which points to a correction in the archetype of *mīlitē to mīlitē (the Ambrosian Palimpsest seems to have *mīlitē); and the MSS. often vary between -ī and -ē, e.g. Naev. Bell. Pun. 14 M. pietati (v. I. -te), Enn. A. 486 M. monti (MSS. montis and monte).

§ 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. ἵ-φι), or -mi (e.g. Lith. sūnu-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 Bacchanalibus suprad, extrad, 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 Ā-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-versed) 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. hāve 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. diēquintae but fide, ch. iii. § 44). (The scansion beneū, malē in Plaut. is doubtful.) Superlative Adverbs in -ē have lost a final d, as is shown by facilumēd on the S. C. de Bacchanalibus. Similarly -ū of Fifth Decl. stems, e.g. fāciē, rē, may be Instrumental -ē or Ablative -ūd; -i 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), -yī- (Lat. -ei, class. -ī, e.g. Neāpolī), -eu- (Lat. -ū, e.g. noctū) (see § 37). The -ē of Consonant-stems, e.g. patrē, cannot be an Abl. suffix, but either Instrumental -ē (-ā?), or Locative -y (Lat. -ē, e.g. Tibārē), used ablatively and instrumentally, as Loc. -y in Gk. Cons.-stems was used to express all the meanings of the Greek Dative case, e.g. πατρ-ē.

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]au[?it]; i. 181 aire moltaticod; Zvet. I. I. I. 72 opidique Uolgni)¹, and Loc. -î would be distinguished from Instrumental -ê (-á ?). 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 Umbrian, 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. kūmben- niēs tanginud, 'by decree of the assembly,' eitiuvad, 'with money,' ūp eisūd sakaraklūd (Lat. apud id sacellum). (The doubtful étie of Zv. I. I. I. 89: sūvad eítie upsed (Lat. sua pecunia operatus est)), requires confirmation before it can be used as evidence that 1ê-stems used an Instr. or Loc. -î instead of Abl. -îd. The absence of an Abl. in -îd 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. usā 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 (?) aetatu firata fertilid (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. -ôd, the O-stem Abl. suffix), beside another case in -e (presumably -ê). If however this -e represents an original -î (cf. Pel. ae for ai, Osc. Bausae 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 ?) mēritō is spelt meretod or merited on the oldest inscriptions.
Oscan a Locative as well as an Ablative Case, e.g. Ā-stems: víáí meśaí Loc., beside étïu vad Abl. (and vituas Gen.); O-stems: Ladinei Loc., beside trísta nimendud Abl. (and sakarakléís 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 execration 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 -i (e.g. O. Ind. múrdhán-i and múrdhní, ‘on the head’), sometimes not (e.g. O. Ind. múrdhán, Gk. δόμευ Inf., a Loc. as δόμεναι is a Dat.). Of Locatives without -i in Latin there are only uncertain traces, such as Prepositions like pënès (Loc. of penus, with -es not sunk to -is, possibly because the accent rested on it in collocations like penès me, penès te, ch. iii. § 12 a. 3), and Adverbs like noctū. The predominant formation is with -i. Of these i-forms, Ā-stem locatives show I.-Eur. -āi in O. Ind. áśváy-ām, Lith. rańkoj-e, with Postpositions -ām and -e, but in Greek the ordinary diphthong -ai (a ‘doublet’ of āi, ch. iv. § 45), e.g. Θηβαί-γερής; and this is also the Italian form (O. Lat. -āi, class. Lat. -ae, Osc. -áí, Umbr. -e). O-stems took -oi and -ei (e.g. Gk. οἶκοι and οἶκει). By the phonetic laws of Latin both these suffixes would become -ei, class. -i (ch. iii. § 18); so the origin of the suffix of Cōrīnthī, &c. is, so far as Latin is concerned, doubtful. But in Oscan we have -ei, which must be I.-Eur. -ei (e.g. mụ́nị́kēí tereí, ‘on common ground’) (Umbr. -e, e.g. destre onse, ‘on the right shoulder,’ may be -oi or -ei). Fifth Decl. stems took -ēi, which already in the ‘I.-Eur. period’ had a ‘doublet’ -ē. It is this latter form which appears in Latin, e.g. die in the phrase postrī-die, die ēxịstīvī, &c. (unless die has lost
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a final \( d \); cf. Faliscan foied 'hodie'). I-stems had \(-\text{ey} \) (e.g. Hom. Gk. \( \pi\tau\alpha\varepsilon \)), which in Latin would become \(-\text{ei} \), class. \(-i \), and would be merged in the Dative (§ 23) [possibly Instrumental (§ 36)] suffixes. U-stems had \(-\text{ew} \) (e.g. Hom. Gk. \( \alpha\sigma\tau\varepsilon \)), but Latin U-stem Locatives show \(-\ddot{u} \), the i-less formation, e.g. \( \text{noot} \), mentioned above. I-stems showed \(-\text{iy}\), Lat. \(-i \), as Ú-stems \(-\text{üw} \), Lat. \(-ue \), e.g. \( \text{sue} \). Consonant-stems had \(-i \) (used in Greek as Dative suffix, as well as Locative), which in Latin became \(-\varepsilon \), e.g. \( \text{Carthagin} \), \( \text{ruv} \), and Infs. Act. like \( \text{a} \), \( \text{viver} \) (contrast O. Ind. jivás-\( \ddot{o} \), Lat. agi, which are Datives), though by false analogy of O-stems (or I-stems ?) we sometimes find \(-i \), e.g. \( \text{ruv} \), perhaps introduced to discriminate the locative from the ablative use, e.g. \( \text{ruv} \text{ esse} \), from \( \text{ruv} \text{ venire} \).

§ 38. Locatives in \(-i\) and \(-e\) in Latin. Héri is by modern editors written with \(-e\) when the last vowel has to be scanned short, otherwise with \(-i\). The scansion heri (by the Brevis Brevians Law, ch. iii. § 42) is common enough in the early Dramatists (e.g. Caecil. Com. 197 R. heri uero, where heri 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. herio (cf. Pers. 108). Quintilian (i. 7. 22) says: 'here' nunc e littera terminans: at veterum comicorum adhuc libris invenio: 'heri ad me uenit,' quod idem in epistulis Augusti, quas sua manu scripsit aut emendavit, reprehenditur. [On his remark (i. 4. 8), in 'here' neque e plane neque i auditur, 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 ruvi is used for 'in the country,' and usually ruve for 'from the country' in Plautus (Langen, Beiträge, p. 308). Charisius (p. 200. 12 K.) attests heri for Afranius Com. 71 R., peregrin for Naev. Com. 93 R., but peregrin for Naev. Com. 84 R., as praec-fisine for Afranius Com. 36 R. The long quantity of the final vowel of peregrin (so both the Ambrosian Palimpsest and the Palatine family) is required by the metre in Plaut. Truc. 127, an anaepaetic line, and peregrin has been explained as the suffixless Locative of an I-stem peregrin- (ch. v. § 34) with the I.-Eur. ending -\( e \), a doublet of -\( ei \) (cf. O. Ind. agni, Loc. of agni, 'fire'). Vesperin, the form always used by the early writers, is naturally referred to the O-Stem vespero-. Temporin (-ari, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) may be related to tempor as fuenor to fuenor, majrori to majrori (§ 33), and so with ruvi (e.g. Ter. Phiom. 363, Plaut. Cist. 226), Carthagini (e.g. Plant. Poes. 1056 AP), Accerunti Plaut., while mame (if not an Adverbial Accusative) may show conversely a Cons.-stem 'Ablative' suffix applied to an I-stem mani-, Manes Fl. (ch. v. § 37). The close connexion of the Ablative and Locative, already mentioned in § 33, is seen in phrases like mame same septimini, Plaut. Men. 1157; luci claro, Plaut. Aul. 748 (the use of claro for clar or clarae is due to the fact that luci being an Adverb does not have the fem. gender of luz).

(For fuller details about these Locatives, see Bell on the Latin Locative; Neue, Formenlehre, ii². p. 640, i². p. 242).
§ 39. Ā-stems, &c. O. Lat. -ai is never dissyllabic, like -āi of the Genitive. In Plautus a common Ā-stem Loc. is vičiiae, as in the phrase proxumae vičiiae, 'next door.' We have Romai on a very early inscription, C.I.L. i. 54: med Romai feed. Die quinti occurs in Cato's account of Maharbal's boast to Hannibal: mitte mecum Romam equitatum; die quinti in Capitolo 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. μητέρ-ɛς), 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. τρέης for *τρεγγες, 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. is-tē from -tei from original -toi). Thus in Greek we find -oi (e. g. λῶκωι), in Celtic -oi (e. g. Gaul. Tanotalknōi; 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. viškaï, O. Sl. vlūci, 'wolves'). Similarly in Latin we find -i from -ei from still earlier -oe or -oi, e. g. O. Lat. poploē (Carm. Saliare), poploei, class. pōpuli, which is thus distinguished from Acc. Pl. populiōs as Nom. Pl. istē (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. Attiersiur 'Attiedii,' Osc. Nuvlanūs '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. ārae (O. Lat. -ai, never dissyllabic, 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. χαραί), 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. -īēs may
have the I.-Eur. suffix, but U-stems with -ēs show the Acc. Pl. suffix, instead of the I.-Eur. Nom. Pl. -ēwēs, which would be in Latin -ēsēs, -ēsēs. (This would hardly contract into -ēs, as we saw before, § 21). The -ēs which is occasionally found for -ēs in I-stems is also an Acc. Pl. suffix (§ 51); and the Ī-stem Nom. Pl. viēs (so in O. Lat., but in class. Lat. virēs for *viēs-ēs, an S-stem) is probably an Accusative form. The -ēs of Cons.-stems, e.g. matrēs, censērēs 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 Ī-stem -uēs, e.g. suēs.

§ 41. Ī-stems. Ritschl (Neue Excursae, i. p. 118) proposed to avoid hiatus in some passages of Plautus by the change of Nom. Pl. -ae to -ās, reading e.g. alternas in Trin. 539:

nam fulguritae sunt alternae ābores,

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 ālias, altēras). He quoted in support of this change a line from one of the Atellanae of Pomponius, c. 90 B. C. (Com. 141 R.):

quōt laetitias insperatas módo mi inrepsere in sinum,

where laetitias insperatas is now usually explained as Acc., governed by inrepsere, though it may quite well be a dialectal form, for the Atellanae in imitating the manners of country life may also have imitated its language. Dialectal -ās Nom. Pl. is found in the old inscriptions of Pisaurum with the s dropped (C. I. L. i. 173 matrona Pisaurese dono dedrot; 177 dono dedro matrona), along with Gen. Sg. -ā(s) [or Dat. Sg. -ā(i)], § 24). In early inscriptions we have -ai for class -ae, e.g. tabelai, datai on the S. C. de Bacch.

§ 42. O-stems. Pilumnœ poploe was a phrase used of the Romans in the Carmen Saliare (Fest. 244. 25 Th. velut pilis uti assueti); cf. fescennœ (qui depellere facsinum credebantur, Paul. Fest. 61. 10 Th.; should we read Fescennœ, class. Fescennini ?). On early inscriptions we have -ei, e.g. fōderati, uirei, vinusrei on the S. C. de Bacch., sometimes written -e (cf. ch. iv. § 34), e.g. ploirume (C. I. L. i. 32). A Nom. Pl. of an IO-stem with -is occurs on an inscription of the first cent. A. D. (C. I. L. i. 1541 b), filis. It is impossible to say whether fēlēi (i. 1272), fēlēi (i. 1284) (cf. soeci, i. 1041) is meant for this form (cf. Choli for Clodis Nom. Sg.), or is a misspelling of fīlēi (i. 1275) or a contraction of it (like gratia for older grattis). O-stems show -ēs, also written -ēs, -īs, in some inscriptions of the end of the second or beginning of the first cent. B. C., e.g. magistrēs (C. I. L. i. 565, Capua, 108 B. C.: heise magistrēs Unerus Louiae muru aedificandum coirauerunt), lanies (vi. 168, Rome), violarias rosaries coronarisis (vi. 169, Rome). (For other examples, see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 646, and add heise magistrēs, Not. Scav. 1893. p. 164, from Capua, mustae pīēs, C. I. L. iii. Suppl. 12318, from Samothrace.) This form is attested for the pronoun hic by Priscian (i. p. 593. 5 H. inveniuntur tamen etiam nominativum ‘hise’ proferentes antiqui), and is found in the Nom. Pl. Mase. of hic, ille, ists in the Dramatists
before a word beginning with a vowel, when the particle -ce is added, e. g. Plaut. Mil. 374:

non pòssunt mihi mináciis tuis hisce ocui exfodiri,

(similarly illisc and istisc are the forms used in Plautus before a word beginning with a vowel, never illíc, 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 dī, a monosyllable. (Dīi and dei are compared to ille and e by Prisc. i. p. 298 H.).

§ 43. Ì-stems. Varro (L. L. viii. 66) says that puppis and puppex, restis and restes were rival forms in his time, like Abl. ővi and ore, ēvi and are. On early inscriptions we have usually -es, e. g. aidiles, C. I. L. i. 187, Eph. Epigr. viii. 676, but ceveix in the Lex Repetund. of 123–122 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 198, 77), fincis and finis in the Sent. Minuciorum of 117 B.C. (ib. i. 199), and pelleis in the Lex Fur. (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 -ēs formation, for *quattuor-ēs (§ 63), I.-Eur. *qëtworēs (O. Ind. catvāras, Dor. Gk. téropes, O. Ir. cethir), though some make it represent I.-Eur. *qëtwôr, supposing this to be a byform of the ordinary Neuter, which would be in Latin *quattuora (Osc. petora or *petoro). Plautine scansion like cânis, turbûnis (Trin. 835) are of course mere examples of the Law of Breves Breviantes, like the Imperatives cārī, pūtī, &c. (ch. iii. § 42) (cf. Acc. Pl. līberās virgūnēs, Pers. 845) and are no evidence of the use of the suffix -ēs.

§ 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 fāmūli, 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. μήρα in Hom. II. 1. 464 ἐπεὶ κατὰ μήρα ἡμᾶς differs from μηρόι of I. 460 μηρός τε ἐξῆς 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. caemnenta, 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. OPERA Sg. Fem. and OPERA Plur. Neut., Horn. Gk. τὰ ἡβία, Att. ἡ ἡβία, with plur. αἱ ἡβίαι. (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 -ī is tri-ginta, lit. ‘three tens,’ § 74), -ū for U-stems (perhaps the long vowel of Lat. pēcu, 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. *sūnū, Nom. Dual of the stem *sūnū-, ‘a son’); while Cons.-stems lengthened the vowel of their final syllable [e.g. Vedic nāmā, ‘names,’ for *nāmō(n)]; 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 Latin loanword sollo (Lat. tota Neut. Pl.) (inc. 160 M.):

uasa quoque omnino dirimit, non sollō 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.
tuderor 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. pluría (cf. compluría) 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, vicērēcia,
fērēntia, &c. (see Neue, ii3. p. 121), but always vētera from
ventus, which was originally a Noun (Gk. (F)ētos, a year) (§ 55).
In O. Lat. we have silenta, for silentia, quoted by Gellius
from Laevis (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 -om is indicated by most of the
I.-Eur. languages (e.g. Gk. ἵππων, μητέρ-ων), which would in
Latin become in time -ām (ch. iii. § 49), then -am (e.g. socium
on the S. C. de Bacch.) (cf. Osc. Nūvůnum, Mā mecθrůnou, Λουκανού, Umbr. Atiersio). Ā-stems took in Greek and in the
Italic languages -āsom, e.g. (Hom Gk. θεάων, Att. θεόν, Lat.
dēārum, Osc. egmazum 'rerum,' which was the Gen. Plur. Fem.
suffix of Pronouns (e.g. O. Ind. tāsām, Hom. Gk. ταόν, Lat.
is-tarum), and after this model a Gen. Pl. of O-stems was formed
in Latin with the suffix -ārum (O. Lat. -orum), a suffix not found
in Umbro-Oscan, which by Cicero's time drove the older -om, -un
off the field. On the same model the Fifth Decl. stems formed
their Gen. Pl., e.g. fāciērum. The use of -ium in Gen. Plur. of
Adjectives like fērentium, audāciunm, and of -um in Gen. Pl.
ārum, vōlācrum, vātum, &c. (see instances in Neue, ii. pp. 258 sqq.,
e.g. civētātum and civetatiunm), is due to that confusion of Cons.-
stems with I-stems, which played so great a part in the Latin
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. 155): atque etiam a quibusdam sero jam emendatur antiquitas, qui haec reprehendunt; nam pro deum atque hominum fidem ‘deorum’ aiant. Ita credo. Hoc illi nesciebant? an dabat hanc licentiam consuetudo? Itaque idem poeta (Ennius) qui insustatiis contraxerat: Patris mei, meum factum pudet, pro ‘meorum factorum,’ et: Textur, exitium examen rapit, pro ‘exitiorum,’ non dicit ‘liberum,’ utplerique loquimur, cum ‘cupidos liberum’ aut ‘in liberum loco’ dicitimus, sed ut isti volunt: Neque tuum unquam in gremium extollas liberorum ex te genus. Et idem: Namque Aesculapi liberorum. At ille alter (Pacuvius) in Chryse non solum: Cites, antiqui amici maiorum meum, quod erat usitatum, sed durius etiam: Consilium socii, augurium atque extum interpretetes; idemque pergit: Postquam prodigium horrorum, 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 armum accidit? quam centuriam, ut censoria tabulae loquentur, fabrum et procum audeo dicere, non ‘fabrorum’ et ‘procorum.’ Planque ‘duorum virorum judicium’ aut ‘triumvirorum capitalium’ aut ‘decemvirorum stipitus judicandis’ dico nunquam. Atqui dixit Attius: Vide sepulera duo duorum corporum; idemque: Mulier una duum uirum. Quid verum sit intellego, sed alias ita loquor, ut concessum est, ut hoc vel pro deum dico vel pro deorum, alias, ut necessae est, cum triumvirum, non ‘virores,’ 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 duci ut Vatiniorum, Maniliorum, denariorum; et non equum puplecum mille assarium esse, sed mille ‘assarium’; ab uno enim assario multi assarii, ab eo assarium. (A list of Genitives Plur. of O-stems in -um is given by Neue, P. 193.) Nostrum 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 agricola (Lucr. iv. 586) follow the analogy of O-stems, as do vectigaliorum, anciliorum, &c., and perhaps currum, &c.; amphorae and drachmae follow the Greek. On the (restored) Columna Rostrata (C. I. L. i. 195. 10) we have the Pronoun oborum ‘illorum’; on a Scipio epitaph of perhaps the end of the third cent. B.C. (i. 32), the Adj. dumor ‘bonorum,’ but -o(m) on the earliest coins, e.g. C. I. L. i. 15 Caio (with Neopolitov), i. 16 Suesano (with Neopolitov). (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 -ōes or -ōis (Osc. -ūís, -ōis) is regarded by some as a Locative, by others as an Instrumental (see Brugmann, Grundriss, ii, §§ 357, 380). The suffix -ūs, O. Lat. -bos, shown by other stems (e.g. civi-bus, lēg-ī-bus with the i of I-stems, lācē-bus or lācē-bus, su-bus or sū-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-i-ss (in Lat. *termīnibus), lig-i-s (in Lat. lēg-i-bus), Umbr. fratr-u-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. § 8o), though this is quite uncertain. This suffix was in O. Lat. employed in the Dat., Abl. Plur. of Ā-stems, e.g. dextrābus (cf. Gaul. Mārpēβo Naμavonikāβo), 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. altēras, fōrās may show the I.-Eur. Locative of Ā-stems (Gk. -oις, e. g. θυράς; O. Ind. -āsū, e. g. āśvāsa) (but see ch. ix. § 4).

§ 49. Ā- and O-stems. The old form prīcīloes (privis, id est singulis), the Dat., Abl. Plur. of a diminutive of prīvus, is quoted from the Carmen Saliare by Festus (244, 21 Th.), and Paul. Fest. 14, 17 Th. has: ab ‘oeloes’ dicebant pro ab illis, but -eis, sometimes written -es (ch. iv. § 34), is the spelling of the older inscriptions: e.g. viēis, leiβereis, pōpuleis, aedīficēis, aγreis, locēis, on the Lex Agraria of i11 b. c. (C. I. L. i. 200); soueis nūges on an old epitaph of a minius (i. 1297):

plouruma que fecit populo soueis gaudia nuge,

which has ē for ei also in the Nom. Sing. Masc. of the Relative, que for quē (class. quī); de manubies (Eph. Epigr. viii. 476, Capua, 135 b. c.). We find -īs contracted in course of time into -īs; thus grātīs (always with -īs, and similarly ingrātīs, in Plautus and Terence; cf. gratīs in a line of Pomponius, c. 90 b. c., Com. 110 R.) became gratīs in classical Latin; provincīs, &c. beside judīcis (the long i being indicated by the tall form of the letter), occur on the Mon. Ancyranum; and of IO-stems we have, e.g. Januarius (C. I. L. vi. 543, of 115 A. D.), Junis (vi. 213, of 131 A. D.). (For other examples, see Neue ii. p. 31.) An example of -ēbus in O. Lat. is quoted by Nonius (493, 16 M.) from Livius Andronicus’ translation of the Odyssey: dēque mānibus dextrābus. The passages of the grammarians bearing on this form, and details of the use of deēbus, féliabus, and īberēbus, the most frequent words of the kind, are given by Neue, ii. pp. 22 sqq. We have Masc. -ēbus with Fem. -ēbus in the Duals duēbus, ambēbus, though the rarity of the formation led to the latter being D d 2
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. I. L. vi. 224 dībus omnibus deabuneque (197 A. D.); 15267 amictibus; 17633 alumnibus. Pomponius, the writer of Atellanae, uses panonibus (Com. 70 R.) for panis in imitation of the rustic mode of speech; and in the Sermo Plebeius of Petronius we have dībus (Sat. 44. p. 29, 35 B. ita meos fruniscar, ut ego puto omnia illa diibus fieri). In the O. Lat. inscription (C. I. L. i. 814): devas Corniscas sacrum, found in the 'Corniscaram divarum locus trans Tiberim' (Paul. Fest. 45. 16 Th.), the two first words may be Gen. Sing. If Plural, they are Locatives like after. The instances of dialectal and Lat. -os are all doubtful (Class. Rev. ii. p. 204).

§ 50. Other stems. O. Lat. -bos of trebībos on a bronze vase in the British Museum (Eph. Epigr. ii. 299 Q. Lainio Q. f. praefectos protebiros fecit), corresponding to class. -bus, indicates a short vowel, for -bōs would have retained ō (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 Plant. Prosodie, p. 53; add Naev. Trag. 57 R.) must be illusory (many of them are cases of syllabae aneces at a pause in the line, e.g. Plaut. Merc. 900, Rudi. 975).

§ 51. Acc. Plur. The I.-Eur. suffix -ns, after a consonant -ns. Thus Ā-stems ended in -āns, which became ās, O-stems in -ōns, which became -ōns, I-stems in -ins, R-stems in -rns, S-stems in -ns, and so on. Latin examples are viās, lupōs, fratrēs [with -ēs from -ēns (ch. ii. § 64) from I.-Eur. -ns], honōrēs for -ōsēns. I.-Eur. -ns, -ns becomes in Oscan -ss, in Umbr. -f, e.g. Osc. viass 'vias,' feǐhŭs, walls (cf. Gk. τέιχος), Umbr. vitlaf 'vitulas,' or with loss of -f via, toru for *tornu 'tauros,' avef, avif, and avef 'aves.'

I-stems in Latin should show -īs (from -īns, ch. ii. § 64); and this is the usual form in the best MSS., though we often find -ēs, the Nom. Pl. ending or the Cons.-stem ending. Thus urbēis is attested for Virg. G. i. 25: urbisne invisere, Caesar, &c., but urbes for A. iii. 106: centum urbes habitant magnas, tres for A. x. 350, but trīs for the following line (Gell. xiii. 21); so on the (restored) Columna Rostrata (C. I. L. i. 195) [c]lasquesque naules . . . claseis Poenicas . . . copias Cartacinienseis . . . naeuis. (For statistics of the use of -īs and -ēs, 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) -yēs-, with weak grade -is- (e.g. O. Ind. svādīyas-, Gk. ἡδῶ Acc. for *ἥδωσα, Goth. sutiza, Lith. sald-ės-nis),
Lat. suávior, older *suaviós, mágis Adv.; (2) -téro- and -éro-, the original sense of which was rather that of likeness, of equal, than of greater degree (e. g. O. Ind. vatsá-tará-, lit. 'like a calf,' Lat. māter-tera, lit. 'like a mother,' Ir. demnithir, 'equally certain,' from demín, 'certain'); for the Superlative, (1) -is-to- (-is-tho-?), (e. g. O. Ind. áś-íṣṭha-, Gk. ἵστερος; O. Ind. svád-íṣṭha-, Gk. ἵστερος, Goth. sät-istis, Engl. sweet-est), apparently composed of the weak Comparative suffix -is- and the TO-suffix (ch. v. § 27); (2) -tēmo- or -tēmo- (-tēmo-) and -emo- or -emo- (-emo-)(ch. v. § 14) (e. g. O. Ind. ánt-tama-, Lat. in-tīnum; O. Ind. upamá-, Lat. summus for *sup-nus). 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 aedí-tīnum, lit. 'living in a temple' (later corrupted to aedī-tinus, as if from tuor, 'guarding a temple,' Gell. xii. 10; Varro, R. R. i. 2. 1); finī-tīnum, māri-tīnum, &c., so that e. g. ch-tīnum probably meant originally 'near in position' (cf. dex-tīnum, '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-em-o-), e. g. maximus for *mágis-imus, sácerrimus for *sacrīs-imus, facīllimus for *facīlis-imus (on the change of -ris-to -ers-, -err-, &c., see ch. iv. § 13). The origin of the usual Latin Superlative ending -issimus, older -issumus, has been matter of much discussion. One theory makes the I.-Eur. suffix of O. Ind. áś-íṣṭha-, Gk. ṭk-ōtōs -istho-, not -istho-, and explains Lat. -issimus as this suffix augmented by -emo- (-emo-). But the change of I.-Eur. sth into Latin ss is not satisfactorily proved by Lat. ośsi-, bone (O. Ind. asthá-, Gk ὀστέον; see ch. iv. § 95), and it seems safer to analyze -issimus into the suffixes -istho- and -tēmo- (on ss for (s)tt, see ch. iv. § 108). 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 merentessemo, karessemo
(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, ἀξιότων; 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 duname) from dwen- (cf. O. Ind. dúvam-, 'honour'), melior, optimus (C. I. L. i. 1016 has opituma, an archaism) from the root op- of opto, ὑπές, &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 ricco, 'richer,' il più ricco, '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. -es-, 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, -iōses, -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.?) meliosom, and Paul. Fest. (359. i Th.) maiosibus, meliosibus (his 'melom' melorem dicant, 87. 25 Th., may be a corruption of a gloss like 'melios' melior; 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, posterōs (ch. iii. § 18)1.

The yes-suffix was originally affixed to the root without the suffix of the Positive stem, as in Lat. ðc-ior, O. Ind. ðs-īyas-, Gk. ðs-ιαν from a Positive

1 The supposed examples of -iās in Plautus are illusory; see Müller, Plaut. Pros. p. 55.
stem *ōku-, but Lat. suātor for *suade-ior, tēnitor, aspērior, &c. start from the Positive stem *swādu-, &c. On the other hand the suffix -tero-, when added to an Adjective, was affixed to the Positive stem, e.g. āxi-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, dectex-ter-ior; ociter, &c. being apparently the Latin equivalent of the Gk. āxi-repos., &c. (ch. ix. §1).

§ 54. The Superlative Suffixes. The suffix -temo- or -tmo- (-tumo-) with -emo- or -mo (-mmo-) 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-tara-), summum from *sup-rum with supero-, infimus (imus seems not to occur in Plautus) with infero-. The old augural term solitium triumulum may combine it with the Comparative -is-. Its original form is difficult to ascertain. The spelling on Republican inscriptions is -tumus, -tumus (ch. iii. §18). Umbr. hondoomus suggests an older -tomo-, -omo-, while Osc. últiamum (Lat. ultimam) shows an affection of t that is usual before a u-sound (cf. Osc. tiurri-, Lat. turris). The form without t is seen in minumus, brāma from brūvis for *breghu- (Gk. Βράχος), (cf. Osc. maimo- ‘maximus’), and apparently attached to a case-form, in supra-mus, extrī-mus, postē-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. oxime (Paul. Fest. 225. 1 Th.) for *te-is-tume, mediōtiusm from the stem mediō- seen in mētiōris. This was the formation adopted by Adjective-stems ending in -li-, -ri-, -ro-, e.g. fācilis, faci-ilimus for *faci-is-nus; ācer (āric), acerrimus for *acri-simus; misero-, miserrimus1, &c., though we have sécrissimus, māturissimus and maturissime, but usually maturime, &c. (see Neue, ii. pp. 187 sqq.). With the last we should probably compare O. Lat. piūrime in the phrase purime tenuero, explained in Paul. Fest. 335. 7 Th. as parissime tenuero. Ennius (according to Charisius 83. 22 K.) wrote equitatus celerissimus, and minerrimus is quoted by Paul. Fest. 88. 11 Th.: ‘minerrimus’ pro minimo dixerunt.

§ 55. Some irregular Comparative and Superlatives. Vetustior appears as the Comparative of vētus, because vetustus with its ill-sounding repetition of the syllable -tus- was discarded in the Positive for vētus, apparently the I.-Eur. Noun *wētos, *wetes- (Gk. ἡτος, a year); in the Superlative veterrimus and vetertiissimus (in Livy and later writers) are both found. Minus, with -us not -has, 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 Osca equivalent of minor is ministro- (Lat. minister), e.g. ampert mindreis acteis cītus mollas moltaum tictud ‘dumtaxat minoris partis pecuniae multas multare liceto’ on the Law of Bantia (cf. Umbr. mestro- ‘major’, Lat. magister). The coexistence of such forms as bēnōvōlis and benevolens (ch. viii. § 90) produced a type of Comparison like magnificus, magnificentior, magnificentissimus; while frugi, which was a Dative Case of a noun [frugi (bonae) sc.

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 bonae; Poen. 892 erus si tuos nolte facere frugem) had recourse for its Comparative and Superlative to the Adj. 
fruigitis. The retention of v in the Positive with its suppression in the other degrees, causes the anomaly in the Comparison of dices, (but cf. Ter. Adelph. 770 dis quidem esse, Demea), dittor, ditissimus; jüneris, jünior. From plée, a development of the root pel-, 'to fill' (Lat. plē-nus, replē-tus, plē-ri-que, Gk. πλήρης, &c.), were formed Greek πλέων, πλειστος; from plö-, another grade of plē- (ch. iv. § 53), the Latin plūs for *plo-is (ploera Cic. Legg. iii. 3. 6), plūrimus for *plois-omo- (ploirune Nom. Pl. Masc. on a Scipio epitaph of the end of the third cent. B.C., C.I.L. i. 32:

hōne oino ploirume cosēuntion R[ömai] 
diōnōro óptumo fuise uiro,

' hune unum plurimi consentiunt Romae bonorum optimum fuisset virum'); the plous of the S. C. Bacch. (C.I.L. i. 196. 19 and 20) may with its ou merely represent the ū-sound which the diphthong oi had by this time assumed (ch. iv. §§ 37, 38), and is hardly sufficient evidence of a formation *plo-uns like minūs; similarly plouruma on the epitaph of a mime (C. I. L. i. 1297, in dactylic hexameters:

plouruma que fecit populuo soueis gaudia nuges,

' plurima qui fecit populuo suis gaudia nugis’) is a misspelling of ploervuma or plūruma. The pleoris of the Carmen Arvale (C.I.L. i. 28), a hymn preserved in a late and wretchedly spelt inscription:

neve luæ rue, Marma, sins incurrere in delleos,
neve lue rue, Marmar, sins incurrere in pleoris,
neve lue rue, Marmar, sers incurrere in pleoris,

'neve luem ruem, Marmar, sinas (siveris ?) incurrere in plurues,’ may be a mistake for ploeres, and the plisima quoted from the Carmen Sallare by Festus [244. 17 Th. ‘plisima’ plurima; but in Varro’s account of the same Carmen (L. L. vii. 27) plusima is the reading of the MS.) should perhaps be corrected to ploisoma (ploisoma), though some regard these forms as evidence of Latin derivatives from the root plē-, like Greek πλεῶν (πλέω) and πλεῖστος. Major is perhaps best referred to an older *mahior (cf. O. Ind. mahīyas-) with h for the Guttural Aspirate, while magis, maximus show another form of root with the Guttural Media (ch. iv. § 116), (but cf. Osc. mais for *mahis, mainas for *mahimases, Umbr. mestru for *mahistro-); the relation, however of the Italian forms to Gothic maiza, ‘more’ Adj. (I.-Eur. *ma-is-), O. Ir. mā, mō, O. W. mo, 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, ānus - a -um, duō -ae -ā, trēs -ēs -ēa, not 4 (O. Ind. catvāras, cátrasas, catvāri, Gk. τέσσαρες -ēs -ēa), nor 5 (O. Ind. pānca Nom., pañcānām Gen., Gk. πέντε, Lesb. πέπτων Gen.). The Numerical Adverbs from 5 upwards end in -iens or -īēs (on the spelling, see Brambach, Lat. Orth. p. 269; Neue, ii. p. 335; the Mon. Ancyrvanum has -ien), an ending which is also found
in totie(n)s, quotie(n)s, and which has been connected with the ending of O. Ind. kiyant- (Adj.), 'how great?' kiyant- (Adj.), 'so great,' probably I.-Eur. -yent. Umbr. nuvis 'novies,' Ose. pomis 'quinquies' seem to show the same ending, with i as weak grade of yē (ch. iv. § 51). [On the change of I.-Eur. -nt to -ns in Lat. and Umbro-Oscan, 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. quietus for quietus, 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 as (= 12 unciae), e.g. uncia, 'one-twelfth,' quincunx, 'five-twelfths,' septunx, 'seven-twelfths,' deunx, 'eleven-twelfths,' lit. 'minus an ounce.' The I.-Eur. word for 'half,' *semi- (O. Ind. sāmi-, Gk. i̯ma-, 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 -yē- of *semisēsis weakened to ι (ch. iii. § 18, p. 188); similarly the -wi- of *cent(m)-essi-, *de(m)-essi- is weakened to ι in centussi-, decussi-. The origin of the -ns (for -nts) of triens, 'one-third,' sextans, 'one-sixth,' quadrans, 'one-fourth,' dodrans, 'three-fourths,' dextans, 'five-sixths,' for *de sextans, lit. 'minus one-sixth,' is not clear; bessi- is usually explained as *du-essi- (on b- from dw-, see ch. iv. § 71), but it means not 'two asses' but 'two-thirds of an as.' The Adjective for 'half' is dī-midius from dis- and medius (ch. iii. § 18). 'One and a half' is sesquī-, usually explained as *sēmisque, with the same syncope as is seen in septertius, 'two and a half,' for sēmis-septertius (cf. Germ. drittehalb).

§ 57. One. I.-Eur. *oi-no- (Gk. oĩn, an ace, O. Ir. oen, W. un, Goth. ains, Lith. vėnas, O. Sl. i-ni; cf. O. Ind. ēka- for *oi-ko-, Cypr. Gk. oi-Fos, Att. oios, alone, for *oi-wo-), Lat. unus (-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.

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. ἀμό-, Goth. sums, Engl. some; K. Z. xxxii. 373); the Adjective, sim-pluś (Gk. ἁ-πλός) or sim-plex (from *sem-plaś, 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:

hōne oino ploirume cosěntiunt d[ōmai]
dūnōrō óptumo fuise uiro,

‘hunc unum plurimi consentiunt Romae honorum optimum fuisse virum’; cf. oinomæi ‘universi’ on the S. C. de Bache. (i. 196), and Oinomama ‘Uni-mamma’ (an Amazon) on an old Praenestine cista (i. 1501), oinā Adv. in the Lex Agraria of 111 n. 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, nomem (for *ne-oīnom*), later nōn (ch. iv. § 15), like our ‘not’ and ‘nought,’ Germ. nicht and Nichts, from Goth. ni wāhts (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. ὕδας), e.g. tres unus passus Plaut. In the Romance languages the Indefinite Article is formed from Lat. unus, as the Definite from Lat. īnē; and we see traces of this use in colloquial Latin, e.g. una adulcesculta, Ter. Andr. 118.

§ 59 Two. I.-Eur. *dūwo- and *dwo- with Dual declension,
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*duwō(u) M., *duwai F., *duwei or *duwei N. (O. Ind. dvā and dvā, older duvā and duvā M., dvē, older dvē F., N., Gk. δῶ and δῶ, also δ(φ)ῶ-, O. Ir. dau and dā M., dī F., W. dau M., dvy F., Goth. tvai M., tvōs F., tva N., Lith. dū M., for *dvū, dvī F. for *dvē, O. Sl. dva and duva M., dvē and dāvē 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-pād-, Gk. δ(φ)ι-πος, O. Engl. twi-fête), Lat. bī-pes, bī-dens (O. Lat. duī-dens, Paul. Fest. 47. 8 Th., cf. duicensus : cum altero, id est cum filio, census, id. 47. 5; duicensus ... δεύτερον ἀπογεγραμμένος Gl. Philox.), while in the Italic languages we have also dú- (Lat. du-plus, du-plex, du-centi, Umbr. du-pursus ‘bipedibus’), apparently the weak grade of an I.-Eur. *dvē- (Lat. du-lius has the same root; cf. Hom. δοῖη, doubt, Germ. Zwei-fel, Zend dvai-di). For the Ordinal the Romans used secundus, lit. ‘following,’ from sēquor, or alter, ‘the other of two,’ from the same root as αἶ-ius, ‘the other of many’ (O. Ir. aile, W. ail, which have also this sense of ‘second’; in O. Engl. óper had this numerical sense); for the Adverb I.-Eur. *dwīs or *dūwīs (O. Ind. dvīs, Vedie duvis, Gk. δ(φ)ίς, M. H. G. zwis, Goth. tvis-., ‘apart’; Engl. twis-t), bīs (O. Lat. duis, Paul. Fest. 47. 6 Th.; cf. duīdens ‘hostia bidens,’ and duicensus ‘cum altero, id est cum filio census’ quoted above); for the Adjective dú-plus (Gk. δυ-πλός, Umbr. du-plo-) or dú-plex (Gk. δυ-πλαξ, cf. Umbr. tu-plak N.); for the Distributive bī-ni from *dwīz-no- (O. Scand. tvenner) or from *dwī-no- (Lith. dvynù 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 duō N., nor to the scansion duō in the Christian poets (Neue, ii. 277; similarly epō for epō). In classical poetry the scansion is invariably duō (cf. duōdēns), but in the old Republican poets we find duo Acc. distinguished from duōs, 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 *dō rather than to *dōs (A. L. L. iii. 531). The shortening of the final vowel can be easily explained by the Law of Breves Breviantes, which reduced háve to háve (ch. iii. § 42); for a similar doubt with reference to the pronunciation of scio as sēō or *scō, see
ch. ii. § 151). The Fem. duae may retain the old suffix of the Nom. Dual of â-stems, -âi (e.g. O. Ind. âśvâ for I.-Eur. *âkwâi, ‘two mares’), which would be retained in monosyllabic *ðreâi without sinking, as in the unaccented syllable, to -i (e.g. ocâda from ocâcaða, ch. iii. § 18). The termination -âbus of duâbus M., N. is shared only by the other Dual-form ambo, though -âbus F. was a common (Dat., Abl. or Instr.) Plural ending of â-stems, retained in legal language especially in the words deâbus, filiâbus, libertâbus (§ 48). But the Plural declension encroached more and more on these Dual forms; ãâõs Acc. M. competes, as we have seen, in the older literature with duâ, while duâs F. is a Plural, as are also the Genitive forms duârum M., N. (older duâm, e.g. duâmârûnum used by Cicero, § 47), duârum F. A Nom., Acc. Neuter duâ 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 ‘duâ’ et ‘tre’ diversorum generum sunt barbarismi, at ‘duâpondo’ 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. *ðreâ in Vulgar Latin, to judge from the Romance forms (e.g. Ital. due, older duï, O. Fr. duî, doi, &c.). In Umbrian the word shows Plural declension, duâ Nom., tuâ Nom., tuâva Nom. Acc. Neut. (On the declension of Lat. duo, see Neue, ii, pp. 276 sqq.). Late compounds like ãîloris, dimâmûnum are hybrid formations with Greek â- instead of Latin â. The relation of I.-Eur. *ðwâi to the Latin preposition dis- apart, has not been established, nor yet to I.-Eur. *wi-of Dor. Gk. âi-sarrì, Lat. vi-ginâi, &c., perhaps connected with O. Ind. vi, ‘apart.’

§ 61. Three. I.-Eur. *trî-, Nom. Masc. *trëygîs (O. Ind. trâyas, Gk. ðrâvîs, Cret. Gk. ðrâvës, O. Ir. trî, W. trî, Goth. prêis, Lith. trîs, O. Sl. trîje), Lat. trîs M., F., trîa N. (cf. Umbr. trîf or tref Acc., tria Neut.). The stem trî- appears in Gk. ðrî-tos, ðrî-povîs, Lat. trî-pes, &c., but a stem trê- in Lat. trê-centi, tre-pondo, Lith. trê-cziâs, ‘third,’ O. Sl. trê-tîjî, &c. The Ordinal trê-rûnas (Umbr. tertîo-) probably shows this stem trê- with metathesis of r; the Adverb trêr, for terr (in Plautus scanned as a long syllable, cf. terr-uncîus) from *ter-ôs, comes from the same stem, or, like O. Ind. trîs, Gk. ðrîs, from the stem trî- (ch. iii. § 15. 8); the Adjective is trî-plûs (Gk. ðrî-πlôs), trî-plex; the Distributive trînûs (see on binûs above), and ter-nûs. We find trî- and ter-interchanged in Compounds like trî-gêmînûs and ter-gêmînûs, trî-vendícûs and ter-vendícûs, tri-vium and ter-vium (C. I. L. ix. 2476), Terventum now Trivento; trî- and trê- in tri-môdia and tre-modia (Varro, Men. 310 B.).

§ 62. Tres. The grammarians prescribe trës in the Nominative and trîs in the Accusative (Neue, ii, p. 284), as is the rule in all I-stems (§§ 40, 51), though Virgil, as Gellius (xiii. 27. 20) points out, uses tres Acc. for the sake of variety in A. x. 350:
§ 63. Four. The I.-Eur. stem *petwor- had various grades, *petwor-, *petur-, *petru-, &c. Its Nom. Masc. *petwōres (O. Ind. catvāras, Dor. Gk. πέτωρες, Att. πέτωρες, Lesb. πέτωρες, O. Ir. cethir, W. pedwar, Goth. fidvōr, O. Engl. fowler; cf. Lith. keturi, O. Sl. četyre) probably appears in Lat. quattuor (some make this an I.-Eur. Neuter *petwōr, §§ 44, 45), apparently for *quotvōr(ē)s, with t doubled before the w-sound (ch. ii. § 130) and -āw- for -otw- like -aw- for -ov- in cāvus, &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 *petru- (Zend caḍru-, Gaul. Petru-corius; cf. Umbr. petur-persus ‘quadripedibus’), which in Latin is quadru- (with ā for ē by analogy of quattuor, quartus?), where the d is puzzling, for -dr- seems to become -tr- in Latin, e.g. ātro- for *ādro-, nātrix for *nādrix (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 q̣ad-, ‘to point, sharpen,’ Engl. whet, the usual change of -dr- to -tr- being seen in -tri-quetrus, triangular. Quadra, which retained ā (by analogy of other words from the same root?), may have been the cause of *petru- taking the form quadru-; cf. K. Z. xxxii. 565]. The Ordinal quartus with its long a (indicated by an apex over the letter on inscriptions; see Christiansen, de Apicii, 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 quātōr stands for *q̣etru- (Zend caḍru; cf. O. Ind. catūr), as aGER for *ag̣os, ācer for *ācris (ch. iii. § 16); the
Adjectives quadrē-plus, quadrē-plex show the curious change of -tr- to -dr-, remarked on above, from which quater is free; the Distributive quaternus for *quatrI-nus (like sācercōs for *sacrīdōs, ch. iii. § 16) from *qētrē-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 Ancestrum (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(ér)decim, where the w-sound would be dropped before the accent, as in Jan(ér)arius, Feb(rér)arius, &c. (ch. ii. § 54). Vulg. Lat. *quattīdecim is indicated by the Romance words for 'fourteen,' e.g. Ital. quattordici, Fr. quatorze, but Vulg. Lat. *quattro 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 enicēs, Rued. 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, Petrius are dialectal Proper Names derived from this numeral, as Pompeius, Pontius (Lat. Quintius) from the numeral 'five.'

§ 65. Five. I.-Eur. *pēnq"ē (O. Ind. pānca, Arm. hing, Gk. πέντε, πέμπ-όβολον, 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 *qēnq"e (Gaul. pēmpē-δονα, quinquefoil, O. W. pimp; in O. I r. with o for e in the first syllable, cóe; cf. Umbro-Ocean pump-, Pompeius), Lat. quīnque with e changed to i before a nasal and guttural (like tingo for *tengo, ch. iv. § 11), and the i lengthened (by analogy of quīntus?). The Ordinal quīntus, old er quīnectus, follows the rules of Latin phonetics that qu becomes c 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 *qēnc-to- in Italic for I.-Eur. *penq"-to (or *pēq"-to-?) (Gk. πέμπτος, Lith. peńktas, O. Sl. petu; Osc. Pǔntiś, also Pompītēs with -mp- from the Cardinal form). The Adverb is quīnques, older quīnquiens, on which see § 56, the Adjective quīnquiē-plex [or with -cu- for -quv- (ch. iv. § 137) quīncu-plex], rarely quincuplus or quinquiplus; the Distributive quīnus for *quīncu-nus (ch. iv. § 157).

§ 66. Quinque. The long quantity of the i of quīnque is attested by the use of the tall form of the letter on inscriptions (for instances, see Christiansen, de Asiciitus, 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, ἑξ to *sweks or *ksweks (cf. Zend xšvās, 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 sexiēs, older sexiens (see § 56); the Distributive sēnus for *sēx-nus (as lūna for lūx-na, ch. iv. § 162).

§ 68. Seven. I.-Eur. *sēptīn (O. Ind. saptā, Arm. evt'ān, Gk. ἕπτά, O. Ir. secht, Goth. sīban; cf. Lith. septyn-), Lat. septem, with Ordinal *septmo- (O. Ind. saptamā-, Gk. ἕπθομος, Pruss. septmas and sepmas), Lat. septimus, older septu-. The Ordinal septimus has -st- in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Umbr. sestentariu; Sestius is a dialectal byform of Sextius. The Adverb is septuā, older septu-. The Distributive septenus stands for *septen-no- (ch. ii. § 130).

In later Latin we find tt for pt, e.g. Settembris (C. I. L. xi. 2885, Setebres 4075); cf. Ital. sette, Settembre. In Compounds we find the stem seplem-, e.g. septempeddlis 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(n), cleverly explained by Fick as 'the two sets of pointed' (i.e. the fingers, without the thumbs, of both hands), from the root āk-, ok-, 'to be sharp, pointed' (O. Ind. aštā and aštāū, Arm. ut', Gk. ἀκρω, O. Ir. ocht, W. wyth, Goth. ahtau, Lith. astū-n-i) is in Latin octō, with Ordinal octavus (cf. Osc. Úhtavis 'Octavius') for *oclōvus (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. ἄννα for *ėn-veFa (?), O. Ir. nóí, W. naw, Goth. niun; cf. Lith. devyn-i with d- instead of n-) is in Latin nōvem 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 nōnus, older noino- (if the Dvenos inscription is rightly read dienoine, on the ninth day), from *nōvēno-, where the ŏ 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. ŏ as an expression of I.-Eur. or as in rōbus, &c. (ch. iv. § 41). (On nōndinum and noundinum, old spellings of nūndinum, for *no(v)ēndinum, 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, *nōvīmo- (O. Ind. navamá-), but in Pelign. we have Novnis ‘Nonius.’ The Adverb is noviēs (Umbr. nuvīs); the Distributive novēnus from *noven-no- (ch. ii. § 130).

§ 71. Ten. I.-Eur. *dēkm (O. Ind. dāśa, Arm. tasn, Gk. δέκα, O. Ir. deich, W. deg, Goth. taihun; cf. Lith. dėszim-t, O. Sl. desę-ti), Lat. dēcem, with Ordinal dēcimus (O. Ind. dašamá-) (cf. the proper name Decius), Adverb deciēs, and Distributive dēnus for which we should expect *dēcēnus 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. *trēvēs-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 *ūn(i)-decim (on Vulg. Lat. *ūndecim, see ch. ii. § 147), duo-decim, trē-decim for *trēs-decim (like nādus for *nis-dus, ch. iv. § 151), quattuor-decim, quīn-decim for *quin(gu)-decim (ch. iii. § 13), sē-decim (the correct spelling) for sex-decim (like lūna for *lūx-na, ch. iv. § 162), septem-decim. Octō-decim and novem-decim were replaced by duo-de-viginti, un-de-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. τρεῖς καὶ δέκα and δέκα τρεῖς, and optionally for
twelve, δώ-δέκα 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. dvādaśama-), &c.; the Adverbs undecies, duodecies, the Distributives undēnus, duōdēnus, and so on.

§ 73. O. Lat. duovicesimus for class. duo et vicesimus, 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 sincere 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 quisquam de nobilioribus, ab emptore ad spectandos libros adhibitus, reperrisset se unum in libro mendum dicebat; sed contra librariorum 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 vicesimo 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 *dek-to- or *dekmt-, changed in Composition into *(d)kmt-[or*(d)kmt-?; cf. Greek -κοτ- in 30-90, τριά-κοντα, τεσσαράκοντα, or τετράκοντα, &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 *vigeuti, *trigenta, *quadragenta, &c., which takes its g apparently through influence of the d of I.-Eur. *(d)kmt- (but vicesimus; so Alb. -zet, 'a gross,' points to g not k), 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. τετρω- of τετρακοντα (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 *septu(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), ete
e.g. vicēsimus, older vicenaumus (this spelling is more frequent than vigesimus) for *vi-cent-lumus, tricēsimus and trigesimus, older -ensus for *tri-cent-lumus (O. Ind. tri-śat-tamā-); the Adverbs are vicīēs, older -ens, tricīēs, older -ens (sometimes trīgies), like decies, older -ens (§ 56); the Distributives vicēnus (with byform vīgēnus), tricēnus (with byform trīgēnus), &c., not like the abnormal dēnus, but like *decēnus (§ 71).

§ 75. Viginti, &c. Viginti is spelt veiginti (C. I. L. i. 1194; x. 6009), but the vi 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 -enta 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 trīginta, producing the form trīenta (C. I. L. xii. 5399, &c.), and in Romance, Sard. trienta, Ital. treinta, &c.; also to quadraginta (a hexameter line on a late epitaph ends, quadragintā per annos, vi. 28047), which had become quarcentā (Fabretti, iv. 134), whence Ital. quarante, Fr. quarante. On the accentuation of these three numerals, see ch. iii. § 11. 4. Septuaginta is the scanson 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 scanson -gintā in late poetry, see Neue, 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, taimhundo (?)), viz. *(d)kmftōm, probably an old Gen. Plur. of the stem *dekmt (§ 46), treated as a Nom., like sēstertium, -i Gen. for mille sēstertium, '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. εκατον-βη, εκατόγ-χεις, centum-plex, centum-gēminus, centu-pondium); though some prefer to regard *(d)kmftōm 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)kmftōm 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, dōcentum (with dū- the weak stem of I.-Eur. dwē-, a byform of dwī-, § 59), trē-centum (with I.-Eur. trē-, a byform of trī-, § 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, tri-centi -ae -a, e.g. trecentae causae Plaut. (cf. nongentus, Plin. xxxiii. 2. 31). (So in Greek YO-stem Adjectives were formed, in Att. -κότοι (with -σι- for -τι-), in Dor. -κάτωι.) They formed their Numeral Adverbs, Adjectives, and Distributives by analogy of the tens, e.g. tri-cent-ies (like trīcies), trīcent-ēsimus (like trīcessimus), trīcent-ēni (like trīceni). The forms quin-genti (for *quīnque-genti, ch. iv. § 157), septin-genti (for *septem-genti, *septen-genti like tingo for *tengo, ch. iv. § 11), apparently influenced quadrin-genti (for earlier quadrī-genti), octin-genti, and even nonin-genti (beside the usual non-genti). Sex-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- (-ē) appears in centi-ceps Hor., centi-minus Hor., centi-pēda (and centum-pēda) Plin., &c., but centom- in centumpondium Plaut., Cato, centumplex Plaut. Pers. 560, centum-gēminus 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, iii. p. 298. The usage is confined to phrases like ducentum auri, argenti, vini, &c.; Plautus has ducenti -ae -a, &c., as in classical Latin. A transitional construction is seen in C. I. L. iv. 1136 nongentum tabernae, nine hundred shops. As to the form of the several numerals; ducenti is found in the late Latin of the Itala; quadrigenti is the Plautine form, though the MSS. have usually (not, however, universally in Bocch. 1183) changed it to quadrigenti; 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 -dri- not -drin- must have been the second syllable of the word used in Plautus' day; quadrigenti, quadrigenus, &c. are probably also the classical forms (Neue, ii. p. 297), but on Mon. Anncy. iii. 8 quadrigenos; of quingentum Festus tells us that the pronunciation before his time was quīncentum (Fest. 338. 19 Th. 'quincentum' et producta prima syllaba, et per e litteram usurpant antiqui, quod postea levis visum est, ita ut nunc dicimus, pronuntiari); sescent is the correct spelling, not secenti (see Neue, ii. p. 297); septime from septingenti occurs on the Edict of Diocletian; noningeni 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 occiduntur, milli (Abl.) passum vicerit, is probably
unchanged

The Cardinals are mostly retained, though ducenti, &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 primus, and for the others uses the suffix -ième. Spanish has primero (like French) for primus, tercero (with the same suffix) for tertius, and uses for nonus noveno (the Lat. Distributive nōvenus), 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 ēgō, O. Lat. ēgō represents I.-Eur. *ēgō (Gk. ēγώ), of which byforms were *egō (Goth. ik, Lith. esz and āsz), *eğom (Gk. ἐγὼν), *egōm (O. Sl. azū; cf. O. Ind. ahām with Aspirate instead of Media). It is strengthened by the addition of the particle -mēt, e. g. egomet, mihimet, and in certain of its cases by the particle -ptē (§ 20), e. g. mihipte, while in the Accusative we find the Pronoun doubled for emphasis, mēmē. For the Genitive, méi is used, apparently the Gen. Sg. Neut. of the Possessive, ‘of mine,’ but in O. Lat. we have mēs (with the Gen. čs-suffix?); for the Dative mēhī (mē) for *mēhei or *mēhōi, with the I.-Eur. Locative ending (Umbr. mehe; cf. O. Ind. māhy-am) and with mē- 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. ἐμῇ Acc. for *ἐμε-ίδ ?), just as the particle *gē is used to distinguish the Acc. in Teutonic (Goth. mi-k, Germ. mich; cf. Gk. ἐμὲ-γέ); for the Ablative, O. Lat. mēd from I.-Eur. *mēd (cf. O. Ind. mād from I.-Eur. *mōd), which with mēd Acc., became mē in the second cent. B. C.; the Locative [I.-Eur. *mei or *moi, O. Ind. (Vedic) mé 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 -ɡh- of mihī, see ch. x. § 1.
§ 2. **Egō** is the invariable scansion of classical poetry, and the almost invariable scansion of Plautus and the early Dramatists; **egō** is found occasionally in late poetry (Neue, ii. 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. 39), 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 *egōmet*), for Lat. **egō** cannot represent L.-Eur. *eōgō*, 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
mépte potius fieri seruom, quám te umquam emittám manu.

For examples of *meve* (a somewhat doubtful form), see Neue, ii. p. 355. *Mis* Gen. is quoted by Priscian from Ennius (*A.* 145 M.):

ingga cura mí cum concordibus aqueiperare,

and probably occurs in Plaut. in *Poem.* 1188, beginning: *rebus míis agúndis* (anapaestic), and in other passages, though the MSS. have usually changed it to the more familiar *mei*. It is often mentioned as an O. Lat. form by the grammarians (see the references in Neue, ii. p. 347), and may represent an original *mēs*, as *Sulutis* is in O. Lat. *Suludes* (ch. vi. § 17). For the Dative, we have on old inscriptions *mihei* (*C. I. L.* i. 1016. 1277), and with e to express the *ei*-diphthong (cf. ch. iv. § 32) *mihe* (i. 1049). A still older form *meho* (cf. *mehi* Plaut. *Men.* 925 (P.)) seems to be mentioned by Quintilian (i. 5. 21 nam 'mehe' pro *mi* apud antiquos tragoediaram praecipue scriptores 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. *consobota* 'commōta' (whether this was a Latin practice is doubtful, see ch. ii. § 56). The final vowel of *mihi*, &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 *mihi* is the usual scansion (Leppermann, *De correctione*, p. 9). *Mihis* is often contracted to *mi*, as *nihili* to *nīl* (ch. ii. § 58), so that we have side by side in Plautus divergent treatments of this Dative, such as (1) dissyllabic *mīhi*, e.g. *Truc.* 77 *Nam mihi haec mēretrix, &c.,* (2) the same with elision, e.g. *Stich.* 427 *mih(i)* expedi, (3) monosyllabic *mi*, e.g. (elided) *Truc.* 173 *Sunt m(i)* étiam. (For instances of *mi*, see Neue, ii. p. 349, and on Nigidius' distinction of Gen. and Dat., *Gell.* xiii. 26.)

The remark of Festus (156. 6 Th.) 'me' pro *mihi* dicebant antiqui, illustrated by a quotation from Lucilius (*inc.* 98 M.): *quaæ res me impendit, means, of course, merely that in O. Lat. another case was used (in this example, the Accusative; cf. *Lucr.* i. 326 *mære quae* impendens *saxa*), where the classical construction had the Dative; and similarly *vae te* Plaut. *Asin.* 481 (cf. *vaee me* *Seneca, Apoc.* 4) is probably nothing but an unusual employment of the Accusative. The Vocative of the Possessive Pronoun *mi*, e.g. *mi* *filii*, *mi* *vir*, has been regarded as a Locative-Dative by some and compared with Homer's *μηρέα μοι*, the Tragedians' *ὡ γονι *μοι*, Vedio *mē giras*, 'my hymns.' But it is more likely to be a byform of *mīe* (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 *ti (Gk. το, σου) nor *si (Gk. ο).]

The Accusative meG is found on the very earliest Latin inscriptions which we possess, the Praenestine fibula (C. I. L. xiv. 4123), with Manios meGfeaked Numa-
sioi, and the Dvenos inscription (Zvet. I. I. I. 285. Rome), with Dvenos meGfeaked (or feeced) ; and in Plautus meG and meG are doublets, in the Acc. as in the Abl., meG often being shortened by prosodical hiatus to meG before an initial vowel, while in Terence meG, &c. Acc., Abl. has ousted meG, &c. Whether Plautine meG
Abl. is ever an Instrumental form, and has not lost a final -d, it is impossible to say ; but there is no indication of its being anything but a phonetic variation of an original meG (cf. ch. ii. § 137). On meG-uidem Plaut., see ch. iii. § 51.

§ 3. 2 Sing. Lat. tu is from I.-Eur. *tu (Hom. Gk. το, ο. Ir. tu, O. H. G. dū, O. Sl. ty), as Dor. Gk. τό from I.-Eur. *tuG. In the oblique cases the I.-Eur. stem was *twē (or *twō) and *tē (or *tō), &c. [e.g. Gk. σε for Cret. τέ, O. Ind. (Ved.) tvā Instr., tvē Loc., tē Dat., Gen.], often enlarged by an affix -bh-, like the
-gh- of the 1 Sing. Pron. (e.g. O. Ind. tū-bhyam Dat.). For the Genitive in Latin the Gen. Sg. Neut. of the Possessive is used, tuG, 'of thine' (see above, on meG), and a Gen. tis ( ? *tis) appears in O. Lat.; for the Dative, tibē, older tibe, for *tebehi (Umbr. tefe ; cf. Pruss. tebehi), 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 meG and meG, § 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-tē, of the Acc. and Abl. tē-tē ; and with addition of the particle -mēt we find tū-tē-mēt (cf. ch. iii. § 39), tihō-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 egeat, quia tē careat : ob eām rem hue ad te missast,

where, if we keep the reading of the MSS. (the evidence of the Palimpsest is wanting), we must sean tis, unlike mis. (Shall we read quia tis ea egeat ?) ;

Trin. 343 nē tis aios miserat (so in the Palimpsest, but the other MSS. have changed the unfamiliar form to tuG), and possibly elsewhere (see Neue, i. e. and add Plaut. Cist. 457). The Dative is spelt tibiG, C. I. L. i. 542. 1453, but tibe in all the MSS. of Varro R. R. iii. 7. 11, and in C. I. L. i. 33 (one of the Scipio epitaphs in Saturnian metre, c. 180 B.C.). The Acc. is spelt tē (probably with elision) on the same epitaph :

quārē lūbens t(e) in-grēmmium, 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 tyranne tulisti.

(For other examples of tute, tutimet, tibimet, &c., see Neue, iif. pp. 361 sqq.; on tāquidem, ĭquidem, see above, ch. iii. § 51.)

The Umbro-Oscan forms for the Accusative (and Nom.?) point to an original tōm (from *twiōm as offio from *fuio; or with i for I.-Eur. ā?), Umbr. tōm and tīo, Osc. tiium (usually taken as Nom.).

§ 5. Reflexive. The I.-Eur. stem was *swē (or *swō) and *sē (or *sō), &c. (e.g. O. Ind. svā-, 'own,' Goth. svēs, O. Sl. svoji; Goth. si-k Acc., O. Sl. sebē Dat.), often with the same affix as 2 Sg. *twē, *tē (see above), viz.-bh.-. The Latin Gen. is swē, the Gen. Sg. Neut. of the Possessive (like mei, tui; see above), the Dat. sībē for *sebhei (Pelign. sefēi, Osc. sīfēi; cf. Pruss. sebebi), with sē- for sē- owing to the unaccented use of the Reflexive; the Acc. and Abl. sē (O. Lat. sēd, which went out of use with med., tel., § 2), often doubled for emphasis, eësē. The particle -met is added for the same purpose to se, sibi, viz. sēmet, sibimet. Se-psē is read in Cic. Rep. iii. 8. 12: quae omnis magis quam sepse diligīt.

§ 6. The spelling sibē is found on C. I. L. i. 38 (an Elegiac Scipio epitaph, c. 130 B.C.) ut sibē me esse creatum Laetentur; i. 196 (the S. C. Baech. of 186 B.C.); i. 198 (the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B.C.); i. 200 (the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C.); i. 205 (the Lex Rubria of 49 B.C.), &c.; the spelling sibē was found (with quasē) by Quint. (i. 7. 24) in several MSS. (sed an hoc voluerint auctores nescio), and was affected by Livy (T. Livium ita 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). Sibē (like mihi, tibi) is the usual scansion in Plautus and the early Dramatists, but sībē is by no means rare, and is normal in the phrase suus sībē, 'his very own' (so mens mihi), e.g. suo sībē gladio hunc jugulo; cf. O. Sl. pisachā svojā si rēči, 'scribasant suam sibī linguam.' There is no Genitive form in O. Lat., *sis, corresponding to mis, tīs (Priscian ii. p. 2. 29 H.). Sed, Acc., occurs on the S. C. Baech., 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, sasse); sesed on the inscr. of the Faliscan cooks (Zvet. I. I. I. 72 a). Sese is much more frequent than mēne and tēne. (For examples of its use, see Neue, iiif. p. 355.)

The Oscan Acc. is siōm (cf. above, § 4, on Umbro-Osc. tōm 'te'), the Umbrian Dat. sēso.

§ 7. 1 Plur. Of the two I.-Eur. stems, *wē- (or *wō-) (e.g. O. Ind. vay-ām Nom., Goth. veis, Engl. we, Lith. vē-du Dual, O. Sl. vē) and *nē- (or *nō-) (e.g. O. Ind. nas, the enclitic Gen.,
Dat., Acc., O. Ir. nǐ, Goth. uns for *ns, Engl. us, O. Sl. nasū; Gk. νῶ Dual, O. Sl. na; with weak grade ης- and an affix -σμē- in O. Ind. oblique cases, asmān Acc., asmābhis Instr., &c., Lesb. Gk. ἄμμες, Att. ἥμεις), 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, Lases, iuuaė, and enos, Mārmor, iuuaė. If the lines have Saturnian rhythm, the accent must fall on the first syllable of enos (see ch. ii. § 141, p. 128 n.)

enos, Lāses, iuuaė... enos, Mārmor, iuuaė;

but this, and indeed every fact about the lines, is doubtful. The form enos is generally explained as having a particle *ē prefixed to nos (cf. ἐ-μῦ). Nosmet is, like vosmet, 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 I.-Eur. stems, *yu- (O. Ind. yū-yām, Goth. jūs, Engl. you, Lith. jūs; O. Ind. yuvām Dual, Lith. jū-du) and *wē- (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 -σμē- is found in Gk. ἄμμες, O. Ind. yușmān Acc., yușmābhis Instr., &c.; the latter is the stem used in Latin vōs Acc. (Zend vā Acc.). Vōs is also the Nominative form; vestrum (O. Lat. vostrorum, -arum) and vestri (O. Lat. vōstri) 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),
vobismet; and -pte in O. Lat. vopte (Paul. Fest. 578. 21 Th.
‘ vopte’ pro vos ipsi Cato posuit).

§ 10. For examples of Gen. vestrum (costrorum) and vestri, see Neue, ii? p. 359; and cf. nostrum, nostrorum, nostri, above. The spelling vobis 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 Tiburtes 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) tvá-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 tūus, O. Lat. tōco- (I.-Eur. *tēwō-) must be similarly derived from the I.-Eur. Gen. *tēwē, Latin suus, O. Lat. sovo- (I.-Eur. *sēwō-) from a corresponding Gen. *sēwē, while meas (*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:

die 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. ἕός), there was another I.-Eur. form, *swō- (O. Ind. svās, Gk. ὁς for *cfōς). 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 suis, which must not be confounded with the Demonstrative stem so- on the one hand (O. Lat. sos for eos, 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 u has been turned into a consonant (w) before a long vowel (see ch. ii. § 149), just as the Ἐ (v) of unaccented meas 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. ἡπέ-τερος, ὑπέ-τερος), 1 Pl. nōster, 2 Pl. O. Lat. vōster, which by the phonetic laws of Latin (cf. vītō from older vītō, ch. iv. § 10) became vester about the middle of the second cent. B. C. [Osc. nestro- (?), Unbr. vestro-]

The Gen. Sg. Neut. of these Possessives was in classical Latin used for the Gen. of the Personal Pronouns, mei, tui, sui, nostrī, vestri, and, where the notion of plurality was involved (as in the Partitive Genitive or with omnīum), the Gen. Pl. nostrum, vestrum (in O. Lat. nostrorum, -arum, vostrorum, -arum) (see § 8).

The strengthening particles -mēt, -plē are added to the Possessives, e.g. meamet, suismet, meapte, suopte, nostraple.

§ 12. The grammarians speak of an O. Lat. spelling misis, from which they derive Voc. mi (as Læti Voc., Lædis Nom.) (e.g. Charis. p. 159. 17 K., Vel. Long. p. 77. 12 K.; other references in Neue, ii. p. 366), though the only instance which they quote is mis in Ter. Heaut. 699 (probably a dissyllable):

at enim istoc nihil est mágis, Syre, miis núptiis aduersum,

where mis (a spelling retained in the MSS. of Terence), like mies (probably a monosyllable) on a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 38):

uitutes generis mieis moribus accumulavi,

and mies (probably a monosyllable) in Plaut. Men. 202: una uiiuis mieis morigeram moribus (probably mies, Truc. 709, where the MSS. read miies), shows that spelling of i for e (I.-Eur. eý) which was the rule in Republican Latin in an unaccented syllable before -is (-is), e.g. abeignieis (but abiegnae Acc.), ascenwivis on the Lex Parieti Faciundo of 105 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 577) (see ch. ii. § 9). [For other passages in Plautus where mis is indicated by the MSS., see Neue, i. c.; in Trin. 822 mis may be Gen. Sg. of the Personal Pronoun, mis (§ 2), or Abl. Pl. of the Possessive: bonis mis quid foret aut meae uitas (anaepastic)]. For the Vocative Sg. Masc., meus was used with an O-stem Noun in the Nominative form, e.g. Plaut. Asin. 664:

da, méus ocellus, méa rosa, mi ánime, mea uoluptas,

Cas. 137:

sine, amábo, ted amári, meus festús dies,
meus pullus passer, méa columba, mi lepus.

(Notice mi lepus in Plaut., where the Noun is not an O-stem. But Virg. has meus sanguis.) 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 pares, 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[bam] for tuam on an old inscription (C. I. L. i. 1290 quei tou[bam] pacem petit adiouta); soleis for suas on the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B.C. (i. 198. 50, beside sui, suae, suo, sua Abl.,) and on i. 1258, i. 1297 (where it is a monosyllable:

plouruma que fecit populo soleis gaudia nuges),
suom i. 1007 (beside suom, both dissyllabic:

suom mareitum cōrde dilexit suom),

The unemphatic Possessive is a monosyllable in the early Dramatists (by Synizesis), in iambic forms, e.g. meōs, suīs, which should probably not be scanned according to the Breves Breviantes Law *mēōs, *suīs (see ch. iii. § 49).
(Instances from Plaut. and Ter. in Neue, ii. p. 371.) How far the Vulgar Latin unemphatic Possessive *mus, *mum, *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.:

virginēs nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas,
cum suas magis videatur significare, sicuti ejusdem lib. vii. fatendum est eam significari, eum ait:

nec quisquam sapientia quae perhibetur
in somnis uidit prius quam san discere coepit,
idem eum ait 'sapsam,' pro ipsa nec alia ponit in lib. xvi.:

quō res sapsa loco sese ostentatque iubetque,
et Pacuvius in Teuro:

nam Teúcrum regi sāpsa res restibiliet;
sis Fest. 428. 11 Th. 'sōs' pro eos antiqui diecabant, ut Ennius, lib. i.:
constitit inde loci propter sōs dia dearum,
et lib. iii.:
circum sōs quae sunt magnae gentes opulentae,
lib. vii.:
dum censent terrere minis, hortantur IBE sōs,
lib xi.:
contendunt Graios, Graecos memorare solent sōs,
interdum pro suos ponebant, ut cum per dativum casum idem Ennius effert:

postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit;
§ 13. THE PRONOUNS. DEMONSTRATIVES.

sam Paul. Fest. 33. 6 Th. antiqui dicebant... 'sam' pro suam). On the other hand Festus quotes in illustration of O. Lat. Puelis part of a line of Ennius with monosyllabic suos (so spelt in the MSS. of Festus 324. 17 Th. and Paulus 325. 6):

Poeni soliti suos sacrificare puelles,
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 Aeneus reliquit,
so that monosyllabic sisos, &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 n. c.):

usum animo suo perfect, tua pace rogans te.

Gen. Pl. suum, tuum, suum, suorum are attested by Priscian (i. p. 308. 23 H.), and occur along with suum (cf. suum, C.I.L. i. 588, of c. 81 n. c.) in the Republican Dramatists, &c. (see instances in Neue), though an instance of suorum (vexstrum) 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 meumet culpā, Plaut. Poen. 446, suumet, suōmet, suōmet, suōmet, suōmet 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 mānu, Cie.; meapte ingenio, Plaut.; nostrepte culpā, Tor. Phorm. 766. (See examples and references to the native grammarians, in Neue, iii. p. 373). Still the usual method of emphatic expression was suā ipsius mānu, meo ipsius ingenio, nostra ipsorum culpā in literary Latin, and in colloquial speech suas sībī, meus mīhā, &c. (§ 6). Examples of Possessives from the Umbro-Oscan dialects are, Osc. tuvā 'tuac,' suvām 'suam,' sūvād 'sūā,' suvēs 'sui' (perhaps Pel. svad 'sūā,' Osc. nistrus 'nostros'); Umbr. tua and tuca 'tua,' tuer and tove 'tuic,' vestra 'vestrā.'

§ 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 ke-, (ko-) appears in Latin in the Adverb ce- of cedo, 'give here,' and in the Particle -ce of huic, ce, illa-ce, &c., but in Oscan eko- is the Pronoun in common use, which corresponds to the Latin hic; and on the other hand the
stems ĝho-, ĝhe- (cf. ĝhi-) of Lat. hi-c (O. Lat. hē-c), ho-c appear as particles in O. Ind. ha, hí, Gk. oŭ-χί, val-χί.

The Latin Demonstrative stems are:

(1) I.-Eur. só-, (sē-), which seems to have been originally confined to Nom. Sg. Masc. and Fem., a stem tö- being used elsewhere (O. Ind. sā and sās M., sā F., tād N., Gk. ὁ and ὁς M., ἦ F., τῶ, for *roδ, N.) So- is the stem of O. Lat. sam ‘eam,’ sos ‘eos,’ sum ‘eum’; to- of the second element of the compound is-te for *is-tō M. (ch. iii. § 37), is-ta F., in-tud 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 iste became in course of time ste.

(2) I.-Eur. ĝhō- (ĝhē-) supplies Lat. ĥi-c from O. Lat. hē-c M., haec for *hai-ce, hoc for hocce for *hod-c, ‘this,’ all augmented by the particle *ke. The i of hič is due to its unaccented nature (see ch. iii. § 18).

(3) I.-Eur. ol- (Lat. āl-tra, āl-limus; see ch. ix. § 56), a grade of the root āl- (āl-) of Gk. ἀλλος, Lat. alius, &c. (§ 29), with I.-Eur. só- appended. The Nom. Sg. Masc. was *ol-sō, O. Lat. olle, or *ol-sōs, O. Lat. allis, Fem. *ol-sā, O. Lat. olla, with ήl by the Latin phonetic law for original ls (cf. velle for *vel-se), Neut. *ol-tōd, which should have been in Latin *oltud, *ultud, but which was adapted to the Masc. 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 ā became i, ille (illis being dropped), illa, illud.

(4) From I.-Eur. ī- (ei-) and eyo- (O. Ind. id-ām N., im-ām Acc. M., Lith. īs M., O. Sl. īt, &c.) comes the Latin ‘anaphoric’ pronoun (i. e. the pronoun which refers to something previously mentioned), īs M., ea for *eyā F., īd 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 ea-ipse with flexion of the first element of the Compound only, and ea-psa with flexion of both elements. Augmented by the particle -ādem (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 -d (often written -t, ch. ii. § 73), e.g. illud, istud (but ipsum instead of *i-plnud), id; the Dat. Sg. of all Genders has -i, older -ei (-oi), like the Locative -ei (-oi) suffix which appears in O-stem nouns such as Corinthī, e.g. illī, istī, ipsī, huic for O. Lat. hoi-ce, ēi, and ēi for *ei-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, ipsī-us (with shortening of vowel before vowel, illūs, &c. ch. ii. § 143), hujus (pronounced *hūyus) for hoi-us, ejus (pronounced *eyyus) which when unaccented became in the rapid utterance of ordinary speech *illis, *istis, *ipsēs, *hūes, *ēies, e.g. illi(us)es modi Ter. Ad. 441, or in one word, illīmodī, 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. § 49), 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. té-bhyas, Goth. pri-m, Lith. té-ms, O. Sl. tē-mū), e.g. Lat. hī-bus; cf. ī-bus for *ei-bus (O. Ind. ī-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 eā in praeter-ea is shown to be an Ablative by aruorsum ead 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. ποι, Dor. πε, ἑκεi; the former is the suffix used in Oscan, e.g. eisei, which is used in the Fem. the ἴ-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, sospa 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- (L.-Eur. swo-) are found in the conversational language of Plautus and Terence. The Neuter *tod is preserved in an O. Lat. Adverb topper for *tod-per, on which see ch. ix. § 7.

§ 15. The particle -ce. This particle belongs to the stems κο- (κε-), (also ḵi- and ḵyo-) (Gk. ἵκεi Loc. Advb., ἥρων, Osc. eko- (often with this particle added, e.g. ekask, 'hae'), Lat. ci-ter, ci-bru, O. Ir. cē, 'on this side,' Engl. he, him, Germ. heu-te, Lith. zsī, 'this,' O. Sl. si], and appears as an Adverb or Preposition in Lat. cē-do, 'give here' (more frequent in Terence than in Plautus), (O. Ir. cīt 'da (?)), and probably in Osc. ce-do, 'hoc venerit.' It is said to be employed as an enclitic in other languages too, e.g. Arm. tēr-s, 'this person,' Goth. āau-h, Engl. though (?). Its widespread use with Demonstratives in Latin and Umbro-Oscan (Lat. kî-ci, ille, O. Lat. illic, iste, O. Lat. istic, Osc. eisaka- and Umbr. erak, 'eā,' Osc. ekask, 'hae,' eox, 'haec, īū-k, 'eā,' and so on) may be compared with the Romance forms which have prefixed Lat. ecco to certain Pronouns and Adverbs, e.g. Fr. ça, 'there,' from ecco-hae; Fr. ci, Ital. ci, 'here,' from ecco-hic; Fr. ec, Ital. ci, 'this,' from ecco-hoc; Fr. celle from ecco-illa, Fr. cett(e from ecco-ista, &c.), (cf. eccillum video and eccistam 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. illic is the Adverb (Locative), while ille is the Dative (so istic and isti); haec is the Nom. Pl. Fem., haec the Nom. Pl. Neut.; but in Plautus illic and illic, isti and istic, are equally Adv, and Dat. Pron., hae and haec (illaec and illae, istae and isticae) are both used for the Nom. Pl. Fem., ilia and iliae (but only haec, istace) for the Neut., while illic, istic, forms not found in class. Lat., are equivalents of ille, iste, illic of illud (but only istae 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, iltise, but before a consonant hi, illi, and in general the forms with -ce are in use before an initial vowel, hace, hasce, hisce Dat.-Abl., iltise, istisce Dat.-Abl., though before a consonant horince, harince 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 dissyllabic hace, &c. being proper to a more elevated style of poetry, e.g. Ennius, A. 294 M. hacee locetus vocat, at the beginning of a hexameter line, so that hacetenus and hocodie, quoted as O. Lat. forms by Mar. Victorinus (g. 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. hoe-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. hiene (Stat. Theb. i. 189; other examples in Neue, ii. p. 422). The Interjection enim seems always to take the forms with -c, e.g. em illic, en istoc, but not the Interjection ecce, e. g. ecce illicam, ecce istam, ecce am (for ecce *ham?, § 16). Prefixed to quidem the c is not used in hiquidem, &c. of the Dramatists (but istuquidem, not istuquidem, in Plautus, as istuc not istud in the simple Pronoun).

§ 16. Hic. The old form hoc (for *ghê-çe) appears on the earliest Seipio epitaph in Saturnian metre (C. I. L. i. 32):

hoc cœpit 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):

cœnsol, cœnsor, aïdilis 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. aïdilis for aedilis on the still older Seipio epitaph, i. 31; see ch. iii. § 22). The Neuter Nom.-Acc. hoc should be *hôce (for *ghêd-çe), 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 his c scriptum, is illustrated only by the form hoccine. Hoc is always long by position in Latin poetry, as hoc Abl. is long both by nature and by position (for *hêd-ce), and hic M. is distinguished from hic Adv. in Plautus and the early Dramatists (spelt heic in Plautine MSS., Merc. 307, Men. 375, &c.), though, like other long syllables, hic, (hoc) may be shortened, when unaccented, after a short syllable by the Law of Breves Breviantes (ch. iii. § 42), e. g. quid hic est?, what is here?, (quid hic 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 Moenitius hic est, that it was pronounced *hice (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 hic M. came to be pronounced *hôce by the Analogy of hoc (for *hodce) N., which was pronounced *hôce. (One
theory supposes hic with long i to have been a byform of hic, Rev. Philologie, 1892.)

In the Genitive we have, e.g. hoiusce 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, hujus P), huius Most. 664 (A, hujus 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 hujusce 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 leegi). Mar. Victorinus (12. 2 K.) quotes 'ex libris antiquis foederum et legum, qui etiamis frequenti transcriptione aliquid mutarunt, tamen retinet 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 hoic (like cui in the poetry of the first cent. A.D., § 25) is scannned as a dissyllable (twice in Statius, Silv. i. 107; i. 2. 135; and even hoic in Ter. Maurus, i. 1375. For other examples, see Neu., ii*, p. 415). In the Accusative the oldest spelling hon-ce appears in the Lex Spoletina (C. I. L. xi. 4766 honce loucom nequis uiolatol), hance in the Lex Bantina (i. 197), hoce for hoice on the S. C. Bach. of 186 B.C., where double consonants are written single, (i. 196. 26 atque utei hoce in tabolam ahenam incideretis) (cf. i. 1291 itus actusque est in hoce delubrum Feronial). We have höne on the Scipio epitaph (i. 32), in the Saturnian line:

höne oino ploirume cosentiont N[ämai],
'houette umum plurimi consentiunt Romanae.' Like hune from honcé M. is hu(e)c from hoc(e) N., a spelling found in an inscription of somewhat irregular orthography (i. 603, of 58 B.C., ad huec templum), and in the Falisco-Lat. huic 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 hocene, e.g. in the magisterial proclamation cited above for hoce Neut. Acc. (C. I. L. i. 1291 ex hocene loco; cf. Orell. 3857), hace in the Lex Bantina (i. 197. 7) and throughout the Lex Repetundarum (i. 198) [cf. hocedie and hacetenus, mentioned as O. Lat. forms by Mar. Vict. (9. 19 K.).] (For the Locative, see the Adverb hic, heic, ch. ix. § 16). Nom.-Acc. Plur. Neut. hacie is found in the S. C. Bach. (C. I. L. i. 196. 22 haice utei in cownetionid exdeceatis, 'haec uti in contione edictatis'); haec has been already cited from Ennius, A. 294 M. haece locutus; hice or heisce, 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 heisunt horti; i. 1071 heisunt duo concordes), and, according to the grammarians, in Virg. E, iii. 102:

his certe, neque amor causa est, vix ossibus haerent;

we have heisce further in some Capua inscriptions of 108-71 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 565 heisce magistres Uenerus Iouiae; i. 566 heise magistri Cererus; i. 567 heise magistri; i. 569 heisce mag.; i. 573 heisc. magistr.; Not. Scar. 1893. p. 164 heisce magistri); cf. C. I. L. i. 1478 (Cartagena), heisce magistris.

For examples of haece F., see Neu., ii*, p. 417; e.g. Virg. G. iii. 305:

haece quoque non cura nobis leviores 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.
THE PRONOUNS. DEMONSTRATIVES.

§ 17. The pronouns. Examples of the various cases of this pronoun with -c(e) in Plautus and Terence are given by Neue, iii, pp. 398 sqq., istic Nom. Sg. M., istae F., istuc N., istic Dat., istum Acc. M., istane F., istunc N., istic Abl. M., istae F., istae Nom. Pl. F., N., istosi-n Acc. Pl. M., istae N., also of the later curt-tailed form ste (cf. Ital. stasera, from Lat. (i)stā seriī) as in the Itala sta nomīna; see L. F. Anz. ii. 153) (cf. ch. iii. § 12 a. 4). (The declension of iste in Plautus is treated by Studemund in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, 1876, p. 57, and its use by Bach in Studemund's Studien ii.) Iste refers to the second Personal Pronoun, 'that of yours,' as hic to the first and ille to the third. In classical Latin, but probably not in the earlier literature, it came to acquire a contemptuous sense. We find istic in an old ritual mentioned by Cato (R. R. 132. 2): Iuppiter dapalis, macte istae dape pollucenda esto. The influence of the Noun declension is seen in Late Lat. isto Dat. Sg. (Apuleius), istum Neut. (Vulgate); istae Dat. Sg. is the reading supported by the MSS. in Plaut. Truc. 790 (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). In colloquial Latin ece is sometimes prefixed to the Acc. case of iste, and forms a compound, e. g. eccistam vide Plaut.
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xvi. 4. 4 nisi harunce quae causa erit, funus familiare, feriae denicales, &c.) In the Dat.-Abl. hisce is used by Plaut. and Ter. before vowels, by Cicero, &c. before consonants too (examples in Neue, ii, p. 419; cf. heise in the Lex Repetundarum, C. I. L. i. 198. 8 de heise, dum, &c.), and the same holds of Acc. hosce and hase (cf. hase sedes, C. I. L. iii. 7290).

The stem hō- (hē-) is augmented by i like the Pronoun Datives Pl., O. Ind. té-bhyas, Goth. pai-m, Lith. té-m, O. Sl. tē-mū, in Dat. Pl. hibus (obsolete in Varro’s time; cf. Varro, L. L. viii. 72), attested by Priscian, ii. p. 10. 15 H. (and Charis. p. 54. 19 K.) in Plaut. Curc. 506:

eodem hērcele nos ponō 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. hae in Cato (R. R. 14. 3 hae rei materiem . . . dominus praebetit). The Nom. Pl. M. heis-ce, 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 héi, hī. (On the declension of hic in Plautus, see Studemund in Fleckeisen’s Jahrbücher, 1876, p. 57, and on its use, Bach in Studem. Stud. ii.) Hic 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. Phorm. 866-9 has hic where iber would be used by Plautus:

át fores
sūspernso gradú placide ire pérrexī, accessī, āstīti,

hic pulcherrumum

fācīnum audīui.

The Adverb hō-die (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 Falaestriomem, ‘but see, here comes P.’, Plaut., though the word may be analyzed into ecce cum as well as into ecce *cum (§ 15). On Faliscan he capat, ‘here lie,’ ‘here lies’ (for *heī or for *heic?), and on Late Lat. hi jacet, see ch. ix. § 10. We have Dat. hui 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 indictivum,' 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: *ullanbar arbos quirquir est... ollaner arbos quirquir est.* The immediate precursor of *ille,* the Nom. Masc. *olle,* is found in the Law of Servius Tullius, quoted by Festus (*290. 15 Th.*): *si parentem puere verberet* (MS. -it), *ast olle plorassit,* *puer divis parentum sacer esto.*

A very old form of the Abl. Plur., *oles,* is cited by Paul. Fest. *14. 17 Th.:* 'ab oles' *dicebant 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* praeidente[ˈd Hani-ba-led])

Macrobius (iii. 9. 10) quotes an old ritual with *ollis legibus,* and on the Lex Furfensis of 58 B. C. (*C. L. L. i. 603*) the same phrase occurs, *olleis 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 *ollis* Dat. Sg., *ollis Dat. Pl., *olla Nom. Pl., *olla Neut. Pl., *ollas 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. *Ec.* *Ennius* in his *Annales* knows only *oll* 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 *olle* found in his imitator, Virgil, and the later Epic poets, while *Lucretius* confines himself to *ollis.* Quintilian mentions *ollis* among the happy archaisms of *Virgil* (viii. 3. 25 'ollis' *enim et quianam* et 'moerus' et 'pone' et 'povricerent' *adspergunt illam,* quae *etiam in pisciris est gratissima,* vetustatis inimitabilem arti auctoritatem). The old spelling may have lingered longest in these forms through the analogy of the Adverb *ollim,* which comes from the stem *ol-* (Unbr.* uo* 'illuc') a byform of *ol-* (ch. *i. 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 *ollis* 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* 'illis... aut tune'; *ollis* 'ibi, interdum, illi, vel illine,' *C. G. L. v. 229. 4-5,* and *ollis* is quoted by Paul. Fest. *231. 2 Th.* as an O. Lat. form of *illic* (cf. Lucil. *inc. 153 M.*: *uoluit olim Auceps illae facit, where the MSS. offer ollit*). The mispronunciation, 'ollis' for *ollim,* censured in Prob. *App. 199. 16 K.*, is merely an example of the tendency of Vulg. Lat. to omit final *-m,* like the mispronunciations 'prida,' 'passi,' 'numqua,' 'ide,' censured on the same page. From *ollim* was formed Late Lat. *ollanus,* '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. *ollis,* 'then,' with O. Sl. lani, 'last summer,' and analyzes *ollinto* 'oll-into,' not *oll-so.* (*I. F. iii. 264).*]

For instances of the addition of the particle -ce to *ille* in its various forms in Plautus, *etc.* (ille Nom. Sg. *M.*, *illaece F., illaece N., illaece Dat., illaece Acc. M., illaece F., illoc Abl., illoc F., illiaece Nom. Pl. M. (before a vowel), illoc F., illiaece Neut., illiaece Dat.-Abl. (before a vowel,* see *Neue, ii.* p. 427.) In old rituals mentioned by Cato in the *Res Rustica* we find *illiaece* (139 illiaece sacri coercendi ego), *illiaece*
Lucilius seems to have proposed the spelling *illi Dat. Sg., *illei Nom. Pl. (ix. 15 M.):

‘hoc illi factumst uni’: tenue hoc facies i.

‘haec illei fecere’: adde e, ut pinguius fiat,
on which see ch. i. § 9. According to Diomedes (332. 11 K.) the strengthening particle -mei 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 deitic interjection, for which in was substituted in class. Latin (ch. x. § 19)], was formed eccilum, 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. eum for *eyom Acc. Sg. M., which ousted the old Acc. im; eis for *eyois Dat.-Abl. Pl., which ousted the oldibus for *ei-bus (O. Ind. e-bhyás), with stem augmented before the Dat. Plur. suffix as in idibus (§ 16). Another old I-stem form may be Abi. i- in i-lico, 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 *eyoé. Ilícō is however better explained as *in slocō, O. Lat. for in locō (see ch. ix. § 7).

It may be owing to this stem eyo- that we find the natural Fem. *ia 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 oam Acc. Sg. F., eaf Acc. Pl. F.)

The particle -ce is not added to this Pronoun-stem until Late Latin, e.g. ejusceodi (Jerome, Epist. 82. 6) by Analogy of hujusceodio. [Posteac in Claudius’ edict on the Ananui (Hermes, iv. 99, I. 13) is an isolated form.] But in Oscan we have iz-ic ‘is,’ in-ik ‘id,’ and in Umbrian (with intervocalic s become r) er-ee ‘is,’ ed-ok ‘id,’ &c., as well as forms like Osc. id-ad ‘ad id,’ Umbr. eo 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 f as in seine and leiterns on the same inscription, an inscription not older than the last quarter of the second cent. B.C. (On eisdeum, 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, abiegnies, aesclunieis (see ch. ii. § 9, and cf. iei Nom. Pl., ietes Dat. Pl. below). (So Umbr. iepru, iepi.) 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’ tonebant pro eum, a nominativo is; ib. 33. 7 antiqui dicebant... ‘im’ pro eum; Gl. Philox. im: abred, eiis aetred; Gl. Cyrill. aed, tovov im (MS. eim)]. Macrobius (i. 4. 19) quotes a law of the XII Tables: si nox futura factum sit, si im occisit, iure caesus esto, and Cicero (Legg. ii. 24. 60) another: cui auro dentes inuncti essent, ast im cum ille sepelirei ureique se fraudem 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 Consonant-stems for that of I-stems, e.g. turrem for turrim (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 uocat, ni it, antestamino, igitur em (MSS. en) capito; and Festus (298. 15 Th.) quotes, from a speech of Caton, si em pereussi. 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. Philox. im: xaiw, fify, is mentioned by Paul. Fest. as en (53. 37 Th. ‘em,’ tum); the Acc. of an O. Lat. derivative of is in the sense of idem is imem in the Philoxenus Glossary (imem: tów aetred), but enem in Paul. Fest. (54. 2 Th. ‘emem,’ eundem) [cf. the form in the Glossary of Placidus, eundem (MSS. hendem): aequem, similiter, 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 scansiones, ei, ei and ei, in Ovid and later poets one, ei (cf. rē and rē Plaut., rē class., ch. vi. § 19). This *eyoi is thought to have become ei much as -eyēs became -ēs (e.g. Lat. trēs for 1.-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, ei, through its unaccented character, would in the rapid utterance of everyday life become a mere monosyllable ei, as tēi became tēi, &c. (§ 12). (Priscian, ii. p. 10. 2 H. speaks as if ei were as much a monosyllable as haie, cui in the ordinary pronunciation of his time). To suppose that eiei was pronounced *ey-yei as *Trōia was pronounced *Troy-ya, piyor, *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 ei.) 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 eei, eei as produced in this way. But the reduplicated form of the i-stem had in Latin the notion of identity, e.g. em-em (gl. eundem). Still the theory given above is far from certain.
the already formed Locative had this pronunciation *ēy-yus [Caesell. ap. Cassiod. 206. 6 K. 'Pompeius,' 'Tarpeius' et 'eius' per duo i scribenda sunt, et propter sonum (plenius enim sonant), et propter metrum. Numquam enim longa fist syllaba nisi per i geminum scribatur]. This pronunciation is indicated by the spelling eiVs on inscriptions (Neue, iii. p. 375) and MSS. (Index to Studemund's Apograph of the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus). The treatment of Nom. Pl. *eiei for *eoi and Dat.-Abl. Pl. *eiais for *eyois is not the same as that of Dat.-Loc. Sg. *eiei; for we have in Plautus and the older poetry no instance of *ei, ēi8, 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. òi, òis, òorum Plant. (not òis, &c., by Law of Breves Breviantes; see ch. iii. § 49).

The old Abl. Sg. -ā is seen in evō die of the Lex Spoletina (C. I. L. xi. 4766), and in Adverbial evō of the S. C. Bacch. (i. 196. 25 qui arvorum evō fecissent, 'qui adversum eā fecissent').

In the Nom. Pl. the spelling ei 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 Antonia de Termessibus of 71 B.C. (i. 204, passim, never ei], on the Lex Rubria of 49 B.C. [i. 205. (1). 48], on the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (i. 206. 24, usually ei], and in Varro (L. I. ix. 2 and 35). We have also i in MSS. (often confused with hi), and inscriptions (examples in Neue, iii. 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 ei (for ēi) from disyllabic ēi, and similarly ēis (is) from ēis, ēii (ii) from ēii, ēiis (dis) from ēiis (see Neue, i. 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 eiis in the S. C. Bacch. of 186 B.C. (i. 196. 5, the only occurrence of a Nom. Pl. of ēis on this inscr.) (possibly in i. 185 eiis), and which should be compared with his (older heis) and hisce for hi, illis (illeis) and illisce for ili (§§ 16, 18). (The reading is in Pauv. Trag. 221 K. ap. Charis. 133. 4 K. Very doubtful). In the Gen. Pl. the form ēum, mentioned by Paul. Fest. (54. 20 Th. 'ēum' antiqui diecaban pro eorum), is found once (usually eorum) on the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 206. 52 ēum h(ac) l(ege) n(ii)l) r(ogatur). The orthography of the Dat.-Abl. Pl. resembles that of the Nom. Pl. We have eiis 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 eiis in the early spelling of the S. C. Bacch. of 186 B.C. (i. 196), while the earliest form of all, eiis, reappears on an inscr. of circ. 100 B.C., the Epistula Praetoris ad Tiburtis (i. 201 de eiis rebus ab uobis pecatam non esse. Quonque de eiis rebus senatuei purgati estis, &c.). We have also is in MSS. (often confused with his) and inscriptions (Neue, ii. p. 383), and the eiis of Republican inscriptions (see Index to C. I. L. i.) admits of being taken as an expression of the sound ēis. 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 latimum putat consuetudo, cum veterum auctoritate plurimum valeat), who quotes Plautus, Mil. 74:

latrónes, ibus dinumerem 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*, *iiis*, *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\[3\] p. 386.

The analogy of the A-declension has produced *ae* Dat. Sg. F, a form found in Cato (R. R. 142 quo modo uliliam uti oportet, et quo modo eae imperari oportet) and probably in Plaut. Mfil. 348: *hoc* eae proximum, but not in use in Varro’s time (L. L. viii. 51); so in Late Latin *eum* for *id* (see Georges, Lex. Worfl. s. v.). Cato also uses *eadus* (R. R. 152 facito scopas urigea uilneas aridas . . . eabus latera dolis intrinsecus usque bene perficere), which is quoted from Cassius Hemina (pro eis differentiae causa in feminino) by Priscian (i. 294. 4 H.).

The obscure form *neceirem* 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 *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 copia esset ei,* the MSS. have *eius*; in *Bacch. 545:* mendacium ei dixit, only the Ambrosian Palimpsest has *ei,* the Palatine MSS. have *ili* [editors similarly prefer *ilii* the (probable) reading of the Palimpsest to *ii* of the other MSS. in *Rud. 219:* neque quiecan umquam ilius profuit]; in *Carc. 544,* for which we have only the testimony of the Palatine family of MSS.: *is* Summanum se uocari dixit; ei reddidii,

*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 licitumst ei dumque actas tulit,*

and is very common in Lucretius, e. g. vi. 674: *

seelicet et fluuius quivis est maximus 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 *ejus, eum, eo* but not *ei*; but in Ovid, *Halieut. 33,* we have *ei* (see Neue, ii\[3\], p. 378, who, however, quotes as examples of *ei* from Plautus lines where it can be scanned *ei* in prosodical hiatus, e. g. *Carc. 603* matet *ei* utendum dederat, like *mei 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- (pi-),* 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 *pathis* (Lat. *patis,* Gk. *pōir,* &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 ali), in the Glossary of Philoxenus as *ipsipte (*ipsipti: *aôrôs, Í.G. L. ii. 87, 26 and 44) and *ipsipse (*ipsipse: *aôrôs, Íb. gr. 35), and augmented by -pte in oepte (Paul. Fest. 78. 16 Th. *in oepte, *eo ipso).

The original declension of *ipsi we may suppose to have been: Nom. Sg. *ips-pte (*i-pte) M., ea-pte F., *id-p-te (*i-p-te) N., Acc. Sg. *im-p-toe M., &c., until the inconvenience of the alternation of -pte and -p-te brought about a levelling process. (*Ipsed 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 *a ispsa in the Palatine MSS. (P), as in v. 604 for eapsa of A]; *eapsa, Psedu. 833 (eapsa, P, eapsa P); *iumpsam non *eampsam, Truc. 133 (eum ipsum non eam ipsam A, eum ipsum non ea ase P); *eampsam, Truc. 114 (eum ipsum A, unsum P), which have been, perhaps unnecessarily, changed by editors to eapse, eapsa. eampsae, eamps.)

The declension of the first element appears in eapse, mentioned by Paul. Fest. (54. 28 Th. *eapse, *ea ipsa), and this and similar forms are sometimes preserved in the MSS. of Plautus (e.g. eapsa, Trin. 974, Truc. 24, Corp. 161, 534), though usually *ipsi is written for the unfamiliar -pte and is sometimes declined, e.g. *eapse, Pers. 603 (eum ipse P); *eapse, Pseu. 272 (eam ipse P); *eapse, Cas. 604 (so A, but eapsa P). (On *sirepsae, see ch. ii. § 8.)

In the Nom. Sg. Masc. we have a byform *ipsus in O. Lat. (*ipsos in a Law of Nuina quoted by Paul. Fest. 4. 29 Th.: *i quisquam aliuta faxis, *ipsos Ioui sacer esto), which is the form used by the Comedians before a Reflexive Pronoun, e.g. *ipsus sibi, ipsus suam rem, &c. *Ipsi is not a development of *ipsus. The two are separate forms, *ipsa for -sô, *ipsae for -sûs, corresponding to the L.-Eur. byforms *sô and sôs (O. Ind. sâ and sás, Gk. ô and ôs) (§ 13). The influence of O-stems Adjectives produced in Late Latin *ipsa Dat. Sg. (Apul.) and *ipsae (Apul.), of I-stems *ipsibus Dat. Pl., ascribed to O. Latin by Serg. in Don. (54. 37 K.). The Plautine *ipsissamus (Trin. 988), like Aristophanes' *aôrôsas, seems to have been, in the form *ipsima or *ipsina, 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, *issae, for *ipsae, *ipsae, see ch. ii. § 8.) *Ipsem is found occasionally (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.).

§ 21. Idem. The affix -dem of *idem, O. Lat. is-dem, tanti-dem, tantum-dem, expressing the idea of 'precisely,' 'exactly,' is thought by some to have been originally *idem, for the Oscean equivalent of Latin *idem is is-idum. This *idem, 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 *anidem [Paul. Fest. 54. 2 Th. emanem, 'eundem'; Gl. Philox. *aneum: rôv aôrôv; cf. Gl. Plac. (h)emdem, 'aequum, 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.]. Priescian (i. 589. 14 H.) derives t-dem from is and idem.

The Nom. Masc. is discussed by Cicero in a passage of somewhat uncertain text (Orat. xlvii. 157): *idem campus habet 'inquit Ennii, et in templis *idem probavit; at 'isdem' erat verius, nec tamen 'eisdem' ut optimus: male
sonabat 'isdem'; imperatrum est a consuetudine, ut peccare suaavitatis causa liceret. He seems to say that isdem [also written with ei for the long i-sound (ch. i. § 9) eisdem] was the form in use, with s dropped with compensatory lengthening before e (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, ii. 2. p. 390.)

In the Dat. Sg. we have eisdem and eistem (like ei and ei, § 19), but eisdem is not found. On later inscriptions isdem is very frequent (examples in Neue, ii. p. 390), and even isdem (Neue, l. c.), a confusion with the Nom. Sg., which had the (archaic) spelling isdem, but the pronunciation isdem. In the Nom. and Dat.-Abl. Pl., Priscian (i. 589. 29 H.) seems to distinguish ei-dem, ei-dem from eistem (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 isdem of Republican Inscriptions (Neue, l. c.; e.g. C. I. L. i. 197. 17 and i. 202) may represent the pronunciation isdem. 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 probauerunt, &c., e.g. i. 1149; i. 1187; i. 1192; cf. i. 1145), and in later inscriptions sometimes isdem (Neue, p. 394). In the Dramatists, &c. with a second long syllable 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., eaedem Dat. (very rare; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.).

§ 22. The Pronominal Gen. and Dat. Sg. In the early Dramatists we find two scanions of illius, istius, ipsius, &c., (1) illius, istius, 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 scanion are: isfl(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, illi, isti, ipsi, e.g. illi modi and isti modi (Cato), isti 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 illi(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. densus became densus, or *prismus became primus, or isdem, isdem; and a large number of Priscian's examples of this Gen. in -i show the Pronoun in combination with modus. Similarly ali(u)s-rei would become ali-rei, as dis-rumpe became distrumpo; cf. Priscian's examples, alli rei causa (Caecilius), 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. And. 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, ipsu (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
§ 23. IV. RELATIVE, INDEFINITE, AND INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS. The I.-Eur. Relative-stem *y-o- (O. Ind. yás, Gk. ὅς) does not supply the Latin Relative, which shows the stem *q²-o-, a stem originally proper (with *q²-i-, *q²-u-) to the Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns (O. Ind. kás, kú-tra, 'where?', Gk. τίς, ποῦ, O. Ir. eia, W. pwy, Goth. hvas, Engl. who?, Lith. kàs, O. Sl. kú-to; O. Ind. cit Neut., Gk. τίς, &c.), but used also as a Relative (Engl. who, &c.). I.-Eur. *q²-o-, *q²-i-, *q²-u- appear in the Latin quis?, si-quis, qui?, ali-ćubi, &c. (Umbro-Ocean 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 (queei) 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 αὐτὸς εἶναι ὁ ἀνδρός 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. *ullād), 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. eiei), *quoi-*eiei; and Gen. Sg. quiouis (class. cujus) will consequently represent *quo- eius. 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. υἷος-ι), e.g. Umbr. poi Nom. Sg. M., porci (*podi) N.; Lat. qui for *q²-o-i (O. Lat. quoi).

The Latin Interrogative-Relative has a Possessive cujus -a -um, older quiouis -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. 1 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 *q̩i̯-yo-, *q̩i̯-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 cuiuscemodi (Apuleius, &c.), a word coined after the type of *kujuscemodi.

§ 24. Stems q̩ii- and q̩io-. In O. Lat. there is a usage of quis, possibly as a Relative, but rather in the sense of siguis or quicumque; e. g. in an old treaty quoted by Festus to illustrate O. Lat. nancitor for nanciscitor (170. 25 Th.): pecuniam quis nancitor, habeto; in an old plebs citemum (Fest. 322. 11 Th.): ecum quis uolet magistratus multare, dum minore parti familias taxat, liceto; on a public notice affixed to a grove at Laceria (C. I. L. ix. 782) : quis uolet (other examples from Cato and from Cicero’s laws are given by Neue, ii3 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. piisest totar Tarsinater ‘quisquis est civitatis Tadinatis,’ Osc. pis hafest ‘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 aduorsum 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 consonant (see Neue, p. 431, and B. P. W. xiii. 278; similarly Cornificius seems to write sigui before an initial s, otherwise siguis, e.g. sigui 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 psaltrim paruit, quicum uiuat; C. I. L. i. 200 quine ab eorum quiem 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 plurem ‘ques’ dixerunt regulam securi, unde etiam dativus mansit in consuetudine), Festus (348. 23 Th.), Priscian (ii. g. 13 H.) &c., seems to have been confined to the Interrogative and Indefinite use. Thus Cato began his Origines with the words: siguis homines sunt, quos delectat populi Romani gesta describere; on the S. C. Bacch. (C. I. L. i. 196) we have: seil ques esent, qui sibi dicerei necese esse Bacchanal habere’; and a line of Pacuvius (Trag. 221 R.) runs:

ques sunt? ignoti, nescioques ignobiles;

(Other examples in Neue, p. 466).
The I-declension Neuter *quia* survives only as an Adverb or Conjunction, e.g. O. Lat. *quia*nam, '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 quts sunt populii. Et declaravit 'ques,' 'quium,' ut 'puppes,' 'puppium'), for this remark only implies that Cato's *ues* was an I-stem formation. The I-stem Dat. *quibus* supplanted the O-stem *uis* (older *queis*) 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 hodie eludificatus est).


cónsol cénso r aidilis qui fuit apúd uos,

to the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (i. 206), which has *qui* far 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. *siqua causa est* (but *seique causa eit* on the Lex Repetundarum, C. I. L. i. 198. 37; *si quae lex* on the Lex Agraria, i. 200. 41; and in Plautus *numquae causast quin*, &c.; see Neue, ii3, p. 445). Gen. Sg. *quoius* appears in the Saturnian Scipio epitaph of c. 200 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 29):

quouis fórma uirtútéi parísuma 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 *e* (ch. iv. § 137); hence *cuius* (pronounced *ciy-yus*, ch. ii. § 55), a pronunciation indicated by spellings like *cuius*, *cuius* (Neue, p. 451). (On monosyllabic *quoi(y)s in qui(y)smodi, &c., in the Dramatists, and *quo in quiqvoiroti, cuiqvoiroti* in Cic., &c., see § 22). The oldest form preserved of the Dative is *quoiei* of a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 34) in a Saturnian line referring to the short life of the deceased:

quoiei uita defécit non honos honóre,

in the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B.C. (i. 198. 10, usually *quo*), and in the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. (i. 200. 68, usually *quo*; cf. *quoíque*, II. 3. 6. 32. 45. 99); though the dissyllabic Dative seems not to occur in Plautus (it is read by some editors in Trin. 353. 558, &c.; see Brix ad locc.), and so cannot have been used in the ordinary conversation of his time. The common form in use on Republican inscriptions is *quo* (see Index to C. I. L. i.); the Lex Julia Municipalis, for example, of 45 B.C. (i. 206) has always *quo*, never *cui*, as it has always *quoius*, never *cuius*, and always, except in two instances, *quo* for *qui* (so *quo* in the Comm. Lud. Saec. of Augustus' reign). And Quintilian (i. 7.
27) tells us that in his youth quoī was the spelling. [Cf. Velius Longus (first cent. A. D.), p. 76. 3 K. itaque audimus quosdam plena oi syllaba dicere 'quoī' et 'hoic' pro cui et huic.] In late poetry caī is a dissyllable, cuiī, 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. pīm) by analogy of Noun I-stems which usually substituted the Cons.-stem -em for the I-stem -im, e.g. terrēm (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 *quaī), a Locative (from *queī), or even an Instrumental (from *quaī). But the spelling quiquām ("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 quiquam (see § 28). The spelling queī on the Lex Agraria of 111 B. C. (C. L. L. i. 200. 17 queīne ab eorum queī emit) merely expresses the sound quī (see ch. i. § 9). This qui, byform of quoī, quaī, occurs in Virgil (A. xi. 822):

Accam ex aequalibus unam, quiem partiri curas.

It was not in living use in the time of Servius (fourth cent. A. D.) (in Donat. p. 411. 1 K. nam dicimus 'a quoī venisti et 'a quiī venisti; sed 'a quiī' in usu esse desīt). 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 hōmine nemo uīuit fortunātiō; Bacch. 335 sed qui praesentē id aūrum Theotimō datumāt; but especially (2) as an Abl. of the instrument, e.g. Plaut Men. 391 quis istēst Peniculus? qui exērgentur bāxeae?, 'what Mr. Brush do you mean? one to clean shoes with?'; Varro, R. R. ii. praef. 3 frumentum qui sātrī fāmus. In this capacity it passes into a mere Adverb like ut, and is used even with a plural noun, e.g. Plaut. Stich. 292 quadrigas qui uēhar; Pseud. 487 (uigintī minās) quās meo gnato des, qui amicām libēret; (3) as an Adverb with the sense of quonmodo; e.g. qui fīt ut?, a phrase in common use in classical Latin; Ter. Adelph. 215 qui potuit melius?; (4) as an enélitic Particile, e. g. hērē queī, edēgō queī, utīnam queī (Plaut.), a usage surviving in classical at-queī. (For a fuller list of examples, see Neue, ii. pp. 455 sqq.; cf. below, ch. x. § 5.) The Nom. Pl. Masc. is written queī on Republican inscriptions (see Index to C. L. L. i.), this being the weakening of an original *quoī, due to the unaccented nature of the Relative (ch. iii. § 12 a. 5), e.g. i. 196 seī quoēs esent, quei sibei deicerent necesus esse Baeclan habere. (On queī Nom. Pl. of queī in O. Lat., and on queēs and quēs, Dat.-Abl. Plur., from *quoēs, see above, § 24.)

§ 26. The stem qīu-. Corresponding to Umbr. pu-fe, Osc. pu-f, 'where' (O. Ind. kūhā, O. Sl. kūde, from L.-Eur. *quauh-), is Lat. -cūbi of iltī-cūbī, 'somewhere,' si-cūbī, 'if anywhere,' nē-cūbī, nūm-cūbī, &c., with cu- instead of qua- by the same phonetic law of the Latin language that has made quincu-plex out of *quinquu-plex (ch. iv. § 137) (cf. Vulg. Lat. nessio-cūbe, 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 quiē. Similarly the -cūnde of iltī-cūnde (aliquonde) is written in Plaut. Pseud. 317 in the Ambr. Palimps.; so Caesellius ap. Cassiod. 202. 28 K. aliquonde per quon debet scribi), si-
§ 26–28. THE PRONOUNS. RELATIVES, ETC.
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cunde, ne-cunde, wants initial c- in the simple form -unde. According to Schmidt (K. Z. xxxii. 405) this Latin initial u-, internal cu-, represents I.-Eur. *q̣ṇu-, a parallel stem of q̣ṇor-, q̣ni- (cf. § 23). (For another possible explanation of this loss of the initial guttural, see Brugm. Grundr. i. § 431 e.) The Latin Interrogative and Indefinite Pronoun iber, 'whether of two' (on the suffix -tero-, see ch. v. § 18) shows a similar relation to O. Ind. kiutra, 'whether' (stem *q̣ḳṭo-, *ḳṭro-), Osc. potro-, 'whether of two' (stem *q̣ḳṭro- or *kẉṭro-; both derivatives of a stem *q̣ḳṭe(ṭe)-ro- or *kẉṭe(ṭe)-ro-). (On other Latin Adverbs beginning with u-, derived from the Interrogative root, and wanting an initial guttural, see ch. ix. § 10.) Ritschl's proposal [based on Trin. 934, where there is a manuscript corruption cubitus for ubi tus (gignitur)] to read cubi, &c., in some passages of Plautus, has not met with approval (Opusc. iii. 135).

§ 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 hie uox prope me sonat? ; cf. Cic. Fbr. II. iii. 7. 16 ne is redimeret, cuja res esset ; ib. 27. 68 Apronius cettorem facit istum, cuja res erat. The Plural is very rare, Plaut. Rud. 745 :

argentum ego pro istisce ambabus quoeae erant dominó dedic,

Trin. 533, with quoium for cujorun, Gen. Pl. (? ) (cuium A, quoium B ; some read quorum) :

neuncunquam quisquamst, quoquis ille ager fuit,
quin pessume ei res uorterit, quoium fuit,
alli étolatum abierunt, allii emortui.

With the suffix -ati-, denoting the country of one's birth (ch. v. § 45), we have cujás, O. Lat. quodatis, 'what countryman?' 'belonging to what country?'

§ 28. Other derivatives. Aii-quis, some one, is a compound of the stem aii-, some (connected with ditto-, other) and the Indefinite Pronoun, like ali-cubi, somewhere, ali-cunde, &c. An O. Lat. Nom. Pl. aliasque is mentioned by Charisius (159. 7 K.). Ec-quis has been explained as nothing else than et quis, with c 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 enos, Umbro-Osc. e-tanto, &c.) with the appended particle -ce (without this appendage in e-uidem, ch. x. § 6, and in e-quis, by form 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-dem, § 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. Quævis (cf. Umbr. pis-her from the verb heri-, 'to wish') may stand for *quis-vis, 'any you please,' 'whosoever you please' (cf. O. Lat. quis nancitor, 'whosoever obtains,' § 24), with the same loss of s before initial v in a Compound as divello for *divis-velo (ch. iv. § 151), and quälubet, for *quis-lubet, like aliago for *atiago (ib.), as well as for qui-vis, qui-ubet. The I-declension Abl. quinis appears in Plaut. Stich. 627 : quicumuis depúgnno multo fécilius

1 aliquis'alius is not found in Plautus, though it occurs in Terence.
quum cum fame. Quí-cum-que, O. Lat. qui-que (C. I. L. i. 197. 5; 200. 50; 202, &c.), had probably a byform *quis-que, to judge from Nom. Pl. ques-
cumque n Cato (Orig. ii. fr. 34 J. quescumque Romae regnaulissent). The latter
part of the word is probably the Adverb quam (O. Lat. quom), when, with
the enclitic particle -que, so that -cumber means literally 'whenever' (see ch. ix.
§ 10. 7). In O. Lat. quiesque is used in the sense of quiescumque, e.g. quiesque
offendero, Plant. Capt. 798, the particle -que (O. Ind. ca in käs-ca, 'whoever,' &c.,
Hom. Gk. τε in ὦ τε, Goth. h in hvō-h) giving to a word the sense of our
'ever' in 'whenever,' '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.
Rev. 216 quiesque uostrum; so quiesque Acc. Sg. F. in Plaut. Pseud. 185.
Another expression for 'whosoever' is quisquis (Osc. pispis, of which the Neut.
pitpit is mentioned by Paul. Fest. 263. 8 Th.), (τιττος occurs in an Old Gk.
inscr., Mon. Antichi i. 3. p. 594), a doubling of the Indefinite Pronoun1. We
have quisquis Fem. in O. Latin, e.g. Plaut. Cist. 610 mulier quisquis es (cf.
Nonius, 197. 30 M.). The Neuter quiesquid, a byform of quiesquierid, shows the same
assimilation of a (ε) before a guttural as occurring for adecorro (ch. iv. § 156).
The shortened form of the Gen. Sg. of quis, current in ordinary pronunciation
when not specially emphasized, viz. quoi(s), cui(s), of (§ 22), appears without
its final s in Cicero's eiusimodi; and the I-stem Ablative quiquis occurs more
than once in Plautus in the phrase cum eò, cum quiquis, anyhow, at any cost,
lit. 'with that thing or with whatsoever thing' (Poen. 536. 586). A curious
passage, Cist. 523:

séd facito dum, mécula per ursus quod cantat, tú colas:
‘cum ebo, cum quiquis’ facito ut uéniant,
suggests that Roman children interpreted the alarm-note of the blackbird
into the words: cum ebo, cum quiquis, ne. veni, 'come along! food or no food.'
(Class. Rev. vi. 124.) Quis prefixed to the Adverb quam, quis- quam had the sense of 'any,' and was used especially in negative sentences. Examples
of its use as Fem. in O. Lat. are Ter. Enn. 678 nostrarum numquam quis-
quam uident; Plaut. Rud. 466:

neque digniorum cénseo uidisse anum me quémquam,
and of the I-declension Abl., Plaut. Pers. 477 nec satis a quiquam homine
accep[see § 25 on qui-quam Adv., 'anyhow' (?)], of S. C. Bacch.: neue
pro magistratud neque uirum neque mulierem quiquam fecise uelut, like
néqui- quam, in vain, lit. 'not anyhow,' always so spelt in the Ambrosian
Palimpsest of Plautus’. Another compound of the Indefinite Pronoun,
quius-piam, some, the formation of which was obscure to the Roman gram-
marians (Festus 338. 28 Th. 'quispiam' quin signifięt alíquip, et 'quae-
piam’ aliqua, simuliterque alicia ejusdem generis, ut dubium non est, ita unde
sequens pars ejus coeperit, inveniri non potest), may be a compound of
*quis-pe, of which quiippe for *quiippe is an Adverbial case-form (ch. x. § 7), with
jam, as nuncliam of nunc with jam (ch. iv. § 67). Corresponding to -quam, -piam
of Lat. quiquam, quispiam is Oscan -um of pid-um 'quidquam,' pieis-um
‘cujuspiam.'

1 So quantum quanta's, 'every inch of you,' Ter. Adélph. 394; quantum quantum,
§ 29. V. THE PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES. These are:

(1) *ālius*; I.-Eur. *ālyo-* (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), *ālūt* in the Nom. Sg. Neut. (e.g. Lucr. i. 263). These byforms, which are to be compared with Cornelius, &c. for *Cornēlius* (see ch. vi. § 5), come into special use in the phrase *alis alīum* (e.g. ad *alis alium* and *cum alis alio* in the Vulgate, *alis alīum*, 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 *ali-īno-* (ch. iv. § 12).

(2) *alter* is formed from the root *a*- (al-?), seen in *ālyo-* 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-par, O. Engl. āper, Germ. ander, Lith. ān-tras). It is often used as an Ordinal Numeral, *‘second’*. A stem *altro-* appears in *altro-secus*, *altro-torsum* (Plaut. Cas. 555) and other words (cf. Gk. ἀλλότριος), but in lines like Plaut. Bache. 1184 *alterum*, &c. need not be changed into *altrum*, &c., but may be scanned as dactyls, *altērūm*, &c. (see Klotz, *Altröm. Metrik*, p. 59); even in Pers. 226 *altre* is not certain.

(3) *ālūs* is formed by the LO-suffix (ch. v. § 21) from *ānus* (see ch. iii. § 15. 5), which also belongs to the Pronominal Declension, Gen. *ānuin*, Dat. *āni*. (With quisque appended we have the word-group or compound *ānuin-quisque*.) The opposite of *ālūs* is *nullus* with the negative prefix *nē-* of *n-unquam, n(e)-ntiquam* (pronounced with both first and second syllable short) and the like (ch. ii. § 149); and *nē-nullus*, ‘not a little one,’ ‘not even one,’ was probably anterior in formation to *ullus*, 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 *nē-hemo*. (On *hemo*, 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 *nē-* and *hīrum* (see ch. iii. § 52; ch. vi. § 11).

(4) *sōlus* may be connected with the Adverb *sē-, sēl-,* apart...
(e.g. sed-itio, lit. 'a going apart') (ch. ix. § 51), and be formed of só-, a grade of sé- (ch. iv. § 53), with the suffix -lo. Some refer the word to the stem sollo- of Osc. sollo-, 'whole,' Lat. soll-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 *tuto- (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) uter is one of those Latin Relative (Interrog., Indef.) forms beginning with u- like ùbi, ùt which are discussed in § 26. With the addition of -que, 'ever' (see on quis-que, § 28), it becomes uter-que. The Umbro-Ocean stem is *potro- (Osc. pūturūs-pid Nom. Pl. 'utrique,' pūterē-pid Loc. Sg.; Umbr. sci-podrub-peī 'utroque' Adv. is a formation like sed-utraque Nom. Sg. Fem., 'each separately,' Plaut. Stich. 106). The opposite of uter is neuter, a trisyllable (ch. ii. § 32), with the negative prefix. Alter-uter is a compound of alter and uter, sometimes with both elements declined, sometimes with the second only (cf. § 20 on ipse, Fem. ea-psa, ea-psa and i-psa). 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, ille 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 Neuq, ii3. pp. 516 sqq.). For the Gen. Sing. of alius the Romans discarded altius, 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
§ 28.] THE PRONOUNS. PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES.

the Pronominal Declension. From the stem to- (te-) comes Lat. tālis (I.-Eur. *tāli- of Gk πηλ-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 afferture si 'tanta multa affertori sit') (tantisse pro tantis C. G. L. v. 155. 36), tōl, older tol-, preserved in tōtī-dem (I.-Eur. *tōtī, O. Ind. tātī; cf. Gk. τόσ(σ)ος for *τοριος), 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. πηλ-κοσ; cf. O. Sl. kōlī, koli-kū), quantus (Umbr. panto-), quōt, older quoī (I.-Eur. *quīōtī, O. Ind. kātī; cf. Gk. πόσ(σ)ος for *τοριος), and (with O-suffix) quītus (e. g. Hor. tu quotus esse velis rescribere). (On cōtī-die, see ch. ix. § 5.) The Late Latin use of tantī, quanti for tol, quōt (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 -ā (I.-Eur. *ambhō(u), Gk. ἀμφω), Gen. ambōrum, &c., Dat. ambōbus, &c., Acc. ambōs and ambō -as -ā; 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 ambis 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. ātā, '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. olorum '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. deorum competed with deum 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, (a) the enclitie, e.g. Fr. me, te, mon, ton, (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 nos alteros, vos alteros (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, *suus* (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-l 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 *qua* 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 *certans*) replaced *quidam*. *Àlquis* was joined with *unus* into a Compound *alicunus*, whence Ital. alcuno, Fr. aucun, Span. alguno. (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 -e- or -o-, e.g. Gk. φέρ-ο-μεν, φέρ-ε-τε; (2) the Athematic, in which this vowel, the Thematic Vowel, as it is called, was absent, e.g. Gk. ἰστα-μεν, ἰστα-τε. In the Thematic Conjugation the 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. Act had -ο, e.g. φέρ-ο, Lat. leg-ŏ; the Subjunctive changed the Thematic Vowel of the Indicative to -ε- (and -o-), 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 -mĭ, e.g. Gk. ἵστη-μι; the verb-stem was weakened in the Dual and Plural Act. and in all Numbers of the Middle, e.g. Gk. ἰστα-τοῦ, ἰστα-μεν, ἰστα-μαῖ beside Sg. ἱστη-; the Subjunctive (with strong stem) showed -ε- or -o- between the root and the Person-suffixes, and the Optative (with weak stem) -yē- in Sg. Act., -i- elsewhere, e.g. Gk. ἰστα-ι-ν, ἰστα-ι-μεν (ἵσται-μεν).

We find early Derivative Verbs like I.-Eur. tr-ă- from the root ter-, pl-ĕ- 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-mī 1 Sg., ē-mās 1 Pl., Gk. εἰ-με 1 Sg., εἰ-μεν 1 Pl., Lith. ei-mī) is in Latin eo for *ēy-ō, a thematic form, though other Persons, e.g. 2 Sg. ē-s, older ei-s (*ei-s(i)), are athematic; L.-Eur. *wēl-mī, 'I wish' (Lith. pa-velmi 1 Sg., pa-velt 3 Sg.) is in Latin thematic in 1 Sg. vēl-ō, 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, *sī-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 vendére (Lat. vendēre), potēre (Lat. posse), solēre (Lat. sōlēre), and in the Third dire (Lat. dicēre), empire (Lat. implēre), apparire (Lat. apparēre), seguire (Lat. sēqui), 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. πένθ-ο-μαι from the root bheudh-, πείθ-ω from the root bheidh-, πέτ-ο-μαι from the root pet-, while the weak grade of the root is proper to the Preterite (Aorist) tense, e.g. Gk. ἐ-πένθ-ό-μην, ἐ-πείθ-ό-νυ, ἐ-πέτ-ό-μην. Latin examples (part of the 'Third Conjugation') are: dūco, O. Lat. dūco, for *duco (Goth. tiuha) from the root deu-k-; dico, O. Lat. dēco (Goth. ga-teiha, 'I indicate') from the root dei-k-; veho for *wegh-ō (O. Ind. vāh-a-mi, Lith. vež-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-dō
(O. Ind. bhī-na-dmi) from the root bheid-, or (2) a nasal affix, 
e.g. Lat. īn-ō (O. Ind. īn-nā-mi, O. Scand. īn-na) from the root 
lei-. Latin meió for *meīgh-ō, beside mingo for *mi-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)neīgh(u)-ō (or 
(s)nigh(u)-ō? M. U. iv. 8), beside núnguo for *(s)nī-n-gh(u)-ō, in a line 
of Pacuvius (Praet. 4 R.):

sagittis nīuit, plūmo et saxis grāndinat.

Another affixes -yō- (-yē-) or -īyō- (-īyē-), an affix which often 
varied with ı́ (cf. ch. iv. § 51); e.g. in Latin (part of the Third 
and of the Fourth Conjugations), fārcio (Gk. φάρκεω for *φρακ-γνω), 
with 2 Sg. fāric-s, from the root bhreq(u)- (cf. frequēns), 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 'Ineptives' 
(Third Conj.), with weak grade of root, e.g. porco for *porc-cco, 
from pūk-, the weak grade of the root prēk-ˌ, 'to ask'; a suffix 
-eyō- (with O-grade of root) used to form Causatives (Second 
Conjugation), e.g. Lat. mōneō for *mon-eyō. 'I remind,' lit. 
'cause to remember,' from the root men- (cf. Lat. me-min-ı), 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. nā-ś, nē-ś, many of these Vowel-stems being Deriva-
tives from Nouns and Adjectives (First, Second, and Fourth 
Conjugations), e.g. cūro from cura (stem *curē-), like Gk. τιμά-w 
from τιμά (-y), albeo from albus (stem *albo-, *albe-), fīnio from 
finis (stem fīnī-, fīnei-). 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 
of 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 
ē-μί for *ēs-μέ, Lesb. ēμμ, Alb. jam, Goth. ēm, Lith. es-mi, O. Sl. jes-mi), 
though, if we may believe Varro (L. L. ix. 100), the older form was esum (sum 
quod nunc dicitur olim dicebatur 'esum'); 2 Sg. es [older es(e), scanned long 
by 'position' in Plautus], I.-Eur. *ēs-si (Arm. es, Hom. ēs-σι); 3 Sg. es-t (Osc. 

---

O. Ind. bhī-na-dmi) from the root bheid-, or (2) a nasal affix, 
e.g. Lat. īn-ō (O. Ind. īn-nā-mi, O. Scand. īn-na) from the root 
lei-. Latin meió for *meīgh-ō, beside mingo for *mi-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)neīgh(u)-ō (or 
(s)nigh(u)-ō? M. U. iv. 8), beside núnguo for *(s)nī-n-gh(u)-ō, in a line 
of Pacuvius (Praet. 4 R.):

sagittis nīuit, plūmo et saxis grāndinat.

Another affixes -yō- (-yē-) or -īyō- (-īyē-), an affix which often 
varied with ı́ (cf. ch. iv. § 51); e.g. in Latin (part of the Third 
and of the Fourth Conjugations), fārcio (Gk. φάρκεω for *φρακ-γνω), 
with 2 Sg. fāric-s, from the root bhreq(u)- (cf. frequēns), 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 'Ineptives' 
(Third Conj.), with weak grade of root, e.g. porco for *porc-cco, 
from pūk-, the weak grade of the root prēk-ˌ, 'to ask'; a suffix 
-eyō- (with O-grade of root) used to form Causatives (Second 
Conjugation), e.g. Lat. mōneō for *mon-eyō. 'I remind,' lit. 
'cause to remember,' from the root men- (cf. Lat. me-min-ı), 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. nā-ś, nē-ś, many of these Vowel-stems being Deriva-
tives from Nouns and Adjectives (First, Second, and Fourth 
Conjugations), e.g. cūro from cura (stem *curē-), like Gk. τιμά-w 
from τιμά (-y), albeo from albus (stem *albo-, *albe-), fīnio from 
finis (stem fīnī-, fīnei-). 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 
of 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 
ē-μί for *ēs-μέ, Lesb. ēμμ, Alb. jam, Goth. ēm, Lith. es-mi, O. Sl. jes-mi), 
though, if we may believe Varro (L. L. ix. 100), the older form was esum (sum 
quod nunc dicitur olim dicebatur 'esum'); 2 Sg. es [older es(e), scanned long 
by 'position' in Plautus], I.-Eur. *ēs-si (Arm. es, Hom. ēs-σι); 3 Sg. es-t (Osc.
ist), I.-Eur. *ęs-ti [O. Ind. ás-ti, Gk. ἀς-τι, O. Ir. is for *is-t, Goth. ist-t, Lith. ės-ti and ės-t, O. Sl. (Russ.) jēs-ti]; 1 Pl. sînumus and sînum (ch. ii. § 16), I.-Eur. *s-mes, *s-mos (O. Ind. s-más); 2 Pl. es-tis should be *es-tis, I.-Eur. *s-tē (O. Ind. s-thā), but cf. Gk. ἐς-τε, Lith. ės-te; 3 Pl. sunt (older sōnt) from *sont(i) beside I.-Eur. *senti (Goth. s-ind), as Umb. sent, Osc. set; the I.-Eur. Optative, s-yē-m (*s-yē-m) 1 Sg., *s-yē-s (*s-yē-s) 2 Sg., *s-i-mos 1 Pl., &c., is reproduced with some fidelity in O. Lat. s-tē-s, s-i-mus, though the vowel i extended itself in time over Sg. as well as Plur., class. Lat. sīm, sīs, sit (§ 55), as in Umb. sir 'sis,' si 'sit,' sīns 'sint'; in the Imperative we should expect *ēs, 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-tō(d) (cf. Gk. ἄς-τω); the Inf. is es-se, the Loc. Sg. of an S-stem, as the Umbro-Oscan *es-om (Osc. ezun, Umb. erom) is the Acc. Sg. of an O-stem (ch. v. § 2); EI- 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 Pers. Ind., 2 Sg. īs, older e-is, 3 Sg. īt, older eit, 1 Pl. ī-mus, older e-i-mus, with strong stem ei-as in Lith. ei-me, ei-te, instead of weak stem ei- (possibly with a bygrade i like O. Ind. i-mahē 1 Pl. Mīd.; but Pol. ei-te 2 Pl. Imper. points to an original ei- for Latin also), 2 Pl. i-tis older ei-tis (with ei- again for i-), except the 3 Plural es-unt from *ey-o-nt(ī), unless -onti was an I.-Eur. byform of -enti in the Athematic Conjugation (cf. sunt from *sont(i)); the form int of the Philoxenus Glossary (p. 75. 23 G.: int, ὀπέθυρα) is too doubtful to quote as an athematic 3 Pl., for it may be a wrong reading for imunt (cf. procl-imunt, red-imunt, ob-imunt), 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. ire older ei-re from *ei-si, Imper. i older ei (Lith. ei-k), i to older ei-t(ī) (with ei-, as in Umbr. ee-tu, for i- of Gk. ἐ-τ(ί), § 57); ED- is thematic in 1 Sg. ed-o (Gk. Fut. ἐδ-o-μας is a Subjunctive form, and is quite regular), but athematic in the other persons, which often show a byform ed- (Lith. ed-mi and ed-u 1 Sg., ēs-t 3 Sg.) (thus Donatus ad Ter. Andr. i. r. 54 distinguishes ut una esset, Subj. of edo, from ut una esset, 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 1.-Eur. -dt- in est 3 Sg. &c., see ch. iv. § 155; on Imperat. es, § 58, below). The byforms edit, eítīs, &c. need not be new Latin types, for there are indications that in the I.-Eur. period this root wavered between the Thematic and Athematic Conjugations (cf. Lith. éd-u for *ēd-o beside éd-mi; Goth. ita for *ēd-o); WELL- was probably declined: 1 Sg. *wél-mi, 2 Sg. *wél-si, 3 Sg. *wél-ti, 1 Pl. *wél-mos or -mōs, &c.; Lat. vīdō, vult (volt) are the normal equivalents of *wělō, *welt(ī) (see ch. iv. § 10 on větra from Gk. ἱλάτα, &c.), so that the 1 Sg. is thematic, as are possibly also the 1 Pl. and 3 Pl. (cf. sumus, sunt), while the 3 Sg. and 2 Pl. are athematic; for the 2 Sg. *wels, which would become *vel(ī) (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. *trīs], the Romans substituted the

The analogy of the Thematic Conj. (so Late Lat. feris, auffere, on which see Georges), or to the ordinary weakening of unaccented ā (so possimus, § 97, sīmus, ch. ii. § 16). On the spelling quaesumus see below, § 33-4.
2 Sg. of a different Verb-root we-, 'to wish' (O. Ind. vi-, with 2 Sg. vē-si, Gk ἠτέμον [I.-Eur. weL-, weL-, weK- (Gk. ἥλω) all mean 'to wish,' and are probably connected); the athematic Imper. vēl (vēl in Plautus too) has become a Conjunction (ch. x. § 4), while the Imper. nōtī of the Compound, has been variously referred to a system of the Fourth Conjunction (I.-Eur. *weL-yō-<, Goth. vilja; O. Sl. velįg), with Imper. *vēlti, like fārcēi, § 57, and to the Optative (cf. 2 Pl. Opt. nōtitīs with 2 Pl. Imper. nōtī; also 1 Pl. nōtīmus, used both in an optative and an imperative sense). The root BHER- belonged to the Thematic Conjugation (Gk. φερ-ω, O. Ir. -biur from *ber-o, Goth. bair-a; cf. 3 Sg. O. Ind. bair-a-ti for *bher-e-ti, Arm. ber-e-ti, O. Sl. ber-e-tů; athematic forms however appear, O. Ind. bair-ti 3 Sg., bhr-tām 2 Du.; cf. Gk. φερ-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 3 Sg. Pres. Ind., fer-tis 2 Pl. (with strong stem fer- instead of weak stem for-), I.-Eur. bhr-; cf. Gk. φερ-τε), fer Imper., fer-re (for *fer-se from *fer-si, ch. iv. § 146; ch. iii. § 37) Inf., while 2 Sg. *fer-r [this is what an original *fer-s(t) 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-, ient- and iunt-, velent- and velunt-, see § 90; and on the Optatives sim, O. Lat. stem, olim, velim, § 56; the Compounds possum, mādo, nādo, &c. are discussed in § 97, ambio in § 46).

Of I.-Eur. athematic Verbs of the type of O. Ind. dā-ti 3 Sg. (Gk. δίω-μο, ἱττη-μο, &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. cātus and cōs, ch. iv. § 54), while 2 Sg. dās, 3 Sg. dāt (O. Lat. dāt, probably so scanned in Plautus, e. g. Most. 60r, Men. 101), show a instead of ə, *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, sibē, ch. iii. § 42), for the ordinary form dō is coined on the type of the 1st Conjugation; the 2, 3 Sg. dā-to is however the correct athematic form, also 2 Pl. dā-te, and Inf. dā-re, older *dā-si. 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. dō is probably *dō-yō (cf. O. Sl. da-jā), and the reduplicated Present-stem of Gk. δι-δωμ, Pelignian didā 'det &c. (§ 9) may appear in reddo, if this stands for re-dī(d)ā. DHE-, to put, appears in the Latin compounds con-dō, crē-dō (O. Ind. šrād-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 fā-, ch. iv. § 114; cf. fācio, I.-Eur. *dāh-k-yyyy, from DHE-K-, Gk. θηχω-a, an extension of the root by addition of k); thus, though condimus, condīt should have *dēs, *dēt (O. Lat. *dēt, class. *dēt, ch. iii. § 49), con-dāmus may represent *dāmus, con-dātis, *dātis, and though 2 Sg. Imper. con-dē should be *dē (Lith. dē k), 3 Sg. con-dīto, 2 Pl. con-dītē may represent *dā-tō, *dā-te, and Inf. con-dēre, *dē-si. (On Opt. dūin from the stem *duo, a system both of Dō- and of DHE-, see § 56.) The roots STA- and BHA- (Gk. ὑστη-μι 1 Sg., ἱστα-μεν 1 Pl.; φυ-μι 1 Sg., φα-μεν 1 Pl.) are treated like the type trā- (a development of the root ter-; see below) and retain ā throughout, sta-s, sta-mus, sta-re, &c., fū-tēr, fā-mar, fā-ri, &c. (cf. Gk. ἵστημεν, ἵστηρε, forming the 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. with the suffix -yo, stō from
*stā-yō (Umbr. stahu, Lith. stō-jūs, 'I station myself,' O. Sl. sta-ja; cf. Zend ā-stāyah, but see Buck, Ὅσκ. Σφρ. p. 24), fo(r) from *bhā-yō (Lith. bōju, '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. fatum Inf.) ; the reduplicated Present-stem of the former (Gk. ἥτη-μυ for *αν-ατη-μυ), in Lat. si-st-o, which usurped the transitive sense that had in O. Lat. belonged to sta, e.g. med Mano statod, 'set me as an offering to Manus,' on the Dvenos inscription, 'astasent' (leg. -int?) statuteunt (leg. -int?) Paul. Fest. 19. 12. 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. ἥτημυ for *αν-ατημυ) and perhaps se-rē (Gk. ἥτημυ) (cf. § 9. An athematic a Sg. Imper. from the root BHEU- (of Lat. fui) occurs in the Carmen Arvalem, fu (Lith. būk, Umbr. fu-tu), if rightly understood in the sense of 'be' : satur fu, fere Mars.

Of I.-Eur. athematic verbs of the type of O. Ind. prā-mi (Łak. πιν(μ)πατμυ) with root plē, a development of root pel- (the strong grade plē- never varying with any weak grade), the Latin examples are : PLE- (cf. PEL-), im-plēre, ex-plēre; TRĀ- (cf. TĒR-), in-trāre, &c. These form the i Sg. Pres. Ind. thematically with the thematic suffix -yo, e.g. im-plēo for *plē-yō, in-trō for *trā-yō (the thematic byforms with this perhaps exist in the I.-Eur. period, e.g. O. Ind. trā-yā-ta beside trā-ti), but the other persons athematically, im-plē-s, in-trā-s, im-plē-t (O. Lat. -ēt), in-trā-t (O. Lat. -ēt), im-plē-mus, in-trā-mus, &c., as also the other parts of the verb, Imper. im-plē-re, im-plē-to, in-trā-to, Inf. im-plē-re, in-trā-re.

Like them were declined other verbs whose stems ended in long vowels or diphthongs, e.g. I.-Eur. *wid-ē (a stem perhaps originally confined to Secondary Tenses, *wid-yō being the stem used in the Present Tense; see § 15), Derivative Verbs from ā-stems, e.g. cārā from the Noun cāra (stem cārā-, ch. v. § 2), from I-stems, e.g. finei- from the Noun finis (stem finei-, fini-, ch. v. § 34), but not from U-stems (e.g. stātus from status, § 15), nor possibly (1) those from O-stems (e.g. flāveo from flāvus), (2) Causatives and Intensives with i Sg. Pres. Ind. in-ēyō (e.g. mōneō, Causative of root men-; f. mēmīnī; 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 *monēs, as well as *mon-eýēs (cf. trēs for *trēyēs, ch. iv. § 66), monē Imper. may come from *monē, a stem in -ē, or *mon-eýē. In the P. P. P. however the two types are distinct, monē-tus, with I.-Eur. weak stem monī-, im-plē-tus with stem plē-, as in the Perfect Ind. Act. mon-ūi, im-plē-vi; see § 39. 4). Farcio (Gk. φάκειον for *φακεύω) 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 -yē, on the other with -i and -ī; the divergent roads which they have taken in Latin are perhaps due to the fact that in the declension of fācio the weak suffix -i asserted itself (Imper. O. Lat. face for *facē, cāpe for *capēi), in the other the weak suffix -i (Imper. farēi), and this assertion of the long vowel brought with it a transference to the Athematic type, fārcē-re beside face-re from *facē-re, though the original difference between fārcio and a Derivative like finīo, is still maintained in the Perf. Ind. Act. far-si, for *farē-si; beside finī-vi, and P. P. P. fār-tus, older farcē-tus, beside finē-tus. (On these stems with suffix -yo, and on the Derivative Verbs and stems ending in vowels which form their i Sing. Pres. Ind. with the help of this suffix, see §§ 15, 21.)
§ 3. II. THE TENSE-STEMS (STRONG AORIST AND S-FORMATIONS). The Tense-stems are formed by various modifications of the root. From the root ġen- for example is formed by Reduplication (with ī as Reduplication-vowel and with weak grade of root) the Present-stem ġi-ġn- (Lat. gignō, Gk. γιγνομαι), expressive of continued action in Present time, 'I am producing,' and by another species of Reduplication [with ē as Reduplication-vowel and in the Singular (see § 39) with the O-grade of the root] the Perfect-stem ġe-ġon- (Gk. γέγονα) 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 ġen- (Gk. ἐ-γεν-ό-μην), and so the O. Lat. form genuit (Varro, Sal. Menipp. 35 B. sed quod haec loca aliquid genuit; cf. Luær. 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 ġen- (with the thematic vowel ġeno-, ġene- as in Gk. ἐ-γενώ-μην, ἐ-γενώ-το) is in O. Ind. used as a Present, jána-ti 3 Sg., and the exact equivalent of Gk. ἐ-γενο- (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, ġn- (ġn-), a-jña-ta 3 Pl. Thus in this verb it would be more correct to say that the Present-stem was both ġi-ġn- and ġen-, 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. privicdoes 'priviculis' (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. ś-ciḥā-t), scidl- being the weak grade of the root secid-, a root which forms its Present-stem in Latin by Nasalization, scindr-. But, as is pointed out in § 41, scidit is more likely to be a Reduplicated Perfect (O. Lat. sci-ći-di, O. Ind. ci-chidā), and to have lost its Reduplication syllable in Compounds like dissicidit (O. Lat. -ūt, -eut) for *dis-sci-cidit, like re-pūlit for *re-pe-pūlit), the Perfect having in Latin come to assume Aorist functions, e.g. dēdī (1) I have given, (2) I gave. Where the Aorist-usage most shows traces of itself in Latin is in phrases like nē atīgas (Subjunctive of an Aorist-stem tāg- beside the Present-stem tāg-), 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. sīnu 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. sī-vi, sī-tum) (cf. tango Pres., tēligi Perf., tacc-tus Verbal Noun). But in a verb like Lat. jungō the Nasal is extended throughout the Verb (e.g. junxi, junctum, § 10). Similarly the ‘Inceptive’ suffix of cre-sco is properly dropped in cre-vi, cre-tum, but the same suffix is in posco (for *pore-sco, I.-Eur. *prk-skō-) extended to Perf. pūposci, &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 trēm-, trēs-, formed from the root ter- (O. Ind. tar-alā-, ‘trembling’) by means of an M-suffix (Gk. τρέμ-ω, Lat. trēm-ō) and an S-suffix (Gk. τρεί-(ς)-ω, Lat. terreo for *ters-ec), 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. trása-ti and tar-ása-ti, Gk. τφέτω; cf. Lat. terreo for *ter-s-); and in a stem like auk-s- of Gk. αὐξάω (cf. αὐξάω) from the root aug- (Lat. angeo), this S-suffix is clearly connected with the S-suffix (-es-, -os-, -s-) of the Noun *augos, *auges-os Gen. (O. Ind. ὄξας, 'strength'; cf. Lat. augustus like ρόβωs-tus, fūnes-tus, ch. v. § 71), precisely as in Derivative Verbs like Gk. τελεῖ(ο)-ω, Pft. Pass. τελέεσσα-ται, from the Noun τέλος, Gen. τελε(ο)-os; and this Noun S-suffix we shall find to be the suffix used in Infinitives like Lat. āgere for *āg-es-i Loc. Sg., ferrē for *bher-s-i Loc. Sg., ferrī for *bher-s-i Dat. Sg., Gk. δεῖξαι, &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 -syo-, e.g. O. Ind. āg-yō (stem bhūg-yo-) stand side by side with Present-stems like Gk. φεύγω (stem bheug-o-). This suffix -syo- is however usually the suffix of the Future-stem (e.g. O. Ind. dek-śyā-mi from I.-Eur. deik-, Lith. bú-siu from I.-Eur. bheu-), but not of the ordinary Greek Futures, e.g. deîξω, φύσω, τυμήσω, 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 τυμίησομεν Fut., τυμίησομεν Aor. Subj., δείξομεν Fut., δείξομεν Aor. Subj. being explained by the fact that originally the Subjunctive of the S-Aorist was Athematic (§ 1), τυμήσα-ο-μεν, δείξιο-ο-μεν (cf. τελέσομεν 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. τυμήσω, ετύμησα, &c. must have had at the first double s, *τυμίησω (-άσω), ετύμησα (-άσα), for s between vowels in Greek disappeared when single (e.g. γενέω(ο)-os), and was reduced when double (e.g. εύσα from the root eus-, for *εύσα, cf. Lat. īs-si, ch. ii. § 129), as in Latin it became r when single (e.g. gēnēr-is, quaero), and was reduced in the classical
period after a long vowel or diphthong (ἰλ.) when double (e.g. *quaeso, older quaessio, haesi, older haessi). Gk. τίμησο, older -ἀσσω, will then correspond to O. Lat. amasso, Gk. δεῖξο to O. Lat. dixo and similar forms. We have also Latin forms in ss used as Present, but always with a peculiar sense (§ 33. 5), e.g. læcessō (cf. lacio, lacto), fascessō (cf. facio), cupressō (cf. capio), incipissō Plaut. (cf. incipio), pētesso (cf. peto; in O. Lat. petissere, 'saepius petere') Fest. 250. 19 Th., adpetissis Accius, Trag. 160 R.; cf. petivi), quaeso (cf. quaero), viso (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-jīvā-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, laccsivi, quaesivi (used as Pft. of quaero), arcessivi, perhaps point to parallel stems in -ss-yo-, *lacessio, *quaessio, *arcessio (cf. the I.-Eur. Fut. in -syo-, Lith. bū-sius beside Gk. φῦ-σω) (on visi, see § 41). Other O. Lat. s-forms (Subjunctive or rather Optative, § 55), like aecrruncassis, 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 Preclatives (more usual in the older literature than in classical 'Sanskrit') 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, faxo, faxim, dixo, dialim) 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. ἐτύμησα (-ασσα), ἐφιλησα (-ησα) in Latin; but, if Umbro-Ocean tt is rightly interpreted as the equivalent of I.-Eur. ss (cf. Att. πράττω for πράσσω, this σι being a Greek development of ky), they do occur in this usage in the other Italic languages, Osc. teremnattens 'terminaverunt,' quasi *terminassunt, prutfattd 'probavit;' quasi *probassit, diuunated 'donavit' quasi *donassit, Pel. coisatens 'euraverunt' 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-rem would be resolved into ama-s-so, and possibly *dixo into dei-c-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 -is- 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, e.s., 'to be' (it appears in the form s in ama-rem, fer-rem, age-rem, &c.), though some regard it as the suffix -es- of Noun-stems, comparing vid-ero to Gk. εἰδέ(σ)ιον, videreimus Subj. to Gk. εἰδε(σ)μεν Οπτ., and these to Gk. εἰδος, -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. á-vēd-iṣam, dixeram to O. Ind. Aorists with -siṣ- such as अक्षिष्ट 3 Pl., and identify this -is- or -as-, as well as -es-, with the suffix of Noun S-stems (e.g. O. Ind. rōcīṣ- N., Gk. γήπας, θύμος-, Lat. ovis), and further with Latin -is- of amav-is-īs, amav-is-sen, 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. δεῖξαμι, δείκταω, &c. continue the a of δεῖξα (see §§ 67, 52, 39). The Umbro-Oscan Future forms, e.g. Osc. dīlest '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 amaverunt, amavero,
and *amaverim*, and also such as *invassem* beside *invasisse*, *dixem* beside *dixisset*, *dixit* and *dixisti* beside *dixisti* and *dixisti*. There is nothing in the laws of Latin Phonetics to prevent the Contraction Theory from being right; *audvissem* would become *audisset* as naturally as *sì vis* became *sís*, *oblivisci* became *oblisi* (Plaut.), *divinus*, *dinnus* (Plaut.) (see ch. iv. § 70); *invasisse* would become *invasse* by that Roman practice of discarding one of two similar neighbouring syllables which reduced *ärcicubii* to *arcübii*, *Resticutus* to *Restüts* (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*, *amarm* with *amarem* 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 *jürigo* (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. Beside the Nasalized Present-stem *tong*- of *tango*, *attingo* we find a stem *tōg*—in O. Lat. In the Dramatists *attigas*, *attigatis* (only in prohibitions) are not uncommon, e.g. Plaut. *Bacch.* 445 ne *attigas puerum istac causa* (cf. Non. 75. 26 M.). A lamp discovered in the very ancient Esquiline burying-ground bears the inscription: ne *stigas non sum tua. M. sum* (Ann. Inst. 1830, p. 260). In the simple verb we have, e.g. *si tegit, nisi tagam* in Paucius (Trag. 344 and 165 K.) (forms compared to *con-tigit, at-tigit* by Festus 540. 27 M.), and probably *tōgo* in Plaut. *Mil. 192*:

remorāré: abeo. Neque té remoror neque té tago neque to—táceo.

Similarly beside the Nasalized Present-stem *tōn*- of *toll*., *attollo* (cf. *affero*), *abstollo* (cf. *aufero*) we have *attulas, abstulas*, &c. (or in the older spelling *attolae, abstolae*) in prohibitions in the Dramatists, e.g. Novius, *Com.* 87 R. *dotem ad nos nullam attulas*; Paucus. *Trag.* 228 R. :

cūstodite istūne uos: ne uim qui *āttolat, neu 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, peruenat*, &c. (e.g. Plaut. *metuo ne aduenat, priusquam peruenat, utinam euenat, quomodo
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 attigas, attulas, &c.), and so are licences 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 ãbiczo (the scansion of the Dramatists) and possibly augur/i/ of Accius (see ch. ii. § 50), on the plea that the Aor.-stem would be ven,-r, for the n is produced from m under the influence of the following consonantal (y), *ven-yo (I.-Eur. *§em-yo-, Gk. βαίρα for *βαύρα) becoming ven-po, vénio, as quom-jam became quómiuam (ch. iv. § 72). The root is §em- (cf. Goth. qiman, ‘to come’). Similarly beside πério, to give birth to, we have parentes. Beside the Reduplicated Present gi-gu-no from the root gen-, we have an O. Lat. Present geno (cf. Priscian, i. 528. 25 H.) of the common type of fero (root bher-), echo (root wegh-), segor (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 facillime 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 ni pia pacvnt, the last word was 3 Plur. of a verb *paco (whence páciscor; but cf. § 28), or with the old usage of writing c both for c and for g, of a verb paco (an unasalized form of pungo; cf. pēpīgī) (see ch. i. § 6). (On ridentes, the ropes of a ship, see below, § 6.)

§ 5. O. Lat. forms with -ss- (-s-). The forms in -(s)so 1 Sg. may be called Future-Perfects; thus faxo corresponds to fecivo in Plaut. fr. 62 W.: peribo si non fecero, si fáxó uapulábó,

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 impotassere, illum confido me reconcillassere, and occur sometimes in the Passive Voice in laws, e.g. mercassitur (C. I. L. i. 200. 71); faxituer in an old Rogatio mentioned by Livy, xxii. 10. 6: si antidea senatus populusque iussisset fieri, ac faxitor; turbassitur in a law in Cicero, De Legg. iii. 4. 11; cf. uti iussitur, ‘as shall be ordered,’ Cato R. R. xiv. 1.

The forms in -(s)sim 1 Sg. have never a reference to past time like the ordinary Perfect Subjunctive; contrast, for example, Plaut. Capt. 127 uisam ne nocét hac (‘last night’) quippiam turbauinert, with Paucuivos, Trag. 297 R. precor neniám petens Ut quae égi, ago, vel áxim uerrocndént bene (see A. L. L. ii. 223); they are frequent in Plautus, who normally uses cææ dixis, cææ faxis, &c., and not (except at the end of a line, i.e. for metrical convenience) cææ dixeris, cææ 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 ausim, faxim, which are found in the main clause), e.g. Aul. 225 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. 59 utinám me diui adáxint ad suspéndium, in prayers, as in the Augural Prayer (quoted by Festus, 526. 11 Th.): bene sponsis beneque uolueris, and with ne in deprecations, e.g. Plaut. Most. 1697 ne occupassis opsecro aram, and expressions of anxiety, e.g. Plaut. Bacch. 598: 

h h
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mihi caúitost
ne núcifrangiulia excüssit ex malis meis.

These usages mark the forms in -ı̂̂̂ sım as the Optative Mood of the forms in -ı̂̂̂ s. This -ı̂̂̂ s- formation appears in Vowel Verbs almost only in the first Conjugation, though we find in the second prohíbíssıt, prohíbíssı̂̂̂ t and prohíbíssı̂̂̂ sis occasionally, cohibíssıt (Lecr. iii. 444), excüssıt (Plaut. Asin. 603), &c., while for the fourth ambíssıt (MSS. ambíssıt) in the (un-Plautine ?) prologue of the Amphiı̂̂̂ tro of Plautus, l. 71, is quoted. In Terence these forms of Vowel Verbs are very rare, e. g. appellàssı̂̂̂ s, Phorm. 742. In Consonant-stems of the third Conjugation they are found in poetry of all periods (făxı̂̂̂ m and ausı̂̂̂ m even in prose); examples are (Labials) caspo, ascesso, incepsıt, (Gutturals) axı̂̂̂ m, taxı̂̂̂ m, inesı̂̂̂ t, nowıt, (Dentals) baesiıs (C. G. L. ii. 27. 55), inescı̂̂̂ t, (Nasals) empı̂̂̂ s, surempı̂̂̂ s (Fest.). [For other instances, see Neu, ii7. 539 sqq.; essı̂̂̂ s of the MSS. of Nonius (200. 30 M.) in a line of Accius [Trég. (Præst.) 16 R.], quoted as an example of castra F.: cæstra haec uestra est: optime essis méri-
tus a nobis, seems a mistranslating of essis (cf. below, § 33. 5); adessı̂̂̂ s of the Lex Repetundarum (C. I. L. i. 198. l. 63) may stand for ad-essent (cf. ch. vi. § 33); niolosı̂̂̂ s (C. I. L. xi. 1766, with annua) and similar forms with s for ss belong to the period when double consonants were written single (ch. i. § 8).]


Of EI-roots: I.-Eur. *bheidhë-, *bheidhë-, 'to be trusting' (Gk. πείθω-μαί, Goth. beida, 'I abide'), Lat. fidō from O. Lat. fëido; I.-Eur. *deikë-, *deikë-, 'to be showing, indicating' (Goth. ga-teiha, Germ. zeige), Lat. dico from O. Lat. dëico; I.-Eur. *meighë-, *meighë- (O. Ind. mēhā-mi, O. Engl. mige), Lat. meio. Of EU-roots: I.-Eur. *deukë-, *deukë-, 'to be leading, drawing' (Goth. tiuha, Germ. ziehe), Lat. dëco, O. Lat. douco for *deukō (ch. iv. § 37); I.-Eur. *eusë-, *eues-, 'to be burning, singeing' (O. Ind. ḍësā-mi, Gk. εὐω for εὐδω), Lat. uro, O. Lat. *onro from *eusō; I.-Eur. *plevë-, *plewë-, 'to be flowing, sailing, swimming' (O. Ind. plāva-tē 3 Sg. Mid., Gk. πλέω(F)ω, O. Sl. plovq for *plew-), Lat. pluo from O. Lat. plovo (cf. Fest. 330. 29 Th. 'pateram perplovere' in sacris cum dicitur, significat pertusam esse; so plovebat, Petron. 44. p. 30. i B.). (The form pluo is proper to Compounds, e. g. perploo, 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 conjugaison 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. τραπεύω Aor. but τρέπειν Pres., πηδέσθαι Aor. but πεδέσθαι Pres., πυθέσθαι Aor. but πεθέσθαι Pres.), has sometimes encroached on the Pres.-stem, e.g. Dor. Gk. τράπω beside Att. τρέπω, Gk. γλύφω beside L.-Eur. *γλευβό- (Lat. gōbo, O. H. G. chlubu, Engl. cleave). Similarly Lat. rūdo (O. Ind. rūdā-mi) beside rūdo (O. H. G. riuzu) seems to show *rūdō- beside *reūdō-, so that rūdentes, the ropes of a ship, lit. ‘the rattlers,’ ‘roarers,’ might be called an ‘Aorist’ participle (§ 4). [In Plautus we have rūdentes, Rud. 1015 mittē rūdentēm, seeleste, as rūdo in Persius, iii. 9 Arcadiae pecuaria rūdere ceras.] The Pft. rūdivi (Apuleius) and Verbal Noun rūditus point to a Pres.-stem *rūd-yō-, like ūglo, § 15.]

Examples of Verbs which have not an E-root are: rūdo, I. A going (the weak grade vād-l- is seen in vādum, a ford); caedo, from older caido, I.-Eur. (s)kaidh- (Goth. skaida, cf. Engl. watershed); ūgo, I.-Eur. *ūgō (O. Ind. ājāmi, Gk. āγω, M. Ir. again, &c.; the strong stem ūg- is seen in Lat. amb-āges, &c.); scūbo, to scrape, I.-Eur. skabḥ- (Goth. skaba, ‘I shave’; the strong stem skūbh- perhaps appears in Perf. scūbi; see § 39).

§ 7. Other examples. Lat. tegō (Gk. στέγω); vegō (Gk. ἑρέω); legō (Gk. λέγω). Like O. Lat. nīvit, beside nīguit, for *sneigbhd- (Zend snādagaiti, Gk. οἶπε, Lith. dial. snėga) is O. Lat. fito for *dheigbdh- (?). (Lith. dągja Intr.), for which ūgo was afterwards substituted by Analogy of ūxī, &c. The form with ū, which we are told, was used by Cato [Paul. Fest. 65. 19 Th. ‘fivere’ (apud Catomen pro fīgere), reappears in the derivative fībula for *fēi-būla (cf. fiscul-ae, Paul. Fest. 64. 7 Th. ‘fīxulas,’ fībulas). (Lith. dygūs however points to *dhigebhd-, and we have fīgier, not fei- on the S. C. Bacch.).

O. Lat. amplōctor (veteres immutaverunt ‘amplōctor’ crebro dictantes, Dion. 384. 8 K.), e.g. Liv. Andr. Odysse:\n
ūtrum génua amplōctens uirginem orāret, may take its o from a Derivative Noun (cf. toga from tegō, ch. iv. § 52, and see below, § 33. 3). The o of oēgu for *quē-guō (O. Ind. pac-, Gk. πέκαω, O. Sl. pekš) has been similarly referred to the influence of oēquus.

§ 8. Weak grade of root. Verto is in O. Lat. verto (Plaut., &c.), so that instead of showing the vowel ē of L.-Eur. *wēt-ō (O. Ind. vārtaē 3 Sg. Mid., Goth. vairja, ‘I become’), it seems to show the o of the Perfect, O. Lat. vort (with weak-grade of stem, wr-, as in O. Ind. va-wrēt-ō Perf. Mid.) and the P. P. P., O. Lat. avortus for *wēt-to (O. Ind. vṛt-tā). But in Umbr. we find vert- in the Present, vorb- in the Perfect and Verbal Noun, ku-vertu, co-vertu ‘convertito,’ ku-vurtus, ‘converteris,’ co-vortus, vorsum Acc. πελόνν. 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) vorbo. O. Lat. vorro for *verro (O. H. G. wirru, ‘verwirre’) may be similarly explained. In Gk. γίνο- o-mai Pres., ἐ-φν-δ-μν 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), *peteō 1 Sg., whence the Perfect petivi.

Other examples of the unaccented verb-form of a Latin Compound asserting itself in the uncompound verb are: clādo for claudio (see ch. ii. § 36); luo for lavo (Sil. Ital. xi. 22); sāicio, sēco for specio, seco (see ch. ii. § 12). (For additional instances, e.g. pīco, see Solmsen, Stud. Lantg. p. 130.)

§ 9. (2) With reduplicated root. Latin examples are: gigno [I.-Eur. *ĝi-ĝnō-, *ĝi-ĝn-ē from root ĝen-, 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-bō-, *pī-bē-, O. Ind. pī-ba-ti 3 Sg., O. Ir. ibi-d; cf. Faliscan pipa-fo Fut.), siato (I.-Eur. *sī-stō-, *sī-stē- from root stā-, O. Ind. tīsth-ti 3 Sg.), sūdo for *sē-sīdo (ch. iv. § 151) (I.-Eur. *sī-zdō-, *sī-zdē- from root sed-, O. Ind. sī-da-ti 3 Sg. for *sisd-, Umbr. ander-sistu ‘intersidito’ Imper., for *sisd(e)-tōd). Often these Reduplicated Present-stems belong to the Athematic Conjugation, e.g. Gk. ἱστή-μι for *sī-stē-mī (O. H. G. sestō-m), beside Lat. sīsto, O. Ind. tīsth-mi; and Latin sistēmus, sistētis correspond as well with the Greek ἵστα-μεν, ἵστα-τε, as with the thematic forms. Similarly Gk. ἱμα- (I.-Eur. *sī-sē-, athematic) is in Latin thematic in sēro for *sī-so, though serī-mus, serī-tis may be equally referred to athematic *sīsa- as to thematic *sisē-, *sisē-; I.-Eur. *dī-dō-, athematic (Gk. ὀδω-μι, O. Ind. dādā-mi) has in Latin lost its reduplication, except in reddo, if this stands for re-di(d)ō as repuli, repperi for re-r(e)pulī, re-r(e)peri, but not in Umbro-Oscan (Pelignt. diāra pronounced *diāa?). All these Latin examples reduplicate with the vowel i, and most belong to roots ending in a long vowel. Some Greek Aorist-stems show this reduplication with the vowel e, e.g. ἐ-πεφν-ν from root φεν-, ἐ-κέκλε-το from root κέλ-, πεπίθ-ῶν from root πεθ-, πεπύθ-ῶτο from root πευθ-, by analogy of which the spurious Presents πεφνο, κέκλομαι 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-ñā-j-mi I Sg., yūñā-j-mās I Pl., yuvāk-tē 3 Sg. Mid. (Lat. jīt-n-gō), from the root yuj- (I.-Eur. yeug-), the other two showing a nasal affix, viz. the ninth conjugation with -nū- varying with a weak grade (O. Ind. -nī-), e.g. str-ñā-mi I Sg., str-ñā-mās I Pl., str-ñū-tē 3 Sg. Mid. (Lat. ster-nō), and the fifth conjugation with I.-Eur. -neu- (O. Ind. -nū-) varying with -nū-, e.g. r-ñō-mi I Sg., r-ñū-mās I Pl., r-ñū-tē 3 Sg. Mid. (Gk. ὅρ-νῦ-μι). In Greek the type of Present corresponding to the Sanscrit seventh conjugation has only -n-, never -nē-, and has been usually modified by the addition either of a nasal affix, e.g. not *λκ-μ-πω (Lat. lī-n-gnō) but λκμ-π-άνω (so τυ-γ-χ-άνω, λανθ-θ-άνω, &c.), or of the -YO- suffix, e.g. κλαζω for *κλαγγγγγ (cf. ἐκλαγγγ) (Lat. clango); the Sanscrit ninth conjugation is represented by σκιδ-νη-μι I Sg., σκιδ-να-μεν I Pl., σκιδ-να-μαί Mid., πίτ-η-μι I Sg., πίτ-να-μεν I Pl., πίτ-να- μαί Mid., &c.; the Sanscrit fifth conjugation by ἀγ-νδ-μι I Sg., ἀγ-νδ-μεν I Pl., ἀγ-νδ-μαί Mid., σκεδάννυμι, πετάννυμι, &c. In Sanscrit all these nasalized stems belong to the Athematic Conjugation, though we have thematic byforms like 3 Sg. yuñjāti, ῥνvāti; but in Greek the first type mentioned is always thematic, e.g. λμπάνω, the others occasionally, e.g. πτνάω, δαμνάω (byforms of πτνημι, δάμνημι), ἵχανανω, &c., στρωννυω, τρωννυο, ὅρινω for ὅρμινω, &c., while we have another type with -nev, e.g. ἵκνεωμαι, ὑπνεχνεόμαι, 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-gnō (O. Ind. rī-ñā-c-mi I Sg., rī-ñ-c-mās I Pl., Pruss. po-linka, 'he remains'; cf. Gk. λυμπάνω), from root leiq2- (Gk. λείπω, Lith. lēk, Goth. leihva, 'I lend,' Germ. leihe); fīn-dō (O. Ind. bhñ-nā-d-mi) from root bheid-
(Goth. beita, ‘I bite’). The variation of -nē- and -n- seen in O. Ind. rī-ṇā-c-mi 1 Sg., rī-ṇā-c-mās 1 Pl., is not seen in other languages, where the weak grade -n- is used throughout. The Latin Presents conquire (Perf. conquexus), 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 e (g) in the group -esc- as in disco for *ūic-sco (ch. iv. § 157), and with i by analogy of other Inceptives (see § 28); and Gk. κν-νέ-(σ)-ω, Αor. ε-κνό-α, may do the same. These forms with nasal infix are often augmented by the YŌ-suffix (§ 15), e.g. Gk. πτύσω for *πτύνω-γω, πλάζω, to beat, for *πλαγγ-γω (cf. ἐ-πλαγγξά), κλάζω for *κλαγγ-γω (cf. ἐ-κλαγγξά), Lith. jungiu, beside Lat. pinso, plango, clango, and jungo; and so in Lat. pinso, sancio (cf. sāc-er), vincio (from the root vyek-). English examples of nasal infix are: ‘I spring,’ from *spr-ν-γhō, from the root spergh- (Gk. σπέρχομαι); ‘I wring,’ from the root wergh- (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. ฤ-ฤ- (O. Ind. ฤ-ฤ-mi, Gk. λί-να-ματ, τρέπομαι Hesych., O. Ir. lēnim, ‘I cling to, follow,’ O. Scand. lina, ‘I grow weak’) is Lat. ฤ-ฤ- from a root lei-, so that the I.-Eur. affix -nā- has been lost in Latin (unless lino represents *li-νά-δ), and only its weak grade (O. Ind. -nī-, Gk. -νά-) remains, e.g. ฤ-ฤ-μέν (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 στανόω) cannot quite be identified with I.-Eur. ฤ-ฤ- (O. H. G. spor-mō-n, O. Ind. str-nya-ti 3 Sg., O. Sax. hli-nō-n; cf. O. H. G. stornēn, ‘to be astonished,’ hlinēn), for the same ō appears in compounds of other than nasal-stems, e.g. occupāre (beside cāpere), profīgāre (beside fligere) (see § 32), and the -nā- of la-ν-ν-ν-ν-ν (cf. lāc-er), coqu-ināre (cf. cóquo), which indeed suggests comparison rather with Gk. -ἀνω of λι-μ-π-ἀνω, ἀμαρτ-ἀνω, &c., than with Gk. -να- of σκληρ-νη-μι, πτη-νη-μι, seems to show the -ā- (I.-Eur. ἀγο-) of Derivative Verbs (§ 32), like sarcinatus from sarcina (a Derivative with nasal suffix from sarco, as facinus from facio), runcinare from runcina, pāginare from pāgīna,
or nominare from nomen (cf. destina, a prop). The I.-Eur. affix -neu-, -nū- has left very few traces in Latin: stér-um-o (Gk. πτέρ-ρυ-μα), mi-nu-o (O. Ind. mū-nō-mi; cf. Gk. μυ-νυ-θω), probably for *mī-new-ō, &c. (cf. dēnuo for de *newō, ch. iii. § 24). English examples of nasal affix are 'I spurn, 'I shine' (Goth. skēi-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-quo, re-liqui, re-li-tus; sī-n-o, sī-vi, sī-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. junco from root yeug-, liuo from root lei-, mī-nu-o from root mei-.

§ 11. Other examples of nasal infix. Lat. rū-m-go (O. Ind. lū-m-pāmi), from root reup- (O. Engl. berōfe, Engl. I bereave); pi-n-so (O. Ind. pi-nā-ś-mi; cf. Gk. πίσσω for *πινσαμ, Lat. pisio); sci-n-do (O. Ind. chi-nā-d-mi); fungor (O. Ind. bhū-nā-j-mi); līn-go, from root leigh- (Gk. λείχω) (cf. O. H. G. lechōm, from *līgh-nā-mi); vi-n-co, from root weik- (Goth. veihā, 'I fight'); ela-n-go (O. Scand. hlakka; cf. Gk. ἐλαγάω, ἐλάχομαι), from root klag- (Lith. klagēti, 'to cackle'); pre-he-n-do (Alb. ēgendem, 'I am found,' Lett. gidu, 'I apprehend, perceive,' for *genu; cf. Gk. χαναδῶ, χέσσομαι. Fut. for *χενω-σμαι), from root ghd- (Engl. get, Lat. praedā for *prae-hed-a); di-sī-n-quo (Goth. stigqa, 'I thrust'; cf. Lith. stęngiu), from the root steiga- (O. Ind. tējātē, 'is sharp'; cf. Lat. in-stigare); e-mū-n-go (O. Ind. muñcāti, 'he releases,' Lett. mūku, 'I escape,' for *munku); fi-n-go (O. Ir. đenagaim, 'I fasten'), from root dheigh- (Goth. deigna); tūn-do (Pft. tū-tū-di); pi-n-go (Pft. pū-pūg-i); accā-m-bo (cf. cībār, Pft. ac-cīb-nī); bīn-go (Pft. te-līg-i, for *te-līg-i, Gk. τελεφορόω); bī-m-bo (cf. līb-inum); ri-n-gar (O. Sl. reg-nā, augmented by -no), beside victus.

§ 12. Retention of Nasal throughout the Tenses. Like junco, junxi, junctum (with possibly a Neuter Noun jungus, -eris, 'a team,' like Gk. ξέγορ, in Plaut. Men. 913: non potest haec rés ellebori iūngere optimírēr), we have pango, pannatum (but pāngī; Priscian says the Perf. of repungo is repuxxi, like expuxxi, or repupugi, i. 524. 13 H.); distinguo, distinxī, distinctum; jungo, juxxi (but fuctum; fuctum. Ter. Enn. 104); plango, planxi, planetum; emundo, emunxi, emunctum; lingō, līnxi, linctum; fungor, fuctus [but on plebeian inscriptions defunctus (C. I. L. ii. 4173), like sactus, e. g. sactissimae (vi. 15511, v. 6580), whence the Welsh loanword saith beside sant; nactus and sanctus are equally good spellings, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.]. Spellings in MSS. like corrump tus (Neue, ii. 560), relinqüi, Perf., are due to the same confusion. When the stem is extended by the YO-suffix, the n is retained, e. g. vincio, vinxi, vincium, from root vyek-, beside vincu, vicu, victum from root weik-, sanctus from sanio. Of roots ending in a dental we have e. g. from tundo, tussus and (post-Aug.) tussus, and the grammarians speak of a Perf. tungi (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 mētior).
§ 13. Other examples of nasal affix. Lat. *sperno* (O. H. G. *sprē-ri*-t 3 Sg., *spurnu*), with Perf. *sprē-ri*, as *cerno* Perf. *cē-ri*-t (cf. Gk. τιμ-ν-ω, *τιμηθ-θην*); O. Lat. *degurnere* (degestare, Paul. Fest. 50. 36 Th.; cf. Gl. Philox. degunere: ἀνογεῖσασθαί καὶ συγγυμναί) for *de-gus-nerε from root geus- (Gk. γεύ(ɔ)ω, Goth. kiusa, Engl. I choose); *ap-pellāre and com-pellāre for *pel-nā-re (Gk. πελ-ν-μαι, I approach, Μ. Ir. ad-ellaim), beside *pellere, to strike*; the Compound-stem with -nā- has a peculiar sense also in *de-sti-nā-re, praev-sti-nā-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-nā-re, to stickle for, Plaut. *Aud. 267*:

'id inhiat, ea affinitatem hanc obstinuaut gratia, whence obstinatus; there is a gloss, gredinunda βαδίσασθα, 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 dānum, exemplum, *prodinunt*, on which see § 73; (2) Derivative A-Verbs from Noun and Adjective Nasal-stems: e. g. opinor, *-ari* from a Noun *opinion*, connected with *prea-optim* (MSS. praedotiont) ‘praecoptant’ of the Carmen Saliare (Fest. 244. 13 Th.), optio, optare, &c.; aestino, *-āre*; vulpinor, *-āri*, to use the wiles of a fox (Varro, *Men. 327 B*); *auctiōnör, -āri*; contiōnör, *-āri*; *sacrińo, -āre*; *nomińo, -āre* (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) *frendo* similarly for fre-n-d-o; *offendo*, *defendo* from the root ghēn-, ‘to strike’ (Gk. θείνο for *θενιω*).

The verb *pando* is of doubtful origin. Some make it a nasalized form like *unda* (cf. Lith. vandū beside Goth. vatō, Engl. water; O. Ind. udān- beside Gk. υδώρ); others make it a word-group, *patem-do*, lit. ‘I make opening,’ like *vendo* and *vēnum do* [Osc. patensins ‘apercirent’ (?) has also been variously explained]. *Mundo*, to chew, if connected with Gk. μασάομαι for *μαστάομαι* (?), will be a parallel formation.

§ 15. With suffix -YÖ-,-ÝYÖ-. Like the Noun-suffix -yō-, -yō- (ch. v. § 4) this varies with -ye-, -yē- or with -ī-. 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 -yō- varied with -ī-: 1 Sg. *cup-yō*, 2 Sg. *cup-i-s*, 3 Sg. *cup-i-t*, 1 Pl. *cup-yō-mos*, 2 Pl. *cup-i-tes*, 3 Pl. *cup-yō-ni* (see Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii. § 702).

Two classes of Present-stems with the YÖ-suffix stand out very clearly, though they occasionally overlap:

i. With E-grade of root and accent on the root, e. g. Lat. spēc-īo (O. Ind. pāś-ya-ti, Zend spas-yē-iti, Gk. σκέπτομαι for *σκεπ-γο-μαί*).
ii. With weak grade of root and accent on the suffix, e. g. Lat. *mō-r-ior for *mr-yōr (O. Ind. mr-iyá-tē 3 Sg.), *vēnīo for *g*y-m-yō (O. Ind. gam-yá-tē, Gk. βαινω for *βημ-γο). 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. kriyē, 'I am made,' kriyātē, 'he is made,' the Passive of karōmi, 'I make,' karōti, 'he makes.' In the Balto-Slavic family of languages these verbs show in the other tenses an Ė-suffix, clearly the same as the Greek Passive -η- of ἔμαν-ν beside μαίρομαι for *μα-νο-μα, 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. jācio and jāćeo, pāvio and pāćeo. In most cases however the Ė-suffix ousted the YŌ-suffix altogether, e. g. sēdeo, sed-ē-s, sed-ē-ṃnō, &c. from an I.-Eur. Present-stem *sed-yō (Gk. ὕποπαι for *τρ梼-γο-μα, O. H. G. sizzu for *sed-yō), video, vid-ē-s, vid-ē-ṃnō, &c. from an I.-Eur. Present-stem *wid-yō (O. Ind. vid-yā-tē, 'he is perceived,' Lith. pa-vydžiu 1 Sg. Pres.) with another (originally not a Present) stem in -ē (Lith. pa-vydeny Inf.). [In Goth. vitais for *wid-ē-ē-s, vitaijī for *wid-ē-ē-t, and in other Teutonic verbs, the same intrusion of -ē- (ēyō-) into the Pres.-stem is seen as in Latin.] These Intransitive Verbs with Inf. -ēre constitute an important part of the second Conjugation in Latin, e. g. ęlēre, ęlēre, pātēre; they acquire a Transitive sense by appending fūcio to a Verb-stem in -ē (ch. v. § 51), e. g. ęlē-ęfūcio, and often take as their Present-stem an 'Inceptive' formation in -seo, e. g. incōlesco, ěrūbesco (see § 28). The association of this type with the Intransitive functions is seen in pendeo Intrans. beside pendo Trans., mūdeo (Gk. μαδάω), vērecor (Gk. ὑραώ, ch. iv. § 10), clēeo and clēo (Gk. κλῦω).

Another class of Presents which show the YŌ-suffix is—

iii. With -ā, -ē, -ō after the root. Beside the root pel-, for example, we have the root plē-, 'to fill,' with a Present-stem *plē-yō-, 'to be filling' (Lat. im-pleo); beside the root ter- we have the root trē-, 'to penetrate;' (cf. Gk. τρῆ-μα) with a Present-stem *trē-yō- (O. H. G. drāu, Germ. drehe), as well as the root trā-,
with a Present-stem *trā-yō- (O. Ind. trā-ya-tē, Lat. in-tro for *trāyō) (see ch. iv. § 66). Unlike the second Conj. verbs just mentioned, vīdeo, sōdeo, &c. with Perfects vidi, sēdi, Supines visum, sessum, and cāleo, rīdeo, &c. with Perfects cāui, rūbi and with Supines wanting, these ē-verbs retain their ē throughout the conjugation, -plēvi, -plētum, &c. In addition to monosyllabic Verb-stems we have such dissyllabic stems as Lat. *ṭomā-yō, dōmo (O. Ind. damā-yā-ti), and a group of onomatopoeic words, e. g. Lat. *ul-ulā-yō, ủlūlo (Lith. ul-ūlō-ju, and unreduplicated ǔlō-ju, Gk. ἕλαυ for *έλα-γω). 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-μ, τί-τρη-μ, κί-χη-μ) 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-χη-μεν 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 *plō-yē-s (cf. trēs for *trē-gēs, 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. pinso beside pinso (an already-formed Pres.-stem, § 10), Gk. ἐσθῶ beside ἐσθα, 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-, jūnio for *jini-yō from the Noun-stem *jini-, statuuo for *statu-yō from the Noun-stem *statu-, custōdio for *custod-yō from the Noun-stem *custōd-, and so on. But since the suffix is in these derivatives usually maintained throughout the Latin conjugation, pīnītus, custodīvi, custodore, &c., they are better reserved for discussion among the Verb-suffixes in § 26 (cf. Gk. ἀῖ-σω, ἀῖ-νυ-μ μ beside ἀῖω for *ḧa-yō). Derivatives from Ā-stems follow the analogy of roots with -ā (e. g. Lat. in-tre, 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. statuuo, statuuis, 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. τίμα-μεν, derived from stem τιμα-, φίλη-μι, derived from stem φιλε-, στεφάνωμι, derived from stem στεφάνω.

English examples of Present-stems with the YÖ-suffix are 'I lie' [O. H. G. ligg(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 YÖ-suffix. We have i often in O. Lat.; cupis, Plaut. Cure. 364:

laùdo. Laudató, quando illud, quód cupis, effécero,

faciis, Amph. 555 (so the MSS.); facit, Cure. 258 (?); inlicite is the scansion required by the metre in a line of Naevius (Trag. 30 R.):

sublimen altos siltus inlicite, ubi
bipedès molantes (MSS, ulocres) lino linquant lumina;

in 1 Pers. Plur., morimur 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 morimur;

we have adgredimur, Plaut. Asin. 680, Rud. 299; and in 3 Sg. Dep. adorîbar is attested by Prisc. (l.c.) in a line of Lucilius (or Lucrétius iii. 515 ?). The long vowel is especially common in the Inf. of the Deponent in Plautus, e.g. adgrediri, moriri, effodiri (cf. parire). (For other examples, see Neue, ii. p. 415.) These forms can hardly be due to the false Analogy of verbs like finio, -i-ri, -itum, -i-re, such as is seen in Late Lat. facritus (coined on the type of finâ-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 i or as ì, 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 Sg. Pres. Ind. which belong to the third Conjugation is that they are YÖ-stems in which -i- asserted itself, rather than -i-, as the weak grade of -yô- (-yô-); capère will then stand for *capîstî, cape for *capî. This does not however preclude the possibility of other explanations being right in particular cases, such as that a system without -yô- existed, say *faci- beside *faci-yô (cf. bene-ficent-ior beside faciens), *rap- beside *rap-yô (cf. rapo, 'a robber,' Varro, Men. 378 B.), that -i- belongs to a stem in -iyô-, -i- to a stem in -yô-, e.g. spécio from stem *spek-iyô- (cf. Gk. σκέπτôte) with the YÖ-suffix immediately following on a consonant.

§ 17. Other examples of E-grade roots. Lat. *côrîo, 'to close,' seen in op-(w)erio, op-(w)erio (Lith. uţ-veriu, 'I shut,' at-veriu, 'I open') (on the loss of w, see ch. iv. § 71); ind-uo for *indôro from *ew-yô, to judge from Umbr. an-owîhi-mu for *and-ov-î-mu, 'induimento' (ch. iii. § 24) from the root ew-, 'to put on.' Similarly haurio for aurio (exaurio is the almost invariable spelling
of Latin Glossaries, Löwe, Prodr. p. 371 n.) from root aus- (cf. Gk. ἀεισθανεῖ, 'to take out;' ἀειστῆρ, 'a flesh-hook'); eroe- (Gk. ἔρως from κρεπυ-γυ, Lith. krok-in and krok-iu).

§ 18. Of weak grade roots. i. With -io. Lat. ciup-jo (O. Ind. kup-yati, 'is in agitation'); fugio (cf. Hom. πε-φευγείτες for -φευγο-) from root bheug- (Gk. φεύγω); griedor from the root ghrerdh- (Goth. gridi-; 'a step,' O. Sl. greda, 'I come,' O. Ir. in-grennim, 'I pursue, attack,' the last two with Nasalized stem) shows the weakening of -re- to -r- mentioned in ch. iv. § 51; similarly farcio for *fracio (Gk. φάρσαω) from the root bhreq- of frequens (and for the connexion of ' cramming' and 'frequency,' cf. saep and O. Lat. saepissimus, 'closely packed,' ch. ix. § 4); likewise rūpio, if connected with repens, 'sudden.'

ii. Intransitive with -eo. Lat. rūdeo from an I-Eur. *rūdh-yō (O. Sl. rūžda, with the e-suffix in Inf. rūde-ti); torpeo with trop- the weak grade of the root terp-; stīdeo (cf. Gk. στήδαθα); mū neo (cf. Gk. μετω), and rādeo (cf. Gk. πετ-άνυμω), both seem to show Lat. ą as a weak grade of ē (ch. iv. § 3). Like rūdeo with Noun rūdor, torpeo with Noun torpor and Adj. torpī dus are a large number of Intransitive Verbs, căudo (color, calidus, plāceo (placidus); but Transitive plāceo, ligdeo (liquor, liquidus); cf. líquor, third Conj.), and so on (ch. v. § 74). The tīne of per-tīneos, lit. 'to reach through,' trans-tīneos, 'to reach across' (Plaut. Mel. 468 commentos transtinet trans pari etem) is the Neuter of tendo.

§ 19. Alternative forms in -o and -eo. Lat. tuor and tuor, 'to look'; fulgeo and fulgio; ferreo and fero; scūteo and scedo; abnueo and O. Lat. abnueo (Dion. 38a. 11 K.). In all of these the form in -o is the older (e.g. contuor, intend Plaut., sceto Plaut., Enn., Luer.; fererit and ferere are common in the early Dramatists, the latter often in Virgil, but to Quintilian a third Conjugation form of this verb is 'inauditus,' Quint. i. 6. 8), while the form in -eo is a new formation on the Analogy of the numerous Intransitives in -eo (cf. Caper 109. 16 K. fīdeo non 'fideo'. We have sorāre in Plaut. Poen. 1179. (See also below, § 33.)

§ 20. Of roots with -ā, -ē, -ō. Latin no for *snā-yō (O. Ind. śnā-ya-tē, and athem. snā-ti, Lat. nat); nōe for *(g)μ-γγ (Gk. νεώ, O. H. G. nāu, Germ. nāhe), tīcēo for *tācē-yō (Goth. ţahtāp 3 Sg. from *takē-yē-ti, and athem. O. H. G. dagē-s, Lat. tācēs; flo for *flī-γγ (cf. O. H. G. blau from *blī-lī-yō, perhaps the same word as Lat. fīo for *flī-γγ, Gk. φλέω, to overflow); hīo for *hīt-γγ (Lith. žūjo-from the root žheji-; jēro for *jēvā-yō, I-Eur. *dyuŋya-yō, from the root djęug- (cf. Lith. džtīng-ing-s, 'I rejoice,' a nasalized Present) (but cf. ch. iv. § 64); cābo for *cub-āγ (from the root keuhb- (cf. cūmba, a nasalized Present). Of onomatopoetic words with 1 Sg. Pres. in -cūjō, we have murnura, tintimino, unco, to bray (Gk. ὀγκαόμαι).

§ 21. Inceptives, 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. cresco, Pft. crēvi; they differ from Present-stem formations like śīno, 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. sénesco means, not 'I am old' (sēneō), but 'I become old.' They are therefore better considered in a separate
§ 22. Inceptives in -skō- (-skō-). The root shows, as a rule, the weak grade, e.g. I.-Eur. *prḗ-skō- (O. Ind. pr-chā-mi, with *-skh- for *-sk-), Lat. posco for *pore-skō, from the root prek-. It is sometimes reduplicated in Greek, e.g. διδάσκω for διδ-δακ-σκω, but not in Latin unless disceo, from root deik-, stands for *di-díc-SCO, (cf. dī-díc-i) and not for *dēc-SCO. An English Inceptive is ‘I wash’ (O. Engl. wæsec, 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-ēyō) 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-ēyō) 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. Offaē memoria; Paul. Fest. 115. 6 Th. ‘monitore’ qui in scaena monent histriones (our ‘prompters’)], torreo ‘to cause to be dry.’ These Causatives of Sanscrit have a different accent from Derivatives in -ēyō- from O-stems, in which the accent falls on the suffix -yō-, e.g. dēva-ya-mi, ‘I honour the gods,’ from dēva-., ‘a god’ (an O-stem, *deiwo-). The same formation often has the Intensive or the Iterative sense, e.g. Gk. φορέω from I.-Eur. *bhōr-ēyō, ‘I carry frequently,’ from the I.-Eur. root bher-, ‘to carry’ (Gk. φέρω, Lat. ferō); Gk. ποθέω for *pọthēw from I.-Eur. *gh3odh-ēyō (O. Ir. guidiu), ‘I ask or desire earnestly,’ from the I.-Eur. root gh3edh-, ‘to ask’ (Gk. θεσσεθαι). The P. P. P. of these verbs shows -i- in some languages (O. Ind. vartī-tā-, Goth fra-vardī-ps), -i- in others (cf. Lith. vartį-ti Inf., O. Sl. vrati-ti); in Lat. Ḗ. e.g. monitūs, nocitus; and there are indications that the I.-Eur. declension of the Present Ind. was *wortēyō 1 Sg., *wortīmós 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 o to u 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. facētō, ventītō.

§ 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 clāro-, 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-io from the stem custod-, and from I-stems, e.g. inānio from the Adj. I-stem inani-. 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. insānio from the Adj. O-stem insanus, 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. κυν-θ-ω beside κυνάω, (2) -d-, e.g. Gk. ἔλ-δο-μαυ from root wel- (Lat. volo), which may be nothing
but the Verb-stems dhē-, 'to put,' and dō-, 'to give' (cf. Lat. crēdo, O. Ir. cretim with O. Ind. śrād dadhāmi, lit. 'I set heart to'), as the common Latin ending -ūgo, -āre, e.g. nāvīgo, seems to be nothing else than the Verb āgo (from *navigus; cf. ch. v. § 80); (3) -t-, e.g. Gk. τέκτων (Lat. pecto) and τεκτῶ, beside τέκτω, which seems connected with the P. P. P. suffix -to- (ch. v. § 27); (4) -s-, e.g. Gk. δέψω beside δέψω, τρέ-(σ)-ω beside τρέ-μ-ω, which seems the same as the ES-suffix of Nouns, e.g. Gk. τέλος, stem τελεσ- (Gk. τελέ(σ)ω, τε-τέλεσ-ται) (§ 3). Latin examples are: gau-d-eo (Gk. γάυδομαι and γνθέω) for *gāvī-d-eo (cf. gāvīsus), sallo for *sal-do (Goth. salta), plecto (O. H. G. fli-h-tu, Germ. flechte) beside plico, -āre (Gk. πλέκω), vīsō, older vīsso, vēsso for *weid-so (Goth. ga-veisō; cf. the O. Ind. Desiderative vi-uit-sāmi), quaeso, older quaes-so for *quais-so, beside quaero for *quaiso, in-cesso for *in-cel-so (cf. cēdo). Other Latin endings are: (5) -sso, e.g. cūpessō, incipissō (Plaut.), pētessō, O. Lat. petissō (Fest. 250. 19 Th.) from cūpio, 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 A-verbs and belong to the first Conjugation, conscribollre, fōdicare, albicre, like mūdicari from medicus. Similarly, (8) -ro of lamb-erō (§ 41) is like -ro of the Derivative temporare from tempus.

§ 28. Other examples of Latin Inceptive. Misc-eo has added the Causative ending to a lost *wiseo [cf. misc sano for miscē sano on an old Praenestine cista (§ 58)] for *mīk-sō [the shortness of the i is seen in the Romance forms, such as Ital. (Tusc.) mesca, 'give me a drink,' the Latin miscē mi] with the weak grade of the root mīk-. 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 aeuitas uittum escit, and aut ei custos nec escit, &c., and even by Lucr. i. 619:

\[\text{ergo rerum inter summam minimamvne quid escit?}\]
as by Ennus, A. 322 M.:

dum quidēm unus homo Romanus toga superescit.

Roots extended by -ā, -ē, -ī alike gnō- from ġēn-, keep this vowel long, as is their custom in such cases (§ 2); hence (g)nō- (Gk. γνώσεω, Epir. γνώσω), (g)nā-scō, cī-scō, vī-scō, hā-scō; and similarly Latin Intransitives in -ēo (§ 32) and Derivatives in -o for *āyō, -ēo, -īo (ib.), e.g. rībē-sco, con-liē-sco, rī-

scō, flāe-sco, ob-dormī-sco, erā-sco [seeiscunda on the Lex Rubria, C. I. L. i. 205. (2). 55], descēso (with, tail form of I on Mon. Anc. v. 28, which also offers
hascover 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 quiësco, on the strength of călesco, nītēsco, stēpēsco and other Inceptives; cf. ch. ii. § 144).

The name 'Inective' is unsuitable. It is only verbs of the second Conjugation uncompounded with a Preposition, such as călesco, līquesco, to which a notion of 'beginning' can be attached, and even then the notion conveyed by the suffix is rather that of passing into a state or condition, of 'becoming' than of 'beginning,' e.g. līquesco, '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. erūdispatchoi (not erūdisco), consālesco (not consaloe), inārDISCO (not inardeo), unless the Preposition retains its separate force, e.g. े-līcō, 'to shine out,' co-haerēe, 'to be united with,' which have the force of līnco ex, haerē cum. Intransitive Derivatives from stems like dulcē, ignīs, grīxī, &c., are formed on this type, and take -esco instead of -isco, dulcesco, ignesco, gravesco, nītīsco, pīngesicos, &c.; and -asco of Intransitive Derivatives from ā-stems, &c., is in Late Latin often changed to -esce, e.g. gemmesco for gemmasco. The spelling -isco for -esco in Late Latin, e.g. erūdisco, may often be a mere interchange of the similarly sounding vowels i and e (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. florīt, florīdent in the Itala), which has left its mark on the Romance languages, e.g. Ital. appārire (apparisco Pres.) from Lat. appārére (§ 33 a). The -isco of ēpiscore, nanciscor, may be referred to the old forms apīo, nancio (whence coepiam, Paul. Fest. 41. 34 Th., nanciam, Prisc. i. 513. 17 H.), as the -isco of O. Lat. pētīso to a lost *petio (whence petici, § 47). 'Injectives' from fourth Conjugation Verbs are the most part ante-classical, e.g. condormisco (Plaut.), ãdormisco (Plaut., Ter.), perprārisco (Plaut. Stich. 761), persentisco (Plaut., Ter.), but odormisco, 'to fall asleep,' is used by Cicero (Tusc. i. 49. 117). They are mostly Compounds (except scisco), and the same is true of the 'Injectives' from third Conjugation Verbs in the Republican writers, e.g. rēispisco (Plaut., &c.), prōfisciscor (cf. fāessere, 'to take oneself off,' and Late Lat. se fīcerē, 'to betake oneself,' e.g. intra limen sese facit, āpul., consēspisco (Cic., Sall., &c.), implicisciœr, 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 trēmescos, gēmescos, &c. 'Injectives' from first Conjugation Verbs found in the early writers are dēnasco (Naev.), hīasco (Cat.), lībasco (Plaut., Ter., Lucr.), collābasco, permānasco, dēsīdasco, 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. vērasco, vespārasco, gemmascos, in which the suffix -esco seems to be added to change the transitive sense attaching to these Derivative ā-verbs (e.g. clarāre, to make clear, to clarify, § 32) into an intransitive.

It thus appears that an intransitive sense attached to the suffix -esco 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 aliquid, Cic., like horrere aliquum (a construction of horreo, pūreo, &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; vollescere, to make soft, not to 'become soft,' a sense which was properly expressed by the Auxiliary fact, e. g. calē-facere, rubē-facere. Assuescere, insuescere, manusuescere, and other compounds of suasce had at an earlier period assumed the sense of assū-facere, manusū-facere, 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, callescerunt 3 Pl. [Nonius 89. 25 M. quotes this form (MSS. calisserunt) from Cato's speech on the Punic War: aures nobis callescerunt ad injurias]; obsēlesco and exōlesco from sīleō with P. P. P. obsūlitēs, exōlitēs; adōlesco and coālesco (cōl-) from the root al- (ol-), 'to grow, nourish' (whence indūles, subūles, prūdes), with P. P. P. adulūs, coālitūs.

For a list of Latin 'Inceptives,' and full details of their history, see A. L. L. i. 465 sqq. Umbrian-Oscan examples are Umbr. pepurkurtent 'rogaverint,' Osc. comparascerunt 'consulta erit.'

§ 29. Of Latin Causatives, &c. O. Lat. lūceo, 'to cause to shine,' to light or kindle (e. g. Enn. A. 158 M.; prodimum famuli, tum candida lumina lucent.; Plant. Civ. 9 tutē tibi puer es: laitūs luces cērum; Cas. 118 primum ōmnium huic lubricis nouae nuptac facem) may be a Causative form, L.-Eur. *louk-ēyo (O. Ind. rōśāyā-mī), and different from lūceo, to shine, which seems to be an intransitive form like sēdeō, with -eo instead of -io, L.-Eur. *lēnk-ya (Gk. λεύσαω); nīceo, L.-Eur. *nēk-ēyo (O. Ind. nāśāyā-mī) is the Causative of the root nēk- (Lat. nex), 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 obesae, officere, &c. The rivalry between Transitive Ā-stems and these Causative-stems, best seen in Lithuanian, where the Causatives (e. g. varty-ti Inf.) form their Present-stems with -ā- (e. g. vartō- for L.-Eur. -wortā-), appears in Lat. nicēre beside nūcēre; dōmāre may be L.-Eur. *dōmā (O. H. G. zamō-, 'to tame'), a byform of L.-Eur. *dōmēyo- (Goth. tamja, O. H. G. zemmi (i) 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. grbh-aya-ti, 'he seizes.' Perhaps Latin ci-o (beside cīo) belongs to this type. But the ending -eo is sometimes added to other Verb-stems which have a Causative sense. Thus in Lat. misc-eo it is added to a stem formed already with the inceptive suffix, so that miscēo for *mīc-sc-īyo has really two suffixes (cf. O. Ind. dhūnaya-ti, 'he shakers, shatters,' beside dhunu-ti and dhā-nō-ti, Gk. eἰλασε beside ἑλασε for *eλα-s-ω). And this may be the true explanation of cīeo also. Jībeō for *yū-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-un-du, 'I am set in motion'] is spelt in the S. C. Bacch. with -ow-, the diphthong always found in the perfect (C. L. L. i. 196, l. 27 ioni-beatsis, l. 9, l. 13 ioni-setis; cf. ionsit 547 a, 1166, ionserunt 199, l. 4, ionserit 198, l. 12); this, if not a misspelling (ch. iv. § 37), will exactly correspond with the O. Ind. causative yōdha-yā-mi (L.-Eur. *youdhēyō). Terreo, for which we should expect *torreo, has in Umbrian the O-grade of root (Umbr. turstitu, O. Umbr. tusetu, 'terreto').
Other Causatives, or Transitive Verbs with the Causative -eo appended, are *vīgeo (older *vīgeo?), to rouse to life, e.g. Pomponius, Com. 78 R. animos Venus veget voluptatibus, dōceo, suādeo, vīgeo, tondae, turgaeo, mordeo, spondeo, augeo, &c.

§ 30. Of Latin Desideratives. These were called by the Latin grammarians 'Meditativa.'

Examples of Desiderative Verbs are essīrīo, partāriō, emptāriō, ēmītāriō (see A. L. L. i. 408: Verbs in -urīo (-ūriō), e.g. ligerrīo, scētāriō, are a quite distinct class, being apparently Derivatives from Verbal Nouns in -āris (e.g. sēcurīs) or -āra (e.g. figura).

§ 31. Of Latin Iteratives. The distinction of (1) 'Iteratives' in -ērito, (2) 'Intensives' in -ētō, -ēso is untenable. The suffix in all its forms denotes repeated action; the usual type is that of a Derivative Ā-Verb from a Perfect Participle Passive, e.g. dōtēre, dormitāre, though from Verbs of the first Conjugation we have sometimes forms in -ētō like dēmitō, vōcitō, vēlitō, pointing to P. P. vocītus like crēpītus (§ 92). As the -o-suffix of the P. P. P. became in time so- (ch. iv. § 155), we have Iteratives in an older form, merto, pullo ('mertare' atque 'pultare' diecquant. Quint. i. 4. 14; Plautus pons on pultem Subj. and pultem Acc. of pūlis in Poen. 729), and in the class. form merso, pulso.

Iteratives which add the suffix to a Present-stem, e.g. sēscītio Plaut., noscitio Plaut., ēgito, are especially frequent in Late Latin, e.g. mergito Tertull., misceo Script. Gromat., while to the class of Iteratives with double suffix belong actito, cectito, cantito, dicītio, hastato, jactito, ventito, vīcito, curtiso, factito, Vulg.-Lat. *taxitare, whence Ital. tastare, Fr. tater, '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. jactare), to throw (Lat. jēcio), mēritō (Lat. mēritare), to deserve (Lat. mērso), chanter (Lat. cantare), to sing (Lat. cēvo). (See A. L. L. iv. 197.) Dōbitare is the Iterative of an O. Lat. verb dubare (Paul. Fest. 47. 18 Th. 'dubat, dubitat'); horāri of an O. Lat. horītor [attested in 3 Sg. horātio by Diomedes (p. 382. 23 K.) for Ennius (A. 465 M.); prandere īubēt horīturque], which seems to be a Deponent of L.-Eur. *gēr-yō (Gk. γερω), a byform of *gēr-yō (0. Ind. bār-yā-mi, 'I delight in'; *herin, the Umbro-Oscan word corresponding to Lat. vōlo, e.g. Umbr. heris, 'vis, Osc. heriātō, '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. gostēn) from *gūst-ō, P. P. P. of ēgūs, 'to taste' (Gk. γεύ-ωγεύω, Goth. kiusan, 'to approve,' Engl. choose : cf. Germ. Kur-fürst); īō, āre (Gk. ἱρ-τέω) from *īōs P. P. P. of ēo, for *īāyō (Umbr. etaiān, 'intent'); īō, āre, to prune, to think, lit. 'to sift or cleanse often' (in Romance 'to prune,' e.g. Ital. potare), from a P. P. P. stem *pū-ō, 'cleansed' (Lat. pūtus, clean, in the phrase pūrūs pūtus, e.g. Plant. Pseud. 1200), from the root of Lat. pū-rus, for *putāyō (cf. O. Sl. pytaja, 'I investigate,' with ī); dēmitō from domitūs; crēpītō from crēpitus; habītō for habitus, which monopolized in class Lat. the sense of 'to dwell,' 'inhabit' (cf. archaic Engl. 'to keep,' as in the Merchant of Venice, iii. 5; it is the most impenetrable eur That ever kept with man), a sense which it shared

§ 32. Of Latin Derivative verbs with ÝO-suffix. The onomatopoetic verbs tintinnio (also tinnio and tintinnare), gingrío, to cackle, of geese (whence gingrina, the name of a small size of fife: genus quoddam tibiarum exiguarum, Paul. Fest. 67. 23 Th.; cf. Gl. Philox.) have a formation analogous to the Sanscrit Intensives (e.g. na-nam-ya-té from the root nam-, 'to bend') and to Greek παρφαινω for *παρ-φαν-ω, μαρμαιρω 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. κλίσιμον from *κλί-σιμον from the root κλει-, and so we have: λιθό-ν, a Late Lat. derivative from λίθος, the Present tense of the root lei-: pínus (Gk. πτίσσω for *πταιν-ω) beside pínso; vínco from *vī-n-co, the nasalized Present of the root výek- (O. Ind. vi-vyak-ti, 'he compasses'); sancio beside sācer. These derivatives naturally retain the nasal throughout the verb, e.g. P. P. P. pínusitus (but from pínso, pístus), sanctus (in Vulg. Lat. sanctus, ch. ii. § 70).

Examples of Verbs in -āyō- from Noun Ā-stems are: scientūla, -are from scientīlla; lācro, -are from lacrīma; mutila, -are (Osc. multaum Inf.) from multa; insidior, -ari, insidiae; mābélo, -are from macula; praedōr, -ari from praedōra; mōnai from mora [in O. Lat. always transitive, 'to cause delay,' 'to detain,' whence nil mora (hane rem), I do not care for, lit. 'I do not (care to) detain']. Lat. poenītio, pīnio, from poenis, may exhibit an alternative method of forming derivative verbs from 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-ως from τίμιον; or may follow the analogy of derivatives from I-stems, or derivatives from Consonant-stems.

Of Transitive Verbs from O-stems: amplīant, 'pro amplificand', Pauv. Trag. 339 R. (ap. Non. 506. 30 M.); nōro, -are from novus; sāno, -are from sanus; narro, -are from gnārus (? ch. ii. § 132); āmno, -are from annu Pl.; spōlīant, -ari from spōlium; numnēro, -are from numeriōs; lŏco, -are from locus; dōno, -are from donum; cūmītios, -are from cumuliōs; dāmo, -are from damnānum. This use of the -ĀYō-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-ya-té 3 Sg., all from an I.-Eur. O-stem, *priyo- (O.-Ind. priyā, 'dear'), O. Ir. caraid, 'he loves,' from I.-Eur. karō- 'dear' (Lat. carōs). On the use of -āo- as a Participial Adjective suffix, meaning 'provided with,' 'clothed in,' &c., e.g. armatus, dentatus, pilatus, from pīsum, cordatus in Ennius' egregio cordatus homo (cf. re-cordāri), see ch. v. § 28. It is probably seen in Gaulish gaesata [gaesati, 'Gaulish mercenaries,' C. G. L. v. 71. 23 (?)], from Gaulo-Latin gaesum, a spear.

The natural formation from O-stems is sometimes in -ēyō-, e.g. Gk. φλάεω, to love, for *φλα-ως, from φλός, dear (stem φλω- or φλω-, ch. v. § 2), δαναντίσω, to be unable, from δάναντος, unable; sometimes in -yō- merely, e.g. Gk. μελισσω for *μελλί-ως from μελαχες. With the latter Lat. ānīo from annus, blandior from blandus may be compared, as in Noun derivative YŌ-stems we have somnīum from somnis, Odūs from Octavus, &c. (ch. v. § 4); with the former, intransitive Verbs from second Derension Adjectives, like claudēo from claudus, albeo from albus, clāreō from clarus, flāeō from flavis [as in Adjective derivative YŌ-stems like aureus from aurum (ib.)], unless these follow the
analogy of Intransitives like sedeo for I.-Eur. *sed-yo (see above, § 15), in which case their ending will be not -âyô but -êyô. (The corresponding verbs in Balto-Slavic have -êyô, e.g. Lith. kêtê-ju, 'I grow hard,' from kétas, 'hard'). The same distinction between transitive -ô, -êre and intransitive -ô, -êre is seen in primary verbs like liqueare and liquevere. (On the pronominal of Intransitive Verbs to take -êo, e.g. ferr-êo, fulg-êo, O. Lat. fervo, fulgo, see § 19.)

We have also Participle Adjectives in -ôitus, e.g. aegrôitus from aeger (stem aegro-), like Gk. μαρσω-'^Ô τά from μαρσώ, Lith. ragû-tas from râgas, 'a horn,' with corresponding Verb-stems in Greek and Lithuanian, e.g. Gk. μαρσώ, Lith. jûkâ-ju, but no *aegrôô or *aegrû, -ôs, -ôinus in Latin. Derivatives from I-stems have -îyô-**, e.g. O. Ind. kaviyâ-té, 'he acts like a seer,' from kavi-, 'a seer,' janîyâ-ti, 'he desires a wife,' from jâni-, 'a wife'; Gk. µητριωμ (i) from µητρις, µητριω (f), from µητρις, κοινω (i) from κοινός; Latin examples are: finio from finîn, finîo from finîs; they show -ô in the Perfect Participle Pass., &c., e.g. Gk. ᾠδήπερος, Lat. finîtus, lînîtus, molîtus, insignîtus, vestîtus, minûtus, statîlîtus, òrîdîtus; from soni, O. Lat. sortîs, comes sortiôr; from pars, stem partiôr, comes partìtor; from prôhis O. Ind. pâti-ô, 'lorn,' Gk. νόσω) comes pôtor, 'to become master of,' with an Active partô (e. g. Flaut. Raud. 911 pîsûatu nómô me uberî komîpotuiû), which was used in Oscar as the equivalent of the Latin possess (Osc. putiâd 'possess,' putiâns 'possess'); (§ 97). U-stem derivatives have -îyô-, e.g. O. Ind. satrâ-yâ-ti, 'acts like an enemy,' from satrâ-, 'an enemy,' Gk. δακριω (ê) from δάκρυ (from Ì-stems, e. g. ὡκχω in the Dramatists), Lat. stîtuo from status, meûnô from meûnus, with -în in the Perf. Part. Pass., e. g. Gk. ᾠδήπερος, Lat. statî-tus, aegrô-tus (from the stem argû- of O. Ind. árju-na-, 'white,' Gk. ἀγρύ-πος), acû-tus (cf. acons, a needle). From the analogy of a number of verbs of similar meaning, which happened to be formed with one or other of these derivatives to YO-suffix, a definite meaning came to attach itself in the various languages to certain suffixes. Thus in Sanscrit the ending -îyô- came to acquire a desiderative sense and was used to convey this notion, not merely in derivatives from I-stems, e. g. janîyâ-ti, 'he desires a wife,' from jâni-, 'a wife,' but in derivatives from other stems too, e. g. putrîyâ-ti, 'he desires a son,' from putrâ-, 'a son' (an O-stem). In Latin, as we have seen, the desiderative ending is -îtria, e. g. partârâ, but it is possible that the ending -îo conveys this sense in cîtîlîo from the O-stem catîlus, câtio from equâs.

A fact of more certain legality is that Latin -î for -*îyô was used to give a transitive sense, e. g. clâro, -âre, to make clear, from the O-stem clârus, nîcê, -êre from normus (and so in other languages, § 29, e. g. O. H. G. niuônô, though in Greek the ending -ôw ousted -ôw from this usage, e. g. νεώ, to make new, from νέος, ἐνιαω, to make healthy, from ἐνιαῦ), and Latin -ô, to give an intransitive sense, e. g. clâro, -êre, to be clear, from the same stem, clâro, while -îo possibly had attached to it the notion of a state of body or mind, e. g. fûrîcio, -êre, to be

1 These Derivatives in -ûyô- must be distinguished from Presents ending in -nuo, like minûo (O. Ind. minû-mi, from I.-Eur. *mi-neu-mi, § 10), as well as from a Present like pîluo (O. Lat. pîlûo, from I.-Eur. *plewô, § 6), and from fîuô, frouor, &c., whose root has a Guttural (cf. fluzi, fructus, § 39. 3). Snu represents an I.-Eur. *sûyô (Goth. sinuja, Lett. schujo, Gk. ξασσω). 2 On First Conjugation Deponents with intransitive sense, e. g. eamûlari, fluctuari (and fluctuare), see §§ 62, 64.
haughty (Cato, &c.), saevio, -ire, to be fierce, insânio, -ire, to be insane, dentio, -ire, to be teething, as -oxo, -oxo were used in bodily ailments in Greek, e. g. ὀφθαλμών, ὀδοντάς, or desideratively, e. g. tosâs.

The -YÖ suffix was the L.-Eur. suffix by which verbs were formed from Nouns and Adjectives, e. g. O. Ind. apas-yâ-ti from ápas-, ápas- (Lat. apus), Gk. ὑπομαῖρω for *ὑπομαι from ὑπομα (Lat. nomen). But in Latin, denominative -yö has been to a great extent supplanted by -a-yö (see below). Thus the Latin equivalents of the Sanscrit and Greek verbs, just quoted, are īpērari 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. 13 R.):

suō sōnitu claro fulgoriuit Ïuppiter.

is in class Lat. fulgivro, -āre; īnpeōrē is the old form of īnpeōrēre, consecrated to religious usage, like parīrē the old form of prārē (ch. ix. § 44); ārēre, Cato, &c. is in class. Lat. ārāre; cf. dūlōs, Varro, Men. 7 B. for dūlōs; ārīrō, Compar. of ārītis, Plaut. Pomo. 1290 (if this is the right reading); gnarīvissē quoted (apparently from Livius Andronicus) by Paul. Fest. 68. 5 Th., for narrasse (cf. Gl. Philolx. gnarītūr; γναρίζεται; C. G. L. v. 72. 9 gnarītūr: cognitum sive compertum est).

The old formation remains in custōdio from custōs; 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: ārībus Peraudienda sunt, ne dentes dēntiant), though dēntōsus, and not dēntitius, is the Participial Adjective. In dentio we have the same -YO- or -YÖ-suffix as in the Verbs indicating disease, state of body, &c. (see below), like insânio from insanus.

When a Verb is compounded with anything but a Preposition the Compound assumes the form of an Ā-Derivative, e. g. acēificare from acēis and fācio, sacrificare from sacrīrum and fācio (cf. sacrificatus), as in Greek we have -oxophoâw, &c. Mōndāre seems to be a similar formation, as if a Derivative Verb from *mōnā-dus, 'giving into the hand'; and the Derivative Verbs in -īgo, -are, e. g. nāvīgo, -are, pārī-go, -are, jārī-go, -are (on O. Lat. purīgo, jurīgo, see ch. iii. § 13) point to *nāvītus, &c. from nāvis and a-go. Mōrīgērāri, to humour, devote oneself to (also mōrem gēre), comes from the Adj. morīgeno-(Plaut. Amph. 1004 meo meaquomst mōrigerum patri essē); īpītātari from a stem *ōpī-tūlo-; &c. (cf. ch. v. § 8b, p. 353). (On the predominance of the Ā-type of Verb in Latin, see § 33 a.)

Examples of these endings are: (i) -ō, -āre: nōmīne, -are from nōmen; cōlōs, -are from cogō; īnēro, -are from omus; scēlēro, -are from scēlus; exāmine, -are from examen; priō, -are from privōs; ignōro, -are to make unrecognizable, Plaut. Men. 468; pōs, -are from plus; prōbō, -are from probōs; sēcō, -are from secur; grāvō, -are, to make heavy, from gravis; cīvero, -are from cīver (not i, Rev. Philologie, xv. 64); leva, -are, to make light, or to lift, from levēs; pērō, -are, to make equal, from par, Plaut. Cure. 506:

ecodem hèrele uos pono ét paro; parissumi estis hibus.

Amphitare, to adjourn a case, is a rough-and-ready Derivative from amplius, the judge's phrase in giving notice of adjournment; similarly compèrendinare, to remand for two days, from (com) perentinun (dies), Vulg. Lat. *hēcāre, to call
hither (Fr. hucher), from hoc; some explain nēgare 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 nēcare, to kill. Whether the a so often seen in Verbs compounded with a Preposition, e.g. profligare (from fīgo), occūpāre (from cōpio), aspernāri (from spernō) is due to the transitive sense of the Compound, or to derivation from lost Adjective-stems *proflīgo, *occūpū, *aspernō, is not clear. (On amplio see K. Z. xxxiii. 55.)

(2) -io, -īre: rauncio, to be hoarse, from raucus; singultio from singultus (U-stem), blandior from blandus, largior from largus, prae-sāgio from sāgus (an Adj. especially found in the Fem. sāga, a go-between, e.g. Lucil. vii. 6 M. saga et bona conciliatrix).

3) -eō, -īre: audent from āridus [O. Lat. aridus, e. g. C. I. L. i. 577. (2) 21; see ch. iii. § 13], which is the Adjective corresponding to ādeo, as calidus to cādeo, nitidus to nīteo, &c. (ch. v. § 74) ; audeo, from āridus, the Adj. corresponding to ādeo, had originally the sense of ‘to be eager,’ ‘to have a mind to,’ e.g. Plaut. Mil. 232 audent participare me quod commentu’s, whence the coloquial sōdes (Terence, &c.), ‘if you please,’ for si audes (Plaut., e. g. Trin. 244 dā mīhi hoc, mel meum, si me amas, si āudēs) (ch. iv. § 67). These two classes of verbs in -eō must be kept distinct, the Derivatives from O-stem Adjectives like fādeo, ardeo, audeo, and the Intransitives with Nouns in -aor and Adjectives in -īdus, e. g. calēo, ardeo (ardidus), aerce (ardidus), nīteo (nītor, nitidus) (see ch. v. §§ 67, 74).

§ 33. Of other Verb-suffixes:—(1) -dē: on jīdeo with jur-, for *dyeu-dē-, lit. ‘to set in motion,’ ‘rouse to action,’ see § 29.

(2) -dē: tōdeo seems to be Causative of a lost *tendo (Gk. tēνδω, to gnaw), for *tem-do from the root tem-, ‘to ent’ (Gk. τέντων) ; per-cella for *cel-do (cf. chā-dēs, Gk. καλά-dēσαν σείσαι, Hesych.) from a root kel- (cf. Gk. ἀσπασ-κόλ-λε); trūdo (Goth. us-briutua, ‘I trouble’).

Since -dē would become dē in Latin (ch. iv. § 114), it is impossible to determine whether the suffix -dē- or -d- appears in ēv-do (cf. Lith. kau-ju), fen-do (and frendo) for fre-do (cf. fremo), ten-do from the root ten-, ‘to stretch’ (cf. Gk. τείνω for *τενυον), of-fen-do and de-fen-do from the root ghenen-(cf. Gk. θείνω for *θενυον). On pando, mando (third Conj.), vendō, see §§ 14, 95, and on mando (first Conj.) § 32, above.

(3) -tē: mē-tē (cf. Mid. Ir. methel, ‘a reaper’; so some explained the name Metellus, Lōwe, Prodîr. s. v.) cannot be dissociated from Gk. ἄμω; nor flē-tē from fale. But this formation is not so common in Latin as in Greek, though all of the numerous Gk. Verbs in -tē, e. g. τέπω, χαλέπω may be formations with the YÔ-suffix, for -ty- seems to have become -ty- in Greek, *τυπω-, *χαλεπω, &c. (ch. iv. § 65). The E-grade of root seems to be used with the T- as with the D-suffix, so that pegot (from root pēk-, Gk. πέκω) is the correct form, O. Lat. -phdo being due to false Analogy (cf. ponēdo with o by Analogy of ponēdo, ch. v. § 72, and see above, § 7).

(4) -sē: prō-r-tē shows the ending -io of verbs indicating bodily ailments, &c. (§ 32) attached to a lost *prōro for *prou-so (O. H. G. friusu, Engl. I freeze) from

---

1 The two forms frenedo and frendo have been explained by a supposed original declension like fren-dēs (I.-

Eur. *-dhēs) 2 Sg., fren-dītīs (I.-Eur. *-dhātes) 2 Pl.
the root preu-; with Gr. αὐξω, a development of *auγω (cf. Lat. aug-ere, a Causative formation, §29) with the suffix -s- (cf. I.-Eur. *auges-, *augos-, a neuter noun, O.Ind. ājas, 'strength'; cf. Lat. augus-tus), we may compare Lat. aux-ilium, and the Umbrian formula in invocations of deities über ose, if this means 'his (sc. donis) macte,' ose being Voc. of a stem *aukso- with the sense of Lat. auctus.

If arcesso is connected with acédo as incesso with incédo, 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 eum, strepitu vocis alias aves arcessit), but the use of r for d before e is peculiar (ch. iv. §112. Accerso 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). queso, in older spelling quassxo (ch. ii. §129), from *qua-s-s-o, is in the earlier writers used along with quairo (older quairo, C. I. L. i. 34, from *qua-s-o), e.g. Plaut. Bacch. 178:

mirumst me, ut redeam, te ópera tanto quaéscere,


Ostia muníto. idem loca naubus celsis
manda facit nautisque mari quaesentibus utiam,
and Trag. 97 R. liberum quaesendum causa; in classical Latin it is found in 1 Sg. quaeso, 1 Pl. quaesiumus. (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. āmasso, &c. to dico, caprs. They are called 'Desiderativa' by Priscian (i. 431. 18 H.), who explains capresso as 'desidero capere' (i. 535. 10 H.). In MSS. they are often confused with 'Inceptive' forms, e.g. laececstem for lucescstem, capexcit for cópessit (for a list of examples, see A. L. L. i. 515).

(6) Verbs in -illo. These are hardly to be separated from Ä-Derivatives from Diminutive Nouns in -illa-, Adjectives in -illo-, &c., such as sciillare from sciilla, stillar from stilla (cf. stria), tranquillo from tranquillus. They are evidently Diminutive Verbs derived in the same style from Verbs instead of Nouns. Examples are: conscribillare from conscivo, e.g. Catull. xxv. 11:

ne láneum latúsulum manúsque mollicillas
inústa turpitér tibi flagella conscribbent!

Varro, Men. 76 B. itaque eas ineravi et conscribílavi Herculis athlis; Varro, Men. 280 B. astrologi non sunt? qui conscribílarnunt pingentes caelem; occílare from occo, Plaut. Amph. 183; soribilo from sorbeo; obstringílare from obstringo, e.g. Enn. Sat. ii. 1 M.:

... restitánt, occurrunt, óbstringílant, óbagílant.

(See A. L. L. iv. 68. 223.)

We have -lo in vópilo, verflá-bundus, ventilo, ustilo, &c.

(7) -co in albico, fodico, vellico seems to have the same Diminutive force as the preceding suffix. As the Adj. suffix -co- is often combined with -lo- in Diminu-

---

1 quaesere, quaessentibus, quaesendum, cannot be the O. Lat. forms of quae-
tere, quaerentibus, quaerendorum, as Valesius of Valerius, &c., for inter-
vocalic s had become r long before the time of Plautus and Ennius (ch. iv. §148).
tives, e.g. quen-ca-lus (ch. v. § 31), so we have in Verbs pandectilanes, stretching oneself (in yawning) Plaut. Men. 834 (cf. gesticulare from gesticulus, Dim. of gestus).

8) -ro. Considera 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 mācēro, vecēro, tītēro.

9) Other formations. Verbs in -iyo, -yore, e.g. O. Lat. gnarigavit, used by Liv. Andr. for narravit (Paul. Fest. 68. 5 Th.), with an Auxiliary iyo giving a causative force, have been already mentioned (§ 27), and verbs in -fico, -yore (§ 32), e.g. amplifico, -yore, in which an Auxiliary facio plays the same part. Facio does not enter into so close composition with the Verb in bene facio, are facio (Lucr. vi. 962 sol excoquit et facit are), celē facio later calēfacio 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), compenē facio, to cut short (Plant. orationis operam compendiafaci); and we have an Accusative case-form as the first element of venum-do (vendo), venum eo (veneo), pessum-do, pessum eo (on crīdo, see § 27; on mando, -yore, § 32; on pando, mando, -yore, § 14). Other Latin Verb-suffixes are -icīlio of ballātio; to stammer, frigūtio, to chirp; saurio (-ārio) of ligurrio, sāturio (on which see above, § 30); -inor, -āri of patrōcino, lenōcino (cf. patrōcinium, lenōcinium), rītōciner, alōcinor, tuburciner, &c.; -isse, -yore, which is borrowed from Gk. -iō, e.g. attliciso (attliciō), graciesso, patrisso (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.1 forms like fidāre (Fr. fier, Span. fiar), a Derivative from fidus, which supplanted class. fidere, as the Derivative pectinare supplanted pectere (Caper 93. 8 K. pecto caput non `pectino,’ et pexum non `pectinatum’), as well as from the fact that Greek loanverbs appear naturally to drift into it, ὑμνεῖν becoming obsōnare, pροτίνεν propinare, &c., just as loanwords in French take -er (Lat. -yore), e.g. trinquer, and in German, -ieren, e.g. marschieren, amusieren. The freaks of false Analogy appear in Vulg. Lat. fugire, 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., fugio, cupio; in Vulg. Lat. florīre, complīre (Ital. florire, 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. Cēlare, a Derivative from *cela, concealment, has supplanted *celo (cf. occulo), and the same explanation should perhaps be given of sōnare (Perf. sōnū), &c. (See § 32.)
of second and third Conjugation Verbs, which we have already remarked in the Latin of Plautus in the case of ferreo, sordeo, &c. (§ 19), is intensified in Romance through the approximation of the ë- and ë-sounds (ch. ii. § 141), so that we have Vulg. Lat. forms like respondère (Ital. rispondere, Fr. répondre), tondère (Ital. tondere, Fr. tondre), and (by Analogy of the Perfect tense sapui) sapére (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. volere (Ital. volere, Fr. vouloir). The Perfects struxi, truxi, prostrávi, contrivi have similarly produced the Vulg. Latin forms tragere (Ital. trarre, Fr. traire), strugere (Ital. struggere, Fr. d'é-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.)

§ 34. B. Imperfect. In Slavonic the Imperfect is formed by appending a Preterite of the Substantive Verb (1 Sg. *jachu from original *ës-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. èveykeiv, &c.), the Imperfect (1 Sg.) is nesē-achū; of glagola-ti, 'to speak;' the Impft. (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, fērē-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. fu-fans, 'they were'), and must represent an l.-eur. bh or dh (e.g. Lat. ībi, Umbr. puf, Osc. puf, O. Sl. kūba from an l.-eur. dh-suffix) (ch. iv. § 114). It can hardly be separated from the b of the Latin Future vide-bo, amā-bo, &c. (see § 36), which is similarly in the Italic languages f, e.g. Fal. kare-fō 'carebo,' but whose equivalent in O. Ir., b, e.g. no charub, 'amabo' [quasi *nu (nune) cambo] (cf. Lat. cārus), shows it to represent l.-eur. bh, not dh (which would be d in O.-Ir.). The Auxiliary verb used must then have been the l.-eur. root bheu-, whence Lat. fui, O. Lat. Subj. fnum, &c.; and Lat. -bam, -bēs, -bat, 3 pl. -bant (Osc. -fans) may represent an l.-eur. Preterite *bhwm, -ās, &c. (on the loss of postconsonantal w, see ch. iv. § 71), seen in O. Ir. ba (from *bam), and corresponding to the Lat. Preterite of the verb es-, eram (from *esām). 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' (l.-eur. ker-, Gk. κρ-αλω, Lat. crev). Lat. vidē-, amā-, finī- 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, *legē-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 -ēyēs, 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 audī-bam like faciē-bam, as in their Future audiam (O. Lat. audībo and audiam) like faciam. The Romance languages point to a Vulgar Latin Imperfect of the second and third Conjugations in -ēam, of the fourth in -ēam (e. g. Sard. timia, finia, Span. vendia, Port. dormia, O. Fr. diseie 'disais,' senteie 'sentais'), while the first Conj. Impft. had -ābam (e. g. Sard. istava from Lat. stdbam), but whether this may be taken as evidence that byforms *time-am, *fime-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 āger-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 *fers-em to ferre for *fere, āmarem, mērerem, 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 ánimus frustra me ire, quom exibam domo.

and the Republican poets, e. g. Lucer. 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 quea, quābam, nē-quebam.

Aibam, a disyllable, is the usual form in Plautus, but we have also aiebam, e. g. Rud. 1080 quam esse aiebas (MSS. alebas).

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 Aufustius who wrote a treatise, dedicated to Asinius Pollio, to show that veniēbam 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
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'amabo,' quasi ' *nu (nune) carabo ' (cf. Lat. cärus)], 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 -ūbo as well as -iām in the Future, and in the plebeian Latin of Novius' Atellanae, or rustic farces, we find vivēbo, for vivam, dicebo for dicam (as in the Atellanae of Pomponius paribus 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 vivēbo, dicebo, on the analogy of vīdēbam, cārēbam, which had Future forms vīdēbo, carēbo. 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. leg-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., audiēs, audiēt, audiēmus, &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 dixo, &c. (see below), were introduced. The spellings affected by Cato diceae, 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 merely an attempt to express by a written symbol the weak sound of final _m_ in Latin (see ch. ii. § 61).  

(3) In _-so_. This formation belongs to O. Lat., _e.g._ _dixo, faxo_. It is discussed in §§ 3 and 5. The similarity in use between _dixo_, _faxo, capso_ on the one hand, and _āmasso, &c._ on the other, suggests that _dixo_ stands for *die-ssō, faxo* for *fac-ssō, capso* for *cap-ssō_._ But the Umbro-Oscan Future, _e.g._ _Osc. _deivast_ 'jurabit,' _censazet_ 'censebunt,' _Umbr. fistav_ 'erit,' _furent_ 'crunt' had only one _s_. In Romance the Future has been lost (but O. Fr. _ier from _erō_), its place being supplied by periphrastic formations with _habeo_ (the usual type), _volō, &c._ Thus Ital. _canterō, Fr._ chanterai represent _cantare habeo_ (reduced to _hayo_) (see Meyer-Lübke, _Rom. Gram._ ii. pp. 138 and 354 sqq.).

§ 37. Fourth Conj. Fut. in _-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 Impf. in _-bam_ was) by the Augustan poets, though Propertius ventures on _dentbam_ iii. 21, 32. In Late Latin poetry it reappears, _e.g._ _lorgibor, Juven._ ii. 562. The existence of _audibam_ beside _audībo_, and of _dībo_ beside _dicam_ may have led in Vulgar Latin to the coinage of an Imperfect without _b_, whence Romance Imperfects like Sard. _timia_, _finia_ (but _istava_, Lat. _stabam_) (see § 34). _Red-dibo_, an _O. Lat._ Fut. of _reddo_, shows the Fut. of _do, dībo_, _e.g._ Plaut. _Men._ 1038 (perhaps _reddibō_ is the spelling indicated here and elsewhere by the MSS._):

```
salutum tibi ita, ut mihi dedisti, reddibo: hic me máne modo.
```

The Fut. of _eo_ and its Compounds, as of _nēqueo, has_ _-ibo_ in class. Latin as well as in the earlier period; and it is not till Late Latin that forms like _reddit, transit_ came into use (_rex_ in _Hor._ C. iv. 4. 65: _merses profundo, pulerio event_, it is the reading of inferior MSS., and like _molibit_ of _C._ iii. 23. 19 has no probability._

Whether third Conjugation _YO-stems_ took this form of Future (and the Imperfect in _-ibam_) is very doubtful. _Paribis for pāries_, quoted from an _Attelana_ of _Pomponius_ (_Com._ 20 R) may be a vulgarism. _Adgreō_ _dibor_ is the reading of the Palimpsest in Plaut. _Pers._ 15, as against _adgreōre_ (_aggredior_) of the other MSS., and seems to be required by the metre; _congreō_ _dibor_ of all the MSS. (AP) in _Plaut._ _Most._ 783 is changed by editors to _congregibor._

§ 38. Third Conj. Fut. in _-ēbo_. _Vireō_ is quoted by _Nonius_ (_509. 3 M._) from _Novius_ (_Com._ 10 R):

```
tibi dum uiuebō, fidēlis ēro,
```

1 Still all the instances of this spelling of _Cato's_ seem to be _1 Sg._ _Fut._ In MSS. of _Plautus_ we find _-en_ occasionally in _1 Sg._ _Fut._ _of Verbs in_ _-io_ (for the references, see _Neue, ii._ p. 447; and cf. above, ch. ii. §§ 1, 3, on the Vulg. Lat. change of _a_ to _e_ after _i_), _e.g._ _facet, accipier_; also _sinem, Truc._ 963 (in the Palatine MSS._).
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 *exseguebo sanguinem*:

iam ego mé conuortam in hirúdinem atque eorum éxseguebo sanguinem,

though in another passage he has the usual *exsugam* in this phrase, *Poen., 614*:

iam nune ego ilicé égredienti sanguinem exsugám procul

(in *Rud., 1009* the correct reading is: exurgebo quidquid umoris tibist). (On Late Latin *inerebis, 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, č being the usual Reduplication-vowel: e. g. from the root *gn-* (Lat. *gi-gn-o*) the Perfect-stem was *ğe-gon-*, *ğe-ğn-* (Gk. *γέ-γον-ε*, *γέ-γν-ε*; cf. O. Ind. *ja-ján-a*, *ja-já-úr*), 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-*, 'to see, know' (Lat. *vid-vo*) the Perfect-stem was *woid-*, *wíd-* (Gk. *ώδ-ε*, *ώδ-μεν*, O. Ind. *víd-a*, *vid-má*); from the root *séd-*, 'to sit' (Lat. *séd-vo*), the Perfect-stem was *séd-* (Goth. *sét-um*, Lith. *séd-čs*, Partic.). Verbs beginning with vowels, e. g. root *ed-*., 'to eat' (Perfect-stem *éd-*, O. Ind. *ād-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-σται* (beside *δέ-δεκ-ται*) from *δέχωμαι*, 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. *tēli*, which is in the time of Plautus *tē-tēl-ī*; cf. Gk. *τέ-ταλμεν*), either by that Latin habit of discarding one of two neighbouring syllables with similar form [ar(č)i]-cābīi, &c.; see ch. iii. § 13. p. 176] *re-t(e)-tuli* (so *dē-tondī*, O. Lat. *de-tō-tondī* beside *to-tondī*), 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. ἐ-δείκ-ε-α, O. Ind. ā-dīkṣ-am, and gave to these its own peculiar person-endings (1 Sg. -i from I.-Eur. -ai or -ai, O. Ind. -ē, 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 *deīk-s-* (Gk. ἐ-δείκ-ε-α) is in Latin called a Perfect, not an Aorist, and is declined like a true Perfect, *dix-i* (O. Lat. *deixei, *deīk-s-ai*), 3 Sg. *dixit* (O. Lat. -it, -eit) like mēmīni, 3 Sg. nēmīnit (O. Lat. -it, -eit).

Strong Aorists, both Reduplicated (e.g. Gk. ἐ-πε-φυο-ν from ἔθην,-, 'to kill') and Unreduplicated (e.g. Gk. ἐ-γενό-μυ from ἔγεν-), 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 Unreduplicated) is hard to find. Thus Lat. *fuli* of *fuli-l* from *fi-nul-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. bhi-bhīd-ē, 1 Sg.) as well as to the Plural (and Dual) Persons of the Active Perfect (e.g. O. Ind. bhi-bhīd-ur, 3 Pl.). It may however be claimed for the Strong Aorist class, like O. Ind. ā-bhīda-m, Aor.; and similarly *scīd-i* has been called a Strong Aorist (O. Ind. ā-chīda-m) with the Latin Perfect-ending, while *scī- cid-i* is the true Perfect-form; even *scī-cid-i* might be itself ascribed to a Reduplicated Aorist-class, as *tēti* has been identified with Gk. τε-ταγ-ών, pētī with Gk. τε-ταγο-ίν. It seems best to class these Latin forms merely as 'Reduplicated' and 'Unreduplicated,' without the more definite title of 'Reduplicated Perfect,' 'Unreduplicated Perfect.' To attempt a further subdivision into Reduplicated Aorist (or Preterite), Unreduplicated 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. \( umē-v-i, re-plē-v-i, audi-v-i, mōn-v-i \). This formation has not yet been satisfactorily explained (see below). The \( v \) disappears in audiit (pronounced audiit in ordinary speech, audiit in Poetry), audiēt, abīt, as in divitior from divitior, O. Lat. dīnus from divinus (ch. ii. § 53), sīs for sī vis.

Examples of the various types of Latin Perfect are:

1. Reduplicated: \( dē-d-l-ī \) (O. Ind. dū-d-ē, Perf. Mīd.; cf. O. Ind. ā-da-da-m, Impf.), Osc. de-d-ēd 'dedit,' Umbr. dēde (on the Umbro-Oscan 3 Sg. Person-ending, see § 69), ĉrē-ĉl-ēd (O. Ind. dā-dh-ē, Perf. Mīd. On crēdō, O. Ind. ĕrād-dhā-, 'I believe,' lit. 'put the heart to,' O. Ir. cērim, see § 27). The I.-Eur. Reduplication Vowel \( ĉ \) (in O. Ind. the vowel of the stem is often substituted) remains in class. Latin in forms like mē-nīn-ī (older *me-men-ī), pē-pēr-ī, but came to be assimilated in Latin fashion (see ch. iv. § 163) to the vowel of the second syllable in mō-mord-ī, tū-tūl-ī (cf. O. Ind. tu-tud-ē), &c., although in O. Lat. to the end of the Republic forms like mē-mord-ī 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 \( ĕ \) (\( ĕ \)) (ch. iii. § 18). Tu-tūd-ī, 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-tād-ē 1 Sg. Mīd., tū-tūd-ūr 3 Pl. Act.), while con-tūl-īt, quoted by Priscian (i. p. 518. 13 H.) along with con-tūd-īt from the Annals of Ennius (ll. 515 and 418 M.), may be the trace of a Latin *tā-tūd-, *te-taud- (O. Ind. tū-tād-a 1 Sg. Act., Goth. stāi-staut 1 Sg. Act., stāi-staut-un 3 Pl. Act., apparently from a root (s)taud-), like ce-cāl-ī from *ce-caid-, root (s)kaidh-. But to-tōnd-ī, spo-(s)pōnd-ī (O. Latin spe-pōnd-ī), from the roots tend- (Gk. τένω), spend- (Gk. σπένω), 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-, &c.,
for their ơ may be due to the Causative Present-stems (§ 29) with which they were associated, *toudeo (I.-Eur. *tondéyo-), *spondeo (I.-Eur. *spondéyo-). 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 1 Sg. Mid.; similarly the ul (older ol) of tetuli will be I.-Eur. l (vl) (cf. Lat. te-tul-i-nus, Gk. τέ-τλ-α-μεν) from the root tel-.

(2) Unreduplicated: vid-i, I saw, have seen, if vid- represents I.-Eur. *woid- (ch. iv. § 10, p. 228), exactly corresponds to O. Sl. vėd-ē, '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. vēd-a, 'I know,' Gk. οἶδ-α, Goth. vait; sēd-ī, unless it stands for *sē-sēl-ī, as sūlo for *sī-sēl-o (§ 9)1, shows the I.-Eur. Perfect-stem sēd- of Goth. sēt-um 1 Pl., Lith. sēd-ēs Partic.; ūd-ī shows I.-Eur. ēd- of O. Ind. ād-a Act., Goth. fr-ēt; ēgi, the Perfect of āgo, does not show I.-Eur. āg-(O. Ind. āj-a, Gk. ἡγ-μα, O. Scand. ēk; cf. Lat. amb-āges), but adopts a Latin raising of ā to ē, seen in other verbs whose root-vowel is a, e. g. ēpēi' 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-mēn, fāc-i o beside fēc-i (Gk. ἐγκα) from root dhē-].

A similar absence of Reduplication appears in Umbro-Ocean, e. g. Osc. dēcūst 'dixerit' (beside Umbr. dersicūst), Umbr. fakust 'fecerit' (beside Osc. fēfacūst), Umbr. vurtus 'verterit' and ku-vurtus 'converteris.'

(3) S-Aorist (Preterite): dīx-ī, older dēx-ei (Gk. ἔδειξ-α; cf. O. Ind. ā-dīkṣa-m) from the root deik-, a Reduplicated Perfect (Aorist?) of which appears in Umbr. de-rsic-ust 'dixerit' (Umbr. rs expresses an intervocalic ī-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. ē (Umbr. ē).
eũa for *eũa) has a short vowel according to Priscian, i. 466. 7 H., like %i-tus which has the weak grade ūs- of the root eus- (cf. Late Lat. ostile for +xmlile, &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-dikšam just mentioned, Gk. ῥ-peξ-α, sometimes a still higher grade; e.g. from the root leiq²-, O. Ind. á-rāikšam Act. [Gk. ε-λειψ-α may represent -lēiq²- or -lēiq³- (ch. iv. § 45), O. Ind. á-rīks-i Mid. has the weak grade] ; and the same variety appears in Latin S-Perfects, e.g. di-vīdeo, di-visi, but āro, āsīi. 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 Perfects in -xi which have the vowel e before this ending, e. g. il-lexi from incubio, and for no others, e. g. dux-i from dúco (so perdūctus, Audacis exc. 359. 15 K., but dedūxerunt 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. ῥ-peξa), there remains a further question whether the long vowel is not due to a similar phonetic law for the group -s, as that which grammarians mention for the group -t (in rectus, lectus, tectus, &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, rēx- for rēg-(e)s-.) The vocalism of the Perfect of jūbeo 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. yōdhati), 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 ĵūsi, as in
the Perfect of mitto. O. Lat. meissei became class. Lat. misi (see
ch. ii. § 129). Cedo has cessi (Prisc. i. 466. 6 H.). Perfects
in -ssi often come from Verb-stems ending in -s, e.g. from
the root eus-, us-ss; thus prēmo probably takes its Perfect
vest-si from a lost Present *preso [cf. Gk. τρέ(σ)ω and τρέω;
Lat. ter(s)-eo and trēm-o, § 3]. Fluxi comes from the stem
*bhlu.sg* (Gk. oivó-φιλώξ), the guttural becoming v in fluvo, class.
fluov; co-nixi from the root kneighb* (cf. nicto); fixi from the stem
dheig*-s, the O. Lat. Present being fivo (§ 7); vexi from the
root wegh-*, Pres. vēho, and so on.

The S-Aorist is not found with Vowel Verbs in Latin as it is
in Greek, e. g. ἐ-τίμη-σα (Dor. -āσα), ἐ-φίλη-σα (with σ apparently
for σσ as in eīσα for *εύσ-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, Osc. duunatad 'donavit' quasi
*donasst, dadikattēd 'dedicavit,' prufattēd, prūfattēns 'probavit,
probaverunt,' teremmattēns 'terminaverunt' [all the examples
preserved belong to the first Conjugation, and so do almost all of
the Latin examples of -ss- forms, e.g. amassō, amassim, amassere (see
§ 5)].

(4) With v (v). This is the Perfect-stem formation of Vowel-
Verbs, as of the first Conjugation, āmūi, nēcā-vi, and with the
v (v) added to a stem not ending in -ā, nēc-vi (so orēpavi and
crepvui, cūbavi and cūbui, dīmēcavi and dīmēcui, &c.), of the second
replēvi, monnī, of the third strā-vi, sē-vi, cre-vi, sē-vi, of the fourth
audīvi, dēsīlāri, and dēsīlēvi. 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-vi (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).
Statūi, fūi, &c. were in O. Lat. statūi (statūvi), fūvi. Pōnūi is
a form introduced by the false apprehension of pō-sittus [from
the Preposition pō- (Gk. ἀπό, Lat. ab, ch. ix. § 12) and sittus
P. P. P. of sīno (pōno for pō-σίνο, ch. iv. § 151)], as if it were
posī-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, misti, which are best regarded as phonetic developments of the full forms amāvisti, mitisti, 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 se-vi is formed from the root sē- (cf. sē-men), but sevo is a Reduplicated Present, for *ṣi-s-o (cf. Gk. ἵμα for *ṣi-ση-μυ, § 9); crē-vi, I determined, sī-vi, strā-vi and others exhibit Nasalized Present-stems, cer-no, sī-no, ster-no (see § 10); crē-vi, I grew, nō-vi, abōlē-vi and abol-ui 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 gēm- (Goth. gēnum 1 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. tēfaciēl 'fecerit.' But in Latin the Perfect Subjunctive adds to the Perfect-stem -ērim, -ēris, -ērit, &c. (3 Pl. -ērivit), 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 vidēs- (cf. cīnēs-), which is seen in its proper form in vidēs-sem (see § 52). In the Perfect Subjunctive person-endings ē, not ē, is correct; scansions with ē 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-tī (O. Ind. ta-sth-ē), stē-li-mus, older stē-te-mos (Gk. ἱστημι); pe-pēd-i from pēdo for *pezed-o (O. Engl. fist); ce-clī-nī, older *ce-chen-ei (O. Ir. ce-chan); but with the Reduplication-vowel changed, di-dī-i, Pres. disco for *dic-sco; pō-pose-i, O. Lat. pe-pose-i for *pe-pēk (root prek-) with ‘Inceptive’-stem suffix -sk- (§ 22) (cf. O. Ind. paprach-a, Act.), Umbr. pe-purk-urent ‘rogaverint.’ Peculiar to O. Lat. are: te-tīnī (O. Ind. ta-tan-ē from tan-, L.-Eur. ten-, ‘to stretch’), which was used as a Perfect of ēneo (apud veteres ‘teti’ = dicitur Diom. 372. 18 K.).

Nonius (178. 7 M.) quotes tetinisse and tetinerim from Paeonius, tetinerit from Aecius; in Plaut. Amph. 926 we should probably read absti-nei for abstines of the MSS.:
nunc quānō factis me inpudicis ābsti-nei,
ab inpudicis dictis auortī uolo,

and teti, -tini should perhaps be read for teni, -lini in other passages of Plautus (Studem. Stud. ii. 122 n.); Paul. Fest. (335. 7 Th.) has preserved for us an old angular phrase, discussed by Messala in his Treatise on Augury, purima tetinera ‘purissime tenuero’; scīdi (sciscidi?), illustrated by Priscian (i. 517. 3 H.) with several passages from the Dramatists.

§ 41. Unreuplicated. The following, with short vowel, which are often referred to L.-Eur. strong (unreuplicated) Aorists, are more probably reduplicated forms which have lost their Reduplication, first in Compounds, then in the Simple Verb: tāli (see below); sci-dī (cf. O. Ind. ci-chid-ē Perf. Mid., ā-chida-m Aor.), in O. Lat. sci-clī-dī (see above), cf. ab-scīdi, di-scīdi, re-scīdi, &c.; fidi (cf. O. Ind. bi-bhid-ē Perf. Mid., ā-bhida-m Aor.), rare in the Simple Verb, but more frequent in the Compound dif-fīdī (e.g. Virg. A. ix. 588 tempora plumbo diffidit; Hor. C. iii. 16. 13 diffidit urbium Portas vir Macedo); -cīlī only occurs in the Compound per-cūlī, just as -pūlī (in the Simple Verb pēpūlī) is only found in Compounds, dispūlī, impūlī, &c. (cf. rep(e)pūtī).

And a large number of the forms usually quoted as Unreuplicated Perfects with stem-vowel unchanged rest on very insecure foundation: -cundi occurs only in Compounds ac-cendi, in-cendi, &c.; the same is true of -fendi of de-fendi, of-fendi, and -hendi of pre-hendi, nor can we be certain whether the e in these Perfects was short or long; *lambi is attested by Priscian (i. 506. 25 H.) with the single example of a line of Lucilius (xiii. 11 M.):

ineundasque puer qui lamberat ore placentas,
where lamberat is evidently Pres. of lambero (Plaut. Pseud. 743):
eúgepae: lepidé, Charine, meó ludo lamberas),
and is probably the very word which is quoted by Paul. Fest. 81. 30 Th. ‘lamberat’ scindit ac ianiat; for *psalī Priscian quotes only a line of Caesius Bassus, the friend of Persius, with psallerat; of mando he says (i. 419. 13 H.) ejus praeteritum perfectum quidem ali mandui, ali mandidi esse voluerunt; Livius tamen in Odyssia (a later hexamer version):
cum socios nostros mandisset impius Cyclops;
-\textit{cērri} (cf. Prisc. i. 532. 22 H.) is easily attested for Compounds, but not for the Simple Verb, and the same is true of \textit{-cādi} (Prisc. i. 515. 16 H.), and to a great extent of \textit{velli} (Virg. \textit{Ec}. vi. 4 vellit et admonuit).

Of the remaining examples of Unreduplicated Perfect with Stem-vowel unchanged, \textit{ici} (Pf. of \textit{ioo}? see Wharton, \textit{Etyma Lat.} s. v.), \textit{strīdī}, \textit{visi} (an S-Aorist?); the usual Perfect of these Present S-stems is in -\textit{iri}, e.g. \textit{acces-\textit{iri}}, \textit{quaes-\textit{iri}}, from \textit{acces}, \textit{quaes}(\gamma), \textit{\textsection} 3), and better attested than these, \textit{pāndi}, \textit{prandi, scāndi, cērti} (on \textit{sidi}, \textit{bibi}, see below); the Verbs with Present in -\textit{ndo} are sometimes credited with a Perfect in -\textit{didi} instead of -\textit{di} (cf. \textit{condi}dī, but in composition \textit{abcondi}dī, though \textit{abcondidī} is quoted from the Republican Dramatists by Nonius, 75. 22 M.), e.g. \textit{descendidi}, quoted from Valerius Antias and Laberus by Gell. vi. 9, 17, \textit{mandidi}, a byform of \textit{mani} (Prisc. i. 419. 13 H., just cited), \textit{prandi}dī, censured by Diomedes, 367. 17 K. This -\textit{didi} is proper to verbs compounded with \textit{do} (1) to give, (2) to put, so is applied by false analogy to \textit{do-secondo}, from the L-Eur. root \textit{skand}- (O. Ind. \textit{skanda}, Gk. \textit{σκανδάληρφν}, O. Ir. \textit{rossoasadain}); the formation of \textit{pāndo} (cf. Osc. \textit{patensins 'aperīrent’ (?))}, \textit{mando, prando} is not clear (see \textsection 14). \textit{Verti}, O. Lat. \textit{vorti} (\textit{ro} became \textit{v}- in the course of the second cent. n. c., ch. iv. \textsection 10), has probably the weak stem \textit{*wrt-}, with which we may compare either the O. Ind. Reduplicated Perf. \textit{M.} var. \textit{vītē} or the O. Ind. Unreduplicated Aorist \textit{ā-vīta-m}; but while the Umbrian forms \textit{ku-vurtus}, \textit{cor-tutus} (or \textit{courtust}, or \textit{conwartus}?), 'converterēs' \textit{‘convertērit, ku-vurtu, co-vertu ‘convertito,' point to a different stem for the Present \textit{wert-}; cf. O. Ind. \textit{vārtatā}) and the Perfect \textit{(wrt-)}, the O. Lat. spelling shows \textit{vort-} (\textit{wrt-}) both in the Present and in the Perfect, as well as in the Perfect Participle Passive \textit{vorsus} (\textit{*wrt-to-}, O. Ind. \textit{vṛtta-}), 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 \textit{vorto} may, however, have represented the pronunciation \textit{vertō} (see ch. iv. \textsection 10).

The alternation of \textit{ā} in Present- with \textit{ē} in Perfect-stem is seen in \textit{fācio} (Umbri. \textit{fācia}, Osc. \textit{fakiai}d "faciat") and \textit{fēc-i} (I.-Eur. \textit{dhē-k} of Gk. \textit{ἐθηκ-}), \textit{frānco} (root \textit{bhrēy}, Goth. \textit{brikan}; see ch. iv. \textsection 51), and \textit{frēg-i, jācio and jēci, cāpio and cēpi, pango and pēgi, ige and ecēpi} (Lucr.) and \textit{apere} (ch. ii. \textsection 150), it is seen also in Oscan \textit{hipid ‘habuerit’} (Osc. \textit{i} is L-Eur. \textit{e}), though \textit{*hēbi} is unknown in Latin; that of \textit{ō} with \textit{ā} in \textit{fōd-īo} and \textit{fōd-ī} [the L-Eur. root is] \textit{bhēdī}, Lith. \textit{bedu}, 'I dig,' W. \textit{bedd}, 'a grave,' varying with \textit{bhdē}, Gk. \textit{βδέω} (with \textit{β} for \textit{π}), Lith. \textit{bada}, 'I prick,' O. Sl. \textit{boða}]; of \textit{ō} with \textit{ā} there is one doubtful example, \textit{seíbo} (with \textit{ā} in \textit{scāberet}, Hor. S. i. 10. 71) and \textit{scāberat}, quoted as a Pluperf. (with \textit{lamberat}, on which see above) by Priscian from Lucell. ix. 77 M. \textit{scaberaet} ut porus concrītis arbores costis; that of \textit{ē} with \textit{ē} is seen in \textit{ēdo and ēdī, ēmo and ēmi, ēgō and ēgī, sēdeo and sēdi, vēnīo (en for \textit{m}, \textit{n}, like Gk. \textit{βαινω}) and vēnī for \textit{*vēmī} (Goth. \textit{gēnum}, 1 Pl.); the weak stem with short vowel is seen in the Present, but not in the Perfect, in \textit{fūgio} and \textit{fūgi} (root \textit{bheug-}), \textit{lūpno} and \textit{lūpi} (root \textit{leiqa-}), \textit{rūmpo} and \textit{rūpi} (root \textit{reup-}), \textit{vēdeo} and \textit{vēdi} (root \textit{weik-}), \textit{vīnco} and \textit{vici} (root \textit{wēik-}), \textit{fāndo} and \textit{fādi}.

\textsection 42. Form of Reduplication. When the root of the Verb began with a group of consonants the I.-Eur. languages is to use only the first consonant of the group in the Reduplication-syllable, e.g. I.-Eur. \textit{*ke-klōw-}, \textit{*ke-klu-}, the Perfect-stems from the root \textit{klu-}, 'to hear' (Gk. \textit{κλαυτε}; cf.
O. Ind. āu-śrāva, O. Ir. ru chuala from *eu-clowa, both of these last having the weak stem vowel ā instead of the Reduplication-vowel ō. This form of Reduplication appears in Latin Reduplicated Presents (see § 9) like si-s-to (I.-Eur. *si-st-, Zend hi-śtāiti, Gk. ἵστημι, 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. spo-pond-i (spo-spondi is occasionally found in MSS.), sci-st-t-i (v. l. sciscidē), Goth. stai-stāt, O. Ind. ta-stāhū (from O. Ind. stā-, ‘to stand’). Bibi shows the ō of bi-b-o, the Reduplication-vowel of Present-stems, as ō of Perfect-stems. Similarly di-di-i may owe its ō to the fact that disco is a Reduplicated Present for *di-de-so (cf. Gk. δι-δόσω for *δι-δόσω) (but see § 22). The Roman grammarians were in doubt whether the correct Perfect of sisto was sīc-t-i or sīc-t-i (see Georges, s. v.), Gellius (ii. 14) speaks of an old MS. of Cato’s speeches which had the reading vaditionum stellasēs, a reading changed by ‘emendatores’ to vaditionum stellasēs; the same doubt existed whether sūdi or vēdi was the Perfect of sūdo (*si-sd-o).

§ 43. Assimilation of Reduplication-vowel to Stem-vowel. Aulus Gellius, in a chapter dealing with peculiar forms of the Latin Perfect (N. A. vi. 9; cf. Nonius 140. 19 M.), says that although posposi, monordi, pepugi, cucurri were the forms used in his time by almost all educated men (omnes ferme doctiores), the older writers used ō in the Reduplication-syllable. He quotes memordi from Ennius (from his poem to Scipio, and referring to the rivals of his heros) (Sat. 20 M.):

meum non est, ut (v. l. at) si mé canis memóderit,
from Laberius, Nigidius, Atta, and Plautus (Aul. fr. 2 ut admemordit hominem), remarking that the last author used also praec-morsisset (the S-Aorist form), posposi from Valerius Antias, pepugero from Atta, oecurrit from Aelius Tubero, spepanderit from Valerius Antias. He even assigns similar forms to Cicero and Caesar (sic M. Tullius et C. Caesar mordeo ‘memordi,’ pungo ‘pepugi,’ spondeo ‘spongō’ 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. Poes. 1074 one of the Palatine MSS. has memordit (D), another me mordit (C), another momordit (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(ē)-cībīi, ch. iii. § 13. p. 176]. This practice of Latin [cf. Gk. ἀρ(ή)-cībī], along with the liability of every short second syllable to Syncope under the older law of Accentuation (ch. iii. § 13), must have operated mostpowerfully to the detriment of the Reduplication-syllable in Compounds, so that it is wrong to refer all Latin Unreduplicated Perfects to I.-Eur. Unreduplicated Perfect and Aorist forms. A Perfect like tūtī, which has in Plautus the form tētī, in Terence usually the Unreduplicated form, tūtī, 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 retātī (not retāti, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) has a double ŏ, which
is clearly not due to the Preposition having had the form red-, but like the
double p of reppēri (beside répērīo), repūlī (beside répello), to the Syncope of the
Reduplication-vowel, re-(ē) -tuli, like re-p(ī) -peri, re-p(ī) -puli. Other compounds,
like con-tuli, ob-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-
pounds. *Contulli, *obtulli, *attulli, *sustulli are impossible forms; they must in
Latin orthography be written contulli, obtulli, attulli, sustulli, 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 pro-
nounces for the first of these alternatives, and warrants us in asserting that
an original tetulli has been reduced to tulli in the Perfect of all the Compounds
of fero (tollo), and in denying the theory that they show an original tulli, an
Aorist formation like Subj. atudás, &c. (see § 44). The shortened form tulli
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-tulli, at-tulli, ob-tulli, &c. would
naturally lead to the preference of tulli for the more cumbersome tetulli, 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(ī)puli, com-pepuli, 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. av-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 geminant, cum
composita fuerint, geminare non possunt), attondi (in Plaut. &c.), despondi
(Plaut., Ter., Cic.), proec idi (Plaut., Cic.) beside totondi, spopondi, ec̣ idi; and this
fact is additional evidence of Latin Unreuplicated forms having lost the
Reduplication-syllable in Composition.

§ 45. Co-existent Reduplicated and Unreuplicated forms. A more certain
example of an Unreuplicated 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 praeciser; and in addition a third Perfect is men-
tioned by the grammarians for the Simple Verb (not the Compounds), an
S-Aorist form panxi, e.g. in the elegiac epitaph of Ennius (ap. Cic. Tusc. i. 15. 34):

hic uestrum panxī maxima facta patrum.

In the same way O. Lat. fēfaked of the very ancient inscription on a Prænés-
tine brooch (C. I. L. xiv. 4123): Manios med fēfaked Numasioi, seems to be
from a Perfect-stem *fē- fēcē (and similarly Osc. fēvacst ' fecerit ' Fut. Pft., and
fēvacit ' fecerit ' Pft. Subj., will have a not ā), anterior to the weakening of
unaccented vowels (see ch. iii. § 18). It would have been in class. Latin, had
the form survived, *fēcēi, related to fēci as pēpīgi to pēgi.

§ 46. S-Preterite. Examples of parallel Latin and Greek forms are dixi,
O. Lat. dei- (Gk. ἐδειγά) (both Lat. dei- and Gk. δει- may before a consonant represent I.-Eur. dei-, ch. iv. § 45), vexi (Gk. ἑδειγα), texti (Gk. ἐστετεκα), depsi (Gk. ἐκελευα), manai (Gk. ἐμαυα for *ἐμενκα), isisi (Gk. ἐσσα for *ἐσσα), pexi (Gk. ἐπεξαµν). The substitution of -si for -xi (of sonxi, tixxi, &c.) in multis from (1) mulseo, (2) mulgeo, fulsi from (1) fulcio, (2) fulgeo, parsii (and peperi) from parco, sparsi from spargo, &c. is due to the preceding consonants t, r (see ch. iv. § 157). The same Verb may use as its Perfect both the S-formation and the Reduplicated Perfect; thus parco has parsii and peperi; praemordeo has praemordii and praemorsii (Plaut. fr. 120 G.): surgo has surreci, but in Livius Andronicus often surregi (in the old spelling surregi; Paul. Fest. 423. r Th. 'suregit' et 'sortus' pro surrexit, et quasi fissi surrectus, fregenter posuit Livius); the difference between di-lossi, neg-lossi (cf. intel-lossi) and di-lossi, e-lossi, &c. has been explained by referring the Perfects with x to a lost Present *lego (Gk. ἀλεγω, to care for); ino, to buy (cf. rentimo, colimo), in O. Lat. to take (Paul. Fest. 53. 26 Th. emere, quod nunc est mercari, antiqui accipiebant pro accipere) as in ad-ino, to take away, O. Lat. ab-emo with the same sense (Paul. Fest. 4. 11 Th. 'abemito' signifies demito vel auferio. 'emere' enim antiqui dieciant pro accipere), dūr-imo, inter-imó, ex-imó (cf. M. Ir. to-emaim, 'I take,' Lith. imai, O. Sl. ima), retains in these Compounds the Perfect-formation of the Simple Verb ēmi, redēmi, coemī, ademī, &c., but in the Compounds cōno, dēno, pōno, sōno, in which its connexion with emo is obscured, it takes an S-Preterite, compsi, dempsi, prompsi, sumpsi (O. Lat. surremit however for sumpsi is quoted by Paul. Fest. 425. 3 Th.); similarly āmilco, a Compound of fācio, is conjugated inconsistently with its forgotten origin amici and amici, amictum, amicere (cf. ambitiun Supine of ambio, a Compound of eo, but ambitus, a going round, canvassing, &c.); why elicio should have as Perfect eliciui, but aliciui, allexiui is not clear.

§ 47. Origin of the Perfect in -vi (-ui). The v (u) of Perfects like āmā-vi, mōn-vi has been variously 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 fūr-v (ch. iv. § 144) from the root dheghs-fōri being regarded as a Perfect formed in the same way as fāli from fōdiō, and not in the manner stated in § 39. 4) and other even less satisfactory hypotheses. A very plausible theory supposes I.-Eur. -vi 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-jānā (with final unaccented i dropped) with Lat. (g)īnīi (with the middle 1 Sg. ending -ai), O. Ind. pa-prāu with Lat. ābēri. 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-dāt, 'I have given,' 'he has given,' but da-dātha, 'thou hast given,' &c., so that the original Latin paradigm may have been plēri, plēsthi, plēcit, &c. There is also an explanation possible which connects these Latin Perfects with Oscan (and probably Umbrian) Perfects in -f (-ff-), such as Ose. aa-mana-fled 'amandavit' 'facendum curavit,' aikda-fed 'aequidavit' 'vines ad normam dererit,' prōf-fed 'probavit,' fufens 'fuerunt.' This Oscan f has been naturally explained, like f of Oscan fu-fans 'erant,' Falisc. bare-f 'carebo,' as representing I.-Eur. bh, seen in O. Ir. charub 'amabo' (quasi 'carabo'). But Italic f may also represent I.-Eur. dh (see ch. iv. § 114), so that these Oscan Perfects, if separable from the Impft. fufans, may contain an Auxiliary Verb connected with the root dhe-, 'to put' (Gk. θήσµα, Lat. crē-do, § 27 and p. 363). Latin n (u) in the middle of a word
may represent *dv (I.-Eur. dw, as in suäcis, I.-Eur. *swädu-, and probably also I.-Eur. dhv), while at the beginning of a word I.-Eur. dw- is represented by Latin b, e.g. bis from I.-Eur. *dwis (Gk. δω[π]) so that the v of the Latin Perfect and the f, ff of the Ocean may both represent the dhw- of a weak stem from the root dhv, ‘to put, place,’ a stem which appears in a fuller form (the E-grade? ch. iv. § 51) in Lat. crë-duas, as the numeral duo (see ch. vi. § 59) appears beside bis. If this explanation, which requires a good many possibilities, be right, Ocean-manaffed will correspond to Latin cüvati, &c., Ocean pruffed to Latin cabut, &c., and the -ss- of messus, &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 cüvati beside cubavi, crëpüi beside -crepavi, the u-forms may be referred to the parallel Consonant-stems of cumbere, *crepere (percrepis, Varro, Men. 124 B.), and similarly lüci (for lüeci) to O. Lat. lüere, süni to O. Lat. söner (cf. § 92). But Perfects in -ui may also come from forms in which a short vowel preceded the Auxiliary *dhwai, just as dúo comes from élavo, dennu from dëívuo (*newód), eruum from *grögº°- (cf. Gk. ὁδος, ἐπίβ-νθος) (see ch. iii. § 24).

Perfects in -vi from Consonantal Verbs, such as petivi from pëto, radivi from rudio, lacessivi from lëcesso, arcessivi from arcesso (and similarly quaessivi for *quaessivi from quaeso, older quaeso, used as Perf. of quaero), probably come from parallel YO-stems, *petio, *radio, *lacessio, &c. (cf. salto and saltio, Perf. salti, lino and lino, Perf. lañüri, &c., § 15).

§ 48. Shortened forms of the Perfect in -vi. Latin v was often dropped when it stood between two vowels, oftenest between two i's, e.g. O. Lat. dënis for divëns, obësci for obëscisci, ätem for ävitem (so dis for divës) (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 monerim of Pacuvius, quoted as an irregular formation by Nonius (507. 23 M.)

Trag. 30 R.:

... die quid fáciam; quod me mórabis effectum dabo,

and Trag. 114 R. di mónerint meliora atque amementiam àeurruncassint tuam (parodied by Lucil. xxxvi. 35 M.), which seems to be a formation from a stem mon- (cf. Gk. μι-μωμα?) instead of the ordinary Perfect-stem monu-), unless it indicates a pronunciation món(we)rim like ἀβγίκιο of the old Dramatists (ch. ii. § 50), and possibly augir,y'a in a line of Accius (Trag. 624 R.) (quoted by Nonius 488. 2 M., who makes the word augura, by some regarded as a Neut. Pl. like róbora; cf. O. Ind. ḍjas- N., 'strength'): pró certo arbitrátor sortis, óraca, adytsus, aúgura, and prógen(y)em (?) prógenëtm in a pentameter line of a Scipio epitaph of this period (C. I. L. 1. 38, c. 130 b.c.):

progeni mi genui: facta patris petiei

(probably a graver's mistake for progeniem genui). (Pósisse, sápisse are shortened forms, not of pósuisse, supplisse, but of possvise, supplisse, § 39.4.) But Perfect-forms

1 Dömun, which is usually explained as Perf. of *domëyo-, a Causative by-form of *domäyo- (§ 29), is by some referred to an I.-Eur. stem ending in a or -ä (cf. Gk. ἀ-δαμάρωs with Lat. domitus). An example of a stem in

I.-Eur., -a is O. Ind. vamı-mi (3 Sg. vamı-ti, but also with the Thematic Vowel, vama-ti), the equivalent of Lat. viño, -ēre.
§ 48. THE VERB. PERFECT.

without v were extremely common; in Cicero's time nosse, judicasse, &c. were usual (Orat. xlvii. 157 quid quod sic loqui, nosse, judicasse' vetant, novisse' jubent et 'judicasse' quasi vero nesciamus in hoc genere et plenum verbum recte diet et inminutum usitate); and in Quintilian's time the forms audivisse, scivisse, conservavisse were scarcely heard even in public speaking [Quint. i. 6. 17–21 inhaerent tamen ei (sc. analogiae) quidam molestissima diligentiae perversitate ut 'audaciter' potius dicant quam 'audacter,' licet omnes oratores aliud sequantur . . . his permittamus et 'audivisse' et 'scivisse' et 'tribunale' et 'faciliter' dieere . . . sed abolit atque abrogata retinere insolentiae cujusdam est et frivolae in parvis jactantiae, multum enim litteratus, qui sine aspiratione et produkta secunda syllaba salutarit ('avere' est enim), et 'calefacere' dixerit potius quam quod dicimus et 'conservavisse,' his adiciat 'face' et 'dicte' et similia. Recta est haec via: quis negat? sed adjacet et mollior et magis trita]. Servius, in a note on the form lenit in Virg. Aen. i. 451, tells us that the pronunciation of every-day life was lenit, 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 annasti, nosti, abit as the favourite forms of his time; and in Terence the usual forms of Perfects in -evi, -ivi and of movi are the contracted (in Plautus the uncontracted, though in the middle, not the end, of a line siris, not sivris, is used), while the uncontracted forms of Perfects in -aevi are used only at the end of a line (in Plautus equally with the contracted). Etq and its compounds have even in Plautus usually the form -it in Perfect forms, except evi, exivi, ambivit, &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 i's. The shortened form of -aevit, 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 -aevit, e.g. Ital. compò from a Vulg. Lat. *comp(v)i aut. (On audít, &c. for audívit, 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 avv for -avv in ćeveram (pronounced *ćeveram?) and -aev in amăveram. But even these Perfects when o, u precede v, are contracted almost as readily as the others: e.g. dēvōro for dēvōvō in the Praetextata of Accius called 'Decius' (referring to Decius Mus) [Trag. (Praet.) 15 R.]

pátio exemplo et mé dicabo atque animam deuoro hóstibus;

commôrat, Ter. Phrm. 101; commôrunt, remosse, Lucr.; adjáro (or adjáério?) in a passage of the eleventh book of Ennius' Annals (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 euramue leunaso,
quae nunc te coquit et uersat in pectore fixa,
equivit erit praemi?

and the same form (3 Sg.) in Plaut. Rud. 305 and Ter. Phrm. 537, &c. Môrunt, mîram, commôrunt, commôrâm, commossem, &c. are not uncommon in the Augustan poets, e.g. Hor. S. i. 9. 48:

dispeream ni

summosses omnis,
and jüerint occurs in Catullus, lxvi. 18:

non, ita me diui, uera gemunt, inerint

(for other examples, see Neue, ii. 533). The usage on inscriptions of the 3 Pl. Pft. forms of córo, próba similarly points to the forms with v being the older [e. g. coraverunt, C. I. L. i. 73, coraverunt 1419, coraverunt 565, &c. (once coraverunt), but coraverunt and coraverunt, coraverunt].

§ 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 dixì, dixèm, dixe, &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 dixì 'excessa syllaba' in the pro Cæcine, 29. 82.) A thing that is almost conclusive proof that dixèm, &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 *capsëm, answering to capsín, no *axem answering to axim. [On the wrongness of the readings subaxet (for subaxcit) in Faëv. Trag. 163 R., facet in Plaut. Capt. 712, accopati, Trin. 420, 564, &c., see Neue, i.ii. p. 539, and for examples of the shortened forms of Perfects in -si (-xi), E. g. vixem and virem in Varro (Mon. 321 B. non eos optime vixi qui diutissime vixent sed qui modestissime), misti, missi, scripti, rescripti (Cic. ad Att. v. 9. 2), -sumpsi, -sumpsae, -cessi, -cessam, -cess, ducti, duxse, -specti, -spexae, vecti, traxe, censure, &c. see Neue, i.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 phuo, tuo was short in the Present but long in the Perfect Indicative, as in the Perfect Participle Passive of similar verbs (J. L. ix. 104 quidam reprehendunt, quod 'pluit' et 'luit' dicas in praeterito et praesentii tempore, cum analogiae sui cujusque temporis verba debeat discrimine. falluntur; nam est ac putant altiter, quod in praeteritis u dicimus longum 'pluit,' 'luit,' in praesentii breve 'pluit' 'luit'; idque in venditionis legi fundi 'rūta caesa' 'ita dicimus ut u producamus') (but cf. dirūtas). Priscian (i. 504. 22 H.) makes this pronunciation, -u, in the Perfects of Verbs in -uo, a feature of Old Latin, and quotes Ennius (Ann. 173 M):

adnūt sese mecum decernere ferro,

while in another passage (i. 503. 14 H.) he quotes pluvisse, pluuit with v (the quantity of the u is not mentioned) from Livy.

Institūti is the reading of the MSS. in Plaut. Most. 86 (in bacchiae metre, a metre in which the long quantity of a vowel preceding another vowel is often retained):

argumentaque in pectus múlta instituí.

The commonest instance of -āi or -āri is in the Perfect of the old verb āuo, viz. āui, used as the Perfect of anm, as āimus in the boast of Ennius on being made a Roman citizen (Ann. 431 M.):

nos sumus Romani qui āimus ante Rudini,

āui (along with profāit) in Plaut. Capt. 555:

quibus insperti saluti fluit atque is profāit,
§ 49-52. THE VERB. PLUPERFECT.

fuerim, Mil. 1364, &c., fuisset in Ennius (Ann. 297 M.):

magnam cum lassus diei
partem fuisset de summis rebus regundis.

We have the spelling FVRETT on an epitaph (C. I. L. i. 1051). (See ch. iv. § 70.)

§ 51. Some Irregular Perfects. Besides the byforms in s of the Perfect of parco, iego, &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 sorbui, says: cum recens haec declinatio a sordidi sermonis viris coeperit (cf. Caper 94. 14 K. non est... sorbui, sed sorbui), and similarly describes terui (for trici) as a 'consuetudo nova' (absorpsi is used by Lucan, iv. 100). The Perfect velsi, for velli, seems also to belong to this class of later coinages (áculsit in Lucan, v. 594; cf. Neue, ii2. 503), and -cinui of concinui (Ov., Tibull.), occamn (Sall.), incinui (Varro), &c. may be a remodelling of a Perfect with lost Reduplication -cinui (concini, occini, in-cinui) after the pattern of sónui, consonui, &c. Messui (found in the older writers) is generally regarded as due to a similar addition of the ending -ui to an already existing Perfect *messi, and also necui (with neci), pecui (with peci), 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. fásus for *it-tus, *it-ta-, fásus for *iad-tus, &c., ch. iv. § 95. 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 contuerit (see Georges Lex Wortf. s. v.). On Heteroclite Perfects like fuai, Perfect of sum, tōli (older tētīi) of fēro, see § 97.

In Vulgar Latin, as reflected in the Romance languages, the ending -ui encroached still more. Cognovit became cognovuit (Ital. conobbe), movit became movuit (Ital. movve), credidit was replaced by caduit (Ital. cadde), stēdit by stetuit (Ital. stette), venit by venuit (Ital. venne), &c. (cf. § 92 on the Vulg. Lat. P. P. P. in -itus, e.g. cadātus, fallen (Ital. caduto)). The ending -si also extended its sphere, respondit passing to responsit (Ital. rispose), prendit to pre(n)sit (Ital. prese), cucurrit to cursit (Ital. corse), &c. (See Meyer-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, -ēras, -ērat of amāv-eram, mēru-eram, replēv-eram, dilē-eram, vid-eram, pēpiŋ-eram, audīv-eram, is most naturally referred to the Imperfect of sum, though videram has been, with the O. Ind. ā-vēdiš-am, analyzed into a Noun-stem in -is (cf. vidis-sem) as Gk. ἐπάκα into a Noun-stem in -es (see § 3). The -is- of the Pluperfect Subjunctive amāvissem, mōniissem, vidissem, audvissem must, if the old view be correct which sees in these forms an
Auxiliary *essem* appended to the Perfect-stem, be a change of *-es-* to the I-vocalism of the Perfect, just as the *a* of Gk. ἐπιδήτω, &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 -ērō, -ērīs, -ērit, &c. (3 Pl. -ērunt), 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. vēdīsam) (see 3). Scansions like *fecerimus* (Catull. v. 10), 1 Pl. of *fecēro*, are due to the confusion of the Future-Perfect forms with Perfect Subjunctive forms (see Neue, ii. p. 510); *aderint* is similarly used for *āderunt* 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. *fēcacunt* *' feecerit' will be like Gk. δεδρακῶς ἔσομαι, Umbr. *fakurent* like δεδρακότες ἔσωνται. (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- (-bō-), are nothing but parts of the Auxiliary Verb bheu- (Lat. *fuī*), 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. prūfītī-set 'probata sunt,' teremnatust 'terminatus est,' Umbr. sincerō est 'scriptum est' (the Auxiliary is joined in writing with the Participle in frosatemost)], and other Tenses of the Passive (Pluperfect, Lat. amātus ēram, amatus fuēram, Future-Perfect amatus ēro, amatus fuēro, Perfect Subjunctive amātus sim, amatus fuērim, Pluperfect Subjunctive amātus essem, amatus fuīsem), but we have many other examples of Periphrastic formation. The 2 Pl. Pass. ending -mini, e.g. fuērimini, is explained (§ 81) as the ending of a Pres. Part. Pass. (Gk. φησίμενοι) with suppression of esse, just as esse is commonly suppressed in the Fut. Inf. dictūrēs, -a,-um (esse) (§ 86). Osc. manāfum 'mando,' if it correspond to mandāns sum,' is another example, showing a Pres. Part. with the Substantive Verb (cf. C.I.L. i. 196 senatuosque sententiam uetei scientes esse). The Auxiliary eo appears in the Latin Fut. Inf. Pass., e.g. dātum (1 Sup.) iri (§ 87), the Auxiliary hābeo in such phrases as missum hābeo for mīsi or dimīsi (e.g. Plaut. Pseud. 602 illa omnia missa hābeo, quae ante agere occipi), 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 faciam (e.g. Ter. Eun. 212). In the Romance languages these expressions have supplanted many of the Latin tenses; e.g. cantare hābeo (Fr. chanter-ai, Ital. canter-ò, with hābeo, habes, &c., reduced to hai, has, hat, havnt, &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 hābeo, 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. Il. i. 262 oū γάρ τοιούτος ιδον ἀνέρας οὗδε ἔτωμαι), 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 'Sanskrit' 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 ē and ə, 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. āsati(i)). In Greek these athematic Subjunctive forms are still seen in Homer (e. g. βῆσμεν, τεῖστε), and later in a few so-called Futures like ἔδω-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 ē (which in Greek varies with ə, e. g. ἕφ-η-τε, ἕφ-ω-μεν, like athematic -e- in τεῖσετε, βῆσ-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-ē- must have been an I.-Eur. Subjunctive stem of ed-, 'to eat;' for we find in Lat. edā-nus, edā-tis, in Greek ἔδω-μεν, ἔδη-τε, and in O. Ind. ādā-n 3 Pl. (O. Ind. ā may represent I.-Eur. ā, ē, ə); *es-ē- from es-, 'to be,' appears in Gk. ἔθ-τε, ἔθω-μεν (cf. O. Ind. āsā-t 3 Sg., asā-tha 2 Pl.); and ey-ā- from ei-, 'to go,' in Lat. eā-s, eā-tis (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- (- soo-)]; thus Att. τεῖσομεν, τεῖστε, δεῖξομεν, δεῖξετε, τιμήσομεν, τιμήσετε, &c. will not be of the same class as the ordinary I.-Eur. Future in -σο-, e. g. O. Ind. dék-ṣyā-mi corresponding to Gk. δεῖξω, Lith. bū-siu to Gk. φάσω, but will be Subjunctives of S-Aorists; and Latin Futures in -so-, like diavo, faxo, &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. amēs from *amāy-ē-s(i) (cf. Osc. devaud ‘juret,’ tādāt ‘censeat,’ sakahīter ‘sacetur’; Oscan ī, in the Latin alphabet ī, represents I.-Eur. ē, e.g. ligato- ‘lēgatus,’ zicolo- M. ‘diēcula’), but in Umbrian we have Ā-forms in kuraia ‘curet,’ etaians ‘intet.’ Similarly the Ė-forms were not used for the second Conjugation in Latin, to avoid confusion between *widēy-ē-s(i), *vidēs 2 Sg. Subj., and vidēs 2 Sg. Ind., only the Ā-forms being allowed, e.g. *widēy-a-s(i), vidēs. 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. ferēs 2 Sg. Subj. from *bher-ā-s(i), ferēs 2 Sg. Fut. from *bher-ē-s(i), faciel 3 Sg. Subj. (Osc. fakiiad, Volsc. facia, Umbr. facia), 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 ēdī-mus, ēdī-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 erē-mus, erē-tis (from *eso-, *eso-), which have been relegated to the Future function, as an *(e)sē-mun, *(e)sē-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 -ī-, 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-ī-tē (cf. Lat. s-i-tis). In the Thematic Conjugation the suffix was -oi- in Singular and Plural alike, e.g. from the root bher-, to carry, 2 Sg. *bher-oī-s (Gk. φέρ-οι-ς), 2 Pl. *bher-oī-te (Gk. φέρ-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 -ī-, the weak form of the suffix (e. g. class. *sim for O. Lat. siēm, like *simus, *sītis), so that a Latin Optative form-like edis might equally well represent an I.-Eur. athematic *
*ēd-ī-s (with E-grade of stem and with ī transferred to the Singular from the Plural, as -yē-
 is transferred to the Plural from the Singular in Gk. στά-ιη-μεν, a byform of σταίμεν), and an I.-Eur. thematic *
*ēd-oi-s. The probability however is that the Optative was confined to the Athematic Conjugation in Latin, and represents in every case I.-Eur. -yē-, -ī-. Again, it would be possible to argue that stēs, stēmus, &c. were representatives of I.-Eur. *stā-yē- (Gk. στά-ής, στά-ή-μεν), 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 -ē-. The use of the weak grade of the suffix -yē- in the Singular of the Optative of es-
 appears in these languages too, e.g. Umbr. si 'sis,' si 'sit, like sins 'sint,' Marruc. -si 'sis' or 'sit,' and has been referred to an Italic weakening of unaccented yē to ī. How far it is possible to assign an Optative force to forms like crēduim in the older literature, and a Subjunctive force to forms like crēduam 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 maētassint, and the formula of the ancient Augural prayer: bene sponsis beneque vulgaris; see § 5), but in process of time all distinctions between Optatives in -im, Sub-
 junctives 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 Ā-Subjunctive mitat 'mittat' used as a Future, with the Optative of the root es-, siaē 'siet,' used in the true Optative sense: goi med mitat, nei ted endo cosmīs uīrco sied 'qui me mittet, ne erga te comis Virgo sit' (asted on the same inscr. is variously interpreted as 'adstet' and as 'ast'; see ch. x. § 5). Sīen, siēs, sīet (on sien, see § 73; *siēmus, *sītis have not found their way into Latin as syāma, syāta have into O. Ind.), possiēm, &c. are by Terence used almost only at the end of a line or hemistich, i. e. through metrical necessity, but
§ 56. THE VERB. SUBJUNCTIVE.

stim, 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 (Oral. xlvii. 157) says, ‘siet’ plenum est, ‘sit’ inminutum: licet utare utroque. [For statistics, see Zander, Vers. Ital. p. cxx, who makes -sit of silt, &c. not the L.-Eur. I of the Plural, but a Latin weakening of -ie- as in Cornelli Voc. for Cornelli (? ch. vi. § 31)]. Besides the class. Lat. ‘Subjunctives’ (Optatives) in -im, sim, étim, vélim (in Plaut. velis and vis are used as the metre requires, without difference of meaning), with its Compounds nótim and málim (on nóli, see § 58), we find an O. Lat. Optative duim. It comes from duo, a system both of & do, to give (root dó-) and of -do, to put (root dhé- of ε-θή-μ, &c.), e.g. duitur (v. l. ardutur) XII Tab. x. 7, interduim, Plaut. fr. inc. 2 G. cicicum non interduim, concreduim, Aut. 585, concrédui, Perf., Cas. 479. We have in Plautus the Optative forms duim, perituim, especially in prayers and exiations (e. g. Most. 668 di istum perduint), interduim (e. g. Rud. 580 cicicum non interduim), creduium (in phrases like Amphil. 672 si situlam cépero, Núnquam mihi diuini quiequam crèduis post húc dieim, ‘may you never trust me again’), as also the A-Subjunctive forms creduam, e.g. Bach. 524 nam mihi diuini núnquam quiesquam crèduat, Ni ego, &c.), and accreduam (Asin. 854 nèque diuini nèque mi humani pósthae quiequam aderíaus . . . si, &c.), while an Æ-Subjunctive form (in Future sense?) is quoted by Paul. Fest. 20. 22 Th. adduedes, addideris (cf. ib. 47. 6 Th. dús . . . pro dederis). We have in Conditional use, e. g. duit in a Law of Numa (ap. Paul. Fest. 278. 9 Th.) si qui hominem liberum dolo scios morti duit, paricidas esto; adduit in a Plebiscitum de Ponderibus Publicis (ap. Fest. 322. 11 Th.) siguis . . . facit iussitum . . . dolumne adduit, &c. Festus also quotes an old form produit which he explains by ‘porro dederit’ (284. 16 Th.).

Duim was the form appropriate to Early Latin prayers, as in the prayer at the ‘agri iustratio,’ preserved by Cato (R. R. xlii. 3): pastores pecaueaque salua seruassis duisque bonam salutem ualeudinemque mihi domo familiaeque nostrae; it is used even in Tiberius’ exiation to the Senate (Tac. Ann. iv. 38). There are also uncertain traces of Optative forms from other verbs, such as coquint, the reading of the Palatine MSS. in Plaut. Pseud. 819 (but coeunt 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 correct reading of the Palatine MSS. in Men. 984 a, where this line of the Mostellaria is wrongly inserted, culparent 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 archtype verberetas tolle, and the first word, being mistaken for a frequentive Verb, was changed to verberitas).

An O. Lat. Æ-Subjunctive is fiam used in the sense of flam, e. g. Bacch. 156, in the amusing conversation between young Pistoeleus and his ‘paedagogus’ Lydus:

Pisr. flam, át ego opinor Hércules, tu autém Linus.

Lyd. pol métuo magis, ne Phénix tuis factis fiam, teque ád patrem esse mótum renúnti, sometimes merely in the sense of sim, e. g. Virg. A. x. 106: ’

Tros Rutulusve fuat nullo discrimine habebo.
The equivalent of \textit{forsitan} (which is not used by Plautus, and only seldom, if ever, by Terence, ch. ix. § 5) is in Plautus \textit{fors fuat an}, e. g. \textit{Pseud. 432}:

\textit{fors fuat an istaec dicta sint mendacia.}

(Cf. Ter. \textit{Hec. 610} \textit{fors fuat pol!} ‘heaven grant it may!’)

Nonius (478. 26 M.) quotes \textit{volum} for \textit{vollim} from Lucil. (xxviii. 15 M.):

\textit{eidola atque atomus uincere Epicuri uolam,}

and Plaut. \textit{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.

\section{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. \(\xi\varepsilon\text{-}\varepsilon\iota\), Lat. \textit{ex-i} from *\textit{ex-ei}), Thematic *bhere, from the root bher-, ‘to carry’ (O. Ind. bára. Arm. ber, Gk. \(\phi\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\), O. Ir. beir, Goth. bair; Lat. \textit{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. \(\iota\-\theta\iota\); O. Ind. \textit{vid-dhi}, Gk. \(\iota\sigma\theta\iota\) for *\(\iota\theta\-\theta\iota\), O. Lith. \textit{veiz-di}, O. Sl. \textit{viž-dî}); the particle -\(k\iota\) or -ke in Lithuanian, e. g. ei-k, ‘go,’ dú-k, ‘give,’ bů-k, ‘be’; the particle -\(u\) (cf. O. Ind. sü for *\(sou\), Gk. ov-tos for *\(sou\-\tos\)) in Sanscrit to the 3 Sg. and Pl., e. g. bharatu, bharantu; the particle -\(tō\) to various persons both in the Athematic and Thematic Conjugations [e. g. O. Ind. \textit{vit-tāt} 2 Sg.; Gk. \(\iota\sigma\tau\omega\) for *\(\iota\sigma\tau\-\tau\omega\) 3 Sg.; Gk. \(\varepsilon\sigma\tau\-\tau\omega(\delta)\), Lat. \textit{ex-tō(\(d\))}]. In Latin the 2 Sg. Imper. in -\(tō(\(d\))\) 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. \textit{Merc. 770} eras petito, dabitur; nunc abi; Hor. \textit{C. iii. 14. 23} si per inuisum mora janitorem Fiet, abito), and the same sense is attached to the O. Ind. 2 Sg. Imper. in -\(tāt\) (see Delbrück, \textit{Allind. Syntax}, p. 363), so that it is not unlikely that this particle -\(tō\) 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. \(\varepsilon\tau\-\tau\omega\) 3 Sg., \(\delta\mu\-\nu\-\tau\omega\) 3 Sg., O. Ind. kr-\(\nu\-\-\tauā\)t 2 Sg., ‘do thou’; but not in Latin \(\ı\lo\), Umbr. \textit{etu}, \textit{eetu}, for *\(e\i-tō\)). In the 3 Pl. it is added to what is called the ‘Injunctive’ 3 Pl., viz. a form resembling an augmentless Imperfect.
The Imperative in form 84.

Imper. 72) fer Umr. 2 Pl. the Subjunctive was used, e.g. Lat. feram, ferâmus. In the 2 Pl. we have the ‘Injunctive’ form (e.g. *bherëtë, O. Ind. bhârata, Gk. φέρετε, O. Ir. berid, Goth. bairîp; Lat. āgite from *agite), beside which we find in Latin a ‘Future’ form with -tōd, e.g. estote, apparently the addition of the 2 Plur. suffix -tōd (§ 72) to the 2 Sg. ‘Future’ Imperative (e.g. estō.)

In the Latin Passive, the Injunctive form in -sō (e.g. I.-Eur. *bherë-so, Zend bâra-so, Gk. φέρο, contr. φέρον, e-φέρο, contr. e-φέρον) is used, e.g. āgē-re for *age-sō (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. āgī-minū for *aäge-menai (Hom. Gk. āγε-μεναι), da-minū (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, dītor, aguntor (cf. Umbr. emantur, emantu, tursiandu). A byform for the 2, 3 Sg. is in -minō, e.g. praē-fāmino, formed apparently by Anal. of 2 Pl. -minī. There is no Perfect Imper. in Latin, though mēmīnī, a Perfect used for a Present, has měmento for *mement-tōd (Gk. μεμάτω for *μεμάτω-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-pē-s, vidē-s, curā-s, finā-s are Imper. im-plē, vidē (Lith. pa-vyde-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, es-t; see § 2). Fer cannot be an Injunctive form *fer-s (like ter for *ters 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 Cure. 245 aufer istace quaeo, whereas ter is a long syllable in Plautus, e.g. Bacch. 1127. In Mi. 1343 however one family of MSS. reads: fer aque animo, the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest being unfortunately wanting, a reading which may easily be changed to fer animo aqueo (as Cure. 245, for which there is similar MS. evidence, is changed by some editors to aufer quaeo istace). The

¹ Or the Plural of the old Pres. Part. Passive, agimini for *aäge-menoi (Gk. āγέ-μενοι), with ellipse of estē, as 2 Pl. Ind. agimini for the same, with ellipse of estē (§ 82). The Inf. is used for the Imper. in Italian &c. in phrases like non parliare ‘do not speak.’
small number of lines with decisive evidence on the quantity of *er in Plautus makes it difficult to speak with certainty. *er is short in Asin. 672 *er amanti ero salutem. *Vēl is a short syllable, capable of acting as a brevis brevians in Plautus, e. g. Amph. 917 vēl ēnūc rogato; *es, *be,' cannot be shown (like es, ‘art’) to be long by position in Plautus (see Solmsen, Stud. Lat. 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. ἐνι-σχε-σ, &c.) for *es-s and *ed-s.

Cē-dō (with Plur. ce-tē for *ce-dītē ?), ‘give me’ or ‘tell me,’ seems to contain the Pronoun *Kē (perhaps Lith. szē, ‘hither’; see ch. vii. § 15), prefixed as an Adverb or Preposition, ‘here,’ ‘hither’ (cf. Osc. ce-brust ‘hie venerate,’ composed of *Kē and a tense of the I.-Eur. root grem-, ‘to come’) to an atheematic Imperative *dō (Lith. dū-k; cf. Gk. ὑποφάνο), the final vowel, shortened by the Law of Brevis Breviantes after the short syllable cē-, being invariably short owing to the rapid utterance of the word in every-day talk (so hācē for axē in the pronunciation of Quintillian’s time, ch. iii. § 42).

Dē for *dō shows the same transference to the Ā-Conjugation as Pres. Ind. dās, dat (O. Lat. dāt) (see § 2).

Another example of an atheematic Imperative may be fu in the Carmen Arvale, if the words satūr fu, fere Mars, are rightly interpreted ‘satur esto, fere Mars.’ Fu will be Imper. of *fūs, like Lith. bū-k. Nōtū may come from a system of the fourth Conjugation, I.-Eur. *wel-yo- (Goth. vilja, O. Sl. velja) (see § 2). (On Late Lat. auferere, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.)

2) Thematic. The thematic Imperatives O. Lat. dīcē, dīcē, fācē (for *fācē, from stem fāc-yō-, § 16) drop their final -ē in classical Latin owing to their frequent use in word-groups, i.e. in close connexion with a following word (like a+t(yu), nēg(yu) before consonants; see ch. iii. § 35). Die mihi, fac sciam are regularly used even in O. Latin authors, and in Plautus we find dīc in questions when the next word begins with a consonant, e. g. dīc quid est, but dīcē is the form employed where there is anything of a pause after the word; cf. Mil. 256 dīcē, monstra, praecipe, and especially Rud. 124:

tu, quidquid opus est dīcē. Dic quod té rogo.

Abdūce, addūce and other Compounds of duco are still found in Terence before a vowel, ablūce, &c., before a consonant, while face is the form employed at the end of a line; eītīcē 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 -e, confice, office, inface, &c. Catullus has ingermi (xxvii. 2) : inger mi calices amariores, from which we may perhaps explain misc sane on an old Praenestine-cista with a kitchen-scene (Mil. Arch. 1890, p. 393) as misc(e) sane from *misc(o), an earlier form of misc(e) (see § 28). The Interjection em (ch. x. § 19) [e. g. em tībī, ‘take that’ (with a blow), em ergo hoc tībī, &c., in the Comedians] may have been originally Imperative of emo, which in O. Lat. (§ 46) meant ‘to take’ (thematic *emo, 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 vēlo (I.-Eur. *wel-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. deictad 'jurato,' estad, likitad 'liceto,' and in Early Latin inscriptions, e.g. 2 Sg. statod, 'sistito' on the Dvenos bowl [a Future Imperative if we are right in interpreting deictane med Mano statod 'on the ninth day set me (with an offering) for Manus']. 3 Sg. violatad, licetad, datod with exvexitod, exereto, edito 'caedito,' on the Spoletium inscription (C.I.L. ii. 4766), estod, licetad with fundatid, proiectad, parentatid on the Luceria inscr. (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, licēō, ferō, habēō, Umbr. fertu, futu 'esto,' habetu. The curious forms in -tēd and -tād on the Luceria inscr. (in hoce locuare stilus ne[qu]is fundatid nee eaduare proiectad nee parentatid) are dialectal (Subj., with i for e in -tēd?). A Third Pl. form with -d, santod, occurs on the Spoletium inscription. (On Umbrian *-tō-tā in 2, 3 Pl., see § 73.)

Deponents sometimes show -to for -tor, e.g. nihilō (Cic. ap. Diom. 340. 1 K.), uentō [C.I.L. i. 204. (1). 8], and on the Lex Repetundarum we have the Passive censento (C.I.L. 198. 77).

§ 60. Imper. Pass. 2, 3 Sg. in -mīnō. This is an O. Lat. form, found as 2 Sg. in Plautus (e.g. progrēdimino, Pseud. 859: tu spectatō simul, si quo hic gradietur, pārīter progrēdimino), and Cato (praefādimino, R. R. exli. 2 ianum Ioenesque uino praefāmino, sic dicitō) (cf. Paul. Fest. 62. 10 Th. 'famino' dicitō), and as 3 Sg. in early legal Latin; antestāmino in XII Tables: si in ius nocat, ni it, antestāmino, igitur em capito; fruīmino in the Sententia Minuciorum of 117 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 199. 32 quel ... non parebit, is eum agrum niu habeito fruīmino); progrēdimino in the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (i. 206. ii. 3; 5, 8, 11).

The corresponding suffix in Umbrian is -mu 3 Sg. (i.e. -mō, from -mōd?, ch. v. § 13), e.g. persini-μu 'precamino,' with 3 Pl. persini-μuono. In Oscan the Passive ending -r appears in 3 Sg. censanur (i.e. -mōr) 'censemonio,' but the so-called Latin 3 Pl. Imper. Pass. in -minor is a fiction of the grammarians (see Madvig, Opusc. p. 239). [Cicero in the archaic language of his laws employs appellāmino (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, auento (Sacceros); prōvunto, docuunto (Probos; cf. 3 Pl. Ind. mereunt, 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 ἑμαυτόν, or
a Neuter force, e.g. Gk. θέρωμαι, ἐρχομαι. In Latin Middle Verbs are called ‘Deponents,’ e.g. cingo like cingo me. Thus the I.-Eur. Middle *seq₂-r, ‘to follow, accompany’ (O. Ind. sácā-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’ (I.-Eur. *bherā-r), is by its absence of person-ending distinguished from the Deponent with -r, e.g. Ose. karanter ‘vescutur,’ 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 vita vivitur of O. Lat. to the Personal vita vivit of class. Lat. is parallel to Horace’s use of invideo for invidentur mihi, or Cato’s change of contumeliam factum itur to contumelia factum itur (§ 87).

The Latin Perfect, as we have seen (§ 39), represents the I.-Eur. Perfect Middle, its 1 Sg. -ē, older -ei, being I.-Eur. -ai or -ai (O. Ind. -ā), so that a Perfect like réverti (older -vorti, -vortei; cf. O. Ind. va-vrtē) goes naturally with a Present revertor. 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, póltus, so that reversus (older -vorsus; 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; adsentior tamen fere omnes dicunt. Sisenna unus 'adsentio' in senatu dicebat, et eum postea multi secuti, 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. Wortf. 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. receor, vereor, irascor. For the Greek Verb-ending -ευω (e.g. κολακ-εύω), used in Derivative verbs indicating 'to play a part,' 'to act like,' we have in Latin an Ā-Middle, e.g. aemīl-or, -āri from aemulus, angūrōr, from angur, dōmīnōr from dominus, poētōr of Ennius' frank confession (Sat. i M.):

nunquam poētōr nisi sim podager,

from poēta and so on. Examples of Frequentative Middles are hortōr from O. Lat. *hōrīor (3 Sg. horītur Enn.), mēditōr from a lost *medōr (Gk. μεδομαί), imītōr (cf. ἰμάγο), nītōr for *nīvītōr from a root with a Guttural (cf. nīxus, 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 ānimus, praeterprōptēr uitam uiiuitur,

quoted by Gellius (xix. 10) in illustration of the word praeterprōptēr, 'inexactly,' 'so so,' a word which was in his time only used in plebeian Latin (nescioquid hoc praenimis plebeium est et in opificum sermonibus quam in hominum doctorum disputationibus notius); the same construction has been seen in Plaut. Mil. 24 (epityra estur), Pseud. 817 (teritur sinapis secellis), (but see edd. ad loca), Pers. 577 (uēniri hanc uolo) (but cf. Plaut. fr. inc. l. 64 G. ego illi ueneor). 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 uadetur?, 386 facile mutibus, 'marriage is easy'; Trin. 580 ībitur; Capt. 80 quom caelestit, '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 anguo, mudo 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, aucepvo for auxcritor, vago for vagor, and so on. Quintilian (ix. 3. 6-7) remarks on the inconsistency of the Middle form of Transitive Verbs, fabricor, pinnor, arbitror, suspicor with the Active form of a Neuter or Passive Verb, vingula, and mentions as parallel forms luxuriant and luxuriat, fluctuat 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. rueto 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 ‘sonnior’). The Passive form of Deponents (e.g. vescor 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 coepus sum, instead of coepi, desitus sum instead of desit, with a Pass. Inf., e. g. urbis coepsta est aedicari (cf. mitescere discordiae cœptae, Liv.), and in O. Lat. we find potestur, poteratur, possesur similarly used (instances in Nonius p. 508 M.), nécitant, neciham (see Georges, s. v.). The Neuter sense of fit (cf. Osc. fiét ‘fiunt’), and its use as Passive of ficio (on the occasional use of faucir, apparently a vulgarism, see Georges), have changed its old Inf. fiere to fieri. Fiere 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 metamorphosis (Ann. 8 M.): memini me fieri pauom (MSS. fieri),

while Cato (ap. Prisc. i. p. 377. 11 H.) used fitur for fit, fiébantur for fiébant. (On Imperat. fi, e. g. Plaut. Pers. 38, Carc. 87, fié Carc. 89, 150, &c., see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.); so véniri is used for venire (vēnum ire) in Plaut. Pers. 577 (cf. peremuda, Epid. 74, pláciinda, Trin. 1159). As coepus sum and desitus sum replaced coepi and desit (originally Middle formations), when these verbs were used intransitively, so Intransitive Verbs like sēdeo, sāndeō, auādeo took a Perfect of Passive form sēdetus sum, gācĭtus sum, ausus sum, in O. Lat. also sēnāi, gāsĭ, ausi (Prisc. i. pp. 420, 482 H.; Non. 508. 27 M.), e. g. Liv. Andr.: quōniam audīui, paucis gāsī. On the Deponent Imperatives nillo, utundo, &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-tā, 'he is carrying,' *ē-bhērē-t, 'he was carrying,' 'he carried,' *bhērōi-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
§ 85.] THE VERB. PERSON-ENDINGS.
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distinguished by the addition of particles, e.g. I.-Eur. *bherē-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, ζπο-μαι, ferēmür, sequimur with Gk. φερό-μεθα, ζπο-μεθα, and with O. Ind. bhār-ē, bhārā-mahē). Latin, as well as the Umbro-Oscan languages, and the Celtic family, uses as the characteristic mark of its passive and deponent flexion the letter r (cf. O. Ir. sechur i Sg., sechethar 3 Sg., sechemmar 1 Pl., sechetar 3 Pl., with Lat. sequor, sequitur, sequimur, 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 Oscan or in the Celtic languages (e.g. Lat. sequor might conceivably stand for *seq₃o-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. Pft. Act. in Latin (e.g. O. Ind. ā-duh-ra, ā-vavṛ-ranta, Lat. dālērunt, 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-Oscan and Celtic, e.g. Umbr. pone esonom-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 -tu- (-tō-); O. Ir. doberr 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., iūvilas ... sakriiss sakraffir avt ultimoam kersnaís, '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 appare, '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 invidor for invidetur mihi, see above, § 62.

§ 66. (1) Active. 1 Sing. I.-Eur. Athematic Verbs ended in Primary Tenses in -mē (e. g. I.-Eur. *es-mi, O. Ind. ás-mi, Arm. em, Gk. εὕμε for *ευσ-με, Alb. jam, Goth. im, Lith. es-mi, O. Sl. jes-mi), Thematic in -ō (e. g. I.-Eur. *bher-ō, Gk. φερω, O. Ir. -būr for *berō, Goth. baira for *berō; Lith. vežū, 'veho'). In Secondary tenses the ending was -m (e. g. I.-Eur. *bher-ō-m, O. Ind. ábharam, Gk. έφερω; O. Sl. nestū, 'I carried,' for *nesom), after a consonant, -m, e. g. Gk. ἐδικα for *ἐδικα-μ. The Perfect had -ā (e. g. I.-Eur. *woīd-ā, O. Ind. vēd-a, Gk. οἶδ-α, Goth. vait for *vaitā; O. Ir. ro cechan 'cecini').

In Latin, as we have seen, Athematic Verbs form the 1 Sg. according to the Thematic Conjugation, e. g. Lat. ἔδω-ō for I.-Eur. *vēd-mi, ἔδω-ō for I.-Eur. *wēd-mi (§ 2), just as in Sanscrit Thematic Verbs take the Athematic -mi, e. g. bhārā-mi for I.-Eur. *bher-ō-m. I.-Eur. *es-mi, however, is in Latin sum, whether originally *sōmē with Syncope of final ɟ (ch. iii. § 37) or merely *sōm, it is impossible to determine (cf. Ose. sum). The curious 1 Sg. inquam 1, with the other Persons formed from a 1 Sg. inquiō, 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. ērā-m (cf. O. Ind. á-yā-m, 'I went,' Gk. ἐ-δρᾶ-v, Goth. id-dja, 'I went'), āmā-ḥa-m (cf. O. Ir. ba for *bām, 'I was'), āmāv-ērā-m, in Optative forms, e. g. si-m, O. Lat. sie-m (O. Ind. siyām, syā-m, Gk. εἰν-v), āmāv-ēri-m, āma-ssis-m, fāxi-m, and in Subjunctive, e. g. āme-m, āmāvissi-m, videa-m, fēra-m (also used as Fut., § 36), fīnia-m (cf. O. Ir. do-ber for *-ram, O. Sl. berę, used as Pres. Ind.). But the 'Future-Subjunctives' (see § 53) take the Thematic ending, e. g. ēr-o for *ōs-ō (Zend. arāhā,

1 Explained as *ind-(s)quam from the root seq- (ch. iv. § 158), or as *ind-(te)quam from the root weq-.
Hom. Gk. ēw for *ēσω, ἀμαύρ-ἐρ-ό, ἀμα-ss-ό, fax-ό, like fór-ό, stó for *stáy-ό (Umbr. stāhu).

In the Perfect, the ending of the Active Voice has been replaced in Latin by the Middle ending -ai (-ai), which became in the unaccented syllable -ei, then -i (ch. iii. § 18), tūtūd-l (O. Ind. tutud-lē), dēd-l (O. Ind. dad-ē), vid-l from *reidei, a Middle form which survives in the O. Sl. vōdē, 'I know,' for *woidai (O. Lat. fecei, poseinei, conquaeisinei, redidei, 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. *ē-si and *ēss-si, O. Ind. ā-si, Gk. ēi for *ē-si, which with the addition again of the suffix -s became ēs, Hom. ēṣ-ṣi; I.-Eur. *ei-si from the root ei-., 'to go,' O. Ind. ē-śi, Gk. ei for *ei-si; O. Ind. bhāra-si, O. Ir. beri. Goth. bairi-s), -s (e. g. I.-Eur. *ē-bhērō-si, O. Ind. ā-bhara-s, Gk. ē-φερε-s, O. Ir. do-bir; O. Sl. veze 'vexisti'; and in the Present Tense, Gk. τι̣θε-ς, Dor. φερε-ς), in the Perfect -thā (e. g. I.-Eur. *woit-tha, O. Ind. vēt-tha, Gk. oτoθα; cf. O. H. G. gi-tars-t). In Latin we have -s in ēs, 'thou art,' for *ēss (scanned as a long syllable in Plautus), whether from older *ēssī (ch. iii. § 37) or not, it is impossible to say, ἄγε-ς for *āge-s (if from an original *age-si, like O. Ir. beri from *bhēresi, 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. siū-s), agā-s, while in the 2 Sg. of the Perfect Tense we have -sti, e. g. dēdī-sti, 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-l (O. Ind. dad-ē), must represent an original -ai (-ai), while the -s reminds us of that -s- which so often appears in the endings of the second Person (e. g. Gk. ἐθν-σθα, τιθν-σθα, ἐθδλη-σθα, βάλω-σθα). (For another theory which regards vidīs- of vidīsti 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 *aṅgē-, *aṅgō-, 'to lead,' as *āṅgē is Voc. Sg. of the Thematic Noun-stem *aṅgē-, *aṅgō-, Gk. àγός, a leader,
Lat. prōd-vgus; (Athematic) v 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. quem 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 -e of O. Lat. dūce, dice, fuce [for *facě (ch. iii. § 37), from the stem facyo-, facē, § 16] is dropped in classical Latin, through its frequent use in word-groups like dic(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, *vols, which would become *fer(r), *vel(l) (ch. iv. § 153). The former word was changed to fer-s by the addition of the 2 Sg. suffix -s, as in Greek eĩ for *iō was made eĩ, thou art; for the latter was substituted the word viś, apparently 2 Sg. of a root wei-, ‘to wish’ (O. Ind. vi-, 2 Sg. vē-ši, Gk. ἴμαι).

Whether dices of the MSS. in Plaut. Trini. 606 non credibile diceis, is a relic of the old spelling of dicēs is doubtful. It may be Future.

§ 69. 3 Sg. The Primary Tense-ending in I.-Eur. was -tī (e.g. *ēs-tī, O. Ind. ās-ti, Gk. ἔσ-τι, O. Ir. is, Goth. ās-t, Lith. ės-ti and ės-t, O. Sl. (Russ.) jes-tī; Dor. Gk. διῶ-tī, Att. διῶ-σι, τίθη-σι, &c.), the Secondary Tense-ending was -t (e.g. *ē-bhērē-t, O. Ind. ā-bhara-t, Gk. ἐ-φερε for *ē-φερε-τ), and the ending of the Perfect -ē (e.g. *woīdē, O. Ind. vēd-a, Gk. ὠῦ-ε, Goth. vait; O. Ir. ro cechūn ‘cecinit’). In Latin all trace of the -t of I.-Eur. -tī has been lost (e.g. Lat. es-t, fer-t, āgē-t for *agō-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 fēcēd, ‘faced,’ the Dvenos inscription has feced, sied (but mitat, apparently 3 Sg. Subj. used as Fut.), and in Oscan we have deded ‘dedit,’ kūm-bened ‘con-vēnit,’ fusī-d ‘foret,’ leivaird ‘juret,’ heriiaad ‘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 dedēt beside fecid (C. I. L. i. 54 Dindia Macolnia fileai dedit. Nouios
Plautius med Romai fecid), and in all other old inscriptions we have invariably -t, e. g. ionsit (ii. 504i, 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. ploirume 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. dědīt may be scanned dedēt, but only vīdit, fōcīt, &c.). The long quantity is found in every type of Perfect in Plautus (see § 39), in vivēt, habēt, adnumereavit, 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 -ēt. 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. dedēt 'dedit,' prūfattēd 'probavīt' (quasi *probassīt, § 3), aamanaffēd 'mandavit' (cf. dēdēt, avarēker, Pel. afded 'abiit') is usually referred to the I.-Eur. Preterite ending -eit, or to the Perfect Active -ē augmented by -t, though whether Umbrian -d (fēfavē for *fēfūred, dēdē 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. Pft. 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. manebāt beside ponebāt, splendēt beside jubēt, potessēt beside esseīt, 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. Pft. ending -it. Indubitable instances of -it in Plautus are emīt, Pœm. 1059:

emīt, et is me sibi adoptavit filium;

vīcit, Pseud. 311:

tīlico uīxit amator, ubi lenoni suppliant;

which are the readings of both families of MSS., while we have vīcit, Amph. 643:

uīcit et domūm laudis cómpos reuēnīt (a bacchiae line);

adnuméravit, Asin. 501:

adnumeravit et creditit mihi néque 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. dēdit like dētī, ābid, ābidī, ābis, &c.), are very few and uncertain (e. g. dīcit, Pers. 260); and even if it were true, as it almost certainly is not, that this scansion occurred now and then in Plautus, it would only prove that the shortening influence of final -it 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. cœdītī Naev. Trag. 5 R., dēditī Ter. Eur. 701, stēlitī, Phorm. prol. 9, crissīcitī Lucil. ix. 70 M., and the long quantity is found after i in the compounds of eo in Ovid, e. g. interītū, ābidīt, reūitīt (see Lachmann and Munro on Lucr. iii. 1042; and cf. interīciūtī, C. I. L. i. 1202).

The spelling in the very oldest inscriptions is -et; feated in the Praenestine fibula (C. I. L. xiv. 4123 Manios med feaced Numasioi, ‘Manius me fecit Numerio’), fekét (or feeted ?) on the Dvenos bowl (Zvet. I. I. 285 Duenos med feked). This can hardly be equated with Osc. -ed, since the other spellings -et, -it point to this early e being merely that symbol of the ei-sound which is often found in old inscriptions (ch. iv. § 34), derivable from an I.-Eur. -ai, for which in Oscan we should expect to find a diphthong rather than the simple vowel e. Other old spellings are -et, -etī, -id, and -it. Examples of -et are fœtū and dedet (beside cœpit) 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 Ablativāl -d (i. 63 de prædāt Mauret dedect; i. 64 de prædāt Fortune dedect); and this is the spelling adopted in the (restored) Columna Rostrata (i. 195 excomet...cœpet...ornuet). The classical spelling -it occurs as early as the Scipio Epitaph, just mentioned, with cœpit; the dedicatory tablet of Minucius, 217 B. C., with vocit (i. 1503 Hercolei sacrum. M. Minuci C. f. Dictator uouit); a Scipio Epitaph of c. 200 B. C. (i. 30) with fuit, cœpit; the dedication of Aurelius, 200 B. C. (Not. Scrv. 1887, p. 195), with dādit, probavit; the decree of Aemilius Paulus of 189 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 5041) with dēcreevit, iousit; and the contemporary decree of Fulvius Nobillor 189 B. C. with cœpit (i. 534 Aetolia cœpit, ‘took from Aetolia’); the S. C. Bacch. 186 B. C. (i. 196) with concertit; while we have both -it and -id on the old Praenestine cista (end of third cent. (?)) quoted above, with dedētī, fecit. But -et is not common, e. g. probavit (with coeverit) (i. 600, of 62 B. C.), fanevit (i. 1051), rediēvit (i. 551, of 145 B. C.), reniēvit (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. Pft. suffix to have been -it, -ēd, which, with the usual change of unaccented e to i, became about the end of the third cent. -iēd (i. It has been suggested that in some types of Perfect, e. g. dīcit (cf. Gk. ἰδεῖτε), fidit (cf. O. Ind. ā-bhid-
ät; but see § 39), the final syllable was originally short, while in other types it was long. But the versification of Plautus points to no distinction having been made between the different types in his time at least. The pronunciation of his age must have been *dixeit, fidiā, amacēt as well as tutudīt, viūtē, fecīt, and this i-sound can hardly be dissociated from the final -i of 1 Sg. tutudī, &c. This -i of tutudī we have seen to be the L.-Eur. -ai, the ending of the 1 Sg. Pft. Mid. (O. Ind. tutud-ē). In the 3 Sg. of the Perfect Middle, Sanscrit shows a similar form to the 1 Sg., viz. tutud-ē. We are therefore led to suppose that in Latin as in Sanscrit *tutudai was the original form both in 1 Sg. and 3 Sg. This *tutudai, which would become in Latin *tutudēi, then tutudī, was in the 3 Sg. discriminated by the addition of the 3 Sg. suffix used in Secondary Tenses in the Active Voice, -ē, and became tutudēi-ē (written in the old orthography tutudē-i), then tutudī-t, then in the second cent. B.C. tutudīt. The other types of Perfect followed in the 3 Sg., as in all other persons, the type of I.-Eur. Perfects like tutudī.

§ 71. 1 Plur. In Lat. we have in all tenses the ending *-mōs (class. -mūs), while in the other L.-Eur. languages we have a variety of endings, e.g. Gk. φερ-μεν, ἐφερ-μεν, Dor. φέρο-μεσ (this I.-Eur. *-mōs varied with *-mōs, the Latin person-suffix), O. Ind. á-bhārā-ma, Vedic vid-má. The scansion -mūs in Plaut. is illusory (see Müller, Plant. Pros. p. 57).

§ 72. 2 Plur. The ending -tē of Gk. φέρε-τε, &c. appears in Latin only in the Imperative, e.g. fer-te, agi-te for *agē-τε, &c. Elsewhere it was replaced by -tēs (older *-tēs), an ending like the 2 Dual ending (with th- apparently) of O. Ind. bhāra-thas, Goth. bair-a-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. estōlē), for -tōl-τε (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-ānti, Gk. εἰοῖ for Dor. ἐ-ντί, O. Ir. it, O. W. int, Goth. s-ind; so Umbr. s-ent, Osc. s-ēt for *s-ent), *bhērō-nti [O. Ind. bhāra-nti, Arm. beren, Dor. Gk. φέρο-μντ, O. Ir. berit, Goth. bair-a-nd, O. Sl. (Russ.) beratī], *e-bhērō-nt (O. Ind. á-bhara-n, Gk. ἑ-φερ-ν). In class. Lat. the ending forms for Primary and Secondary Tenses is -nt, e.g. ferox-nt (older *fero-nt, e.g. coventiont on a Scipio Epitaph, m m.
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, explé-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, *dāu, *explen, *prodīn, *nequin, and that these forms were expanded by the subsequent addition of the Thematic Secondary ending -unt, later -ūnt, much as Gk. ἔι for *ei̯i, 2 Sg. of εἰ̯i, was by the addition of the Secondary suffix -s expanded to εἰ̯s, or O. Engl. sind, 'they are,' to sind-un. If it were a mere case of Nasalization like tu-u-do, lī-u-o, *stå-u-o in desēnō (?), &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 *dan, *eks-plenti become *explen, has not yet been satisfactorily shown (see I. F. ii. 302).

I.-Eur. -nti, -nt (e.g. O. Ind. dād-atī, Gk. λελογχ-ατι) 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. fīu(e)nt 'fiunt,' prūfattens 'probaverunt,' Umbr. furent 'erunt,' Osc. censazet for -ent 'censebunt.'
The ending of the 3 Pl. of the Latin Perfect -ěrunt is to be compared with the O. Ind. 3 Pl. endings with -r- of various Tenses (e.g. á-duh-ra Pret., duh-ratě Pres., bharē-rata Opt., duh-rām and duh-ratām Imper.; very rarely -ranta, in ā-vavṛt-ranta. The O. Ind. Perfect has in 3 Pl. Act. -ur, e.g. dadur, 'they have given,' and in 3 Pl. Mid. -rē, e.g. dadiēre, representing probably I.-Eur. -r and -rai). The byform -ěrē is in O. Lat. -erē (dederi, C. I. L. i. 187, probably from Praeneste: M. Mindios L. f. P. Condetios Ua. f. aediles uicesma partì 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 *φέροντ-τω. The final -d is seen in suntōd on the Spoletium inscription (C. I. L. xi. 4766). The Umbrian ending appears to have been -tōtā, e.g. etuta and etueto 'unto.'

§ 74. 3 Pl. Pres. in -nunt. Dōnunt for dant is quoted from the older poets by Nonius, 97. 13 M., e.g. Caecilius, Com. 176 R. patiēre quod dant, quàndo opta nōn dānunt (cf. Paul. Fest. 48. 18 Th. 'dānunt' dant); it is often used by Plautus (the references are given in Neue, Forment, ii. p. 412), and is found on a Saturnian dedicatory inscription of two brothers, money-lenders, called Vertuleius (C. I. L. i. 1175, Sora:

dōnu dānunt Hēroclei máxsumé mēreto);

prodīmunt for prodeunt is quoted by Festus (284. 22 Th.) from Ennius (A. 158 M.):

prodīmunt famuli; tum candida lumina lucent;

so obīmunt for obeunt (id. 214. 4 Th.), redīmunt 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: πορείνται may be a corruption of inunt: πορείνται (see § 2)]; nequīmunt for negueunt (Fest. 162. 24 Th.), quoted from the Odyssea of Livius Andronicus:

pārtim érrant, nequīmunt Graeciam redire,

and paralleled with ferīmunt (MS. fermunt) for feriunt (MS. fereunt; cf. 400. 14 Th.), and solīmunt for solent [rather for solunt, the obsolete verb of which consulo is a compound; cf. Fest. 526. 14 Th. 'solino' idem (Messala) ait esse consulo]; explūmunt for explunt by Paul. Fest. (56. 14 Th.); inserīmuntur for inseruntur is used by Liv. Andr. (ap. Fest. 532. 24 Th.); millia ália in isdem inserīmuntur.

§ 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 dedrot on another inscription from the same place, i. 173 Iunone re, matrona Pisaurese dono dedrot) and emeru on an inscription of Cora (i. 1148 Q. Pomponius Q. f. L. Tullius Ser. f. praitores aere Martio emeru) cannot be taken as a proof that -rī
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 -t in dede, i. 169, and apparently of -nt in i. 177 M., Curia, Pola Livia, deda), and emeru on the Cura inscription may be a similar dialectal variety, or merely a graphic contraction for emerunt. Final -nt often loses the dental on late inscriptions and is written -n or -m; thus we have feerum and feerum (also feerum, 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 quamquam fuerunt qui nobis quoque adierent dualem 'scripserere' 'legere': quod evitandae asperitatis gratia mollitium 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 'scripsere alii rem'; 'scripserunt' esse verius censeo, sed consuetudini auribus indulgenti libenter observ. (Ennius, however, seems to prefer-erunt to -ere in his Annals; Terence prefers-ere.) The older spelling -runt, mentioned by Quintilian (i. 4. 16), who quotes dederunt and probaverunt, 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. -rai of the O. Ind. 3 sg. Pft. Mid. -rie, e. g. dadirē, 'dedere'; the ending -runt (older -ront), either from an I.-Eur. -ront (cf. O. Ind. -avṛr-ṛnta), or from a subsequent addition of the usual 3 Pl. Thematic suffix -unt (-ont) to a 3 Pl. Pft. in -r. Thus *dedērē (a 'doublet' of dedēre?) would become dedērunt 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, feērunt, Amph. 184 locavērunt, Pers. 160, esserarunt, Mil. 1432, &c.; emērunt, Ter. Eun. proI. 20, conlocarunt, ib. 593). Plautus appears, however, 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 Lucerius (e. g. instērunt, i. 406; 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 generally explained as a 3 Plur. of the Auxiliary stem es-, 'to be,' and is compared with Gk. -eōr of 3 Plur. Plupft., so that dedērunt from *dedesunt would be a quite different formation from dedērunt and dedēre, with I.-Eur. r. Another theory makes it *dedis-ont, the first part being a Verbal Noun-stem *dedis- (see § 52). [On curavērunt for curavērunt beside the older soivauam (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 i Sg. Active in -m substitute in the Passive -r for -m, e. g. fēra-r Fut. and Subj., fērea-r Impf., except in the Perfect group, where a periphrastic form is used, e. g. lātus sim, latus esse−, not *tulerīr, *tulīsset, also latus ero, not *tulerōr (see § 54), though in Oscan we do find this adaptation of the Active forms in comparascuster, Fut. Pft. Pass. (pou 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. ἐ-δα-θης), which is retained in the O. Ir. Imperative (e. g. cluit-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-ōha, Gk. φέρεο for *-so, ἐ-φέρε-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., *sequerē-s becoming sequerēs (ch. iii. § 18). The addition of this -s discriminates the Ind. from the Imper. form as āgīs 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. -minē, formed apparently from 2 Pl. -mēnē on the type of 2, 3 Sg. Act. -lō(d), see § 60, and on forms like āutītī for utītor, § 59.]
§ 79. 3 Sg. The Italo-Celtic ending is -tōr [e.g. Lat. sequitār from *seque-tōr, O. Ir. seekethar; cf. Osc. sakarater 'sacra-
tur,' with -ter from syncopated -t(ō)r as Umbr. ager from *agīr(ōs)], formed by adding Passive -r to the I.-Eur. Secondary ending -tō (e.g. O. Ind. ā-di-ta, Gk. ē-do-τo; O. Ind. ā-bhara-ta, Gk. ē-φέρε-τo). 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., agī-tor Pass., agī-tō(d) Act. (On O. Lat. -mīnō, e.g. antestamino, 'let him take to witness,' see § 60, and on -to for -tor in utītō, &c., § 59.)

§ 80. 1 Plur. The Italo-Celtic ending is -mōr (e.g. Lat. seqūīmōr for *sequo-mōr, O. Ir. seechennmar with a curious doubling of the m), formed by changing to ō 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. fērīmīnī from *fero-menoi (Gk. φερόμενοι) in the Present Tense, and analogical formations in the others, e.g. fērēbā-mīnī, fērā-mīnī, fērē-mīnī. The 2 Plur. Imper., though similar in form to the 2 Plur. Pres. Ind., e.g. ferimini, is usually explained as an old Infinitive (Dat. of a MEN-stem), for I.-Eur. *bheremenai (Gk. φέρε-μεναι) (see § 57).

§ 82. 3 Plur. The Italo-Celtic ending is -ntōr (e.g. Lat. sequuntār from *sequo-ntōr, O. Ir. seeketar; 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. ē-φέρο-ντo. Cf. Gk. εἶμι-πλην-ντo 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. āgī; cf. Gk. χεῖναι); (2) Dat. of an S-stem, e.g. ji-šē, 'to conquer' [cf. Lat. da-rī, O. Lat. da-sei (§ 85), Gk. πεισά]; (3) Dat. of a MEN-stem, e.g. dā-manē, 'to give' (Gk. δοθεῖν; Lat. da-mīni 2 Pl. Imper. Pass., see § 57), vid-mānē, 'to know' [Gk. (ἐ)ιθοῦσα]; (4) Loc. of a MEN-stem (without -i, see ch. vi. § 37), e.g. dhār-man, 'to keep up' (cf. Gk. δοῦνα); (5) Dat. of a TU-stem, e.g. dhā-tavē, 'to set' (cf. Pruss. dā-twei, 'to give'); (6) Acc. of a TU-stem, e.g. dhā-tum (this is the classical or Sanscrit form of the Infinitive of every verb) (Lat. con-dītum 1st Sup., Lith. dē-tū Sup., O. Sl. dē-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. dētum-bime, 1 Pl. Opt., as the Lat. 1st Supine is joined with impersonal iri to form the Fut. Inf. Pass., e.g. sublātum irī or sublātnirī, see below); (7) Dat. of an I-stem, e.g. dr̥-āyē, 'to see,' and many others. The Teutonic Inf. is Acc. of an ONO-stem, e.g. Goth. itan, Germ. essen from *ēd-ōnō-m (cf. O. Ind. ādanam, a Neut. Noun). The form chosen for the Latin Inf. Act. was a Loc. Sg. of an S-stem, e.g. āgē-rē from *age-sī, amā-rē from *ama-sī, vidē-rē from *vide-sī, finī-rē from *fini-sī, es-sē from *es-sī, dōdis-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. torreo from *torseĭō, ch. iv. § 153), ls to ll (cf. collum from *solōs-, Germ. Hals, ch. iv. § 146). For the Inf. Pass. a Dat. Sg. was chosen, either (1) of a Root-stem, e.g. āg-i (O. Lat. ag-ei) from *āg-ai, mōr-i (with the diphthong ai...
weakened in the unaccented syllable, first to *ei, then to i, as in *ō-ce-aido, oc-ceido, oc-cido, ch. iii. § 18), or (2) of an S-stem, e.g. ōmā-ri (O. Lat. ama-rei) from *ama-sai, vidē-ri from *wide-sai, finē-ri, O. Lat. mōri-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 agier, amārier, 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 esse, e.g. constat id factum esse, constat ea facta esse, for the Fut. Pass. the 1st Supine with īri, Inf. Pass. of co, 'to go,' e.g. constat id factum īri, constat ea factum īri. The Fut. Act., e.g. constat id eventurum (esse), is most naturally explained as a combination of the Fut. Part. Act. with 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 -tū (e.g. eventū, dictū, Locs. of TU-stems, ch. vi. § 37) with an old byform of esse, viz. *esom, later *erum (Umbr. erom, Osc. ezum, Acc. of O-stem), dictūrum for *dictū-erum being in time made personal dicturus -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. arī in arē-facio and similar Verb-stems, see § 34.

In Vulg. Lat., as reflected in the Romance languages, the Perf. Inf. has been lost; esse has become essere (Ital. essere, Span. ser, Fr. être); velle, volēre (Ital. volere, Fr. vouloir), this verb having been transferred (by the analogy of its Perf. volui like nonui, habui, &c.) to the second Conjugation, voleo 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. (Ital. voglio), voleat, 3 Sg. Pres. Subj. (Ital. voglia), as posse became potère (Ital. potere, Sp. poder) through the likeness of its Perf. potui to the second Conjugation type. (cf. § 33 a).

1 Some make it an addition to i of the Active Inf. ending, with Syncope of the final ē, as in biber for bibère (A. L. L. vii. 132). Similarly in Vulg. Lat. esse-re replaced esse (see below).
§ 84. Pres. Inf. Act. Biber for biberē in the phrase biber dare (quoted by Charisius 124, i.K. from various early authors, and censured as a mispronunciation by Casper, 108, 10 K. biberē non 'biber'), seems to be a case of syncope of final -ē (like nec for nēque, animal for ānīmāle, colour for calcēre, ch. iii. § 36), though it has been also regarded as a veritably old form, a Locative without i (ch. vi. § 37), like Gk. βο-μεν 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, ii2, p. 409). Even in the time of Plautus it can hardly have been so current as the form in -ē, -ri: for it is confined to the end of iambic and trochaic lines, e.g. percontuviar, Most. 963 (see Lorenz, ad loc.), and is never found with a short antepenultima (except deripier, Men. 1906); restrictions which indicate that it was a form used only for the sake of the metre.

That the -r of -er 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 -ē in Plaut. (e.g. Pseud. 355, 1003) has been explained as a relic of the use of -ai (O. Lat. -ei or -ē, ch. iv. § 34) as Active suffix (I. F. iv. 240). But it may be otherwise explained, as syllaba ances 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. Gellius in the seventh chapter of the first book of his Notae 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 iniimicos meos hoc dicturum (from a speech of C. 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. Casina) (from Plaut. Cas. 693, where our MSS. are almost unanimous for oecisuram !); non putavi hoc eam facturum (from Laberius, Com. 51 R.). Priseian (i. p. 475. 23 H.) quotes from Cato: illi polleiti sese facturum omnia; from Lucilius (xvii. 8 M.): nupturum te (sc. Penelope) nupta negas.

The existence of nouns like scriptūra, versūra, pictūra points to the Fut. Part. scriptūrus -a -um, versūrus -a -um, pictūrus -a -um, &c. (formed from Ú-stems, as Gk. ἱερόδ-, from a Ú-stem; cf. ch. v. § 16, ch. iv. § 60) having been an old formation (cf. offensae beside offensus, répulsae beside repulsa), 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. 253; 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, *contumelia mihi factum itur* : atque euenit ita, Quirites, uti in hac contumelia, quae mihi per huisece petulantiam factum itur, rei quoque publicae mediis 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 istaec uidetur praeda praedatum irier.) 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 *-tuiri* 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. *sublaturi* ; for a list of examples from Lætæntius, 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 spectatūm*, lit. ‘to go to the seeing,’ like *ire dōmnūm*, to go to the house, *ire Rōnam*, to go to Rome), the same form as is in Sanscrit the regular Infinitive of the verb (see § 83). An O. Ind. usage like *draštūm ā gachanti*, ‘they come to see,’ *hōtūm ēti*, ‘he goes to sacrifice’ (cf. O. Sl. vidētī idetī, ‘he goes to see’) (Delbrück, *Altind. 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. *āgilis cursū*, nimble in running). The Loc. Sg. in -ū of U-stems often played the part of a Dat. (e.g. *curren* for *curreni* 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*) *lepīda mēmōratū*, pleasant for telling, where in the older language the Dative proper in -ni is used, e.g. *lepīda memoratui* (Plaut.), as well as the Locative, e.g. *ridicūla audītu*
(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 ōb rem ita faceres méque meosque pérditum ires liberos,

(cf. *Bacch.* 565 mi ires consultum male), and the use of the Accusative without a Preposition is paralleled by phrases like *i mālām crūcem* (Plaut.), *suppētias, insītias, essēquias* ire, &c. Like *nuptum dare* and *nuptum ire* are *vēnundāre* or *vēnundāre* (vendere) and *vēnum ire* (vēnire); but cf. O. Ind. *vasna-yā-ti, 3 Sg., Gk. ἀνακαυλά*); *pessundāre* or *pessundāre* and *pessum ire*. A similar Acc. of a Verbal Noun TU-stem is *asom* (class, *assum*, 1st Supine of *ardeo*) in the phrase *asom ferō* on an old Praenestine cista with the representation of a kitchen scene (*Mēl. 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-tā-, Gk. θέ-τός, Lat. crū-dī-tus, Lith. dė-tas; Goth. vaurh-ts, ‘wrought’), or the NO-suffix (e.g. O. Ind. pūr-nā-, ‘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. dīs-ya-, ‘seeable, worth seeing;’ O. Sax. un-fōd-i, ‘insatiable’; cf. Gk. αἰγ-ιος, venerable, Lat. *exīm-īns*), or -TWO-, -TĖWO- (e.g. O. Ind. kārtvā-, ‘worth doing,’ Gk. δωκ-τέ(f)ος, 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 jēsmū, ‘I have carried,’ and the Aor. Part. Act. or Pass. in Armenian, e. g. gereal ‘capiens, captūs.’

The Pres. Part. Act. (and all Active Participles, except the
Perfect) took the suffix -ent-, -nt-, -ont- (see ch. v. § 63) (e.g. O. Ind. bhārant-, Gk. φερων, -ορος, Goth. bairands, O. Sl. bery), Lat. für-ens, -entis, sēdēns (Umbr. zeďēf). The Perf. Part. Act. took -vēs- (e.g. O. Ind. rik-vās-, Gk. λελοω-(f)ws, 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. fēfacuēst ‘fecerit’), and probably in Osc. sipiūs, knowing, with full knowledge [from *sip-wes- (?)]. That the n is long (I.-Eur. ū or ō) is inferred from the absence of Syncepe, for *sipūs, *sipōs would become in Ocean *sipōs; 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-māṇa-, Gk. φερό-μενος; cf. Pruss. po-klausi-manas, ‘being heard’), though it is found in the 2 Pl. Ind. Pass., e.g. fērininu (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. screihto-, Osc. scrito-); the Fut. Part. Act. in -tūrus is probably a formation with the suffix -ro- from a TU-stem Verbal Noun, e.g. scriptūros, stem *scriptū-ros- from the stem *scriptu- of scriptūs, -ūs, pictūrus from the stem *pictu- of pictūs, -us, &c., like Gk. ἰξὐ-ρός from ἰξύς. [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. lācer for lācerūtus (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. frijōnds, lit. ‘loving,’ assumed the sense of ‘friend’; Lat. rūdens (see § 6), lit. ‘rattling,’ assumed the sense of ‘a rope, tackling’; benevolēns 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. e-, ‘to be’ (cf. O. Scand. sannr, ‘sooth, true,’ which acquired the sense of ‘truly charged,’ ‘guilty’). Of Pres. Parts. becoming Adjectives in Latin examples are congruēns (beside congruus), benevolēns (beside benevolus), benevolēns (cf. -mērus in Lucilius’ mercēdīmērae lēpōnes); indigenās, not indicus, and inedicus, not inscius (but nescius), are used by Plautus. The result of this close connexion of
Verbal Adjectives (especially Compounds) in -us with Participles in -era, is a Comparison like benevolus, benevolentior, benevolentissimus, magnificus, -entior, -entissimus (see ch. vi. § 35).

The O-grade of the suffix which predominates in the Greek declension, φερον, -οντος, -οντι appears in Lat. sons (beside prae-sens, praenuntia, ab-sens, &c.), euntis, -i, -em, -es, &c. (beside Nom. Sg. iens), viduntas (beside volens). 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, L.-Eur. *es-mi, *ei-mi, *wel-mi (see § 2). It almost seems as if the declension of the Pres. Part. of 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., *iuentem Acc. (see ch. vi. § 1, p. 367), or sons Nom. Sg., sentis Gen. from an I.-Eur. *sonts Nom., *sntos Gen. (cf. O. Ind. sant-, satás Gen.).

*sentis Fem. (cf. prae-sentia) from sint- like Dor. Gk. ἐσσα for ἵσσα, the equivalent of Att. oσσα (ch. iv. § 81). The use of euntis, eunti, &c., cannot well have been due to the dislike of the combination -iɛ- (iens has ɛ-), the vowel being lengthened before ns, ch. ii. § 144), for this combination is not objected to in other Participles, facientis, capientis, &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 ē (see ch. iii. § 18; and cf. below, § 94, on -undus and -endas 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. cūtāver, pāpēver, others in O. Lat. gnārīres Plur., 'knowing,' e.g. Plaut. Most. 100:

simul gnaruris uos uoló esse hanc rem mécum.

(Cf. Gloss. Placid. 'gnaruris' gnarus, sciens: Gloss. Philox. 'gnarurem' γναύριον: 'ignarures' ἀγροῦστες: 'gnarurat' γναφίζε). Mōnos seems to be not a Perfect Participle, but an Adjective derived from a Perfect Particle-stem, as Gk. κεκραμόσ (Eurip.) is a Noun derived from κεκραγα.

§ 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. śi-tā-): citus, 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 L.-Eur. kō- (cf. Lat. cōs, a whetstone) (ch. iv. § 54); lātus, O. Lat. latūs, broad, lit. 'extended' (cf. O. Sl. stel-jić, 'I spread, extend'1), or a Noun, e.g. nātus, a son (in Plautus and Terence we have as a rule gnatus, a son, natus, born), legātus, 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. fortus, originally P. P. P. of the I.-Eur. root dherg̣h-, 'to establish' (O. Ind. dṛghā-

1 Another example is cunctus 1168: fac istam cunctam gratiam. (for co-cinctus?), which has still its Accturatus is always a Participle in participial sense in Plant. Most. O. Lat.
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'established, firm'), in-gen, lit. 'unknown,' from the root ēn-, 'to know' (O. Engl. un-cūd, 'uncouth'). When used as a Noun the Neuter often appears, e. g. lectum (also Masc. lectus, of the fourth or second decl.), lectum, fitium (the sense of 'destiny' probably originated in the phrase 'fari fatum alicui,' to lay a doom or spell on one, like the Welsh tyngdu tyngned; see Rhv's, Proc. of Internat. Folklore Congr. 1891, p. 150), and (especially in the case of Abstract Nouns) the Feminine, e. g. offensā, rēptula.

The Participle in -to of Intransitive Verbs has the sense of a Perfect Part. Active, e. g. cēnātus, having dined, pransus, pētus, like our 'learned' in such a phrase as 'a learned man,' 'a learned judge.' Hence its use as the Perfect Participle of Deponent Verbs, e. g. aspernātus, sēcātus, and the coexistence of Deponent Perf. Part. and Act. Verb, e. g. fisus beside fīdu, māestus, sad, beside mācro. These participial TO-stems from roots which have developed in Latin into Deponent Verbs often retain their true passive sense, e. g. avīnus Pass. (Plaut. Asin. 196; cf. Polign. oísa aetate 'confecta aetate'), so that there is a justification for Virgil's obītus carminis, Horace's dēestātā bella, and the like.

It seems to have taken in L.-Eur. the weak grade of the Verb-root, e. g. L.-Eur. *wīd-to from the root weid-, 'to know' (O. Ind. vittā, Gk. ē-aroς, Goth. un-vis), *klū-to from kīleu- (O. Ind. śrītā-, Gk. ἁλύτης, Lat. in-clūtus, O. Ir. cloth for *clūt̄o-, O. H. G. Hlot-hari (the equivalent of Gk. ἄρβορας, cf. Germ. Heer, an army), the name 'Lothair'). In Latin this is also the rule, e. g. dāc-tus from ācō, ās-tus from āro, tentus for *tn-tos (Gk. ῥαρίς) from root ten-, pētus (Plaut. Pseud. 1200) used with its equivalent pīt-rus. See ch. ii. § 144, where it is suggested that the long vowel of ēctus, &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 *aut-tus, *oīt-to-, flexus for *flectus, salsus for *sald-to- (cf. Goth. saltan), percūsus for *kīld-to- (cf. òdēs), to others where the Perfect has s (′), e. g. farusus (cf. farsi Perf.), fixus (cf. fīxī; but fictus from fingo, fīnxī), just as the analogy of haesi has produced the late form haecūrus, and haesi (P. P. haustus), haussūrus beside hausturus, or as the analogy of the Present Tense is followed in O. Lat. sortus (sortus?) with -rf for -rt, ch. iv. § 157) for *surrectus (Paul. Fest. 423. 1 Th. 'suregit' and 'sortus' pro surrexit, et quasi possit fieri surrectus, frequenter posuit Līvius), experfectus for experrrectus. Lucil. iii. 56 M.; Lucr. iii. 929, &c.).

On Oscar prūfto- 'probatus,' Umbr. vaśeto- (from stem vakā-), &c., which have been compared with Lat. exprīptus from crepāre, implicitus from implicare, see von Planta, i. p. 214. The difficulties which they offer have not yet been satisfactorily removed.

In Italian, French, and Roumanian the ending -ātus (like statūtus, minūtus, &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. vendātus (see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. p. 370). (Cf. § 51, above, on the encroachment of the Perfect in -ut in Vulg. Lat.) For the Past Part. of sum the Italian and French languages use status (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' Participles. Priscian (i. 534. 6 H.) says: 'retus' pro retitus dieabant, quomodo 'saecius' pro saecius, et 'lassus' pro lassatus, et 'lacerus' pro laceratus et 'potus' pro potatus; Gellius (xix. 7) quotes from Laevius 'oblitteram' gentem for oblitteratum, with other novelties such as 'accumitret' for lacreret, 'pudoricolorem' auram, curis 'intolerantibus' for intolerandis.

§ 94. IX. THE GERUND AND GERUNDIVE. The Gerundive (Adj.) in -ndo-, Umbro-Oscan -nno- (e. g. Osc. trîbûm . . . úpsannam deded ' domum . . . operandam dedit,' Umbr. esonîr . . . popler anferener et ocër pîhâner ' 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, eventum 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 cognoscentiae antiquitatis (ch. vi. § 20, p. 383 n.). In the older Latin writers when this formation is turned into finite form, i.e. when a statement 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 -ėndo- through weakening of the vowel ə in the unaccented syllable, for we have anfereno- for *āmbhī-bhērēndō- in Umbrian, where a weakening of this kind would not be found. Although the form -enđo- became the approved form in classical Latin, while -ėndo- (from an earlier -ėndo-) was relegated to the legal and archaistic style, e.g. rēs rēpōtundae, 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) tribuneui, fruendeis, fruendum, &c. stand side by side with legundis, scribundī, defer-
endo, quaeerundai, &c. The two are rather parallel endings like -ōnt- and -ēnt- in the Pres. Part. Act. (see § 90), although the ultimate acceptance of the ĕ-form in both these cases may have been helped by the Latin tendency to turn a short unaccented vowel before a consonant-group into ĕ (ch. iii. § 18).

With the Gerundive suffix are evidently connected the suffixes of Adjectives in -bundo-, -cundo-, &c., e.g. errō-bundus, irā-cundus, rūbī-cundus, rōtundus (cf. O. Ir. cruind, 'round,' ālaind, 'beautiful'?). The b of the first of these has been referred to the root bheu- of fui, &c., the c of the second to the suffix seen in rūbī-care, alī-care, &c. (above § 27, ch. v. § 31).

§ 95. Origin of the suffix -ndo-. The suffix -do- of lāci-dūs, &c. has been referred to the verb dare, so that lāci-dūs would really mean 'giving light' (ch. v. § 67). In the Gerundive this same suffix (cf. Aīus from aīo, Panda from pando, &c., ch. v. §§ 2, 3) may perhaps be joined not with a stem, as in lāci-
dūs, but with an Accusative case, as -ex' (from aīo) is in vin-dex (ch. v. § 80), or as the finite verb is joined in composition with an Accusative in venō-dō, vendo, pessam-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. āgitandum est vigilias 'Act.', and āgitandae sunt vigilliae 'Pass.', and 'anulus in digito subtertenuatur habendo' Act.-Pass., may then be explained from the double sense that can be attached to an expression like rīvōrem dare, (1) to blush, Neut., (2) to cause to blush, Act. The Accusatives will be Accusatives of Verbal Noun-stems *rotam-dūs, *ludām-dūs (ludāndus, Audacis exc. 359. 15 K.), *rubēm-dūs, *habēm-dūs (Ital. proviendi points to habēn-
dus); *ferēm-dūs (with *ferēm-dus; cf. fērē-bam, § 34) (see § 34 on rubē-facēo, &c., i-īted, &c., and cf. the Zend Inf. dām, 'to set, to give'). That -md- became -nā- in Latin, but -mn- (often written n) in Umbro-Oscan, we see from Lat. quon-dām, quan-dō, Umbr. ponne and ponae, Osc. pon from *qəm-dē.

§ 96. Adjectives in -bundo-, -cundo-, &c. Examples of -bundo- from Verbs
of the first Conjugation: *errō-bundus, praedā-bundus* (Sall., &c.), *populā-bundus* (Liv., &c.), *vertītā-bundus* (Varr. Men. 108 B.); of the second: *piātī-bundus* (Aug. poets); of the third: *fāri-bundus, māri-bundus, quīrī-bundus, trēmē-bundus* (cf. *tremē-facō, tremē-so*), *fremē-bundus* (Accius, with *fremi*-?, and Aug. poets); of the fourth: *lasīrē-bundus* (Plaut. *Stich. 288*; the quantity of the third vowel is not decided by the metre, but must be long). Examples of *-umbo*- are from the first: *fi-a-cundās* (cf. *fit-tus*), *irā-cundās* (cf. *irā-tus*), *fāe-cundās* (cf. *iē-tus*); and from the second: *fe-cundās* (cf. *fe-tus*), *verē-cundās* (from Plaut. onwards), *rābī-cundās* (Ter., &c.; cf. *rabē-facō*). *Rōtundās* has *-undo* (cf. Ital. rotondo, Span. redondo, &c.) from *-undo* (on the spelling *ratundus*, see ch. iii. § 33). *Sōciemus*, a Plautine word for *seicus* (*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. *fini*; and the heterolite conjugation of verbs like *to be*, *to go* seems to date from the I.-Eur. period. Other Latin examples are *fio* (for *fiērio* from *bhw*-, a weakened form of the root *behu*—; cf. Osc. *fiet*, fiet *fient*) and *factus sum*; *fērio* and *percussi*; *fēro* and *tūli* (O. Lat. *tētuli*, § 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 *tolo-no* (Ir. *tallaim*), with the Nasal Present-stem and *sustuli* for *sustētuli* (§ 44), with Preposition and Aorist- or Weak stem (§ 3); *vescor* and *pātus sum*; *arguor* and *concīdus sum*; *vėminiscor* and *recordātus sum*; *müeōr* and *mūdicatus sum*; *surgo* differs from *surrexi* and *surrectus* in being syncopated (cf. *porgo* and *porīgo*); 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 (*A. iv. 183*) uses the full form *sub-rīgo* in an active sense: tot subrigit aures; on *vīs* beside *vōlo*, see § 3. Other verbs, classed as Irregular, are the Defective Verbs: *coepi* (the Present *coepio* is found in O. Lat., see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s. v., e.g. Plaut. *Men. 960* neque ego litis *coepio*; Pers. 121 *coepēre* Inf.; on *coepi* dissyll. and *coēpi* trisyll., see ch. ii. § 150); *inquam* for *

---

1 *fīret* beside *esse* seems to be a form -pucr; the Oscan equivalent is *fusid*, of *fīeret*, *bhveisit*, like *soror*; cf. Osc. *fust* Fut.

*swēsōr* (ch. iv. § 10), or *Marci-por* for
*ind-squam (ch. iv. § 158) from the root seq\textsuperscript{u}, 'to speak' (W. heb, O. W. hepp, 'quoth he,' &c.), the unweakened form of which appears in O. Lat. insèque Imperat., insequis, 'narras, refers, et interdum pergis,' C. G. L. v. 78. 10 [or *in(đ)-ve-quam from the root weq\textsuperscript{u} etc.;] inque, an Imperat. of inquam, is used by Plaut., and the 2 Sg., &c. of Pres., inquis, inquit, inquinunt and of Fut., inquiunt, 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-iō (ch. iv. § 116), infit, see Neue ii\textsuperscript{2} p. 612; infio is quoted from Varro by Priscian, i. p. 450. 17 H.; āi Imperat. (a disyll.) is used by Naevius, Com. 125 R. ulel āi uel nega (but aie 'incepe, dic,' C. G. L. v. 165. 7, like infe 'inceipe, die, narrar,' ib. 211. 10, infens 'dicens,' ib. 211. 37); the two vowels of āio are sometimes united in a diphthong, e.g. aibam (disyll.), 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 potis and pōtē sum (examples in Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v., Neue, ii\textsuperscript{2} p. 600); pote is properly the Neuter of potis, 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. potis est, it is possible, Ter. Phorm. 379, credo equidem potis esse te, scelus, Plaut. Pseud. 1302; so with potis 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, putiains and putians 'possint,' putiadi and pūtiad 'possit' (cf. Lat. ē̄ptūi, like mónni from moneo), but the Latin derivative potio is used in the sense of 'potem facere,' potior (fourth and third Conj.) of 'potis fieri' [cf. potior fieri used in the sense of potiri, Plaut. Cas. 112 quam tu eius potior fias, like certior (and certus) fieri], e.g. eum nune potiuit pater seruitutis, Plaut. Amph. 178; postquam mens rex est potitus hostium, Capt. 92; regni potiri, Cic. On possimnus for possumus in MSS. of Virgil, Ecl. vii. 23 and perhaps viii. 63: non omnia possimnus omnes, also in the Verona Palimpsest of Gaius (99, 14; 101, 2), &c., see ch. ii.
THE VERB. IRREGULAR VERBS.

§ 16. Possem for potessum has been explained by the Analogy of possum (for pot(e)-sum) beside potis-sum, possim beside potis-sim.

Malo, a contraction of māvolo, seems to come similarly from māgē (a byform of magis, ch. ix. § 4) united into a word-group with vōlo, and nōlo from the Negative nē- and vōlo, 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)-vōlo became *mavvōlo (written māvolo, as *carvi was written cāri, § 39. 4), much as I.-Eur. gě or gw became Lat. v (ch. iv. § 139). And nē-vōlo (for the word-group cf. ne-secio, nē-queo, Engl. cannot) may have become *nōvōlo as I.-Eur. *nēwos became Lat. nōvus (ch. iv. § 10), and similarly *novis, *novolt, *novolumus, *novoltis, *novolunt. By loss of intervocalic v (ch. ii. § 53) arose nōlo (the only form known to Plautus), nōlumus, noltis (ap. Diom. 386. 19 K.), nolunt, while O. Lat. nē-vis, nē-volt, as well as class, non-vis, non-vult, non-vultis are re-formations. On Imperat. nōli see § 2, and on the spellings māllo, 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. été), have been already mentioned (§§ 83, 92); the Pres. Subj. seems to have been siam (Ital. sia, Span. sea, O. Fr. sole). For Lat. ev various verbs were united in the Vulg. Lat. paradigm, e. g. Fr. je vais (from Lat. vādo), nous allons (from Lat. ambulo?). Lat. hābeo was, owing to its Auxiliary use, shortened to a declension like hayo, has, hat . . . havat (Ital. ho, hai, ha . . . hanno; Fr. ai, as, a . . . ont; Span. he, has, ha . . . han). Vulg. Lat. voelo, volere Inf. (Ital. voglio, voler; Fr. veux, vouloir) by Analogy of Pft. volui, as Vulg. Lat. potere (Ital. potere, Span. poder) by analogy of potui, have been cited in §§ 33 a, 83.

1 Both mavo and malo, mavelim and malim occur in Plautus, but malo, malim, &c. are predominant later, though we have mavo once at the end of a line in Terence, Hec. 540. Mallem is not found in Plautus, only marellem (Solmsen, Stud. Lantg. p. 55-)

N n 2.
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. náktam, ‘by night,’ satyám, ‘truly,’ Acc. Sg. Neut., pratarám Acc. Sg. Fem., Gk. πρότερον Acc. Sg. Neut., μακράν Acc. Sg. Fem., κρόφα Acc. Pl. Neut.), Ablative (cf. O. Ind. dūrát, ‘afar’) [also Instrumental (?)], cf. O. Ind. dívā, ‘by day,’ Gk. ἅλλη], and Locative (cf. O. Ind. dūrē, ‘afar,’ Gk. òικω, ἄναμμενεί, ἐκοβάλ), 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. raption-, ch. v. § 42), sensim from the stem sensi- (class. sensiôn-), uni-versim (Osc. úniversésim) &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, divinī-tus, &c., is in O. Ind. occasionally used as an Ablative suffix (Sing. or Plur.) of Nouns, e.g. mātr-tas, Abl. Sg. of mātār-, ‘a mother,’

1 In O. Ind. the Instr. Case is in the sphere of motion, ‘by the route of.’ (Delb. Altind. Synt. p. 129.)
The close relation of Noun and Adverb suffixes makes it difficult to draw any hard and fast line between the suffixes used in the formation of Adverbs, and the suffixes used in the declension of Nouns. An example of a purely Adverbial suffix is *-ies* (older *-iens*), by which most Numerals form their Adverbs, e.g. *sex-ies* (cf. *tōt-ies, quōt-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, -vormtm*) of *quāquāversus* (*-m*), *āliōvorsum* (contracted *aliorsum*), *retrōvorsum* (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 *verto*, to turn, or as the *-tēnus of hactenus, āliquātēnus*, &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, -mī*, 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. *brōvīter*, 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, dēx-ter*, &c. (ch. v. § 16) (*ī-terum* is an Acc. Sg. Neut. of a similar formation), though they have been also referred to the noun *īter*, *brēv-īter* 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 *prīnceps*, though it might be regarded as Acc. Sg. Neut. (cf. *exordium* princeps), *demus* an O. Lat. byform of *dēmum*; 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 ī-terum, another time ( Acc. of *itero-, O. Ind. ītara-, 'other;' from the Pronoun-stem i-, ch. vii. § 13, with the suffix -tero-, ch. v. § 16), ē-terum (ch. x. § 5), commūdum (beside commode), 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. fācīlē, difficile, sublimē ( though -iter is the usual suffix, e. g. breviter, fādēlīter, 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, facilīus, brevīus. Accusatives Sing. of Nouns used Adverbially are vicem, id gēnus, &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. τόρα), a door. Of Acc. Pl. Neut. forms we have ceterā (Virg. A. ix. 656 cetera parce puer bello), omnīa (Virg. A. iv. 558 omnīa Mercurio similis; C. I. L. vi. 1144 omnīa magno Constantino), possibly the O. Lat. forms contrā [for which contrā, an Abl. Sg. Fem., was used in class. Lat., and contrūl, an Abl. Sg. Neut. (cf. Lat. contrō-versia), 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. fāciliūs, O. Lat. facilīmed, brevissīme), the ordinary ēd-suffix (ch.vi. § 33), e. g. certo (beside certe), vero (beside vere), asśiduo (usually assiduē), explōrāto (and explorate), mērito and imperito (neither of these are Adverbs in Plantus, for they are used with meo, tuo, &c.), festīnāto (also festinātum), fortūtō (also fortuitu; see ch. v. § 49). Examples of Ablatives Sg. Fem. are dextērā (seil. parte), rectā (seil. via), ēādem (seil. opēra), extrā, suprā. As was pointed out before (ch.vi. § 36), the loss of final ā 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. āna, omnīno) are not really Instrumentals (e. g. Gk. λάθρα, κοώθ)?; 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 cētō, mōdō, and of -ē in bēnē, mūlē, 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-gérvas, male-sānus (cf. diēquintī beside fīdē, ch. iii. § 44). It is only rarely that the occurrence of an Adverb on an old Latin inscription, or on inscriptions written in Oscean, or some other dialect which retained -d, enables us to decide, e.g. O. Lat. meritoō (meretod), porod, extrad, suprad, Osc. contrud, Falisc. rected, which are Abl. forms, Osc. suluh, 'wholly,' from the stem sollo-, 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 gratiiis), 'for mere thanks' (cf. Ter. si non pretio, at gratiis), ingratiis (ingratis), fōris (used with verbs of rest, e.g. foris manere, occasionally with verbs of motion from, e.g. foris venire), alernis. Examples of Locatives of U-stems are hīmī (first found in Terence, Andr. 726), postrī-dīc, die crāstīnī, noctū (cf. O. Ind. aktāū) (see ch. vi. §§ 37–38).

Pronominal Adverbs show various suffixes: (1) -bē (older -bei) with locative sense, e.g. ľīō, ľūō, also ľō bē, 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. iliō, isti, there, which in classical Latin always have the particle -c(e) appended, illī-ī-c, istī-i-c; (3) -ū, to indicate motion to a place, e.g. ēō, quō, īstō, āliō, apparently Abl. forms like porrō (O. Lat. porod); O. Lat. hoc, istoc, illoc may represent *hūl-c(e), *istūl-c(e), *illūl-c(e), Acc. Sg. Neut., for in class. Lat. we have ēuc, istuc, illoc; (4) -ā, to indicate direction, manner, &c., e.g. qua, ea, which like quō, eo are Abl. forms (O. Lat. arvorsum ead), not Instrumental like Greek πη, ταύτη, πάρτη (afterwards confused with Dative -η); (5) -in, to indicate motion from a place, e.g. illim, istim, which in class. Lat. always append the particle -ce, illine, istine (cf. hinc, dehinc); (6) -unde, with similar sense, in unde, inde; this unde is shortened by syncope of the final vowel to -in in the Compounds proin, dein,
exin, &c. (ch. iii. § 36). Other endings like -dam of quondam (cf. guidam), -dem of qui-dem, tan-dem, with the sense of 'exactly,' 'precisely' in ibi-dem, tanti-dem (cf. idem, ch. vii. § 21), -tem of i-tem, -ta of i-ta, are apparently case-forms of pronominal stems, as -quam of un-quam, ne-quam (cf. quis-quam), appears to be Acc. Sg. Fem. of the stem *qʰo-.* (See ch. x. on the Conjunctions.)

Other Adverb formations are (1) in -fāriam, indicating division, e.g. bi-fāriam, quadri-fāriam (cf. Gk. -φάριος from -φαῖτος, e.g. τρι-φάτος); (2) in -sēcus, indicating motion from a place; this sēcus is an Adverbial Noun, and is appended to Adverbial forms in -im, e.g. extrin-sēcus, intrin-sēcus, altrin-sēcus, as -tenus to Abl. Sg. Fem. forms, e.g. qui-tenus, aliqūi-tenus, eā-tenus; it is derived from the root seq₃-, 'to follow,' and must be distinguished from (1) the Adverb sēcus, otherwise (O. Ir. sech, 'beyond,' W. heb, 'without'); (2) the Adverbial Noun sēcus, a Neuter byform of sexus, used in phrases like: trecenti occisi sunt virile sēcus, '300 were killed of the male sex' (see § 50 on the Preposition sexus). The Abl. finī (finē) occurs in O. Lat., like tenus, after an Abl., e.g. senem osse fini dedolabo, Plaut., oleas operito terra radicibus fini, Cato; but came to take a Genitive, e.g. amforas nolito implere nimium, ansarum infimarum fini, Cato; fine inquinum ingrediuntur mare, Sall.

Instances of Adverbial word-groups are ad-fātim, sufficiently, lit. 'to weariness,' ad-nōdum, quem-ad-nōdum, quā-rē, quam-ob-
rem, dē-nūmō de nōcō, sē-dūlō for se dolo, i-licō perhaps for in
slocō (old form of locō), i-licet, sci-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. quasimmente, O. Fr. ausiment. (For fuller details of the formation of Adverbs in Romance, see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. pp. 637 sqq.).
2. Nominative Adverb-forms. Brevis, &c. are better considered Nom. Sg. Masc. than Acc. Sg. Neut. for *brevi-terum, since the loss of -um seems only to occur in a few words of constant use, such as *aenumen, ni(hi)lam, 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)(um) habeo (ch. iii. § 52). Iterum did not become *iter, nor *eterum, *eter. 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 istuc potis est fieri ?, Plaut., with Neuter subject (see ch. viii. § 97). The Adverbs (Prepositions) propter, proper, &c. might be similarly explained; propter it ille, *protera it ille, *proteri sunt illi became propterit, proteramunt without distinction of gender or number (but see p. 554). Núper (Superl. nupervim) appears to be Nom. Sing. Masc. of the Adjective nupero- (Plaut. Cæt. 718 recens captum hominem, nuperum, novicium) for *növi-péro-, 'newly acquired,' unless it is Acc. Sg. Neut. of an I-stem Adj. (ch. v. § 34) for *nupere. Facul (Paul. Fest. 61, 32 Th., 'facul' antiqui dicebant et 'faculter' pro facile ; Fest. 266. 20 Th., 'per-facul' antiqui, et per se 'facul' dicebant, quod nunc facile dicimus ; Nom. 111. 21 M. 'facul' pro faciliter, huile contrarium est 'difficul'), a word used by Lucilius in his description of the Roman patricians (vi. 2 M.):

pecare impune rati sunt

posse, et nobilitate facul propellere iniquas.

is better regarded as Neut. Sg. for facile, with syncope of -e, as in vulpe for vulpe, Neut. of *vulpis (ch. iii. § 36), than as Nom. Sg. Masc. of an Adj.-stem faculo- (cf. sacrí-faculus), since the reduction of -lós to -l seems to be dialectal only (e. g. Oscar *famul) (ch. vi. § 4), and not, like the reduction of -rós to -r (e. g. Lat., Umbri. agon, Gk. ἀγών), shared by Latin. We have difficul Nom. Sg. Neut. in Varro Men. 46 B.:

quod utrúm sit magnum an párvum, facile an difficul.

Simul (older semel, C. L. L. i. 1175, in MSS. of Plautus semul, 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-lè, 'when,' to-li, to-lè, 'then,' &c.; simul and simulter (a byform of simuliter, used by Plaut. Pseud. 382) correspond to facul and faculter. Deinceps was declined like príncipes in L. Lat. (Paul. Fest. 53. 1 Th. 'deincepem' antiqui dicebant proximo quemque captum, ut princípem príncium captum; cf. ib. 50. 5), and may have been associated with príncipes in a fragmentary line on the Lex Repetundarum (C. L. L. i. 198. 79); index deinceps faciat príncipe cessante). Dénum (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. Truc. 245; qui dé then-sauris integris demús danunt (demum oggerunt A), and is required by the metre in Trin. 781. In the Adverbal compounds of veras the terminations -us and -aum compete in the early literature, e. g.urusum and uurusus (also ursum, rurusum, &c.), ch. ii. § 104;urusum appears to be used in Plaut. after Compounds with re-, e. g. redeo ursum, 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), ursum and uurusus, but in the classical period one of the rival forms often has the monopoly, e. g. uurusus, prorsum, ursum (for statistics, see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 259 ; Neue, Forment. ii. 743). These compounds show other
adverbial suffixes in *universim* (Osc. *universesim*), *ānōsē* for *unō-verse* (Paeuv. Trag. 213 R. ōcēdisti, ut múta paucis uērba unose obo[mn]tüm). 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 *hūmānter*, 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. *āntīcitē, maestītē*, Plaut., and the eleventh book of Nonius is devoted to obsolete Adverb forms, especially (1) Adverbs in -ter from O-stem Adj.s, (2) in -i from I-stem Adj.s, e. g. *ēōrē, fūdītē, (3) in -tus, e. g. *mēdūlĭtus, lāргītus, commānītus*]. The NT-stems have -nter, e. g. *veshemenēr, īmpūdēnter*, instead of -nt-ter (cf. 3 Pl. Imper. *fērunt-ōr* for *fēront-ōr*, ch. viii. § 57), by dissimulation, some say, for *-nti-ter* (ch. iii. § 13, p. 176). From *audāx* we have *audacter* (less commonly *audācitē*; see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v.), but from *fallāx, fallācē-ter*, from *ēmūnāx* *ēmūcētēr*, from *prīcētē* *prōcētē*, &c. *Difficilēter* is more usual than *diffićilīter* (see Georges); *facēltēr* is mentioned by Paul. Fest. (61. 32 Th. *fadč*). *Faciēnt* is mentioned by Paul. Fest. (61. 32 Th. *facēnt*), but *facēltēr* (see Georges) was the form that competed with *facēltē* (cf. Mart. Cap. iii. 325 cum *difficilē dicamus, cur *facēltē* *dici non potest*?); *simulērit* is quoted from Plaut. *Pseud.* 382 by Nonius 170. 19 M. Quintilian condemns both *audacēnter* and *facēltēnter* [i. e. *facēltēnter*] (also *facēltēntum*) *quam molestissima diligentia* perversitate, ut *audacēnter* *potius dicant quam audacēnter, licet omnes oratores alium sequantur, et *emicavit* non emicuit, et *coniōr* non coire; *his permissātum et *audīvīsė* et *scivīsė* et *tribunale* et *facēltēnt* *dicere*), regarding *audacēnter* and *facēltē* as the true Latin forms.

Other Adverbs that might be called Nominative forms are: *ēminōs* and *commīnōs* (the spelling co- minus is due to the analogy of ε-minus; see Georges s. v.), which may be Nom. Sg. of Compound Adjectives (cf. Gk. *πρόχερ, πρόχερ*). From *ēminōs* (*ēminēs* is used with a Perfect Participle, e. g. Lat. vi. 791 nocturnumque recens extinctum lumen), which is equated with *libēns* by Charlesius (114. 21 K.), utimur sic *recens venit*, quod est adverbio nomen, ut *libēns dictī*]; *libēns* comes very near répenē in phrases like Liv. xxii. 8. 1: repēns alia nuntiatur clades); *prō-tenus* (also *prō-tenu*), ‘stretching forward,’ may be the Nom. Sg. of an O-stem, as the (somewhat doubtful) form *prō-tēnis* (Afran. Com. 107 R. comīsium prōtēnis rectā domum Digēdīmur) may be the Nom. Sg. of an I-stem (ch. v. § 34); *sedēns* in *intrīn-secūs*, &c., has been sometimes explained as Nom. Sg. of an Adj. *secō-, lit. ‘following from within.’ But these, and indeed all the Adverbs cited as Nominatives, are capable of other explanations; *recens* (like *dieincēs*) as Acc. Sg. Neut.; *commīnōs, ēminōs* [with the other Adverbs in -s, *versus* and other compounds of *versus* (∗versus*)] as augmented with the same particle-*s* (p. 573) as appears in Greek μηβηρ(ας), ἀμπής (and ἀμπῆδ), εὖβης(ας), &c. (with *dēmus* cf. Gk. ἡμως, τημως, and for *-tēn-, -secūs*, see above); *praeter, propter, subter* are best explained as suffixless Locatives (ch. vi. § 37) like O. Ind. pră-tār, ‘early,’ sanu-tār, ‘away,’ Lat. *super* and Gk. *upa* (cf. O. Ind. uār-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 (I.-Eur. -tre?); e. g. *tātra, there,* *yātra, where,* *anyātra* (Lat. dītēr?), ‘elsewhere,’ *prātī-trē, &c. becoming by syncope *prāt-ter, &c.; *prōclē* has been similarly explained as *pro-te* (ch. iv. § 105), by Dissimilation from *pro-tē* (ch. iv. § 84), or as Acc. Neut. Sg. of a compound Adjective, whose second element
is from the same root, qβελ-, as Gk. τῇλε, πάλαυ, but it is more naturally referred to some extension of the Preposition πρό by a co-suffix (cf. rēcī-prīcēus from re-co- and pro-co-, O. Sl. pro-kū); nāpēr (Superl. nāperrīme) may have as its second component the Preposition per of autō-per (§ 7), sem-per (?), Osc. pert in petīro-per t 'quarter,' and as its first the adverbial particle τῆν (O. Ind. nā, 'now,' Gk. νῦν, νῦ, Lat. nu-dius 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.:

hic media remis Palinurum peruenio nox.

The parallel Adverbs in other I.-Eur. languages, e.g. Gk. παράσ, O. Ind. aktōs, 'by night,' vāstós, '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. divas Gen., Gk. Διήδος Gen.) and inter-diūs. They have also been explained as suffixless Locatives (ch. iv. § 37), like O. Ind. sa-divas, 'at once,' pārve-dyūs, '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 diasque. Inter-diūs is more common, e.g. Plaut. Asin. 599: nunc enim esse negotiosum interdiūs uidēlecit Solōnem;

(see also in Georg., Lex. Wörfl. s. v.), just as interdiū became the usual word for 'by day,' while diū [formed on the analogy of noctū, 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 anapaestic):

noctūque et diū ut uiro 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 quīœsant.

[On diū, for a long time, see ch. x. § 12; we have quadrīus for quamdiū 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, -sī, the suffix of the Loc. Plur., cf. Gk. πήδας and μεροταν); its cognates are O. Ind. makṣū, 'soon, quickly,' an Adverb from the Adjective makṣū-, 'quick,' O. Ir. mos- (e.g. mos-rīcū, 'I will soon come'), moc'h, 'early.' Vīx (connected with vicem?) must be of similar formation.

Per-nox is an Adj. (e. g. lunā pernocte, Ov.), so in Late Lat. perno et perdius, -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 gēnus, sēcūs in virīle secūs, &c.), may be mentioned partem (e.g. magnam partem, maximam partem), principium (e.g. Cato, R. R. 157. 1 de brassica pythagorea, quid in ca boni sit salubritatisque, principium te cognoscere
When used alone as an Adverb, the Acc. Sg. partim retains its old form partim (see Gell. x. 13 on partim hominum venerant and Cat'o's cum partim illorum erat). If saltem is Acc. Sg. of *salte-, a leap, lit. 'with a leap,' 'swiftly, easily, assuredly,' it has taken -lem by analogy of au-lem, ë-tem, &c. [saltim, e.g. C. G. L. v. 146. 13, is, according to Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., a late spelling, like decim for deccem (ch. ii. § 8; cf. B. P. W. xiii. 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 datāmīn from the Frequentative dātāre, whence datārin 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

ludēns datāmīn dāt se et communēm facit.

alium tenet, alii ādnieta, alibī manus

est ēcupata, āliī pernelliī pedem,

alii dat antulum āspectandum, ā labris

alium inuocat, cum ālio cantat, āttamen

aliiī dat digitō litterās;

praeertim from sero, lit. 'in the front row' (cf. disertim O. Lat. for diserte);

tōdēm, at a trot (see Nonius, 4. 1 M.), connected with tōlo; strictēm (e.g. strictēm tondere, as opposed to per pectīnum tondere, Plaut. Capt. 268) from stringo, to graze, touch the surface; pēdētēmēmī, cautiously, like sensīm, lit. 'feeling,' (Nonius quotes a byform pedepressīmī, 29. 1 M.); passēm from pāndo; cursēm, hastily, for which Virgil and others use curāv [AbL. Sg. of the Verbal Noun-stem cursu-, like the Comedians' curricūlā fugere, abre, pereurrere, &c.], AbL. Sg. of currīculum (cf. Plaut. Trin. 1103, Stich. 337)]; statēm, at once, lit. 'standing,' 'on the spot' like ilēār, § 7), is the Acc. Sg. of the Verbal Noun stōtē [class. stātūm], while O. Lat. stātum (for the ā, see Nonius, 393. 5 M.; Donat. in Phorm. v. 37), comes from a bystem stātē- (cf. stātu- and stātū-); in Plautus the word has the sense of 'standing to one's ground,' e.g. Plaut. Amph. 239 nēc recedit loco quīn statēm rēm gerat; ib. 276 ita statēm stant signa; it does not mean 'at once' till Afranius' time (Langen, Beitr. pp. 16 and 337). Parallel with the Adjectives in -ātō- derived from Nouns, e.g. togātus from bōga, and, like them, not postulating the existence of a verb in -āre (e.g. *togāre) (ch. v. § 28), are Adverbs in -ātēm like assāldūm, from assālūt, a splinter (e.g. Plaut. Capt. 832 āperite hasce ambās foris, Prius quam pultando assāldūm foribus exiitium ādfero), guttātum de gutta, ostiātum de ostium, vicātum de vicēs, grādatum de grādūs, &c., also paulātum, paulūcclātum, nostrātum from noster; cf. nostrātes), and from proper names, tongiātīnum (tongiātīnum loqui, ... a Tongīlo parasito, qui ... salutātus convicio responderēt; see Löwe, Prodr.), zopyriātum, Lucill. ix. 74 M. Vir forms its Adverb with -ītīm, virītīm (so propriētīm Lucr. ii. 975). Confestīm comes from a stem *festī-, a byform of which, *festīn-, is indicated by the Verb festīna, from which Virgil (A. ix. 488) coined the Adj. festiīnus. These Adverbs in -ītīm (-ān) 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). Vicēessim (which some derive from vicē-essī, a Loc. Plur. of vicē, Acc. vicēm) is an abnormal form. In O. Lat. we have also vicēssātum, with that substitution of -ātīm for -īm, -m, which we see in two forms mentioned by Paul. Fest. 79. 12 Th., interātīnum for interītum and interiūtum (cf. Plaut. Truc. 882?) for interiūm. Prō-īnīnus (also spelt prō-īnīn; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) meant (1) forward, onward (of
§ 4. ADVERBS.

space or time), e.g. en ipse capellas Protones 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); quæ-tenus (also spelt qua-tinus; see Georgges), whose earlier form quatenus 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 -am, of which -a was a byform, and explains Gk. Adverbs in -ά as τάξα, ἄσα, κρόσα as Instrumentals in -m; see J. F. i. 17). Other examples quoted are: perpēram, 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 (Pragmaticon, fr. inc. i. M.), a precursor of Horace’s Ars Poetica:

discirebile in theatro pérperos
pópularis,

along with the derivative noun perpēritúdo (fr. inc. ii. M.):

et eo plectuntūr poetae quām suō uitio saépius
dúctabilitate ánimi nīnia nēstra aut perperitiūdine;

protinam, 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 pēdibus protinam sēse ab his regionibus, and sometimes wrongly written protinus in MSS. of Plautus and Terence (e. g. Ter. Phorm. 196), seems to be an Acc. Sg. Fem. of an Adjective-stem *protino-, as continua is Abl. Sg. Neut. of the Adjective-stem continuus; prō-miscam (e. g. Plaut. Pseud. 1062 ut mei laetitia laetūs promiscem siet; cf. Paul. Fest. 281. 1 Th.) is similarly related to the usual prō-miscu (also promise).

Of Accusative Plural, ἀλῖας (sc. vices), at other times, alērīs quoted (apparently from Cato) by Paul. Fest. 20. 3 Th., utrasque, on both occasions, used by the historian Cassius Hemina (ap. Non. 183. 25 M.: in Hispania pugnamutum bis. utrasque nostri loco moti), and by the comedian Caecilius Statius (Com. 225 R.):

atque hērcel,

utrasque te, cum ad nōs uenisse, subsērcinatam uidi),

have been called Locative Plural forms like Gk. θέρραι, and the occasional use of fōrās in the sense of fōra (better explained as a vulgarism, e. g. Petron. 30, p. 21. 10 B. III et pridie Kalendas 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. 130), in Plautus and Terence, e. g. tueri contra (cf. Liv. i. 16. 6 and ix. 6. 8 contra intuinti), aurō contra vendere, &c., and has the final vowel short like frustrā (for the quantity -ā, see Brix, Trin.3
introd. p. 20) [ne frustrā 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. ἄρια Pl., ἄριον Sg.) of *con-f(ē)ro (ch. v. § 16); and frustrā may be the same case of a stem *frustrō-, whence frustrāri [cf. Liv. ii. 31. 9] neque frustrarbor ives meos neque ipse frustra dictator ero; Einnius in one of his Satuarea (inc. 84 M.) plays on the words frustra and frustrari for four lines consecutively: nām qui lepide pōstulat alterum frustrāri, Quém frustratru frūstra eum dicit esse frūstra, and so on, somewhat in the style of the Schoolmaster in the Merry Wives of Windsor; torvā tuor, to the language of poetry. (Serv. ad Aen. iii. 594 cetera Graius, &c., quotes from Sallust sanctus alia; cf. Tac. Ann. xii. 3 juvenem et alia claram, 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. pessime), longius (Superl. longissime). The Adverb corresponding to the Compar. Adj. major (pronounced 'māj-jor,' ch. ii. § 55) is not *majus but magis; this magis, properly *ma(h)is (Osc. maɪs), takes its g from magus, as *figura for *fihura (ch. iv. § 116) takes its g from fingo, and represents either L-Eur. *mais (*mais?), (Goth. mais), from a stem mā-, seen in O. Ir. mār (mōr), 'great,' or more probably *maγhīs from a stem maγh-, seen in O. Ind. māh-, 'great' (cf. the Oscan name Mahio-). In either case the suffix is -is, the weak grade of the Comparative suffix -eos, seen in Superlatives like Gk. πλέ-ιο-τρος, Goth. ma-is-tς, &c. (ch. vi. § 52), just as the -w of Att. πλεῖός, a byform of πλεῖων and πλεῖω, 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-trō-, minus-trō-, Osc. minus-trō-). 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 maγhīs, regarded as a Nom. Sg. Mase. or Fem., was formed maγi, a Nom. Sg. Neut., as pōē from pōēs (cf. Serv. ad Aen. x. 481 nune mage sit, &c.: 'māge . . . proper metrum dictum est pro magis, sicut etiam ‘pote’ pro potis . . . quod adeo in usum venit ut etiam in prosa inveniatur; Cicero in Frumentia: mage condemnatum hominem in judicium adducere non posse), whence mācéō (pronounced *macvolo?), ch. viii. § 97 for mag(ō)-vōlo; nimus did not produce a parallel Neuter in -v, *nime, perhaps because there existed already a cognate Neuter in -inn, nīminn (Neut. of the Adj. nīmus) with Comparative sense, 'too much'; but sītis, a Noun meaning 'sufficiency' (cf. fictīs, § 7), and properly used in sentences like sat is mīhi dīcītārum, then extended as an Adverb to sentences like satīs dīcītārum habeō, satīs dīces sum, developed a Neuter *sātē, curtailed to sat1); plus, if plus on the S. C. Baceh. (C. I. L. i. 196, of 186 B. C.) be merely an expression of the sound pūs (as plωr̄na, 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. sotīs, 'satisfying'); whence, with addition of the suffix -ro-, was formed the Latin Adj. sātūr (stem sātus-). Paene may similarly represent *paenū

(cf. pēnāria). Satīn (with the Interrog. Particle -nā) is used in questions, e. g. satīn abīt? 'has he gone?'

Terence puns on satīn and satīs in Phorm. 683: Satīn est id? Nescio hèrele: tantum ĩssus sum.
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ch. iv. § 37, will have, like magis and nimir, the comparative suffix -is, and will represent *plo-is [cf. plora, ‘plura,’ an archaism used by Cicero in his laws (Logg. iii. 3. 6), plo-ir-ume, ‘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 ple- of Greek πλεῖον, πλεῖστος (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 mágue erutque aüdi minus, where the final of the word is elided (cf. ch. viii. § 78 on -rē and -ris in 2 Sg. Pass.).

For plèrum-que, plèrum is used in a passage of the historian Sempr. Asellio (ap. Prisc. i. p. 182. 13 H. ut fíeri solet plèrum, ut in victoria miítor man- suetiorque flat), an Acc. Sg. Neut. of the O. Lat. Adjective plèrus, used for example by Pæcuvius, Trag. 320 R.:

períere Danai, pléra pars pessum datost.

Other examples of the Adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of 1-stem Adjectives are: rúdēp for velupe (ch. iii. § 96); impinē from impinus, a compound of in and poinus; vili, an Adverb in common use in the time of Charisius (116. 7; 187. 7; 183. 14 and 18 K.); fidēle, quoted from Plaut. Capt. 439 (fac fidele sis fidelis) by Nonius, 512. 59 M.; sublinē, 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 sublimen, sublimen and sublimen, see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 462); saepe, 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 saepísquisa,

‘the most closely packed store,’ ‘the densest store’ (fréquens seems to be connected with fácio by a similar transference of meaning).

Gellius (x. r) says that Pompey consulted various authorities, and finally Cicero, on the question whether he should write tertiam or tertio consul in the dedicatory inscr. 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 -e, older -ed (e. g. facilum on the S. C. Bacch., C. I. L. i. 196; cf. Falisc. rected, Osc. amprufid ‘improve,’ Umbr. rehte, tote ‘publice’), a suffix which in classical Latin was distinctive of O-stems as -(i)ter of I- and Consonant-stems. The ending -e (the Abl. suffix, originally -ed; possibly in some words the Instrumental suffix, originally -i, 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 sibito (cf. O. Lat. desubito), omnino, térri, mérito (meritó, C. I. L. i. 190), the Abl. of meritum, desert (cf. Plaut. Asin. 737 meritíssimo ejus), &c. Charisius seems to say that the use of -o for -é 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 -a, e. g. módó, with Adverb or Preposition prefixed in postmódó, prépémodo [these
are not early forms; postmedio is indeed read in Ter. Hec. 208, but propemodum 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, if. p. 600); O. Lat. antigratio (antiqui pro vale direxunt, 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 Abst. Sg. of a Verbal Noun, an IO-stem (ch. v. § 4), anti-gerim from anti and gere, a carrying in front; O. Lat. número, quickly, or too quickly, e. g. Plaut., Mon. 287 numerum hoc 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 vulgarus; principio (rarely Acc. Sg. principiun); impedio (Abl. of impeditum, outlay), used as an Adverb (Gell. xix. 7. 10 translates it by impensus) by the Republican Dramatists, especially with magis, minus, e. g. Ter. Enu. 587 impêundio magis animus gaudebat nilii. Instead of fortê, the Nom. foris is sometimes used (e. g. Virg. A. ii. 139) with an ellipse of sit or fum [cf. forsitum (first in Terence)] and forsa (first in Lucr.), often written forsitam and forsan (see Ritschel, Opusc. ii. 570) by Anal. of Advbs. in -on? cf. p. 69, while fortasse and fortassus (in O. Lat. followed by Acc. and Inf., e. g. Plaut. Asin. 36 ubi fit polenta, tē fortasse dicere, but also, e. g. Rud. 140 fortasse tu hoc nocius es ad prandium) seem to be parts of a verb *fortare, to assert, affirm, derived from O. Lat. foretus, strong, as affirmare from firmus. Opévit, 'Abl.' of opus, appears in a great many Adverbial expressions, e. g. magnopere, tantopere for magnum opera, tantum opera (cf. Plaut. Mil. 75 mo opera oruit maxumo). Ritĕ is a similar formation from *ris, a by-form of rītus (cf. O. Ind. rītā-, 'the fitting time,' esp. for a sacrifice, rītā-, 'fitting, suitable,' P. P. P. rītā, 'fitly, duly,' Adv. [Instr.]).

Temēvit (on the quantity of the final e, see A. L. L. iv. 51) is either the Loc. Sg. of a lost Noun *temus (cf. O. Ind. tāmas-, 'darkness'), lit. 'in the dark,' or Acc. Sg. Neut. of a lost Adj. *temoris, lit. 'darkly, blindly' (cf. O. Lat. temēritēs). On the adverbial Locative cases of Nouns in common use, hātunt, dānt, mīlitiae, &c., see ch. vi. §§ 37-38. Dīē whether with original -e (cf. cōd dīē, C. L. L. xi. 4766, an inser. where -e is not invariably written after a long vowel; die noine or dēe noine, 'on the ninth day,' on the Dvenos inser., if this reading be the correct one) or with original -ēd (cf. Falisc. foied, apparently 'hodie' [Not. Scav. 1887, pp. 262 and 397]: foied vino pipāfo kra karefo hodie vinum bibam, eras carebo) occurs in a great many Adverbial word-groups, e. g. postridē (cf. die crastinē), priē-dīē, coltā-dīē and coltā-dīē (spelt quotidian only by precisians, Quint. i. 7. 6), perēn-dīē, hā-dīē, mērā-dīē (see ch. iv. § 112), from which was formed the Noun meridies. Coltā-dīē can hardly represent anything but a compound of dies and the word quot in some form or other (cf. quot Kalendis², Plaut. Stich. 60; quotannis, and in Late Latin quot diebus and quot dies) with co- written for quo-, its equivalent in sound (ch. iv. § 137), but what that form was is not easy to say. Make it qué-tus, a correlative of titus (cf. totos dies, Plaut. Av. 73; totis horis, Mil. 212).

¹ Whether forsitum really occurs in Terence is doubtful. (Fleck. Jahrh. 1894. p. 284.)

² coltā-dīē, the reading of the MSS. in Plaut. Stich 165, is changed by editors to quot dies.
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others postulate a *quot-tus (beside quō-tus from quo-) formed from quot with that TO-suffix which is used in Ordinal Numerals, quar-tus, quin-tus, &c., just as quot-umnus (Plaut. Pseud. 962. 1173) is formed on the type of septumus; others again suppose *quō(g)lus (O. Ind. katithā) to have been a byform of quītus; peren-die, the day after to-morrow, is connected with Osc. perum, without (originally 'beyond'; cf. Gk. περά), of the phrase perum dolom maliom 'sine dolo malo,' and means literally 'on the beyond day'; hō-die seems to join to die the bare stem hō- (but see ch. iii. § 51 on sī-quiādem). (For other Abl. and Loc. Adverb-forms, see ch. vi. § 38.)

Eādem, at the same time, always with the Fut. or Fut. Pft. in Plautus, e.g. Trin. 577:

i hac, Lēsonice, mēcum, ut coram nuptīis
dies constitutur; eādem haec confirmābimus,
is occasionally found without ellipses of ὑπή, e.g. Capt. 449:

sēquere me, uāstīum ut dem ā tarpezitā tibi:
ēadem opera a praetōre sumam sỳngraphum;
ūnā may, in some uses at least, have sprung from a similar phrase; cf.
Pseud. 318:

quia pol quà opera credām tibi,
ūna opera alligēm canem fugitūam agninis láctibus.

Of Adverbs in -ē from O-stems may be noticed: valē [the full form vālīde is found in Plautus, Pseud. 145 (AP), &c.] from vālīdus; Cicero was the first to use it with an Adj.; fērē and fērmē are related as Positive and Superl. (cf. p. 185).

§ 6. Adverbs in -tus. The best established in classical usage were anti-
quītus, divīnitīus, providentially, fundītius, lit. 'from the ground,' 'from the bottom' (derived from fundūs, O. Ir. bonn, Gael. bonn, 'the sole, the ground or base'; cf. O. Ind. budhnā, Gk. πούμαγ and πόδας, the bottom of a vessel, O. Engl. botm), pēnītīus, lit. 'from within' (see § 37 on pēnēs), rūdīcitūs, întus.

Intus is used not only of motion from within, e.g. Plaut. Men. 218 euocate intus Culindrum, but also like Greek ἀγεί (cf. ἄριά), of rest within, e.g. Capt. 192 ibo intro atque intus sūbduecān ratiūneulam; cf. Lucil. ix. 59 M., who explains the distinction between ad and apud as the same as that between intro and intus:

intro nos uocat ad sese, tenet intus apud se.

Quintilian declares the use of întus 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 întus, denotes not merely motion from, but also rest in, e.g. uti subitus homo ambulare possit, Cato, R. R. xlviii. 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 commūnitūs, publicītūs, pugnitūs, with the fist, humānitūs, immortālitūs, largītūs, 'pro large'; and elsewhere mentions ānimītūs, germānitūs, mēdīlītūs [from the Saturae of Ennius (1. 7 M.)]:

Enni poeta, sālue, qui mortālībus,
uersus propinas flāmmeos medūlītūs],

O O...
§ 7. Adverbial word-groups and compounds. Anteoper πρὸ τοῦτον, Gloss. Philox., seems, if the reading is right, to represent *antia [Acc. Pl. Neut. of *antio-, Gk. ἀρτίος: cf. antiaē (sc. comae), front eurls], with the Preposition per (on o for ι in the unaccented syllable, e.g. filius, see ch. iii. § 18), as παραμ-περ represents πάραμ (Acc. Sg. Neut. of *par-o-, lerrus) with the same Preposition (cf. the Umbro-Oscan Numerical Adverbs, Umbr. triu-per, 'three times,' Osc. petirow-per, four times; on the form pert, see § 38). Topper, a word quite obsolete in Quintilian's day i. 6. 40 ab usitim et jam obliteratis repetita temporibus, qualia sunt 'topper' et 'antigerio' et 'exan克莱re' et 'prosaipia,' et Saliiorum carmina vix sacerdotibus suis satis intellecta) seems to be a similar word-group with an Acc. Sg. Neut. *tol (from the Pronominal-stem to-, ch. vii. § 13; cf. is-ted) 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 nāllum peius màcerat humānum
quaìmde màre sæuom, uis et uī sunt māgnae;
topper cŏrūm confringent inportünae úndae.

and in his translation of Bk. xii. 17:

topper eīt ad aēdis uēnimus Circāi,

and of Bk. x. 395:

topper fācit hōmines ut prius fuerunt;

2 'fortasse,' a later sense, e.g. Paeuvius (Trag. 424 R.):

topper tecum sit potestas fāxit si mecūm uelit,

and the historian Caelius Antipater (cetemp. of C. Gracchus): eadem re gesta, topper nihilino minorе negotio acto, gratia minor esset. Sem-per may likewise have as its first element an Acc. Sg. Neut. *sem (Gk. ὁ), and as its second the Preposition per (semipetens1 may then be a formation on the analogy of neuternus; but see Suppl. Arch. Glott. Ital. i. 58). These examples suggest that in paulis-per2, tantis-per, aliquantis-per the first element may be a Neuter-stem in -is, possibly a weak grade of Comparative -ius (cf. magis, 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 ὧδοπερ, καθάπερ, &c. (ch. x. § 1). (On nuper, see § 2.) Impræsentīūram is more naturally analyzed into in praesentia rerum (a phrase which actually occurs in

---

1 Explained as *semper(r)termis with loss of r by Dissimilation (ch. ii. § 103)
2 Paulisper, with the tall form of I P. L. vi. 27788.
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 edí, bibi, lúsi; Plaut. Poen. 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 sassetatem, which shows that the grammarians of the Empire still realized that affatim was a combination of the Preposition ad with a Noun (like ad sassetatem, Plaut. Rud. 758; ad rávim, Aul. 336, Cist. 304; praeconis 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 eratigationes, sed utraque pars in unam vocem coalisset). 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). Anussin (Paul. Fest. 5. 3 Th.), Accusus of anussis, a carpenter’s rule, may be a similar late curtailment of ad anussin, though we find examussin as early as Plautus. Another word-group of the kind is sedulo, from sé, a Preposition used in O. Lat. in the sense of its cognate sine (§ 51), and dúlos. From the Adverb se-dulo (with ú for ó in the unaccented syllable, ch. iii. § 26) was formed the Adjective sedulus. That this is the true account of sedulo is clear from se duolulo male of the Lex Agraria (C. I. L. i. 200. 40), and from the comparison of phrases like Plaut. Trin. 90 hanc dicas dolo, 480 non tibi dicam doló, Men. 228 non dicam doló, with Capt. 886 quod ego dico sedulo, Ter. Phorm. 453 ego sedulo hanc dicisse 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 plebscitemum about weights and measures quoted by Festus (322. 3. Th.): ex ponderibus publicis, quibus haec tempesatae populus oeteri qui solet, uti coaetquetur sedulum, uti quadrantali uni octoginta pondo siet, congius uni 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 Ergasius, who is hurrying to give Hegio news of the arrival of his son, cries out:

émíor intérminoque négías obstiterit óbuiam,
‘that no one stand in my way’; it has not the sense of praesto in Plautus nor in Terence. From obtiam was formed the Adjective obtius (but cf. periiam, periius), as from sedulo, sedulius. Like obtiam (and inter-vias with vias Acc. Pl.) is obiter, a word regarded with suspicion by purists, though Augustus gave it his sanction, and reprobated Tiberius for using per viam instead. The Emperor Hadrian seems to have reversed his predecessor’s decision (Charis. 209. 12 K.)
'obiter' divus Hadrianus Sermonem I quaerit an Latinum sit . . . quamquam divus Augustus reprehendens Ti. Claudium ita loquitur: scribis enim 'per viam' aviri rov obiter. *Ilici* is explained by Charisius (201. 17 K.) as in-ilic (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 manule; * 836 Plaut. vatic. 608*), of 'in eo loco,' but the sense of *ivi* is foreign to ilico, a fact which tells against its derivation from *i*, an old Abl. Sg. of is, and locus. *Ilico* 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 *iliet*, which in the Comedians has the sense of *Tre lice* (e. g. Plaut. *Capt. 469*):

iliet parasiticæ arti maxumam malam 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, iliet, was brought again into fashion by Virgil in the sense of *ilico*, e. g. *Aen. xi. 468*:

iliet in muros tota discurritur urbe.

[Charisius quotes the note of a commentator on this line: (iliet) nune pro ilico, id est statim. antiqui pro eas liceit,' and mentions a somewhat similar use of the word in a line of Afranius (Com. 215 R.): an tu eloquens iliet?, 'have you become an orator all at once?'). By another freak of language the confusion of iliet 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 sciliet (cf. Paul. *Fest. 74. 22* 'iliet,' sine dubio). A verbal group like iliet is videlicet, which in the earlier period occurs with the construction of videre liceit, e. g. Plaut. *Asin. 599*:

nunc enim esse
negotiosum interdix uidelicet Solonem,

Lucret. i. 210:

esse videlicet in terris primordia rerum,
also scilicet, construed like scire liceit in such a line as Plaut. *Pseud. 1179* scilicet solitum esse, 'of course he used to' (on these verbal Noun stems i-, vide-, sci-, see ch. viii. § 34). *Sis* (for *vi*, ch. ii. § 53), *sultis* Plur., similarly takes an Inf. in Plaut. *Asin. 399* sis amanti subuenire familiari filio.

The word *modus* enters into several adverbial word-groups. Besides *admodum*, propemodum (and later propemodo), postmodum (and postmodo), which have been already mentioned, we have *quemadmodum*, quomodo [cf. cujusmodi, quijusmodi, ejusmodi, ete., which in Plautus are scanned as cretics or the equivalents of cretics (ch. viii. § 22), cuicuiusmodi (perhaps not in Plautus)], *quodammodo*, tantummodo and (in Late Latin) *solummodo*, ete. (cf. the compounds omni-modis, multummodis, on which see Neue, ii. pp. 609 sq.). We find *res* in qua-rē, quam-ob-rem, ete., dies in in-dies, propemodiam.

A Preposition with a Noun (or Adj.) appears also in *de-nūd, for de nūco* (with
§ 8. Other Adverbs. One of the puzzles of Latin etymology is the O. Lat. Adverb *simul*, the equivalent of *simul* (Parallel to *simul* in French and Spanish), found as an archaism on some inscriptions of the Empire in the forms *simut* (C. I. L. vi. 1758), and certainly once (possibly twice) *simitur* (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 *simutu* (175. 16 M.) with three examples from Lucilius and Plautus; so that this form is well established. Plautus elides the last syllable in *stitu*, 249, mecum simul ut iles ad seso domum. The later (plebeian) form *simitur* can hardly be due to a change of -ed to -er like that seen in O. Lat. *aper, apur for apud* (§ 19); it is more likely to be a corruption caused by confusion with the Impersonal *iter, 3 Sg. Pass. of eo, to go*. *Simitu* has been explained as a Compound of the root sem- (ch. vi. § 57) in some form or other with *itū*, the Abl. Sg. of the Verbal Noun *itus*, a going.

Another puzzle is *igitur* (the quantity of the final syllable cannot be determined in Plautus), the oldest sense of which is ‘then’, ‘thereupon’ (cf. Non. 128. 14 ‘igitur’ positum pro postea), e. g. the first clause of the XII Tables: si in ius uocat, ni it, antestaminio; igitur em capito, a clause well known to Roman schoolboys of the first B. C. as the beginning of one of their most formidable lesson-books (cf. Cic. Legg. ii. 4, 9 a parvis... Quinto, didiciamus si in ius vocat atque alia eujus modi ‘leges’ nominare); Plaut. Cas. 215 mōx magis quom ótium et mihi et tibi erit, *igitur tecum loquar: nūne uale; Mil. 772 quando habebo, igitur rationem meærum fabricarum dabo; *igitur tunc* (e. g. Most. 689), igitur deinē, igitur demōn are all frequent in Plautus. This makes unlikely the theory that *igitur* is a curtailment of *quid igitur?*, a form of *quid igitur?*, with *ā* weakened to *ī* in the unaccented syllable of the word-group *quid-igitur?* Another theory connects it with Lith. -ktu of tōktu, ‘so’, kōktu, ‘as’, or with O. Sl. -gda of togda, ‘then’, igda, ‘hitherto.’ It has also been resolved into the three Pronominal-stems i- (ch. vii. § 13), ūko- [ib.; *digitus* is quoted as a parallel case of the change of -edt- to -igit-]; others make the particle *gē* (Gk. *γέ* the second element of *igitur*), and *to* (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 frequens, apud alios nunquam reperiarit). Another Adverb (?) of uncertain etymology is *sirempse* in the formula found on old laws, *sirempse lex esto*, 'the same law shall hold' (*C. L. L.* i. 197. 12; 198. 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.* i. 1991, p. 296).

*Setius,* less (*esp. non setius, nihil setius, also quo setius like quo minus*), is the correct spelling, not *sectius,* which is not found till the period when *ti* began to be confused with *ci* (see ch. ii. § 90, and Fleckeisen, *Fläsfig Artikels*, p. 28), so that the word cannot be equated with Gk. ἐξσαον (for ἐξσαον; cf. ἐξσαον). Though treated by the Roman grammarians as the Comparative of the Adverb (*Pre-*position) *secus* and as a byform of the normal comparative *setius* (e.g. Afranius 293 R. sin, id quod non spero, ratio talis sequiuis céciderit) (from the root *seq*-, 'to follow,' Gk. ἐπορα; lit. 'following,' hence 'inferior'), it seems impossible to connect *setius* with *secus* (see § 1) or with *sequius.* Gellius (xviii. 9. 4), describing a controversy he had heard over the spelling of the O. Lat. verb *inesco* (*insequo*), to narrate (Gk. ἐνσαον), mentions as an argument adduced by one of the disputants, that the form *sectius* 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 nihil esse mihi uidentur setius quam somnia,

and that this *sectius* was connected with the O. Lat. *insectiones* 'narrationes,' so that the line really meant 'nihil 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 *setius* was the oldest form (from *secto-*, a participial-stem from *sequor*; 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 *it* for *ett* too doubtful (ch. ii. § 130) to make this theory at all convincing. It is much more likely that *setius* and *secus* were entirely different words (like *melius* and *bened, peticus and morte*), associated as Comparative and Positive owing to their similar meaning.

*Oppidium* 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. ἐποίει) as opposed to the *uru.* 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] arduum. The*
Adverbial Abl. oppidō will then be exactly similar to planē. 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 -cuv-, e.g. iber, si-cubui, 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-Ocean forms point to -fi as their original suffix, with f representing L.-Eur. bh (Gk. -φι), as in the Dat. Sg. of the Personal Pronouns (e.g. Osc. sife 'sibi,' L.-Eur. *sebehi, ch. vii. § 5), or more probably dh (Gk. -θι; cf. O. Sl. kūde, O. Ind. kūha). Latin -bi is in O. Lat. -bei [e.g. ubei on the S. C. Bache. (C. I. L. 1. 106); 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 ibadem), a variation of quantity which is most naturally explained by supposing that the last syllable was originally long (representing L.-Eur. -ei), and was in time shortened through the influence of the short first syllable (aē from aē, &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-cubui, num-cubui, &c., ubi-que, iber, ibadom (rarely ibadem in Plaut.), in-bi 'inibi esse like in eo esse (ut), 'to be on the point of'), inter-bi (often used by Plautus for intervā, interim), post-bi (used sometimes by Plautus for postea), iberi and the less usual aliubī (as early as the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C., C. I. L. i. 200. 86: aliubīne aliterue), utribi, utribique and utribique (on these spellings, see Georges s. v.), neutribi.

(2) With suffix -i (older -ei). In the language of Plautus iber or iberic (older ibern, Paul. Fest. 231. 2 Th.), isti or isteric may be Dat. Sg., 'to him,' or Adverb (Loc. Sg.), 'there.' The scribes of our MSS. however have gone on the principle of correcting iberi, isteri, 'there,' to iberic, isteric, usually (e.g. Capt. 278, where the metre requires iberi), and almost always iberic, isteric, 'to him,' to iberi, isteri, 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 -c(e) at all periods of the literature, hic, older hec (C. I. L. i. 551. 590. 1007. 1009); hecei on the epitaph of an actor, i 1297:

Protogenes Cloul[i] suanei hecei situs minus,
plorumque que fecit populo soucis gaudia nugas,
may be a graver's error, for the orthography of the inscription is erratic; hecei (i. 1049 me hecei situm immature). But on late inscriptions we occasionally find hi (e.g. ii. 3244 hi jacet). [Faliscan he, hei in the formula he (hei) cupat 'hic cubat, -ant' may owe the suppression of its -c to the initial -c- 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 -c(e), sic1 (cf. Umbr. i-sek

---

1 For an example of the older spelling sece we may take this touching epitaph of a girl called Flavia Amoena [Mitth. (röm.) viii. 150]:
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'item'); from the Relative (Interrog., Indef.) the Adverb qui (which is perhaps rightly regarded as an Instr. (cf. O. Engl. hwi, O. Sl. čimi) from a stem qui-, ch. vii. § 25), and with the suffix -v(e), quin (ch. x. § 16), as well as the compounds alicui-qui and alicui-quem, cetero-qui and cetero-quem, nē-qui-quem (ch. vii. § 28), and perhaps quippe (if for qui-pe) and quippeam (quippeam) (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-cunque, aliqua, illa, illo, 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. alīocversum and aliorsum, Plaut. (for the suppression of v between the two vowels, see ch. ii. § 53), quiorsus, -m. The Preposition ad is appended in quo-ad, and prefixed in ad-ad (used in a literal sense in the older literature, e. g. Cato, R. R. xl. 3 surculum artīto usque adeo quo praeceperit; cf. adeo res redit, '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.:

ūt seīre possis adquo te expediat loqui,

and 249 R.: irātus 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, uō-tro, por-ro; and that this -ō represents earlier -ōd, the Ablative case-ending of O-stems, we see from the spelling porod on an old Praenestine cista (Mēl. Arch. 1890, p. 303). Osan adpūd in a Capua inser. (Rhein. Mus. 1888, pp. 9 and 557. adpūd 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, seriau arnipo ... pesnis fust 'sedeto quoad precatus erit' (the -ni- of arnipo 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- (?) (Gk. óbror-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. qui for quo with i, ch. vii. § 25), but to other parts of its declension, e. g. Acc. Pl. Fem. pa-e; the Adverb from O. Lat. sēd-āter-que (Plaut.), 'each separately,' is in Umbrian sei-podruk-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 Umbrian has been used as an argument that Umb. ubo 'illue,' postra 'retro,' &c. are Instrumentals. Similar formations from ille, iste are found at all periods of Latin, illī (cf. Umb. ulla, ubo), istō (for examples, see Georges), but the Adverbs generally used are illeue, istue, with final syllable scanned long in poetry, and similarly from hie we have hue, hither, ad-hue, hither-to (is *hō indicated by the form horsum for hororsum?). In the earlier literature the forms with the enclitic -e(ε) end in -oe, with final syllable again scanned long, e. g. hoe (as in Plaut. Capt. 480, where the parasite is touting for a dinner):

quis ait. 'hoc ? aut quis profitetur ?),

an archaic form employed by Virgil, A. viii. 423 (see the note of Servius on the passage):

hoc tune Ignipotens caelo descendit ab alto
ADVERBS.

§ 10. [for other examples, see Georges, Lex. Worf. s.vv.; 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 -oi-ce with the Locative suffix -oi, which is used in Adverbs of motion towards in Greek, ποί, ὁποί, &c., but it seems unnatural to regard it as anything but a phonetic development of the earlier -oc. 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 ποί, ὁποί, but ποῦ, ὁποῦ, 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 c really represents ce, from an earlier de, *hoct-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. já 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 habe fieri possit, and the word-group quominus, lest, e.g. quominus habe fieri possit; also quo, whereby, &c. These too are Ablative forms, originally *quōd*, *eōd*, as we may see from Osc. pod ... minus 'quominus' in the Tabula Bantina (Zvet. I. I. I. 231. 10): nep fesacīd pod piś dat eizac egnad min[s] deivaid dohād malud 'neve fecerit quo quis de ea re minus juret dolo malo'; Osc. svapod ... svapod 'sive ... sive,' Umbr. sroppo; Umbr. eso (iso) from the stem *ek-so-, also esoc (issoc) for 'ek-sok 'sic'; with the last, cf. the Latin gloss: soc, itsa, Löwe, Probv. p. 350, a doubtful form. In a leaden excretion tablet (Zvet. I. I. I. 129), written in Oscan (presumably not the best Oscan), we have svaipuh (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 Oscan po+p (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 Oscan. In another Oscan excretion 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, hauv-qua-quam, qua-propter (cf. Plant. Amph. 815 qua istaeque propter dicta dicantur mihi), ea (often appended to Adverbs, propter-ā, praeter-ē, post-eā, ant-eā, and on the S. C. Bacch. arcus sum ead in the sentence: seī quēs essent. quēi arcuōrum ead fecissent, quam suprad scriptum est), ea-ēm, alia, aliqua, hac (appended like ea to Adverbs, post-hac, ante-hac, praeter-hac, and in a plebeicium ap. Fest. 322. 8 Th. adversus hac; cf. Osc. post eac 'posthae'), illae, istae. With tēmus appended these Adverbs indicate distance: quatemus, 'how far' (on the subsequent development of meanings, see § 4), haecemus, 'thus far' (cf. Hor. est quadam prodire tēmus). The formation is evidently the same as that of Adverbs derived from Prepositions with the suffix -tro. (-ro-), e.g. extra (exstrad S. C. Bacch.), supra (suprad S. C. Bacch.) (cf. Oscan pullad 'qua,' an Adverbial Ablative Sg. Fem. of the Relative, formed by adding the Abl. Sg. Fem. of the Oscan Demonstr. stem ollo- (Lat. illo-, older ollo-, ch. vii.
§ 18) to the Relative stem po- (ch. vii. § 23); [p]ullad viù uruvú ást 'quá via flexa (' est,' Zvct. I. I. 136. 55). Quo-ad is found for quo-ad on late inscriptions, and is a not uncommon variant in good MSS. (see Georges).

(5) In -im, utrin-que, illim (found in Cicero as well as in the older writers, whereas istim is doubtful; see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s. vv.), but usually illinc, as istinc, 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 olim, though in two at least of these three last words, it has not its usual sense of motion. Interim is equivalent to inter-ad, inter-ibi (Plaut.), while olim, from meaning 'at that time' (often answering to quam in Plautus, e. g. olim quom caletur maxime, Truc. 65), came to mean 'at any former time,' 'formerly,' 'once upon a time,' then 'at any time,' 'occasionally' (e. g. Lucil. iii. 4 M. uiamque Degrumatuts uti castris sensor 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. 0laius, ole (class. ile), best analyzed into *ol-so- (ch. vii. § 13), for oll- would not become 0l- (ch. ii. § 130); it is rather to be derived from the stem ol-, a grade of the OL-(AL-)stem, without the suffix so- (cf. Umbr. ulb 'illuc' with u the equivalent of Lat. o).

The origin of the suffix -im has not yet been satisfactorily explained.

(6) In -inde. This suffix seems to be the suffix -m (hardly the Acc. Sg. suffix) augmented by the particle -de. As the Adverbs meaning 'thence,' ible, ister added to -im the particle -c(e), the corresponding Adverbs from is, qui add to -m the particle -to (cf. Gk. iido-ôe), which, like -ce, was liable to be curtailed of its final short vowel in every day pronunciation (ch. iii. § 36). Thus we have inde (which should not be derived from the Preposition in, but must go with unde), indi-dem, and with prefixed Adverb de-inde (curtailed to dein), proinde and proin, ex-ind(e) (and exim, a different word from exim; see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s. v.), &c., unde, si-cande, ne-cande, nudi-que, altunde, alëcande. For utrinde, quoted from a speech of Cato by Charisius (224. 14 K. utrindte factiones tibi pares) we should expect utrundte.

(7) In -on (-om), the Acc. Sg. Neuter, e. g. ten and with the enelicic -c(e), tine (cf. none and etiam-nunm), quon, other quon, with appended jam in quin-iam (ch. x. § 13), and appended -dam in quon-dam (cf. qui-dam, ch. vii. § 28), dum (ch. x. § 12), dà-dam (ib.), non-dum. 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 in and eni (ch. vii. § 19); and from the Relative-stem seen in uti, &c., we have the wn- of un-quam (cf. O. Lat. *unquis of nee quam quam quam ' Fest. 162. 22 Th.), and with negative ne- prefixed, nun-quam (ne quam) is 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-cunde) in the cun-of qui-cun-que (ch. x. § 2), ne-cun- quam (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 tanm as an O. Lat. form of tan 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-, tan. The two are united in tan- quam. Whether jam, now (cf.
Lith. jaū, ‘already’), is the corresponding formation from the stem i- is not certain. The indeclinable Adj. nē-qua(m) may be a colloquial compound of qua(m), as the Adverb nē-quaquam is of quaquam, so that nequam would literally mean ‘a no-how’ (cf. O. Lat. nequa(tia) ‘detrimenta’ Fest. 162. 23; Paul. Fest. 163. 13 Th.). Another compound is perquam, exceedingly (cf. adnudum quaum, Plaut.).

The addition of the Preposition dó (§ 27) to quaum gives the Adverb quandó (ch. x. § 12), originally temporal, then causal (cf. quamque-didem, uti-quando, quandò-que (Umbr. pamm-pel) (cf. O. Sl. kàdu, ‘qua, unde’?), while O. Lat. quam-dé is a byform of quaum, than, as in a passage of Livius Andronicus (quoted in § 7): peius . . . quamde . . . , uti . . . quamde mare saecum, and Lucr. i. 630 quam de gravis inter Graeos qui vera requirunt. Other derivatives are ali quam in ali quam-diu, &c., qua(m)-vis (rarely with Subj. in Plautus, and always with an Adj. or Adv.; not in Terence), and qua(m)-quam (cf. tam-quam), n(e)-uti-quam, n(e)-qua- quam, &c.

From the pronominal-stem *no- (O.Ind. nà-nà, ‘in various places or ways,’ lit. ‘there and there,’ ‘thus and thus’), connected with the stem *eno- (*ono-) O. Ind. ana-, ‘this,’ Lith. anàs, ‘that,’ O. Sl. onü; we have nam used in emphasizing a question, e. g. quid cerussa opus nam? Plaut. hence quis-nam, who?, O. Lat. quiu-nam, why?, and in the sense of ‘for’; from the stem *do-, -dam of quon-dam (cf. qui-dam).

(9) With other suffixes: of t-suffixes we have (a) -ta in i-tà, so (Umbr. itek), i-tà-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 Ioui saer esto; cf. the gloss aliuta (leg. aliuta), aliud, amplius, Lòwe, Prodr. 432]. The final a was no doubt originally long, if every final short vowel became -e in Latin (ch. iii. § 37), but there are no traces of this quantity in itaque in the older poetry (on itaque in the Saturnian epitaph of Naevius, see ch. x. § 8), and probably none in ite 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, au-tem (cf. O. Ind. -tham of ka-thám, ‘how,’ &c.?).

(c) -t (originally with a short final vowel, probably i; cf. O. Ind. i-ti, ‘thus’). in ùt, ùti-nam, ùti-que. The Umbro-Ocean equivalents of Latin ut show an s after the ù, Umbr. puze, puse, ending originally in -tsi or -tsé, Osc. puz (pous on the Bantine tablet must surely have ou for ù), which in Latin appears in the local Adverbs us-qua(m), nus-qua(m).

Us-que is a different word, derived from the I.-Eur. Preposition ud-, as abs-que from ab (see § 57 for ùsque).

The suffix t appears also in aut, which probably ended originally in a short -i (Gk. αυτ-ίε has τε for I.-Eur. *q-τιε, ch. x. § 2), as we see from Umbr. ọt, Osc. avti. The long -i of ùti is probably Loc. -ei (§ 11).

Of t-suffixes, besides (a) -dam of quon-dam (temporal Adv. of qui-dam) and (b) dum, with idea of time in dà-dum, non-dum, vic-dum, inter-dum 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 tantt-dem, ibi-dem, indi-dem, iti-dem, tòti-dem (from *tòtì, 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 identi-dem, repeatedly (explained as ‘idem ante idem’ or ‘idem tum idem’), also with the idea of time (cf. dum in inter-dum, non-dum) in tan-dem (cf. demum), pri-dem.

§ 10.]  

ADVERBS.
§ 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; *pôno ceased to be recognized as a compound of po- (see § 12) and *sîno, and changed its Perfect *pô-sîvi to posui (ch. viii. § 39. 4); *summitto 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. *pôrîgre, 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-lîttora, ch. iii. § 12 a. 6), and in the Roman ortho-
graphy they were usually written together (e.g. *ingalliam, initialiam*, 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. *ἐν* and *ἐν* 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 nos placo* was the archaic phrase for *supplico* retained in Latin prayers; *transque dato* and *endoque plorato* are legal archaisms for *traētōque* and *implōrātōque*, Fest. 444. 30 Th.). An arrangement like *sub nos placo, ob nos sacro* (for *obscerco vos*) (cf. Vedic *vī nō dēhi, ’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 compounds of 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.-Eur. Prepositions often show an appended particle (Pronoun and Adverb), such as (1) -s(ĕ), Gk. -σε, e.g. *ἀψ, ἐξ, Lat. abs, ex, sus-; (2) -d(ĕ), Gk. ὀμον-δε, e.g. Lat. *postid*, *antid*, *prod-* (cf. O. Sl. -dŭ of prě-dŭ-, ’before’); (3) -tī, e.g. O. Ind. *prāti*, Zend *pāti*, Gk. *πορί, ποτί*, Osc. *pert-;* (4) -n(ĕ), e.g. Lat. *pōne* for *pos-ue* (cf. Germ. von, O. H. G. *fona* and *fon*). These particles, whose original form is not always recognizable (thus a Latin -d from -*dĕ* 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’ -dē of Gk. δομονδε from the ‘pro-
nominal’ -dē of Gk. δ-δε); 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 en-dōs,-
indūs- with the different Preposition en-, in-, in such words as
indū-grēdi, in-grēdi, indū-pēratōr, im-perator, and ultimately
to the disuse of endo, indu, in favour of en, in. (In Terence inaudio
alone is used for earlier ind-audio and in-audio. A similar con-
fusion 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 *abdūrare, *abandire, *abtenere have supplanted
obdūrare, obandire, obtēnere). 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. Ocean ūp, 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
§ 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. ἀπα, e.g. O. Ind. apa-i-, ‘to go away,’ Gk. ἀπειμεῖναι, 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 Ppt. pō-sīvi changed to pōs-īni owing to a false apprehension of po-sītus as if it were posi-tus like mōnī-tus). (Po-lubrum, a wash-basin, pō-ōre, and Germ. vo-n, O. H. G. fo-n, and fo-n, have also been referred to this I.-Eur. form, § 39). The form āp- appears in āp-ěrio, and was no doubt the shape assumed by the word in such collections as ab templo; ab is due to the same

(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 junegabant, quod hoc facere minime 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, ii, pp. 942 sqq. for statistics), but in the older literature often follows it; and in Umbro-Oscan postposition is common, e.g. Umbr. asam-aď, ‘ad aram,’ termmon-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 Enelitic Pronoun (ch. iii, § 12) might be inserted (cf. O. Lat. ant-i-d-eo, § 18 7, 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. ἀπα, e.g. O. Ind. apa-i-, ‘to go away,’ Gk. ἀπειμεῖναι, 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 Ppt. pō-sīvi changed to pōs-īni owing to a false apprehension of po-sītus as if it were posi-tus like mōnī-tus). (Po-lubrum, a wash-basin, pō-ōre, and Germ. vo-n, O. H. G. fo-n, and fo-n, have also been referred to this I.-Eur. form, § 39). The form āp- appears in āp-ěrio, and was no doubt the shape assumed by the word in such collections as ab templo; ab is due to the same...
Latin preference for -b rather than -p, as substituted ob for op (Osc. op; cf. Lat. op-erio), sub for *sup (ch. ii. § 73). The form abs (pronounced and often written aps, see ch. ii. § 86), in which the Preposition is augmented by the particle *s(ê) (Gk. ἀψ), is used in Composition before Temnes, 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 (foreset), equivalent to 'si sine me esset,' where que, like its O. Ind. equivalent ca in the Rig-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. I. L. vi. 197). That â (Osc. aa-manaffed 'amandavit,' Umbr. aha-, aa-, e.g. aha-vendu beside pre-vendu) is another form of ab, as ê of ex (see below), is generally believed, though it is difficult to see why ob and sub did not develop corresponding forms *œ, *sū; it may be an entirely different word, associated with ab because of its resemblance in meaning, form, and usage 1. Au- of au-fāgio, au-fēro, &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(ê) (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 afluō and afluō, 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. afluō for āvōlan. 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 w- sound, like the Greek digamma (cf. Prisc. i. 35. 17 H.).

1 Lat. â 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; ā before b, p, m, f, r, c, q, g (Labial and Guttural sounds); abs (and a) before tu, huus, &c.; ab and a before t, d, l, n; in class. Lat. ab is used before vowels and t, n, r, s, j; ā before b, p, f, v; abs before e, q, t (Cicero began with abs te, but discarded this expression for a te); in Late Latin ab is used before vowels, ā before consonants (see Langen, Beitr. 33). The usage of ā in the older period allows of its being a mere phonetic development of ab, for ā bello may be simply an expression of the sound abbello (ch. ii. § 130), and so the shortening of ā by the Law of Breves Breviantes in Plautus, e.g. quā ā bello portat?, 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 praeposito est 'at,' equo nunc tantum in accepti tabulis manet, ne his quidem omnium, in reliquo 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 eitiam 'au-fugit,' quod 'ab-fugit' turpe visum est et 'a-fer' noluerunt, 'aufugit' et 'aufer' maluerunt. Quae praeposito praeter hae duo verba nullo alio in verbo reperietur. Velius 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 afovelant as an actual form used by an ancient writer. On an inscription of Amiernum (Not. Sav. Oct. 1891) we have af vinaeus, af villa (beside ab castello, ab sejete); on the Epistula ad Tiburtas (C. I. L. i. 201, of c. 100 B. C.) of nobis; on the milestone of Popillius (i. 551. of 132 B. C., from Lucania) of Capnum (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) of 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-tiutha with Lat. ad-dāco, Goth. at-baira with Lat. ad-fēro) is a different word from the Conjunction at, I.-Eur. *at (Goth. ap- in ap-jan, 'but'), though often confused with it in Roman spelling (ch. ii. § 76). On the old form ar, e.g. arfuerunt, 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-Ocean as in Latin, is found augmented with the particle *s(e) in Ocean, e.g. az hūrtūm 'ad hortum'; but also ad, e.g. adpūd 'adquò,' 'quoad,' idad 'ad id.' In Umbrian we have ad, e.g. ad-fertur 'adfertor,' adputrati 'arbitratu' (ch. iv. § 112), postfixed to Nouns, e.g. asam-ad 'ad aram,' written ar- in aruipo 'quoad' (§ 10. 3).

(Gk. ἀμφω, Lat. ambo; cf. O. Ind. ubhā-, Goth. bai, baj-ōps, Lith. abū, O. Sl. oba), appears in Latin compounds in the forms, (1) amb- before a vowel, e.g. amb-arrāle (sacrificium) ‘quod arva ambiat victima’ (Serv. ad Ecl. iii. 77), amb-urbiales (hostiae) ‘quae circum terminos urbis Romae ducabantur’ (Paul. Fest. 4. 15 Th.), amb-ustus ‘circumustus’ (ib. 4. 17), whence by false analogy combn-ustus, instead of *com-ustus (unless this rather represents co-amb-ustus), amb-litus ‘circumitus’ (ib. 4. 18); (2) am- before a consonant, e.g. am-ter-mini (oratores), a phrase of Cato’s ‘qui circa terminos provinciae remanunt’ (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 circumvendebant’ (ib. 16. 1; Charis. 231. 11 K. seems to quote a similar amfines), ām-icio for am-jicio. The form amb- in compounds bears the sense of ‘both’ in ambi-dens (ovis) ‘quae superioribus et inferioribus est dentibus’ (Paul. Fest. 4. 9 Th.), am-bius-trum ‘quod non liebat nisi ambos censores post quinquennium lustrare civitatem’ (‘Serv.’ ad Aen. i. 283), am-bivium. In Umbro-Oscan the word appears with an r-suffix (cf. inter), Osc. amfr-ēt ‘ambiunt,’ Umbr. ambr-ctuto ‘ambiueto,’ but also e.g. Osc. am-nūd ‘circuitu,’ am-vianud ‘vice,’ Umbr. an-ferener ‘circumferendi.’

§ 17. Ān-, a curtailment of I.-Eur. *ānū, ‘on’ (Zend ana, Gk. àvá, Goth. ana, Engl. on, O. Sl. vù for *ōn) (cf. I.-Eur. *ānū), (O. Ind. ānu, Zend anu) may appear in ān-hēlūs (also derived from the root an-, ‘to breathe,’ whence ānūmus, &c.), an-quiō [by some explained as *amb(i)-quiō], an-tennaē, an-testari (or for *ante-tennaē, *ante-testari, ch. iii. § 13, p. 176). Its presence is more certain in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Osc. ava-fāker ‘consecravit,’ angetu-ēt ‘proposuerunt,’ Umbr. an-tentu ‘intendito,’ am-pentu ‘impendito,’ unless it is here some variety of Lat. in, as an- the Umbro-Oscan negative prefix (ch. iv. § 81) is of Lat. in-.

the Preposition (governing the Acc. as in Latin) appears without
the final short vowel (this loss of a final ȳ is common in Oscan),
e.g. ant púnttram ‘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 quaé Thyestae quondam antepósitast Téreo.

On antennâ and antestor, see above]. With the particle *dè
appended, as in postid- in O. Lat. antid-eo (e.g.
Plaut. Trin. 545 sed Campans genus Multo Surorum iam antidit
patientiâ), 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 -i of I.-Eur. *anti, not being final,
does not sink to ė (cf. anti-stes, &c., ch. iii. § 39).

§ 19. Apud, which is also spelt aput, seems to be the I.-Eur.
Preposition *ἀπό (of which Lat. ab is a curtailment; see above),
augmented by the particle *d(e), or *t(ī), and must have been
originally *apo-d, or *apo-t (cf. Dor. ποτ). An old form apor,
with that change of -d to an r-sound (before f, v) seen in arfue-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 eisúd sakaraklúd ‘apud id sacellum.’

§ 20. Circum, circâ, circiter. Circum, around, is the Ad-
verbial 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.):
quod lúna ciricos ánnuo in cursu institit.

In the early literature circum is the only form, whether Adverb
or Preposition, but in class. Lat. a byform circâ 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 mittere, ‘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 haec circiter. The form circo appears in the Adverb id-circo, as circa in quo-circa, with the same logical sense (cf. Osc. amund, ‘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 comno- ‘comitium’ from the Prep. com-).

Cis, citrā, on this side (cf. Umb. cimu, sîno, ‘retro’?), are formed from the I.-Eur. pronominal root ki-, ‘this’ (Gk. -ki of oûkí, 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 citrō (Abl. Sg. Neut. or Mase.) corresponds to citrā as utrō (e.g. ultro citroque) to ultrā.

§ 21. Clam, clancontinental. Clam, an Adverbial Acc. Sg. Fem. (?) from the root kel-, ‘to hide’ (Lat. célō, ocelō, &c.), had in O. Lat. a byform clam-de, clande (written clade in the MSS. of Placidus 15. 32 G.; but cf. quamde from quam, ch. x. § 11), whence was formed the Adj. clandestīnus. Another O. Lat. form written callin 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, Adolph. 52 clanculum patrem. Cf. the glosses: clanculae 'absconsae' (C. G. I. v. 277. 58); clanculum 'occultum' (ib. 278. 1).

§ 22. Cóm-, (eóm), with, and co- (e.g. cōgo for cō-dgo), I.-Eur. *kóm and *kō (?) (with palatal or with guttural k?) (O. Ir. com-, co, W. cyf-, cy, Osc. com, con, co-, Umbr. com, -co, co-) is in early inscriptions written quom (Bersu, Gutturale, 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 privativ '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 exaeic fefacust 'si quis contra hoc fecerit,' is followed by the Adverb (Locative) exaeic, as Lat. arvorum in the S. C. Bacch. by the Adverb (Abl. Fem.) ead: sei ques esent, quiei arvorum ead fecient. 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. āris, 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. sākṣid). Incoram with a Gen., e.g. incoram omnium, is found in Apuleius.

§ 25. Dō, 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-díkatted '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 Numeral Adverb *dwís [O. Ind. dvís, Gk. ὅς, 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-łoo, and before voiced consonants (see ch. iv. § 151) dī-, e.g. di-móveo (dis-nota) on the S. C. Baceh., C. I. L. i. 196.

§ 27. Endō. (Cf. O. Ir. ind-, e.g. ind-riuth, '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-pērātor, O. Lat. indu-perator, class. in-grēdi, O. Lat. indu-grēdi. It seems to represent an I.-Eur. *en-dō (Gk. ἐνδο-θι, ἐνδο-θεν, ἐνδορ), compounded of the Prep. *en (Lat. in) and the Prep. *dō (cf. Lat. dō-ōc; O. Ir. do, Engl. to, Lith. do, O. Sl. do), the last element being connected with the Adverbial particle *d(e) (Gk. ὁμω-δε). The final -d has been preserved from becoming -c 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 formendo occurs, e.g. in the epitaph of Ennius, quoted by Cicero, in his De Republica (ap. Sen. Eppl. 168. 34):

si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cuiquam 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,
PREPOSITIONS.

§ 28. Ergā, ergō. Ergā, originally local (e.g. Plaut. True. 405 tonstricēm Suram Noústin nostram quae ergā aedem sesed 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 ultrā and nitrō, intrā and intrō, or whether they came originally from two different stems, it is impossible to say. Ergo has been explained as the compound of the Preposition ἐν and the Abl. Sg. of a stem *ręgo- (from the root *ręg-, ‘to stretch’), meaning ‘direction,’ so that its change of meaning would resemble that of German wegen (originally von wegen). Ergā might similarly represent e *ręgā, like e rēgōne, opposite. It is not restricted to the expression of friendly feeling in Plautus, e.g. Pseud. 1020 ne mālus item erga mé sit, ut erga illūm fuit; Cas. 618 aut quōd ego umquam erga Úénerem inique fécerim.

§ 29. Ex, ec-, ὡ, out of. I.-Eur. *eks (Gk. ἐξ, Gaul. ex-, O. Ir. ess-, W. es-; cf. Lith. isz?) appears to be a compound of a Preposition *ek and the particle *s(e), as Gk. ἔξ, 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. Seaur. 26. 14 K. effatus, non ‘exfatus’ nec ‘ecfatus,’ ut quidam putaverunt; Ter.
Maur. l. 949. K. muto vel partem prioris, si fit hirtum, syllabae, 'ecfer' ut dicam, vel illud, 'hoc tibi effectum dabo'), e.g. ecfōdio, ecfēro, 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 d (e.g. e-dūco; cf. sē-dēcim), m (e.g. e-mitto; cf. sē-mestris), &c. (ch. iv. § 151). Corresponding to Lat. e we find in Osc. ex-stint (apparently with a different sound from I.-Eur. e, which is in Osc. i, í, e.g. licud 'lege'), eehianasūm 'e(ve)hiandarum,' Umbr. ehiato- 'evehiato-,' easa 'ex ara,' &c. (see ch. ii. § 6).

Extrā. (O. Lat. extrad; cf. the S. C. Bacch., C. I. L. i. 196 extrad urbem) is an Abl. Sg. Fem. of an extension of ex by the suffix -t(e)ro- (ch. v. § 16), like in-tra, ci-tra, ul-tra, &c. Oscan ehtrad (with ᵐ for ct, as in Uhtavis, the Oscan form of Octavius), O. Ir. ehtar may represent an original stem *ek(s)-tero- or *ek-tero-.

§ 30. Īn, in, the unaccented form of O. Lat. en [cf. ënque, but ināllo on the (restored) Col. Rostrata (C. I. L. i. 195)] is I.-Eur. *ēn (Gk. ē, O. Ir. in, W. yn, Goth. in, Lith. į). 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), ēs, Att. īs], and appears to be a Locative case, formed without the case-suffix -i (ch. vi. § 37). (The Greek byform ēvi 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 (īn), 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 fanis.' Osc. -en with the Abl. imad-en 'ab ima (parte),' ciscu-en ziculud 'ab eo die (*dieculo),' which has the sense of Lat. ab, has been referred to Lat. inde (but see § 10. 6).
§ 31. **Infrä** (infera, *C.I.L.* i. 1166), an Abl. Sg. Fem. like *suprä*, *citrä*, *inträ*, connected with the Adj. *inferus* (on which see ch. v. § 16).

§ 32. **Intöör**, between (O. Ind. antär, O. Ir. ētar; e. g. O. Ind. antär-chid- ‘inter-scindo’), is formed from *in* by the addition of the suffix -tero- (see ch. v. § 16), like *interior* (cf. *intrö*, *inträ*), as *ex-tero-*, &c. from *ex*. The Oscan form is anter, the Umbrian form is anter, ander (governing the Ace.), both with an- corresponding to Lat. *in-,* the Preposition, as to Lat. *in*, the Negative, e. g. Umbr. an-takro- ‘in-tegro-.’

§ 33. **Inträ, intüs.** *Inträ* is an Abl. Sg. Fem. like *exträ*, class. conträ (while *intro* is an Abl. Sg. Neut. like Osc. *contrud, Lat. contrö-erscia*) (cf. Osc. *Entra-,* the name of a goddess). *Intüs* (Gk. *εν-τὸς* with the I.-Eur. affix -tös, implying usually motion from, § 1) wavers between an Adverb and a Preposition in such a phrase as Virgil’s *tali intrus templo,* ‘in such temple, within’ or ‘within such temple’ (cf. Lucr. vi. 798).

§ 34. **Juxtä**, 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 *juxo* 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-ώτος,* &c.). The Adv. *juxtim* is found as early as Livius Andronicus (*Trag.* n. R.).

§ 35. **Öb, I.-Eur. *op(i),** apparently a variety of *opi* (Gk. *επί,* on, to, *ὁπίσω*σκευ, behind, O. Ind. *āpi,* ‘by,’ Lith. *api-,* ‘around’; cf. Lith. ap-szvesti, ‘to make light,’ with Lat. *ob-caeco,* to make dark), is in Oscan *op* (with the sense of Lat. *āpud,* governing the Abl., e. g. *op tovtad* ‘apud populum,’ *ūp esūd sakaraklūd* ‘apud id sacellum’), and often retains its -p in Latin spelling in compounds like *op-tineo* (e. g. *opienui* on a Scipio Epitaph, *C.I.L.* i. 38; cf. Quint. i. 7. 7), *op-ērio,* 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.
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

586

[Chap. IX.

ob praepositio alias ponitur pro circum, ut cum dicimus urbem
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36.
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38. Per, through (Goth, fair-, Lith. per), connected with
I transport, bring or pass through (O. Ind. pr-,

I.-Eur. *pero,

'
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Gk. Treipco, Tretpa, Lat. ex-perior, &c.),
cf.
to
Osc.
corresponds
per- of peremust, Fut. Pft. of a verb used
O.

SI.

perjj;


apparently in the old sense of Lat. *perēmo* (Fest. 266. 31 Th. ‘peremere’ Cincius in libro de Verbis Priscis ait significare 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 *-ti* of Gk. *πορτί*, § 11), e.g. *comono pertlemest* ‘comitia peremet,’ *am-pert*, ‘not beyond’ (used like Lat. *dumtaxat*, § 7), *petiro-pert*, ‘four times’ (cf. Lat. *sem-per*, § 7), and to Umbr. *per*, *pert*, e.g. *per-etom* ‘peremptum,’ *trio-per*, ‘three times,’ which with the Abl. has the sense of Lat. *pro*, e.g. *nomne-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 paucas pererias, Ter. *Hec.* 58; hence *per-taeus* did not become *per-tiuss*, ch. iii. § 23), is seen in Lith. *per-saldūs,* ‘very sweet’; cf. Gk. *περι-μύ辔*, very long, &c. (cf. Engl. ‘through’ and ‘thorough’). Again Lat. *per-* approaches the usual sense of Gk. *περί*, about, around, in *pertēgo, perungo, percolito.* The sense of ‘past,’ ‘beyond’ (cf. Osc. *am-pert*, pert víam ‘trans viam,’ Umbr. pert spinia ‘trans spinam’(?)) appears in *per-go,* &c.; and with the implication of wrong or injury (cf. Gk. *παρά-βαίνω, παρ-άμυναi*), in *per-jarus* [from which *pejēro, perjero* (see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s. v.), can hardly be separated, though the *Prince* is hard to explain], *per-do, per-fidus,* and of difference in *perēgrē* 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. *nomne-per,* &c. in the Eugubine Liturgy: *(tio . . . ocre-per Fisin, tota-per Lovina, erer nomne-per, erer nomne-per . . . subocau te pro arce Fisia, pro populo Iguvino, pro ejus (M.) nomine, pro ejus (F.) nomine, subvoco, estu esunu fetu fratrus-per Atiediae ‘ista sacra facito pro fratribus Atiedis’*), once written -pert in the phrase: Petruniapert natine ‘pro Petronia natione,’ it has the local sense of Latin *pro-* forward, in front, 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. *peri- in *per-ātt(i), from *wētos-*, ‘a year,’ O. Ind. *qarut,* ‘in the former year,’ Gk. *περιοσι, Dor. περιοτι*). The reason of this is that the I.-Eur. root per- produced a large number of Prepositions, representing different case-forms, &c., *péri* Loc.
(O. Ind. pārī, ‘around,’ Gk. περί), *prōs Gen. (O. Ind. purās, ‘before,’ Gk. πάρος), *perm (O. Ind. pārā, ‘beyond’; cf. pārā, Gk. πέρα; Lat. perem- of peren-die, Osc. perum dolom mallow ‘sine dolo malo’), and so on. The weak grades of the root, pr-, pr-, seen in Gk. napd, Goth, fura, Engl. before, appear in Lat. por- of por-tentum, &c., Umbr. pur-titu, pur-ditom (unless this be merely a metathesis of pro], and in Lat. prō, Umbr. pro, pru, Osc. pro, pru, as well as in Lat. prae from *prai (Pel. prai-, Osc. prae, Umbr. pre), perhaps a Dative form (cf. Gk. ταπατ, O. Ind. parē).

§ 39. Pō-, retained only in a few Compounds, po-situs, po-lubrum, porceo, &c., as Teut. *miþ, ‘with’ (Goth. miþ, Germ. mit, like Gk. μετά) is in English retained only in the compound ‘mid-wife’ (see under ab, § 12).

§ 40. Post, pōnē. Post, behind, from *posti, 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 *pō-(Lith. pa-, ‘under,’ O. Sl. po, ‘about’), a curtailment of *apō (see § 12). In certain collocations the -t was dropped by the Latin phonetic law (ch. iv. § 157), e.g. C. I. L. i. 1454 postempus; 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 pō-, e.g. pō-merium (so spelt, not pomœrium), quod erat post murum ‘post-mœrium’ dictum, Varro L. L. v. 143.

Pone (Plaut., &c.) adds the suffix -nē (§ 11) to post (Umbr. postne, opposed to perne; cf. pustnaio-, pusnao- Adj., opposed to pernaio-).

Umbrian post is joined with the same case as pre (Lat. prae), e.g. post verir Treblanir and pre verir Treblanir, in O. Umbr. pusveres Treplanes and preveres Treplanes, and similarly Osc. pūst feihús ‘post fines,’ while Osc. post exac corresponds to Lat. posthac.

In Umbro-Oscan we find a Preposition postin governing the Acc. case with the sense of Lat. secundum, e.g. Umbr. pusti kastruvuf, ‘according to their lands,’ Osc. pustin slagim, ‘according to the locality (?)’.
§ 41. *Poste, posti-d, pos, pō-. *Poste, which shows the regular change of -i when final to -e (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, uestraquepectora 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 *anima to *animal, *nequè to *noc, &c. (ch. iii. § 36). The Adverb *posti is not frequent in Plautus (e.g. *postid locorum, *Poen. 144, &c.), as also *postid-ea (cf. *antid-ea, *antid-hac), compounded with the Adverbial Abl. Sg. Fem. of *is (§ 10. 4) (e.g. *postidea 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-ea, ad *id locorum, *Sall., *Liv.), though this explanation requires us to see in *postidea, *antidea, &c. a pleonastic repetition of the pronouns, *post-id-ea, *ant-id-ea. Cicero (*Orat. xlvi. 157; cf. *Vel. Long. 79. 3 K.) says that he preferred *posmeridianas (quadrigas) to *postmeridianas, 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 Ribbeck, *Prolegg. 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. prě; cf. O. Ir. rē or ria, with a dropped final nasal). In O. Lat. also pri, according to Paul. Fest. 282. 27 Th. (cf. *pria-cus, *pria-tius, *priumus for *pria-mio-, Pelign. Prismā-, pri-stafalacirix ‘prae-stabulatrices’), probably I.-Eur. *pri (Lith. pri, O. Sl. pri, Goth. fri-), connected with I.-Eur. *prō, ‘before,’ and with Gk. πάρος, O. Ind. purās, 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-Oscan languages; Pel. prai-cim, Osc. prai, prae-sentid ‘praesente’ (with the usual sense of Lat. praesens; in the Columna Rostrata we have *praesens in its older sense: praesente[d] . . . dictated or[m, ‘being in command,’ *C. I. L. i. 195], *praec-fueus ‘praefectus,’ Umbr. pre verir Treblanir ‘ante portas Treblanas,’ pre-pa, ‘priorsquam,’ lit. ‘praec-quam,’ pre-habia ‘praeebeat.’

§ 44. Pro, por-. Pro, before, forth, is I.-Eur. *prô (O. Ind. prá, Gk. πρό, 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 Oscaan preposition (or I.-Eur. *prů, Gk. πρότερον, &c.), e.g. pru-hipid 'prohibuerit, pruter-pan' priusquam,' and may have been I.-Eur. (Gk. πρῶ-τ, early, O. H. G. fru, Lett. prû-jam, 'forth'). These Oscaan forms suggest that Lat. prô was not originally *prôd, an Abl. form (which would be in Oscaan *prud-, not pru-), so that the prôd- of prôd-est, prôd-ire, may be a form augmented by the particle *-d(e) like anti-d-, posti-d-, r-ed-, &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, pôrricio for *por-jicio, por-rô (O. Lat. porod), &c. is either a metathesis of prô-, or represents an I.-Eur. by-form *pr (cf. Gk. παρά) (see ch. iv. § 92). In Umbrian we have pro- for Lat. pro, before, e.g. procanurent 'procinuerint,' affixed in ie-prú (cf. promo- 'primus'), and pur- in a verb corresponding in sense to Lat. pôrricio and in form apparently to Lat. prô-do, with P. P. pur-ditum, Imper. pur-dovitn.

§ 45. Prô- and prô-. The variety prô- and prô- 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: prôchad atque prôpellat, Lucr. iv. 194 and vi. 1027; Lucr. prôpragore; O. Lat. prô-tinum. Prô- almost ousted prô-in class. Latin, but prô- is normal before f, e.g. prô-ficiscor, prô-fundo, except in prô-ficio (for prôd-ficio, as in Late Latin ?); but Catullus (lixv. 202) has prôfudit; Plautus (Men. 643) and Ennius (Trag. 293 R.) prôferit; Plautus (Trin. 149) prôfecturus. The Greek πρὸλογος is prólogus in the Comedians (cf. prófola, Lucil. v. 28 M.), προφάσω is prófanare. Even in classical poetry we have próvare. O. Lat. prô-turus might be similarly explained, were it not for the fact that there are indications of an old form prôptervo- (so in the MSS. of Plaut. Bacch. 612, and in the Ambrosian Palimpsest in Truc. 256; see Löwe, Gloss. Num. pp. 142, 184, who connects the form with Gk. προπέρῆς). Prôbus (cf. O. Ind. prabhû- 'preeminent') apparently adds to prô the same formation (from the root bheu- 'to be '?) as super-bus (cf. Gk. ὑπερφώς) to super.

§ 46. Prôcûl is formed from *prô by the suffix -ko- [a suffix often attached to adverbs, e.g. Lat. posti-cus, anti-cus (ch. v. § 31), réciprocus 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 I.-Eur. *prò* 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. **Proptēr**, 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 *praeter* from *prae* (**§ 43**), *circiter* from *circum* (**§ 20**).

§ 49. **Rē-**, back, has in O. Lat. a byform *rēd-, with the addition of the particle *d(e)* (**§ 11**; cf. *anti-, posti-*, which in class. Lat. remains in *red-co, red-do*, &c. (*reddivus* is peculiar), but is before a consonant usually discarded for *rē-, e.g. red-ducō* (O. Lat. *red-duco*, but perhaps only *re-dux*), (before a vowel, not till Late Latin, e.g. *readifico*; see *A. L. L.* viii. 278). From *re-* was formed the Adverb *re-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 *rēco- from this Preposition (ch. v. § 31) is seen compounded with a stem *prōco- from the Prep. *prō- in the word* recī-procōs. In Umbrian this Prep. appears in two Compound Verbs, re-vestu ‘revisito’ and re-statu ‘restituito’.

§ 50. **Sēcundum, sēcūs.** *Secundum*, according to, close behind, &c. is the Adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of *secundus*, following (**§ 4**). In plebeian Latin *sēcūs* 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, *sēcūs merita ejus, sēcūs viam*, &c., but also in O. Lat. authors, for Charis. (220. 14 K.) *quotes hoc sēcūs, ‘soon after this,’ from the historian Sempr. Asellio*), which may be Nom. Sg. Masc. of an Adj.-stem (cf. *heres sēcūs, ‘h. secundus,* C. I. L. iii. 387), or Acc. Sg. of a Neuter S-stem *sēcūs*, like *tenus* (**§ 54**). Apparently connected with the Prep. *sēcūs* are O. Ir. sech, ‘past,’ W. heb, ‘without,’ from a stem *seqh-o-; and the Latin Adv. *sēcūs* appended to Adverbs in -im, e.g. *extrin-sēcūs* (**§ 10. 5**), as well as the *sēcūs of phrases like sēcūs accidit, non sēcūs atque* (Comp. *sequīns*) 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. Sinē, sē. Sine, if connected with O. Ind. sanu-tār (cf. sani-tār), M. H. G. sun-der (which have the suffix -tero-), must represent I.-Eur. *s'ni (*s'nü), and must have been in O. Lat. *sene, 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-ītio, lit. ‘a going apart,’ se-orsum (-s) (a dissyll. as early as Plautus), sē-dūlō from sē dolō (whence the Adj. sēdulus, § 7), sē-cūrus, sē-cėdo, sē-cerno; it is evidently connected with the Conjunction sēd (ch. x. § 5); the d of sēd-ītio, &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 fraudē 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, ll. 29 and 42, but se dulo malo l. 40) (cf. Paul. Fest. 500. 6 Th. ‘sed’ pro sine inveniuntur posuisse antiqui). The compound sed-uterque (cf. Umbr. sei-podruhpei) occurs in the Nom. Sg. Fem. in Plaut. Stich. 106 sedutraque ut dicat mihi. This sē(d) has been plausibly connected with the I.-Eur. Reflexive Pronoun-stem *swe- (Lat. sē Acc.), and explained as originally meaning ‘by oneself.’ The Old Slavonic Prepositions svē-nē, svē-nī, svē-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. ė-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 nesī ‘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 (nesī pro sine positum ... Dianae Aven- tinen ... 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. *ὑπό (O. Ind. úpā, '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 'subtentido,' 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. *ὑπέρ, *ὑπέρι (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 kumne '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 indero '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).'</br>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. teusahaan, 'a cord,' in Plaut. Bacch. 793 pendébit hodie púlere; ita intendí teunus) is used as a Preposition as early as Ennius. It takes the Abl. Sg.,
§ 55. **Trans**, across (Umbr. *traf, trahaf*), is either the Pres. Part. of *trāre, in-trare, pēnē-trare* (probably the Nom. Sg. Mas. 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. *tré* or *tria, tri, trem-, tar, W. *trwy, trach*, O. Ind. *tirás*, all from the root ter-, ‘to go through, drive through’ (O. Ind. tr-, ‘to bore,’ Gk. ῥεῖπω, Lat. *tērō, &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, ll. 54, 58, &c.), *trā-mitto* (and *trans-mitto*). Umbr. *traf, trahaf* (i.e. *träf*), tra 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 vita 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 ā 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 *ovis*, 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 e. g. Tauro tenus, Cic. (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. Pl.*). It is in the sense of ‘as far as,’ lit. ‘stretching from,’ e. g. *aliaqua-tenus, hac-tenus* (on which see § 10. 4; cf. *prō-tinus, § 4*).
55-58.

PREPOSITIONS.

§ 57. Usqué, with long u, to judge from Romance forms like O. Fr. usque, Fr. jusque for de usque (for Lat. ü 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 absque 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 ὦς (for ὦς εἰς) came to be used as a Preposition, e.g. ὦς 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 Adverbiah 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. ἢβε, ὃβε), 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 ὦς, περ, &c., ὡς ὦς, ὡς περ); 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. *qʷo-, *qʷe-, *qʷi-, *qʷu- are all various forms of the Relative and Interrogative Pronoun-stem, ch. vii. § 23; -tē and -tī appear in O. Ind. u-tā, Gk. aτ-τε, O. Ind. i-tī, Gk. ε-τι), 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. saltām for saltīm, adapted to au-tem, sæ-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, sæ-tem, u-t(ē), Gk. αὖ-τέ, O. Ind. u-tā(-ā), i-ti, ‘so,’ O. Sl. te, ‘and’; (2) the D-particle of O. Ind. i-dā, ‘now’ (Lat. īdō-neus?); dum, ἢβ-δεμ, Gk. δῆ, δέ, δ-δε; (3) the DH-particle of Gk. ἐν-θα, O. Ind. κύ-ха, ‘where,’ O. Sl. ку-де, ‘where;’ (4) the P-particle of Lat. quip-pe, nem-pe, Lith. kaip-p, ‘how, as,’ szeip ... teip, ‘so ... so’; (5) the N-particle of Lat. nam, num, nem-pe, quis-nam, O. Ind. hi-ná, ‘for,’ O. Sl. tu-ná, ‘then.’ These particles are not easily distinguished on the one hand from the particles affixed to Prepositions (e.g. *-tī of O. Ind. pra-ti, 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. ὅν 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 *dδ 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 *sε 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. ἤ-θα, is the asseverative particle *dhī, joined to Imperatives, as Lat. dūm in āgē dūm; the *-tōd of the 2 Sg. Fut. Imper., e.g. quando uidebis, dato, Plaut., is the Adverbial 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 *gē (Gk. γε) used as the sign of the Acc. Sg. in Goth. mi-k, Germ. mi-ch, *ghī (O. Ind. hī,
Gk. \( \text{val-} \chi_1 \) as the sign of the Dat. Sg. in O. Ind. mā-hy-am, ch.vii. § 1). The -d of the Acc. Sg. of the Personal Pronouns in Latin has been similarly explained as the particle *td, 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 id in the Rig-Veda) (see ch. vii. § 1).

§ 2. (1) Conjunctive.—Que, et, atque, ac, quoque, etiam. -Que, I.-Eur. *-q\( ^{2} \)e (O. Ind. ca, Gk. τέ, Goth. -h, e.g. ni-h ‘ne-que’), apparently the bare stem of the Relative *q\( ^{3} \)o-(\*q\( ^{3} \)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 -c 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 exórnat ; pérq(ue), cónsueriúm commúné, &c. (Skutsch, Forschungen, i. p. 151). I.-Eur. *-q\( ^{2} \)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. quei quemque, 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. ὃς τέ, Goth. hvō-h F.); so quis-que, each (cf. O. Ir. cá-ch, W. pawb, O. W. paup, apparently from I.-Eur. *q\( ^{2} \)e-q\( ^{2} \)e or *q\( ^{3} \)a-q\( ^{3} \)e). This -cunque seems to be nothing but cum-que, ‘whenever’ (Hor. C. i. 32. 15), though some connect it with O. Ind. cañá (with ka-, &c, ‘whoever,’ &c.), and others make the -cum- (-cun-) a byform of um- (um-) of um-quam, &c. (ch. ix. § 10. 7). The corresponding particle in Ocean is -píd (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 kvā, ‘where,’ and ca, Lat. -que). Similarly, at-que̩, 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:

\[ \text{quóniam conuocáui, atque illi me ex senatu ségregant.} \]
§ 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. Wortf. 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 (once), 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 iuventus.

§ 4. (2) Disjunctive.—Ve, aut, vel, sive, seu. -Vē is I.-Eur. *

-awē, (O. Ind. āvā, e.g. nāktam vā dīvā vā, 'by night or by day,' Hom. Gk. ἀγ( ἐ)ί), probably a curtailment of an I.-Eur. Adverb *āwē (O. Ind. āva, 'away'). The I.-Eur. particle had also the sense of 'as,' 'like,' seen in Lat. ce-um, O. Ind. i-va, 'as,' e-va, 'thus,' later e-vām.

Aut is compounded of I.-Eur. *au [Gk. aὖ, again, Goth. au-k, 'also' (quasi *au-ge), Engl. eke], another curtailment of the same Adverb (cf. au-fūgio, auf-ūro, ch. ix. § 12), and the particle -tē (§ 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 volō (ch. viii. § 58), lit.
‘choose,’ as Germ. wohl (e.g. Homer, wohl der grösste Dichter, ‘Homerus vel summus poeta’) was originally Imper. of wollen.

Vel can hardly represent vell for *vels, an old 2 Sg. ‘Injunctive,’ for it is so thoroughly a short syllable in Plautus as to be capable of acting as a Brevis Brevians (ch. iii. § 42), e.g. Poen. 827 vel in lautumis, vel in pistrino, although Umbr. heris... heris, e. g. heris vinu heri puni ‘vel vino vel posco,’ is 2 Sg. Ind. of heri-, ‘to wish’ (whence Herentas, the Ocean Venus).

Other instances of Imperatives used as Particles are pūtā, for example, Hor. and ἄγε; em, the Interjection, probably represents ēmē, 2 Sg. Imper. of emo, I take (§ 19).

Sivē is compounded of sī, older sei, and -ve. Before -u, the curtailed or syncopated form of -ve (as -c of -quē, -n of Interrogative -uē, &c.), the ei-diphthong was by the Latin phonetic law (ch. iv. § 66) reduced to ē (as in demus from deinu(s), ch. iv. § 33). Lat. si was in Umbrian sve (Osc. svaī), and the Umbrian equivalent of Lat. sive is sve-po ‘siquō.’

§ 5. (3) Adversative.—At, ast, sed, autem, atqui, tamen, ceterum, verum, vero. Āt is the I.-Eur. Adverb *āt(ī) (O. Ir. aith-., ‘back;’ Lith. at-, O. Sl. otū, ‘from’), used in Latin, as in Gothic (a)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 antiques variam vim contulit vocibus, pro atque, pro ac, pro ergo, pro sed, pro tamen, pro tum, pro cum, ut in glossis antiquitatum legitimus scriptum), especially (1) ‘if further,’ ‘and if moreover,’ e. g. Lex Serv. Tull.: si parentem puer uerberet, ast olle plorassit, puer diuis parentum 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 hic peribo, ast iline ut dixit non redit,

with the sense of ‘further’ or ‘but,’ Accius, Trag. 260 R.:

idem splendet saepe, 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 archaisms 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 asted on the Dvenos inscription (usually explained as adstet) be really ast, it is a byform with the particle -d(e) like postid (ch. ix. § 40).

Sed, 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 (sēd), '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. i-tem) to the I.-Eur. Adverb *au [Gk. aŭ; again, Goth. au-k, 'also' (quasi *aŭ-ye)], Engl. eke], which is probably identical with the Preposition an- of Lat. an-fēro, an-fūgō (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 currendum et pugnandum et autem iūrigandumst in uiā,

(cf. sed autem, Ruld. 472; et autem, Poen. 841).

Atquī 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).

Tōmēn 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-etsi and tamen-etsi). 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. arvamen '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 famine, as a proof that interrogative -ne appended to tam produced this same form:

tām capularis? tānne tibi diu uideor uitam uiuere.

On the other hand tanne is mentioned by Festus 542. 26 Th. as the O. Lat. form of tām with interrogative -ne, and exemplified by Afranius, Com. 410 R.: tanne árcula Túa plena est aránearam? Festus also quotes tame, as an old form of tām, on which see ch. ix. § 10. 8.

Cēterum is the adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of the stem cētero-(Nom. Pl. cēleri), as cētera in such a line as Virg. A. ix. 656: cētera parece puer bello, 'for the rest—you are a boy—deal sparingly with war;' is an adverbial Acc. Pl. Neut. Cēterum of Plautus' Truc. 847, &c. is exactly parallel to unum of Plautus, Mil. Glor. 24 nisi unum epityra ei ēstur insanūm 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-leri, &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, imō. The formation of quidem has not yet been satisfactorily explained. The qui- may be the bare stem of the Pronoun (see § 2 on quit-
6, or if *idem represents *uid-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, ii 9. 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 quidem, *me quidem (like *quidem, ch. iii. § 51), or the division of a dactyl between two words in iambic and trochaic metres, e.g. *atque quidem.

*Immo (not *imo, according to Brambach, Hülfsbüchlein, s. v.) has the scansion of a pyrrhic (w) according to the MSS. in passages like Terence, Phorm. 936:

*immo *uero *uxorem *tú *cedo. In *ius *ambula,
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. mār, mór, '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,
*maeat *sacra *ferens,
is most naturally referred to I.-Eur. *eno- (*ene-) (cf. O. Ind. aná, '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

---

directly with *e-nom ‘igitur,’ of the Dvenos inscription, Pel. inom (?), ‘et,’ Ose. *nìm, ‘et’ Umbr. *e-nom (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. *e-nom of the Dvenos inscr. (from *ei-no-; cf. O. Ind. čna-, ‘he,’ čnā, ‘so, here’), as O. Ind. asā-ú, ‘this’ (from *e-so-) to O. Ind. čšā-, ‘this’ (from *ei-so-).

*Nam, often used in O. Lat. in questions, e.g. ‘quid eerussa 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 *qeo-, tām 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 -pē (§ 1) to some case of the Relative or Interrogative or Indefinite Pronoun, either the Acc. Sg. Neut. quippē for *quīd-pe (cf. quippinati equivalent to quidnī), or (if -ippē can represent -iπ- in Latin; cf. ippīpe ‘ipsi neque alii’ Paul. Fest. 161. 37 Th., and see p. 116 n.), the Loc. Instr. Sg., quippe for *qui-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 aurem 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 nempe 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. fuvereis ergo (ch. ix. § 28), as possibly standing for ē *rögo (cf. e rōgione), ‘from the direction,’ and has been compared with German wegen, M. H. G. vonwegen.

Itaque, compounded of itā (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):

itāque postquam est Órho traditus thesáuro (see p. 128 n.).
The grammarians of the Empire distinguish *ìtâque*, therefore, from *ìtâque*, and so, 'et ita,' (e.g. Serv. in Don. 427. 13 K. tune corripitur media cum una pars fuerit orationis, tune vero producitur cum duae), but short *a* is invariably shown in the Dramatists in both senses of the word. The grammarians' rule about *ìtâque* resembles their rule for the penultimate accentuation of *plérdque*, *utrdque*, Nom. Sg. Fem. (cf. ch. ii § 93 on Late Lat *àqua*, *aequa*).

*Igitur* had in O. Lat. the sense of *tum* (Paul. Fest. 74. 29 Th. 'igitur' nunc quidem pro completionis significacione valet, quae est ergo. Sed apud antiques ponebatur pro inde et postea et tum), as in Plaut. *Mil*. 772:

quándo habebo, igitur rationem meárum fabricarúm dabo,

or in the first law of the XII Tab.: si in ius uocat, ni it, antestamino. igitur em capito. 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. Juppiter ut Danaum omne genus pereat, is the Conjunction *ût*, that (older *ùl*, 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 *nonné* 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, *Men*. 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. *nò*; cf. *nuce* for *num-c(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,
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§ 11. (9) Comparative.—Ut, uti, quasi, ceu, quam. Ut, of which the final short vowel is preserved in ulti-nam, ne-uti-quam, [pronounced u(e)u-li-qua-m with first, as well as second, syllable short], ulti-que, is one of those Relative Particles that appear in Latin with initial n, 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.

Üti 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 quansei occurs in the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C., i. 200. l. 27; and in Plautus we have (1) quam si 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 -si short as early as the time of Plautus, whereas the combination as (ms) properly lengthens a preceding vowel in Latin (ch. ii. § 144). We are thus driven to suppose that quam (adverbial Acc. Sg. Fem.) and qua (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 *kó- (ké-), 'this' (ch. vii. § 15) and the particle *wé, 'as, like' (§ 4). It has been supposed that as sev is a syncopated form of sive (*seí-w(e), § 4), ceu must come from a fuller form *kéi-w(e), the Locative Case of the Pronoun with the particle *wé. 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 tau quam. Its Oscan equivalent is pan (Zvet. I. I. I. 231. 6 maies mgm [as tovti] cas amnul pan pieismum brateis 'magis rei publicae causa quam cajusipiam gratiae') or pam (ib. 231. 16 pruter pam medicatinom didest 'priusquam judicamentum dabit'). In O. Lat. we have a form augmented by -dē, quamde, e. g. Liv. Andr. ap. Fest. 532. 8 Th.: nāmque nullum pēius mácerat humānum quamde máre saēuom nis et cui sunt māgnae,
(a translation of Hom. Od. viii. 139). This quamde, quandae (Umbr. pane) would probably become *quan (Osc. pan?), as deininde became dein (ch. ix. § 10. 6), and would be merged in quam.

§ 12. (10) Temporal.—Quum, quando, dum, donec, ut, ubi. Quum, O. Lat. quom, is most simply explained as an Adverbal Acc. Sg. Neut. of the Relative, an I.-Eur. *qom. Terentius Scaurus (28. 9 K.) mentions an old form of the word (MSS. cuine, for which editors read quonne or cuine), and quotes a couplet from the Carmen Salire; 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 pun, pon seem to be compounded of I.-Eur. *qom and a particle -dē [cf. O. Lat. quamde for quam (Umbr. pane, Osc. pan) § 11; and see below on quan-do].

Quando 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. quamde, 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 quandōquīdem is at all periods of the literature (see Studenmund’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. III. 23 K.). In quandone (C. I. L. vi. 25048 nequa ei loci controversia quandone fieret; 25905 con qua reliquias meas quandone poni volo) we have the suffix further augmented by the particle -ne (cf. dō-nū-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). Quandoc, 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 uēc of uēquē. The scansion quandōquīdem, found as early as Plaut. (Trin. 991 sālus quando-quīdem ādvenīs; some would scan quandō-dem) seems to be like sitquīdem (see ch. iii. § 51).
Dum, which is often a mere asseverative particle, e.g. ἀγέ dūm (Gk. ἀγέ δῆ), quīdūm, how so? primumdūm, first of all, is an Acc. 
Sg. Neut. from the Pronominal-stem *do-, as tum from *to-, quum 
from *qũo- (Gk. δῆ 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. δῆv for *δῆv, O. Sl. davé, 
‘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 -dūm in non-dūm, 
etiam-dūm, inter-dūm, &c. On late plebeian inscriptions we find 
a form donec, while, e.g. C. I. L. vi. 25c63:

ad tu ne properly 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 nune, tunc (ch. ix. § 10. 7). The connexion of the two 
meanings ‘while’ and ‘until’ is seen in archaic Engl., e.g. 
Macbeth, iii. i. 143 while then, God be with you.

Donec 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:

ibi mānens sedēto dōnicum nidebis 
mé carpēnto uēhente mēm domum uenisse,

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-ui-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 done-
cum. Donec is more naturally explained as the syncopated form 
of doni-que (cf. nec and neque, § 18), and doni-que as *done 
mented 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).


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. *mēdhyos, O. Ind. mādhyas, Gk. μέδις(ρ)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 hinc iturust ipsus in Seleuceiam,
mihi conmendauit virginem ;

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. *qođ (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 Homeric ὅ in such a line as Od. i. 382:

ηθλήμαχον θαύμαζον θ' θαρσαλέος ἐγρήγειν.

In Plautus it is always, or almost always, subject or object of a relative sentence, e.g. Capt. 586:

filium tuum quod redimere se ait, 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 sequocasset.

Quiò is an Acc. Plur. Neut. of the Relative I-stem (Slov. či, ‘if,’ Bulg. ви, ‘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. jēi, 'if,' of the Pronoun seen in Lat. *is, ea* (ch. vii. § 19). Greek ἐλ has been connected by some with the Latin, by others with the Lith. conjunction. *Sic, so,* is the same word with the enclitic -c(e) appended (ch. vii. § 15). Osc. svai, Umbr. sve come from a stem *swo-* ('whence Goth. sva, 'so'), of which O. Lat. suad 'sio,' quoted from an augural prayer by Festus (526. 15 Th. suad '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. Bacch. and the Lex Repetundarum, and *nise* (with *e* for the *ei-*diphthong, ch. iv. § 34) on the Lex Rubria. The change of *ē* 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 svae*), in Umbrian by a form no (Umbr. *nostve*). 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 *nisi* we may compare Osc. *ne pon ' nisi quum ' (Zvet. I. I. I. 231. 14 *izic comono ni hipil ne pon, &c. ' is comitia ne habuerit nisi quum,' &c.).

*Nis, I -Eur. *nei,* perhaps *nē* with the deictic particle *i* of Gk. *ouros-*i, &c. (ch. vii. § 23), had originally the sense of *nōn* or *nē,* as in *quid-ni, quiippi-ni* [Lith. *nei,* 'not at all'; Osc. *svae pis censomen nei cebnust 'si quis in censum non venerit,' nei-p más pomtis com prēivatud actud 'neve magis (quam) quinquies cum privato agito,' nei *svae ' nisi,' svai nei-p ' si non ' si nee'], and still retains this sense in some passages of O. Lat., e.g. Cato: *caveto ni quam materiem doles, and in Virgil's line : ni teneant cursus. It came however to acquire the sense of *nisī* 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.)

Sīn is usually said to represent sī-ne, 'if not,' with the same syncope of the negative particle as in quīn, lest (§ 16), or as of the interrogative particle in audīn for ādis-ne, &c. (§ 10); and this explanation exactly suits its use in sentences like Cic. Epp. Pamm. xii. 6. 2 qui si consecutus erit, vicimus; sī, quod di omen aver- tant, omnis omnium cursus est ad vos. But this negative sense of sīn, 'if not,' is hardly attached to the word in the time of Plautus. The Plautine use of sīn 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 discrīpsi? instead of: quod ego discrīpsi, illudne rescrībam?], so that, e. g. Plaut. Trin. 309 si animus hominem pepulit, actumst... sīn ipse animum pepulit, uiuit, might more properly be written: sīn ipse animum pepulit? uiuit. It is however unnecessary to regard the n of sīn as either the Interrogative or the Negative Particle -ne; for it may be merely that Demonstrative suffix -ne seen in alīquīn, &c. (§ 16) [Quīn (see § 16) represents (1) quī with Negative -ne, (2) quī with Interrogative -ne, (3) quī with Demonstrative -ne]. The older spelling sēin occurs, for example, on an epitaph, much affected by the Romans ¹ (Not. Scav. 1887, p. 180):

mortua heic ego sum, et sum einis, is einis terrast;
sein est terra dea, ego sum dea, mortua non sum.

Sīve and sēn (see ch. iv. § 33).

Mōdō is the adverbial Abl. (Instr. ?) Sg. of mūdus, measure, limit (cf. Hor. quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus?), 'only'; dum-mōdō, '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 Epichar-mus' epigram (ap. Schol. Hom. II. x. 144):

eiμι νεκρός, νεκρός δὲ κόπρος, γῆ β' ἡ

κόπρος ιστίν.
ei δὲ τε γῆ νεκρός ιστ', οὐ νεκρός,

άλλα θεός.
mo do 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 dātō (originally *datōd) Plaut., hāvē, bēnē, mālē, &c.

§ 15. (13) Concessive.—Etsi, quamquam, quamvis, licet.
The formation of all these words is evident: et-sī, 'even if,' quam-quam (repeated), quam-vis, 'how you wish' (like quan-tum-vis, 'however much you wish' or quam-tībet, 'how you please'), licet, '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 faciēlis like eo faciēlis. Quōmēnis adds to quo the Comparative mēnis, 'less,' used in a negative sense (cf. mēnēmē, 'by no means'; pārum sciēns, '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: efficite qui detūr tibi; Ego id agam mihi quī ne detur, and in a fragment from some comedy (Com. inc. 47 R.):

haud facile est défēnsū quī ne cómbruantur próxūmae.

In some instances it represents qui (Nom. Sg. Masc.) with -ne, e.g. nemo fuit quin sciret (qui nesciret); and a construction like nulla mulier fuit quin sciret, nil tam difficile est quin exquiri possit, is best explained as a universalizing of qui Masc., as of potis Masc. in potis 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 τῶν for ōv 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 quin were a favourite theme of Latin grammarians; see Gell. xvii. 13). Quin in affirmations, e.g. hercle quin recte dicis, Plaut., may be merely the Adverb qui of
herequ, &c. with the Demonstrative suffix -ne (so atquin and atqui, alioquin and alioqui, ceteroquin and ceteroqui; see on these forms Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.); 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 di,

is the Adverb quin 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 seruaui? ’you mean the man whose life I saved?’ (see above, § 14 on sin).

Né is I.-Eur. *né, ‘not’ (O. Ind. ná, O. Ir. ní), a variety of I.-Eur. *nē, ‘not’ (Lat. nē, § 18). In O. Lat. nī (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. nī in nī hīpid ‘ne habuerit,’ nī fīud ‘ne fuerit,’ Marruc. nī in nīta[g]a ‘ne tangat’ exactly correspond to Lat. nē.

Nērē adds to nē 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 sí siet
amátor, numquam suífere eius sumptús quæat;

lit. ‘ne(dum) tu te posse credas dico satrapam non posse,’ ‘satrapa non potest, nondum tu potes,’ with which we may compare Plaut. Amph. 330:

ux inecdo inánis, ne ire pósse cum oneré existumes.

Nedum is related to ne, as vixdum to vix, nondum to non; cf. Liv. xxiv. 4. 1 puerum vixdum libertatem, nedum 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 *nē* and *nae*, as there were in Greek *pri* and *rai* (cf. *di* and *dai*), representing an original *nē* and *nai*, a Loc. Sg. Form (cf. Osc. svaī, ‘if,’ § 14). The form *nē* corresponds to *nē* of the affirmative suffix -nē found in the Dramatists with Personal and Demonstrative Pronouns; cf. O. Scand. þér-na ‘tibimet’ (e.g. Plaut. Mil. 565:)

égone si post húnc diem
muttiiuero, etiam quòd 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. něsmi, &c.), but also to other parts of speech, e.g. ne-fas, u(e)-utiquam, neuter (ne-§ I.-Eur. *nē*, O. Ind. ná, &c., appears in nēquiram, &c.); in- (I.-Eur. *n̄*, O. Ind. an-, a-, Gk. àn-, a-, &c.) and ve- (I.-Eur. *vē*, O. Ind. vā--; cf. O. Sl. u-bogu, ‘poor’), a curtailment of I.-Eur. *avē-, O. Ind. av-, ch. ix. § 12) only to Adjectives, &c. (but see Langen, Beitr. p. 181 on imprōbare, infīleri, 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 represented in Umbro-Oscan by an-, e.g. Umbr. antakres ‘integríς,’ Osc. amprufid ‘improve.’

*Nōn* is generally supposed to represent *noe(num)*, the ‘doublet’ of *noenum* (usually explained as *nē-oïnom, ‘not one’) before an initial vowel, as *nihil*, *nil* was the similar doublet of *nihilum* (ch. iii. § 52); though the absence of a satisfactory parallel for the change of *oe* to *ō* (instead of the usual *ū*) 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 *-nū*); cf. O. Ind. na-nú, Hom. oū vu, and see ch. iii. § 37).

*Noenū* (e.g. Lucr. iii. 199 noenu potest) should be written
*noenus, and represents *ne-unus as noenum; *ne-unum (cf. démus and dénum, ch. ix. § 2) with suppression of -s in pronunciation (ch. ii. § 126). The other theory makes it differ from noenum in appending *nű 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. où) to I.-Eur. *äwê-*, 'away' (see above on vê-), so that it would properly be spelt *and.

The Roman grammarians preferred the spelling hand to hant, 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. Viet. 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 pulcrum pulcrai feminae. (On the spellings hand, hant, han, 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 t litteram exeat, erit conjunctio; si vero 'haud' cum aspiratione scribatur et in d litteram exeat, erit adverbium).

*Nēv in O. Lat. has the sense of non* [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 (six neip portust issoc puni subra wrehto est 'si nec portarit ita uti supra scriptum est'). The g of nēg-ōium, neg-lēgo (often spelt neclego in MSS.; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), &c. is variously explained as a phonetic change of the -c (*qê) of nec (see ch. ii. § 73), or as the particle *gê (Gk. γe) of *nē-g(e) (cf. Lith. nê-gi, ne-gu), a different formation from *nē-q(e).

§ 19. INTERJECTIONS. Interjections, being for the most part onomatopoetic words, do not come under the phonetic laws

---

1 Catullus (lixiv. 83) uses the phrase funera nec funera to express the Greek τάφοι άταφοι.
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. enge [in the Dramatists enge (engae) with a lengthening of the final syllable like our 'bravo,' 'hallo'], sôphos, pâlin, 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 *èm* (Gk. ἔμ) is used by the classical writers (in the Comedians èm is used only in rhetorical questions, e.g. ennunquam?, Plaut. Men. 142, 925), seems to be the Imperative of ēmo, 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 em ergo hoc tibi. Others make it Adverbal Acc. of *is,* O. Lat. em, '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], *ellós,* &c. So *ecce* (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-ay*) produces *ecclillum,* eccillos, &c., whence the Romance forms, Fr. celui, Ital. quello, &c. (see ch. vii. § 15). *Eccum* has been explained as *ecce* *kum* (the enclitic -ce not being appended to the Pronoun because it exists already in the Interjection, just as *ecceellunc,* &c. is never found); and this analysis is preferred to *ecce emum,* 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 *ecce emum* might be explained as a parenthesis, e.g. Amphitruo eccum exit foras, 'A.—see him—has come out.' *Eccum* is the original of the Italian

---

1 Hēiā, 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 hēiā 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, ii. p. 985) seems to be merely the Preposition (Adverb) *prō*, forth, lit. 'away with it!'

*Vae*, I.-Eur. *wai* (Goth. *vai*, Lett. *vai*), borrowed in late Greek, *oβαi*, is the same word as our Noun 'woe.'

*Āγē* is, like *em*, an Imperative used interjectionally, in Plautus and Terence often with the enclitic *dum* appended, *agedum* (like Gk. *ἀγη δή*, § 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 *vio* (for *veni*), *tie* or *te* (for *tene*), *guar* (for *guarda*).

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 *dius* 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 *ἐδεπόλ* 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 *ecce re*, 'lo indeed.'
INDEX
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-\( \ddot{a} \), shortening of, 210 sqq.; in Nom. Sg., 210 sq., 373; of \( qua \), Adv., &c., 551.

Ä-Subjunctive, 512 sqq.

\( a, ab, \dot{a} \), &dquo; Rep., 575 sqq.; ab-confused with \( \ddot{o} \), 574.

\( \ddot{a} \)bante, 573, 595.

\( \ddot{a} \)best, the scansion, 214 sq.

\( \ddot{a} \)bicio, 45.

\( \ddot{a} \)bignus, pronunc. of, 138.

Ablative (see Declension), Adv. use of (see Cases).

Ablaut (see Gradation).

\( \ddot{a} \)bnuo and \( \dot{a} \)bnuo, 476.

\( \ddot{a} \)blover and \( \dot{a} \)blover, 500.

\( \ddot{a} \)bsciio and \( \dot{a} \)bscissio, 112.

\( \ddot{a} \)bscondi and \( \dot{a} \)bscondidi, 502.

\( \ddot{a} \)bsido, 79.

\( \ddot{a} \)bsinthium, 79.

\( \ddot{a} \)bsque, 576.

\( \ddot{a} \)bstinei (?), 501.

Abstufung, 367.

\( \ddot{a} \)bstulas, 464.

\( \ddot{a} \)busque, 595.

\( \ddot{a} \)byssey, the scansion, 156.

\( \ddot{a} \)c (see above).

Acca Larentia, 118 n.

\( \ddot{a} \)c\( \ddot{e} \)lo, 194.

Accentuation, 148 sqq.; studied at Rome, 151 sqq.; Early Law, 157 sqq.; I.-Eur., 157 sqq., 165 sqq.; of \( \ddot{a} \)c\( \ddot{e} \) fissus, &c., 158; of Sentence, 165 sqq.; Secondary, 158 sqq., 161; Paenultima Law, 160 sqq.; of Word-Groups, 161 sqq., 169 sqq.; of \( \ddot{o} \)-s, 163; of addi\( \ddot{e} \), &c., audit, &c., 163; of illi\( \ddot{e} \), &c., 163; of tani\( \ddot{e} \), &c., 163; with \( \ddot{u} \)e(e), &c., 163; of Gen., Voc. Sg. of 10-stems, 163 sqq.; of Interj., 164; Vulg. Lat., 164 sqq.; of \( \ddot{e} \)rem, \( \ddot{e} \)rhom, 164; with Mute and Liquid, 164; of Comp. Vb., 164; of Numeral, 165; and Ictus in Plaut., 166 sqq.; of sum, 167; of Pron., 167 sqq.; of Rep., 167 sqq.; of Adv., 168 sqq.; of Conj., 169; of Auxiliary, 169.

\( \ddot{a} \)centus, meaning of, 152, 154.

\( \ddot{a} \)cepti (?), 508.

\( \ddot{a} \)ceptor for \( \ddot{a} \)cipiter, 115.

\( \ddot{a} \)ccero, 487.

\( \ddot{a} \)c\( \ddot{e} \)r\( \ddot{e} \)mus, Plaut., 58.

\( \ddot{a} \)c\( \ddot{e} \)l\( \ddot{e} \)s, Plaut., 58.

\( \ddot{a} \)c\( \ddot{e} \)p\( \ddot{e} \)ter, 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 \( \ddot{a} \)ribund\( \ddot{u} \)s, fremebund\( \ddot{u} \)s, &c., will be found under -\( \ddot{u} \) bund\( \ddot{u} \)s, the reference for \( \ddot{a} \)m\( \ddot{e} \)nt\( \ddot{e} \)ci\( \ddot{u} \)us, &c., under -\( \ddot{u} \)ci\( \ddot{u} \)us.
Accius, doubling of vow., 8 sqq.; 99 for nty, 10 sq.; ei for i, 9 sq.

adcanis, 275.

acerrum, 323.

acereus, 541 n.

Accusative (see Declension), Adv.

use of (see Cases).

acer, 260, F. 371; -ris, M., 371.

acercus, 180.

acerrus for aeritas, 365.

actus, 335.

-adus (see Suffix -KO-).

Achiric, 196.

acies, acicatudus, 347.

acredula, 353.

acrufulious, spelling, 364.

acritia, pronunc. of, 134; of actum, 139.

Active, endings (see Verb).

actus, Noun, 344.

actum, 565.

ae, 260.

acspedium, 259.

-icus (see Suffix -KO-).

Acute Accent, 153 sqq.

ad, Prep., 576; spelling of, 76 sq.; ar, 288, 99.

adagio, 291.

addres, 515; -it, 515. (See arlicitur.)

adeo, Adv., 568; accent, of, 166.

adeps, alipes, 287.

adessit (?), 466.

adgreimal, the scansion, 475.

adgregatus, 285.

Adjectives, dist. of Gender (see Gender); Decl. (see Declension); Compar. (see Comparison); form of (see Suffixes); Numerals (see Numerals); Pronom. (see Pronouns); used as Part., 540, 543; from Part., 540 sqq.

adjuro (joe-), Fut. Pft., 507.

adduit, Perf., 508.

adolesco, 481.

adorite, the scansion, 475.

adpetitissis, 462.

ad quo, 568.

adsum, pronounced ass-, 313.

advenat, 464.

adventitious, 337.

Adverbs, 548 sqq.; Nom. forms, 553 sqq.; in -ter, 553 sqq.; Gen. forms, 555; Acc. forms, 555 sqq.; Compar. of, 557 sq.; Abi., Instr., Loc. forms, 559 sqq.; in -tus, 561; in -tim, 548; in -e, 548; word-groups, 562 sqq.; -mente, 552; of doubtful origin, 565 sq.; Num. (see Numerals); Pronom., 567 sqq.; Compound, 360 sq.

adversus (-m), Prep., 595.

adulescens, spelling of, 197.

advenus, 259.

adusque, 595.

ae, pronunc. of, 37 sqq.; and e, 42, 242; for au, 42; for Gk. Ï, 42 sq.; for a, 242 (see also AI).

Acestiai, 168.

aeides, 241, 346.

aeeis, 340; aeeiles, Nom. Sg. 376.

aedilus (tus), 405.

aegetus, 484.

-aest- for -ai-, 242.

aenidus, 258.

Aenea, Nom., 373.

aequanumus (-tus), 123, 364.

aenipero, 192.

aequipus, pronunc. of, 42.

-aes in Gen. Sg., 381 sq.

aes, 157.

Aesculapius, 242; spelling, 198.

aeus, 173.

aevum, 241, 251, 348.

af, Prep., 576 sq.

affatin, 563.

affluo and affluo, 576.

age, 600, 618.

arger, 221.

agibilis, 332.

Aigma, 10 sq., 60, 65.

aegmen, 292.

aegnomen, 294.

aegnus, 235; F., 370.

agre, 221; egi, 497; actum, pronunc., 139; age, 600, 618; azim, 465 sq.

agreed (?), the scansion, 373 n.

agricola, 317.

Agrientum, 197.

agnid, 334.

Agustus for Aug., 38, 41 sq.

Ahab and Aha, 54.

Ahonarobus, 364.

aehenus, 265; spelling of, 55, 57.

AI, phon. changes of, 241 sq.; AL, 251 sq.; ai on inscr., 242.

-ai of Gen. Sg., 381 sq.; Dat., 386.

ado, 546, 265; pronunc., 53; spelling
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aio, 8; ai, aie, Imper., 546; aibam, aiebam, 491; pronunc. of ai-, 43.
-ai- from I.-Eur. l., 279.
ala, 293.
alexer, pronunc. of, 18; -ris, M., 371; -cer, 18, 198.
albus for aie-, 51.
albogdlerus, 361, 364.
Albsi for Albensi, 177.
albi and aibam, 567.
alicunde, 570.
alveus for alv-, 51.
alveus for aiebam, 491.
amasius, 305.
ambo, 451.
ambo for abm-, 80.
amnis, 282.
amnio for abm-, 80.
amo, 274; -ento, 3 Pl., 519.
amoenus, 246.
ampendices, 578.
amplor, 483.
ampluctor 578; -ent-, 467.
amplio, 485.
amsegetes, 578.
amtermini, 578.
amurca, 33, 75.
amussum, 593.
amygdoconsum, -i, 198.
an, Conj., 606.
an-, Prep., 578.
Anaptyxis (see Parasitic Vowel).
anas, 274.
ancaesus (-isms), 198.
ancaesus older, -cetes, 178.
anclabris, 334
ancora, 155, 190; -ch-, 59.
anclusus, a servant, 178; -cilla, 333.
anclavibus, 196.
anclus, 259.
angina, 287.
anget, 326.
angio, 271; -ustus, 223, 356.
angula (-illa), 115.
anguis, 338.
ak, 199, 578; alien-, 98; -it-, 112.
animadverta, 362.
animus, -mas, 223.
annus, 117, 314.
anquina, 247.
anquiro, 578.
anser, 272.
antae, 274.
anse, 578; ant(e)positus, 579; antea, 579, 569; antelae, 569; antid-, 579; antelae, 579.
antennae, 578.
antes, 578.
antestamina, 519, 578.
antiae, 562.
anticus, 337.
antides, 575, 579.
antigero, 560.
antiope, 562.
antiques, 337.
antistes, 350.
antius, -ō, 289.
anus, Gen., 384.
-ānus (see Suffix -NO-).
ānus, 333.
Aorist (see Tense-Stems).
aper, 222.
apero, 475.
Apex, overlong vow., 4, 129, 134, 161 sq.
apinae, 59.
apio, Vb., 480.
apiseco, 480.
aplastrum, 96.
Apocope, 203 sqq.; accent in, 153, 161.
appo, 472; -animo, 519
Appenninus (App.), 177.
Appius (see Claudius).
apprima, 565.
apricus, 173.
Aprilis, 178.
aprugus, -vus, 294.
apul, 579; -or, -ar, 288.
aqua, 223; trisyll. (?), 87; ā-, aeq.,
aqūlē, the scansion, 210.
Aquilonia, 286.
-ar- from L-Eur. r, 279.
ara, asa, 305.
*aramen for acrementum, 201.
arama, 292.
aratrum, 330.
arbiter, 288.
arbor, 290; -os, 356; -osum, Acc., 305.
arboratum (-butrum), 306, 335.
arbutum (-butum), 197.
arca, 223.
arceso, 487; -iici, 506; accerso, 487.
arcoari, 176.
arca, 300; decl. of, 344; F., 344.
arca, 279.
ardeo, 486.
ardeo, 184.
arvuitur (?), xii Tab., 288, 515.
are- (facio), 490; arf-, 184.
arena (see harena).
argentum, 296.
arger for agg., 288.
Argiletum, accent of, 161 sq.
argumentum, 336.
arpusus, 484.
arus, 261; -ile, 144.
-āris (see Suffix -RI-).
arispex, 29.
-ārius (see Suffix -IO-); ousted by
-āris, 321.
arvus, 279.
aro, 223.
arvites, 300.
ars, 341.
artem, 172.
Article, Def., 452; Indef., 410
Articulation, Basis of, 30.
artio, 485.
artus, 343.
Aruncus for Auro-, 42, 40.
arvum, 323; -iuss, 323.
-as (see Suffix -TI-); accent of, 163.
as, Nom. Pl., 398; Gen. Sg., 381.
aser, blood, 261.
asaus, 305.
asom fero, 539.
aspe for absep-, 310.
asper, asper-, 185.
aspergo (argo), 200.
aspermor, 470, 486.
Aspirates, phon. changes of, 279 sqq.;
Gk. in Lat. orth., 4, 11 sq., 54, 57
sqq., 72, 99 sq.; Tenues (see
Tenues Aesp.).
asporto, 210.
assentior (-o), 521.
Asseverative Particles, 614.
Assibilacion (see Palatalization).
assiduus (-o), 550.
Assimilation, of Cons., 311 sq.; of
Prep., 312 sq.; of unacc. vow.,
201; of final cons. (see Sandhi).
-asso, Vb.-forms in, 462 sqq.
assulatim, 356.
ast, 600 sq.
asted, Dven. Inscr., 514.
-aster, -ast(r)inus (see Suffix -TERO-,
Suffix -DI-).
at, Conj., 600; spelling, 76 sq.
Atella, 312.
ater, 81.
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Athematic, Conjug. (see Verb); Pres. Part. Act.; 541.
-ātīm of Adv., 556.
atquē (ae), 598 sq., 122; spelling, 599; atque atquē, 599.
atqui (n), 601, 614.
arītus, 485
atrex, 259, 354.
attāt, 617; accent of, 164.
attīgus, 464.
attīlas, 464.
-ātus, e.g. dēntātus, P.P.P., 483.
ĀU, phon. changes of, 242 sq.; pronunc., 37 sqq.; weak grade of ŌU-root, 261; -au- for āvē, 243; ĀU, 252.
au-, Prep., 576.
aū, Interj., 38.
auubulculus, 235.
auncps, 180.
audacter (-ter), 554.
audeo, 486; -si, 522; -sus sum, 522; -sin, 465; ausās, 112.
audio, 307.
āx (see have). Avernus, 197.
āxcrvencosis, 462.
āxerta, 197.
āufidus, 250.
āugō, 482, 243.
āugur, -ger, 198; -ra, Accius, 48.
āxilitus, 235.
āxila (olla), 41; āxiula, 112.
Āxiius, 267.
āxra, 261.
āxričalemum, 41.
āxriga, 261.
āxris, 243.
Āxvra, 243, 356.
āxruugo (-igo), 37.
āxrum, 243.
āxus (os-) in osculor, &c., 41, 262. aus for aŭx, 52.
auscula, 243; asc-, 41.
ausper, 180.
ausus, 112.
austenus, -ris, 338.
austium, 262.
aŭ, 599.
aŭtem, 601, 571.
aŭtor for -ct, 89, 119.
aŭtumo, 180, 225.
aŭuncalus, aunc-, 49, 172; aunc-, 172.

Auxiliary Vbs., 511; accent, 169.
auxilla, 333.
Avyayibhava, Compd., 360 sq.
-āx (see Suffix in Gutt., -KO-.
-ax, e.g. auveax, 355.
axim, 465 sq.
axis, 305, 338.
axites (-tiotes), 352.

B, pronunc., 78 sqq.; for Gk. φ, 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.
bae, spelling of, 116 sq.
Bahuvrthi, Compd., 360 sq.
bālus, 282, 358.
bālbutio, 488.
*bālidūs (?), 287.
bāliena, 48, 58; spelling, 117.
bālnemum, belin-, 173.
-bem of Impft., 489 sqq.
barba, 283.
barbaeum for rer-, 52.
barbar(us), 374.
baron, 184.
bāsīlica, bass-, 115; basis, bass-, 115
Basis of Articulation, 30.
bātīlum (see rat-).
bāttvau, spelling of, 113.
bātītudo (-tus), 341.
Bēlva (?), 48.
bēlīn, O. Lat. dvelīn, 268.
bēlīus, 326.
bēne, -e, 551; ben(e), 184; -merens, Adj.
540; -vēlens, 332; and -lus, 540;
-ficus for rer-, 51.
bēnīgmos, pronunc. of, 138.
Bēntbui, 184.
*bērbix for rer-r, 52.
bessi, 409
BH, phon. changes of, 282 sq.
bhā-, ‘to speak,’ 457.
bhār-, ‘to carry,’ 457.
bhēu-, ‘to be, 458.
-bi of ibi, &c., 551, 507.
bī of bidēns, &c., 411.
bībo, Vb., 468; -i, Perf., 593; -er(e),
Inf., 537.
bicorpor; 376.
bīgāe, 196.
-bīlis (see Suffix -DHLO-)
bimus, 144, 294.
bini, 411.
bipinnis for -pen-, 23.
bis, 411.
blosfenus, the scansion, 156.
blata, 314.
-bo of Fut., 491 sqq.
bonus, 326; Compar., 406.
bov, 253; bovis, bu-, 250.
-br- for mr, 269 sqq.
-bra (see Suffix -DHRO-).
braex, spelling of, 116.
brachium, 58; spelling of, 117.
Breathing, Gk. in Panhormus, &c., 57.
Breath-Stops (see Tenues).
Breves Breviantes, 210, 126, 129 sq., 201 sq.
breris, 227, 292
breviter, 553.
Britanni (Britt-), 115.
Broken Reduplication, 358.
Bruger for Phyr-, 36, 58.
brum (see Suffix -DHRO-).
bruma, 407.
Bruttii (-rit-), 29.
-bs-, -bt-, pronunc. of, 79.
bucetum, 335.
bucina, spelling of, 117.
bubba for vwha, 50.
bulum (see Suffix -DHLO-).
-bundus, e. g. erabundus, 545.
Burrus for Phyrh-, 36, 75.
burrus, 75.
-bus, Dat. Pl., scansion of, 404.
bustar (bo-), 205, 250.
bustar (cf. bustum), 250.
bustum, the scansion, 156.
*butis (-fl), 116.
Butrio, 33.
buxus, 75.

C, the letter, 2, 6 sq., 76; pronunc.
84 sqq.; palatalization of, 87 sq.;
for qu, 299 sqq., 315; d for th,
283 sqq.
cadaver, 541.
cadaverae, 288.
cadavera, 337.
cadus for ceci di, 509.
Caecilius, Cec-, 42; Caeie, 242.
caecus, 242.
caelis, 346.
caelo, 242; ceci di, 496; cedere, 184.
caelebs, 48.
INDEX.

Carna, 317.

clava, 278, 273, 349.
carpatae, 75.
carpo, 279.
cartilage, 279.

Carvilius Ruga, letter G, 7.
carius, 491.
causa, 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.)
cassis, -ida, 354; causula, 286.
cassus, empty, 565.
Castrum, 155.
caus, -ss, 110 sq.
Cato (Elder), -ae for -am, 61, 493 n.
catullos, 484.
catus, 258, 541.
caveatum, 362.
cavaculus for -calc-, 96.
cauda, 41.
cavo, 233; cave, accent, 169; pronunc., 491; cavi, 499.
Cawennas (cave ne eas), 169.
caurus, 258.
causa, -ss, 110 sq.

Causative Vbs., 477, 481 sq.
causis (cave sis), 49.
cavus (cav-), 234 sq.
-ce, Particle, 432 sq.
cello, 432, 518; cetté, 284.
celó, Perf. cessi, pronunc., 111.
cétre for caedere, 184.
cedrus, 289.

celer, 351; -rissimus, 407.
-celo, 486.
celo, 488 n., 227.
celox, 354.
census, 229.
cena, 277; -atus, P. P. P., 520, 542; -oe, 44, 277.
-coni, Perf., 501.
censeo, 273; -endo, Pass., 519.
centum, 418 sq.; -plex, 418 sq.; -hussi, 409; -centum for -t, 418 sq.; -testinus, -tensus, 416 sq.
cerebro, 296; -ber, 370.
ceresium, cherry, 18.
cerno (-e), 520.

Cervix (Sg., Plur.), 355.
Cerus, 329.
cesarius for caes-, 43.
cetero-, 244; -rum, Conj., 602; -ra, Adv., 602; -roqui (-n), 568, 614.
cetera, 284.

-ctum, 335.
ceu, 607.

-ch- (Gk. χ), -ech-, Plaut., 58.

Change of unaccented vowel (see Weakening).

Chersonesus, the spelling, 136 n.

Chi (see Aspirates).

Chius (Adj.), scansion of, 132.
-ci- and -ti-, 82 sqq.
cibus, decl. of, 344.
cicindela, 333.
cicenia, Præn. cœna, 22.
cicur, quant. of i, 485.
*citus for -icc-, 116.
cio (cio), 481; citus, 335, 541.
cincinnus, 315.
cinctutus, 335.
cingo, -nixi, -nexus, pronunc., 140.
cinis, 357.

-chin (-cinum), 488.
circēs, 354.
circēs, -rum, Prep., 579; -â, 579; -iter, 580.

Circumflex Accent, 153 sqq., 161.
cis (citrus), 580, 432; -ter, 432.
cistella, 333.
citera for -thar-, 190.
citrus, 289.
citus, 541; cē-, 335; -ô, Adv., 551.
civicus, 337.

-d- for -dr-, 81.
clades, 219.

clam (clanculum), 580; clamato, 580.
clamo, 279.
claudestinus, 580.
clyndo, 471.
claro (-erc), 484.

105; (Emp.), reforms alph., 3 sqq., 36, 47 sq., 79 (see also ClO-).
claudo, 180, 352; cluo, 40, 196.
clavus, 347.
clavus, 298.

cleps, 258; -psi, 505.
cleis (clue-), 29.
clypeus (clue-), 49.
clytrus, 275, 323.
cloaca (clue-), 37.
**THE LATIN LANGUAGE.**

| Clodius, 41; Cla-, 42. | Commendo (man-), 200. |
| Cloeius, 250; Clod[i], 246. | Commentus, 335. |
| Close Syll., quant. of vowel, 133 sqq. | Comminus, 554; m-, 115. |
| cluo (-uo), 473, 295. | Commiriciun, the spelling, 229. |
| -clum (-culum, q. v.) (see Suffix -LO-). | Communis, 247. |
| clunis, 250. | Como, -mpsi, 505. |
| Clutemestra, the scansion, 202. | Compages, 346. |
| co- for quo-, 300. | Comparison, of Adj., 404 sqq.; |
| coa (from coeo), 318. | Compellare, 472. |
| coalesco, 481. | Compensatio, length by, 314. |
| cocutum, 300. | Compertinuare, 486. |
| coelum for coel-, 44. | Compeso, 192. |
| coempionalis senex, 143. | Compitum, 194. |
| ceena for ce-, 44, 277. | Compleere, in Romance, 489. |
| coepio, 545; -pi, 502; scansion of, 143; | 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 Pacuv., 360; in Lu., 360; in Plaut., 362; (Verbs), 362 sq.; accent of, 164; influence on Simple Vb., 468; (Adv.) (see Adverbs); (Prep.) (see Prepositions). |
| coero, coi-, for eero, 248. | Concepsit, xii Tab., 379 |
| coetus, 142, 39. | Concido, -ui, 509. |
| cogito, 143. | Conditio, 341; -cio, 88. |
| cognatus, spelling of, 114. | Conoea, Praen., 22. |
| cognomen, 294. | Conesto for cohon-, 143. |
| cognosco, con-, 294; Perf., 509. | Confestim, 556. |
| copo, 143. | Confusa (sus), 318. |
| cohibeo, scansion of, 143. | Confirmo, 309. |
| cohors, 183. | Coniger (go-), 74; gu-, 33. |
| coliclicio, prono. of, 53. | Congruens (-us), 540. |
| coinquio, 311. | Conitor, spelling of, 114. |
| colina (?), the spelling, 236. | Coniceto, 302; -nixi, 499. |
| Collective, Compd., 360 sq., 365; | Conjugations (see Verb). |
| Noun, 399. | Conjunctions, 596 sqq.; accent, 169; |
| collega, 318; -gius for -m, 370. | variety of meaning, 596; of stem, 596; of vow.-quant., 596; Con- |
| collis, 271. | junctive, 596 sq.; Disjunctive, 599 |
| colium, gender of, 369. | sq.; Adversative, 600 sqq.; Limit- |
| colium for -i, 112. | tative, 602 sq.; Explanatory, 603 |
| cibo, 227; spelling of, 300. | sq.; Conclusive, 604 sq.; Optative, |
| colober for -hab-, 37. | 605; Interrog., 605 sq.; Compar., |
| coloepia for -ly-, 36. | 606 sqq.; Temp., 608 sqq.; Causal, |
| colosio, 321. | 610; Condit., 610 sqq.; Concessive, |
| columna (colum-), 185. | 613; Final, 613 sq.; Assev., 614 sq; |
| columna, prono., 69; -lon-, 37, 69; | Neg., 615 sq. |
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conjux (-nx), 69, 358.
conquaesitei, 242.
conquiscor, 470.
consecare for -sec-, 200.
conscribilo, 479, 487.
considore, 488.
consilium, 286; -sit-, 286.
consipitus, 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.
cowfe'o, 67; pronunc., 141; -cowf-, 250; -net-, 310.
contra, 581; -a, 557.
Contraction, e.g. era for cera, 177; e.g. mg for magnum, 125; Contr. Vb.-forms (see Verb).
controversia, 581.
contubernium, spelling of, 193.
contidit, 346.
contumeliafactum itur, 581.
contuberculum, spelling of, 114.
conuella, 273.
convicium, 225.
convita, 318.
convolo (-voll-), 228.
copia, 144; copis, Adj., 144.
copula, 143.
copumo, 470.
coga, 467; -int (?), 515.
cogus, 291; spelling of, 299.
cor, 279; scansion, 122, 215.
corallium (curali-), 34.
coram, 581.
corpus for -vus, 51.
cordatus, 483.
corriga for cor-, 114.
Cornelis, 372.
cornicen, 192.
Corniscos, 404.
corns, 347.
cornus, 279.
corpus, cornel, 279.
corr~lla, 333.
corona, 59; spelling of, 59.
corruptus, cœr-, 114; -myl-, 471.
Corus, 258.
cos, 259.
cosentiont, Scipio Epit., 529.
cosmis, Dvenos inser., 307.
cothurnus, 33.
cotonea, 75.
cottide, 560; spelling, 227 sq.
coventis, S. C. Banea, 250.
covauerunt, 246.
coxa, 298.
crobro, 220.
crudi for clatri, 97.
crapula, 197.
Crasis, 142 sqq.
Crassus, story of, 169.
crustinus, 325.
crates, 219, 279.
crebesco for -br-, 95.
credo, 479; -duam, -im, 514.
creo, 329.
crepi for capra, 98.
crepo, -ui, -ari, 499, 506; -itus, P. P. P., 542.
crepus, 98.
crepuseulum, 273.
cresco, 479; -rei, 500.
creatae for cet-, 96.
creterra, 118.
crbrum, 330.
cremen, 336.
cremoris, 339.
crestra, 339.
croco, 476.
crudelis, 340.
crudus, 298.
cruentus, 352.
cruor, 298.
crusum, pronunc. of, 114; -rum, 96: -rum, chsur-, 97.
Crustuminus (Cl.), 93.
-d̆ for Gutt. with t, 291, 293.
dum, e.g. virectum, 335.
-ca- for gua, 86 sqq., 300.
cubi, 446.
cubiculum, scansion of, 175.
cudo, -ui (-avt), 506, 499.
cuculus, 290; -ullus, 115.
cudo, 486; -di, 502.
cui (see qui, quis); cui rei ?, 606.
cuicimodi, 445, 564.
cujus, Poss., 443, 447; cujus, 447.
cujusmodi, 444.
culitus (κυλως), 59.
cutii, Perf., 501.
culmen, 235; (column-), 185.
culmus, 503.
culo-, Dim. (see Suffix -LO-).
culpa, col., 236.
culm, scansion of, 146, 175 sqq. (see -clum).
cum (see com-).
cumbo, 471.
cunctus, 503.
cuncto, 155.
cunque, 503.
cunctum for cult-, 97.
cupa (Cup-), 116.
cupio, 476; -is, 475.
cur, 606.
cura, 247; coi, coe-, 248; cou-, 246.
curbus for -re-, 51.
curiosis, 353.
curricula, 556.
curro, 239; cecurr, 503; Perf. in Romance, 509.
cursim, 556.
curtina for co-, 34.
curtus, 239.
custos, 308.
cuto (quatio), 196.
cutis, 260.
cygmus, 292; ci-, 36.

D, pronunc., 80 sqq.; and -t in at, ad, &c., 76 sq.; phon. changes of, 285 sqq.

D-particle (see Particles).
-d, Abl., 391 sq.
Dalmatia (De-), 17.
-dam of guidam, &c., 552.
Dama, spelling of, 117.
damma, spelling of, 117.
dammas esto, 183.
dammum, 328.
Dambius for -uv-, 51.
damunt, 531.
dapsilis, 340.
dasi (?), O. Lat Inf., 537.
datativum, 556.

Dative (see Declension).

dativia, 286.
de of inde, &c., 570.
de, Prep., 581; confused with di-, 574.
deambus, 403.
debo, scansion of, 143.
debil for -tis, 376.
debilita, 176.
decem, 416; -cim, 19, 21; -cimus, 416.
Decius, 416.
decimarius, 326.

Declension (Noun, Adj.), 366 sqq.;
declino, 470.
decor, M., -us, N., 356; decorus Adj., 356.
decreuit, 22.
decussi, 409.
dedro, 531; -d, 531.
defendo, 486.
defrudo, the spelling, 196, 40.
defratum, 261; -fri-, 197.
defactus, 471.
degener, 356.

Degrees of Compar. (see Comparison).
degunere, 472.

Dehnstufe (see Gradation).
deinccep, 553.
deinde, 570; dein, 122.
deuten (-lin-), 199, 225.
delicatus, 287.
delico, 286.
delirus (-ler-), 199, 22.
delubrum, 331.
-de of idem, &c., 441; of tandem, &c., 552.
demo, -pos, 505.

Demonstratives (see Pronouns).
demum, 549; -s, 553.
Denominative (see Derivative).
dens, 540.

Dentals, phon. changes of, 283 sqq.
dentio, 485.
denuo, 564.

INDEX.


depresa, 336.
derbiosus, 268.

Derivative Verbs, 478, 483 sqq.
descenditādi, 502.
descis, pronunc., 479.
doses, 358.

Desideratives, 478, 482, 484.
desiderō, 488.
desitus (-iv), 499.
destitus sum, with Pass. Inf., 522.
destino, 470, 472.

Determinative Comp., 360 sq.
destatus, Pass., 542.
detonti (-ot-), 504.
decus Cornicisus, 404.

dexum, 409.
devóra, Fut. Perf., 507.
deus (cf. die-), 244; dei, di(-), Nom. Pl.,

399, 21; deum, -orum, Gen., 402;
déis, dlus, Dat., 21; dibus, 404;
-di(?)s, 618.
dextans, 409.

DH, phon. changes of, 289 sq.

DH-particle (see Particles).
dbē-, ‘to put,’ 457.
di- (see dis-) for de-, 574; for bi-,

412; di for z, 105.
dice for -am, 492.
dicex, 355.
dicis, Gen., 358.
dico, 243; -ees(?)s, 2 Sg., 526; -c (-ce),

Imper., 518; -xii, 495, 497, 504;
-xo, 465; -xim, 465; -servō, 212;
dicabo, 492, 494; dicturam, O. Lat.,

537.
didē, Perf., 496, 502.
dienoîne, Denvos inscr., 560.
diequinti, 397; pronunc., 212.
dieś, 252; pronunc., 24, 30, 133; gend.,

399 n.; Nom. Sg., 377; Gen., 382;
dili, 382; in word-group, 169; in

Comp. Adv. 560; dienoîne, Denvos

inscr., 416.

Disspiter, decl. of, 364.
difficil. N., 265; -iter (-liter), 553.

Digamma, Lat. F., 2, 5; for v, 8.

Digintia, 287.
digitus, 76; -et-, 185.
dignus, 293; pronunc., 138 sq.

dilexi, Perf., 505.
diloris, 412.
dimico, 194; -avi (-ivi), 499.
dimidius, 409, 159; de-, 30.

Diminutives, 333, 336 sq.
dimimus, the spelling, 314.
dingu, O. Lat. for lingua, 286.
dinumnum, 412.
dinus for divi-, 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. ε, 244.
dirimo, 582.
dirrumpo, the spelling, 314.
dis-, Prop., 582.
discerniculum, 333.
disciplina, 176; -pie-, 97.
disco, 477; didici, 501.
disertim, 556.
dispaeseco, 586.
dispensate for -nd-, 64.

Dissimilation of l, r, 275 sq.; syll. lost by, 176.
dissipō, 304; spelling of, 193.
disestante for -nt-, 64.
distingua, 471; spelling of, 301 sq.

Distributives (see Numerals).

Dite, Voc., 389.
diu, 555; -tius, 325.
dives, dis, 406; Compar., 408.
divi, Perf., 498.

Division of Syl., 124 sqq.
divissio, the spelling, 110 sq.
dius, Adv., 555.
divus (cf. deus), 244; devas, 404.
dixerat illis, pronunc. of, 123.

-dō of cupidō, &c. (see Suffix -N-).

-dō, Vb., 486; Perf., 502; of condon

&c., 457.
dō, I give, decl. of, 457; da, Imper.,

518; dédi, 495 sq.; dedro (-t), 531,

124; datus, 222 (see duō).

docem, 259, 482; -unto, 3 Pl., 519.
dodrans, 409.

Dolabella, 331.
dolitus, 485.
dolus, 318.
domnus for -min-, 185.
dono, Vb., 474, 481; -ui, 506 n.
domus, 353; decl., 344; -mos, Gen.,

380, 384.
donec, 609; -icum, 609; -ique, 609.
donum, 232.
dorsalis, 340.
dos, 341.
dossum for -rs-, 96.
Double Cons., proun. of, 108 sqq.;
for Single, 113 sqq.; written, 3; 8;
II, 7 sq.; VV, 7; Vow., 3, 9 sq.
Doublets, 120 sqq., 204.
druclus, 145.
Dropping (see Loss).
drum for tr-, 289.
Drusus, 289.
Dural, the short, 366, 400.
Dvandva, Comp., 360 sq., 365.
dubito, 482.
dubius, 411.
dicatii, 411; -um, 0. Lat., 418 sq.
duce, 466; duci, Imper., 518; -xi,
pronunc., 498; ducus, pronunc., 542.
dualum, 260.
Dvenos Inscr., 2.
duicensus, 411.
duidens, 411.
Dvigus, Comp., 360 sqq.
duis, O. Lat. for bis, 411.
dum, 609, 570.
dup, 286.
dumtaxat, 565.
duminus, 237.
dunc, 609.
duo for do, 515; -m, 515.
duo, Num., 410 sq.; scansion, 411;
-um, Gen. Pl., 412; -a, Neut. Pl.,
412; -decim, 416; -centi, 419; -vice-
simus, 417; -devigni, 416.
Duodecim Tabl. (see Twelve Tables).
duonus, 268.
duplex (-us), 411.
dupondius (-on), 197.
dus, e. g. pallidus, 333 sq.
Dusmus, 237.
dw-, phon. change of, 265 sqq.

E, pronunc., 18 sqq.; for oe, 44; for
oe, 42 sq.; for i in hiatus, 19,
22; in atomic syll., 25, 30; e for i,
25, 29 sq.; phon. changes of, 223
sq.; for short vow. in atomic syll.,
191 sq., 194; for a after i, 17; for e
after e, 230, 232; for i, &c., 205 sq.;
e for e lengthened, 224; for -bd-,
-èh-, 224; in grade of e-root, 260;
not weakened to i, 199; shortening
of -a, 211 sq.; O. Lat. e for ei, 244
sq.; Gk. (see Eta).
-e, loss of, 204 sq.; 'Dat.' in, 387;
with i in Abl. SG., 390 sqq.
-e of Adv., 548.
e, ex, Prep., 583; ee, 583.
E-grade of Root (see Gradation).
E-Subjunctive, 512 sqq.
eadem, Adv., 561.
eapse (-ia?), 441.
ebam of legebam, &c., 490.
ebo, Fut., 3 Conj., 493.
ebris, 592.
ecastor (e,-e), 618.
ece, 617; -ere, 618; -um, 617, 435;
-illum, -atunum, 432.
ecesis, the spelling, 115.
equis, 447.
Ecthilipsis, 309 sqq.
eus for equus, 86.
eidepol, 618.
e, Imper., 518.
edo, Vb., deel. of, 456; èdi, 497; -am,
-im, 512; Imper., 518; essus, the
spelling, 112; -us, 309.
edo, -èdula (see Suffix -D-).
editus, 340.
edus for haedus, 42.
edetas, 326.
egus, deel., 421 sqq.; scansion, 422;
imhi, scansion, 422.
egregius, Voc. of, 389.
egretus, O. Lat., 285.
El, on inscr., 244 sq.; for i, 9; for
i, 245, 22; for e, 22; phon. changes
of, 243 sqq.; for atomic ai, oi, 243
sq.; El, 252; O.Lat. e for ei, 244 sq.
ei-, 'togo,' 456.
eiöro, 199.
eiönom, Dvenos inscr., 604.
eiöus, Nom. Pl., 0-stem, 398.
ejulo, pronunc. of, 53.
eius, Prop. Names in, 320.
ejuscomedi, 437.
eg-, phon. change of, 228 sq.
èla (see Suffix -LO-).
eleti, Perf., 505.
egiöus (see Suffix -LI-).
Elision, 144 sq.; of -m, 61 sq., 144;
s, 123; -i of -ài, -à, 381, 383 (see
Hiatus).
### INDEX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td><strong>eremus</strong>, the scansion, 156.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td><strong>erga</strong>, 583.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td><strong>ergo</strong>, Prep., 583; Conj., 604; accent, 166; -ii, 212.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td><strong>erro</strong>, 308.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td><strong>erugo</strong>, -uto, 298.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td><strong>erumna</strong> for aer, 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>-(er)nd, -ere, 3 Pl., 353 sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td><strong>ervum</strong>, 196.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td><strong>es, est</strong> (see eso, decl. of).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td><strong>es, est</strong> (see sum, decl. of).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>-es (see Suffix -T); -es, -is, Acc. Pl., 404; Nom. Pl., 399; O-stems, 398.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td><strong>eosco</strong>, 310.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td><strong>esis</strong>, -ensumus, 418.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>esse for esse, 536.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td><strong>esses</strong> (?), 466.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td><strong>esse</strong>, Vb.-forms in, 421 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>(e)s, (e)s, Procop. of, 121.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>-ester (see Suffix -TERO-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td><strong>et</strong>, Conj., 599.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><strong>Eta</strong> (Gk.), Lat. ae, 42 (see -ens-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td><strong>etiam</strong>, 599; -dem, 609; -num, 570; -nunc (-nun), 62, 69, 121.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td><strong>etx</strong>, 613.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>-etum, e.g. <em>arboretum</em>, 335.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td><strong>EU</strong>, pronunc. of, 39 sqq.; phon. changes, 245 sqq.; EU, 252.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td><strong>evenat</strong>, 646.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td><strong>euge</strong> (-ae), 617; accent, 164.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td><strong>eius</strong>, -eum (see Suffix -IO-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>-(e)x of remex, &amp;c., 595.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td><strong>exadversus</strong> (-m), Prep., 292.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td><strong>exammus</strong>, 563.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td><strong>exaurio</strong>, the spelling, 475.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td><strong>exemplum</strong>, 271.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td><strong>exfuli</strong>, 309.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td><strong>exist</strong> (?), Fut., 493.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td><strong>extimus</strong>, 319.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td><strong>exinde</strong>, 570.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td><strong>exolesco</strong>, 481.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td><strong>expurgitius</strong>, 542.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td><strong>expers</strong>, 192.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td><strong>explicunt</strong>, 531.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td><strong>explodo</strong>, 196.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td><strong>explorato</strong> (-e), 550.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td><strong>exsugebo</strong>, 494.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td><strong>exta</strong>, 311.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td><strong>extemplo</strong>, 565.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td><strong>extingo</strong>, spelling of, 301 sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td><strong>extispica</strong>, 358.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

elius, 293.

-ella (-us), -etl, 112 sqq., 115.

elum, 617.

-ellus (see Suffix -LO-).

-em for L.-Eur. m, 273 sq.

-em, -im, Acc. Sg., 388; for -am, Fut., 493 n.

em, Interj., 617.

eu, 'tum', 438; 'eum', 438.

emem, 'eundem', 438.

eminus, 554.

imiter for in-, 30.

em, 505; em, 502; -psi, 505; *plus*, spelling of, 70; emeru, 531; -psi, 466.

-endus, -undus, Ger., 544.

enungo, 471.

-emus of supremus, &c., 407.

-eu- for L.-Eur. n, 273 sq.

en, Prep. (see in).

en, Interj., 617.

Enclitics, 165 sqq.

endo, indu, 582 sq.; and in-, 583; en- doque porato, 573.

eneco, spelling of, 194.

enim, 603; -vero, 603.

Ennius, introduced double cons., 3, 8.

cencis, 197.

cen, Carm. Arv., 425.

cens (see Suffix -NT-).

cens for Gk. Π (?), 136 n.

ensis, 274.

-enilia, -ium (see Suffix -NT-).

-entor, Compar., 407.

enubro- (-nib-), 191.

enunquam, 617.

-enus (see Suffix -NO-).

eo, Adv., 568 sq.

eo, Vb., decl. of, 456; eunt-, Part., 541; -it, Perf., 214.

Epirus, accent of, 155.

epulonus, 348.

eques, 336.

equidem, 603.

equifer, 361.

equi, 484.

equis, 286; spelling, 300; pronunc.

of e, 42.

-er for ri, 231 sq.; for -dr- in faerera, &c., 34 (see also E).

-er, from -ros, 374; M., -ris F, 371.

erisco, pronunc. of, 479.
EXTRA, 584.
exvus, 475.

P, the letter, 2, 5, 291; pronunc. 98 sqq.; for Gk. φ, 11; from L.-Eur. bh-, 282 sq.; -bh-, 283; dh-, 289 sq.; -dh-, 289; ġhw, 297; ġh, 302; for h, 294 sq.; ḏ, 78, 80.

Fabrius, 95.
fabula, 334.
facesso, 462.
facetus, 335.
faciæ for -am, 492.
facies, 345; -is, 347.
faciæ, 457; decl. of, 458; cat. e/, &c., 183 sq., 488; -is, -il, 475; vocæ, 497, 502; voc(ε), 518; faxo (-im), 465; -xel (?), 508; fefaked, Praen. fib., 504; fefed, Dvenos inscr., 528.

faecundus, 545.
faecundia (fen-), 42.
faemus (fen-), 42.
fagus, 221.
falla, 355.
falz, 486.
fama, 328.
famæ, 345.
famo, 353.
familiæ, 193; -ā (?), Nom., 211; -as, Gen., 381.
famul for -lus, 374.
famum, 307.
far, 357.
farèo, 476; decl., 458; -rus, 542; -farian, 552.
farina, 357.
farinus, 279, 294.
farreus, 277.
fæstidium, 176.
fæstitium, 271.
fæstitus, decl. of, 344.
fatig, 503.
fatim, 503.
fatum, 542; -sus, 370.
Fatusus, 324.
fatusus, 324.
favilla, 235.
favor, 357.
fave, 355.
fæbricula, 333.

fæcundus, 545.
fefaked, Praen. fib., 504.
fel, 295.
felis, 346.
fælæs, 354.
fælæs, 225.
femina, 225, 337.

Feminine (see Gender).

femur, deel. of, 349 sq.
-fendo, Vb., 486; -di, Perf., 501.
fero, ferme, 561, 185.
feriae, 307.
ferio, percusus, 545; ferinunt, 531.
fero, deel. of, 457; fer, 517; tuli, 545, 494, 503; tetuli, 494, 497.
ferox, 354.
fortum, a cake, 310.
ferveo (-vo), 476; -bui, 51.
ferus, 297.
fersemeo (?), 398.
festus, 307.
fetigo for fatu-, 18.
fætus, 344.
fæber (feb-), 229.
fibula, 467.
fæcula (-cella ?), 353.
fædele, Adv., 559.
fædeia, 290.
Fædenæ, the scansion, 127 n.
fides, 345; -iī, Gen., 383.
fædincæ, 358.
fidæ, 243; in Romance, 488.
fædícæ, 337.
fidus for foedus-, 356; fidustus, 356.

Fifth Decl. (see Suffix -YE-, -E-).
fígæ for -thus, 375.
fígæna, 184.
fígæ, 467; -xi, 499; -xus, 542; fígarus, 534.
fígura, 291.
fluous, 225, 22; -ie, -i, Voc., 389 sq.; flíábus, 403.
fílæ (fe-), 229.

Final, Cons., pronunc. of, 119 sqq.; -d, 122; -m, 67 sq., 123; -nt, 124; -r, 97; -s, 108, 123; -t, 123; double cons., 119, 122; Vowel, short, 203 sqq.; long, 207 sqq.; syll. in -m, 216 sq.
findo, 459; fídæ, 495, 501.
fíngo, 297; -nxi, pronunc., 140; -nctus, 471.

fínt (fe-), Adv., 552.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>finitimus</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft, 522; fteri, 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Lat. -re, 522; flur, 522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firmus, pronunc. of, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flagra, 222; confused with fragro, 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flamen, a blast, -mm-, 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>florere, in Komance, 489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fifth Decl.:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flor, 550, 557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forcip, 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forcella, the spelling, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forculus, O. Lat., 182 sq., 541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form, 545 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foris, 557; in Vb. Comp., 575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formus, pronunc. of, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formidolosus, spelling of, 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formonus for -os-, 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formus, 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fornas, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for, 278; Adv., 560; forsan, -m, 560; forstan, -m, 560; f. fuat an, 516; farte, 506; fortasse (-is), 560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forte, S. G., ending, 524 sq.; Pl., 529; Syll., accent of, 157 sqq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flor, O. Lat. for figo, 467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flaxae, 467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragro, 222; confused with fragro, 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flamen, a blast, -mm-, 118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>florus, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fler, 486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flamina, 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flEO, 476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexuntes (?), 352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flo, 476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora, 356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>florum, in Romance, 489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flus, 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluctum, 352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flus, 484 n. ; -xi, 499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foculum, 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>folio, 488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fodi, -odi, Perf., 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fodefragrus (-erif-), 365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuedus, N., 356 ; fid-, 356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fons, pronunc. of, 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for, decl. of, 457 ; fori, 221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foras, 550, 557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forcis, 178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forcilla, the spelling, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forculus, O. Lat., 182 sq., 541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form, 545 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foris, 557; in Vb. Comp., 575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formus, pronunc. of, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formidolosus, spelling of, 197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formonus for -os-, 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formus, 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fornas, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for, 278; Adv., 560; forsan, -m, 560; forstan, -m, 560; f. fuat an, 516; farte, 506; fortasse (-is), 560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortes and Lenes, 71 sqq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortis, 541; -ret-, 342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortuito (-u), 550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forum, 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossilia, 307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fovea, 295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foceo, 289, 302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Decl., blends with Second, 343 sq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr- for mr-, 269 sqq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequenatives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frequentatives, 478, 482 sq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigidus, frid(d)-, 30, 119; -gd-, 185; -aria, 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigus, 306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigutio, 488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frigi, 407; Compar., 408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frumentum, -mint-, the spelling, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frunci for -ond-, 31, 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruniscor, 479, 237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frusor, 484 n. ; -imino, 519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frustra, (-d), 557; -aur, 40; -or, Vb., 558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frumentum for -tum, 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuga, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fugio, 476 ; fugi, 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fui (see fiuo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulgeo (-go), 476; -isi, 505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulgorio, 485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulica, (-lo), 236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulmentum, 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fultus, 235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuma, 'terra,' 295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fumus, 237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funambulus, 364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundanicius, Gk. mispronunc. of, 58, 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funisidic, Luecera inser., 519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funidicus, 561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundo, fudi, 502 ; exfutus, 309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funera nec funera, 616 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funerus (?), 356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungor, 471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funtes for -ont-, 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fua, -ami, 515 ; fu, 518 ; fui, Perf., 545 ; scanion, 132, 508 sq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fur, 233 ; scanion, 215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furca, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furnus, 239 ; for-, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fur, 297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furves, 306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuscus, 306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusio-, 305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fusus, the spelling, 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fudilis, 309 ; spelling of, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future (see Tense-stems); Fut. Perf. (do.); Fut. Imper., 516 sqq.

guesum, 305; spelling of, 112.
Gaius, 252; pronunc., 53.
gallicinum, 194.
gallina, 370.
garria, 277.
gaudo, 479; gavior, 522; -us sum, 522.
Gaulish, mispronunc. 27.
geta, 296, 261.
gemma, 273.
gener, 271.
generix, 191; -nit-, 200.
genista, 195.
Genitive (see Declension); IO-stem, accent, 163 sq.; Gerund. of Purpose, 383 n.
geno for gigno, 459, 465.
gens, 341.
gen, 296; -na, the scansion, 144.
genius, 326.
genus, 225.
gernum, 271 sqq.
Gerund, &c., 543 sqq.
gesticulator, 488.
-yy—written for ng, 10 sq.
 GH, phon. changes of, 296 sq.; GH, 298; 8H, 302.
 guh- (gho-), Dem. Pron., 430.
gigno, 468; geno, 459, 465.
gignina, 483; -rio, Vb., 483.
-ginta, the scansion, 418.
glacer, 290
glacies, 261.
glans, 302.
glarea, 288.
glerem for -dir-, 30.
globus, -mus, 80.
glos, 296.
glosa, spelling of, 112.
gluma (gibu), 282.
-gnr, pronunc. of, 89; -gn-, 64, 70.
Gnaeus, 294.
gnur- (Adj.), -us, 220; -aris, 541; (Vb.) -itur, 485; -ivisse, 485; -igaevi, 488.
gnatus (nat-), 541.
gnitor, 485.
Gnosus, spelling of, 117.
-gnus (see Suffix -NO-).
-go (see Suffix -N-); for guos, 301 sq.
gobius, 74.
govus for gyos, 36.
goytus (co-), 74.
grabbatus, 118.
Gracchus, Varro’s deriv., 93.
Gradation of Vowels, 253 sqq.;
Weak grade, 255 sqq.; of ye, wē, 256; E-grade, 255 sq.; O-grade, 255 sq.; ē-o, 258; ē-o, 258; 8-ā, 258 sq.; 8-ā, 258 sq.; ā-0, 259; ā-ā, 259 sq.; ē-ā, 260; I-ī, 260; 8-ī, 260; ē-ū, 260 sq.; ē-ā, 261; 8-ū, 261 sq.
gradior, 476.
gradius, 222.
gralae, 285.
gramae, -mmosus, 118.
granda, 297.
granum, 219 sq.
grates, 341.
gratis (-iis), 403, 551.
gratus, 279.
gravastellus, 332.
Grave Accent, 153 sqq.
gravedo (-ide), 23, 353.
gratis, 301; -ad, 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.
-gu- for gua, 86 sqq., 301 sq.; pronunc., 84 sqq.
gubernum, 74.
gulhus (see cul-).
gummi, 74.
-guo (-go) in Vbs., 301 sq.
gurges, 301, 358.
gurgulio, 275.
gusto, 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 (-tt), 116.
gyla, the spelling, 29, 36.
gypos (goe), 36 sq.

H, pronunc. of, 53 sqq.; to denote vowel-length, 54; hiatus, 265; for, 56, 294 sq.; dropped bet. vow., 54, 294; from gh, 296 sq.; from gh, 298.
habeo, 280; scansion of Comp., 143; 'to dwell,' 483.
habito, 482.
hacetenus, 433.
haedus, 424; fades, 56; ed, 42.
haevo, 424; -sst, the spelling, 112; -surus, 542.
Half-long Vowel, 127.
halca (al), 56.
halo, 220.
hanser (see anser).
harena, spelling of, 56.
haridus, spelling of, 56; far- (?), 56.
haruspex, arisv, 29.
hasta, 308.
haud, 616; hau, 120, 122; -quaquam, 569.
hauv, pronunc. of, 49, 56, 127 n.
haurio, 475; -ssi, the spelling, 112; -surus, 542.
hebes, 351.
hec, O. Lat., 433.
Hecuba, O. Lat., 197.
hedera, hael, 43.
Hedonei, Gen., 381.
heia, 617 n.
heles, 276, 229.
heim, Interj., 617; pronunc. of, 61.
Heracles, spelling of, 197.
Herentas.
heri, 264, 396; (-e), 25 sq.; -sternus, pronunc. of, 135.
heries (heriem Junonia), 345.

Heteroclite, 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.; pronunc., 433; huic, pronunc., 44.
hic, Adv., 567, 433.
Hidden Quantity (see Close Syllable)
hiens, 358, 297; -mpvs, 70.
 hilaris, 338 sq.; -rus, 182.
hilaritudo (-ta), 341.
Hibernia for Illyr, 36, 115.
hinnulaus, pronunc. of, 118.
hic, 476.
hincidentem, 433.
hircus, spelling of, 56.
hirrio, 90.
hirsutus, hirtus, 229.
hirtus, 337.
hoc (Adv.), O. Lat., 568.
hoidie, 433.
hodie, 561; pronunc., 84.
holus (hel), 228 sq.; -atrum, 362.
homicida, 364.
homo, 349; hem, 367; hum, 33, 236; -atus, 333; -uncio, 337; -unculus, 337.
hordvum, 298.
hortiar, Enn., 482.
horreo, 277.
hornum, 568.
horton, 482.
horvus, 296.
hospes, 178, 298.
hosticapax, 187, 371, 373.
hosticus, 337.
hostis, 298, 341.
huc, Adv., 568.
*hucare, 496.
hi, Interj., 39.
hujusceemovii, accent. of, 162.
humanus (-iler), 554.
humerus (see un-), 338.
humilis, 338.
humus, 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 aito, &c., 8, 47, 53; symbols of long, 9; pronunc., 23 sqq.; phon. changes, 230 sqq.;
Lat. i for atonic vow., 193 sqq.; for e bef. ng, gn, &c., 225 sqq., 229 sq.; in hiatus, 19, 21 sqq.; in tuncine, &c., 206 sq.; for a in optimus, &c., 189, 23 sqq.; i prefixed to st-, &c., 102, 105 sqq.; -t dropped, 204 sq. Lat. i for e in filius, &c., 224 sq.; for atic ai, oi, 243 sq.; for e, 243 sq.; for i lengthened, 230; varying with i, 260; -i shortened, 213.

J, the letter, 7; pronunc., 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-a, -u, -i in stupula, &c., 37.
ja- pronounced je-, 15, 17.
jacio, jaceo, 473; jeci, 502.
jactum, 332.
jacentaculum, 17.
jacentur, 17.

jacentur, 17.

iam, 'eam,' Acc. Sg., 437.
jam, 570.
jandulam for -mad-, 66, 121.
janitrius, 274.
judo, 17.

Janua, 264; jen-, 17.

Januarius, pronunc. of, 15; Jen-, 17.

Janus, decl. of, 344; -is, Carm. Sal., 339.

-ibam, -ibam, Impf., 491.

ibi, 567; -dem, 571, 567.

-ilo, Fut., 493.

-ic of illis, &c., 551.

-icanus, e. g. Afr., 327.

ici, Perf., 502.

-icuus (see Suffix -KO-).

Ictus, and accent. in Plaut., 165 sqq.

-icuus (see Suffix -OK-).

idecrico, 580; iec-, 314.

ideam, 431; decl. of, 441 sq.

identidem, 571.

ideo, 568.

idolatria, 176.

idolum, the scanning, 150.

-idus, e. g. pallidus, 353 sq.

je- for ja-, e. g. jecto for jacto, 15, 17.

jejur, decl. of, 349; jec-, 41.

-iës, old spelling of -ës, Dat. Abl. Pl., 19, 21.

jejrumus (jaj-), 17; pronunc., 53.

-ie(n)s of Numeral Adv., 408.

iens, euntis, Gen., 541.

jento (ja-), 17; jejent-, 17.

-ier, Inf. Pass., 536 sq.

-tarem, accent of, 164.

igitur, 565, 605; accent., 169.

Ignatius for Egn-, 229.

ignis, 229.

ignoro, 485.

ignosco, 363, 615.

-iago of navigo, &c., 479.

-iago (see Suffix in Gutt.).

-it of abit, &c., 528; of auditt, &c., 132.

illyct, 564.

illyco, 564.

illygnus, 293, 229.

-illa (see Suffix -LI-); -illis, of Pass. Adj. (do.).

illyc, Adv., 569.

ille, 430, 436 sq.; pronunc., 122.

acento, 167; -ui, Dat. Sg., 452.

ille and illex, 135 n.

illyc, the spelling, 112.

illy (i), Adv., 567, 432.

illycio, -eci, pronunc. of, 498, 139.

illim, Adv., 570.

illimodi, 431.


illuc, Adv., 568.

-illus (see Suffix -LO-); (-illus), 115.

illustris, 293.

-im of sensim, &c., 548; of illim, &c., 551; (em) Acc. Sg., 388.

im, 'eum,' 438.

imagen, 521.

imblicus for umb-, 29.

immem (?) , 'eundem,' 438.

imitor, 521.

immanis, 339.

immo, 603.

impendio, 560.

Imperative (see Moods); as Particle, 600; accent of addid,c, &c., 163.

Imperfect (see Tense-stems).

impro, 192.

Impersonal Pass., 520 sq.

impetrio, 485.

impleo, 473.
INDEX.

impliciscor, 480.
implicitus, P. P. F., 542.
Imporcius, 279.
improsentiarium, 562.
imprimis, 565.
improdo, 615.
imputdentur, 554.
impe, 559.
-imus of Superl. (see Comparison).
imus, infinitus, 407.
in (en), Prep., 584; im, ini-, 50 sq., 66, 69, 99 sqq., 121; bef. s., f., 136 sqq.
in-, Neg., 615; with Vb., 615, 363.
-in (see Suffix -N-).
incassum, 564.
Inceptives, 476 sq., 479 sqq.; -esco, 134.
incipissimus, 462.
incisiva, 197.
indito, 470.
indutus (-lit-}, 239; spelling of, 197.
incogitabilis, 334.
incoho, spelling of, 57.
incolomis, the spelling, 192.
incoraria, 583.
inde, 570; pronunci., 122; -didem, 570 sq.
Indefinite Pron. (see Pronouns).
Indeterminate Vow., 257.
indigena, 583.
indigeo, Vb., -us (-ens), Adj., 540.
Indo-European, languages, 218; prototype of word, 218; alph., 218 sqq.
indoles, 345, 583.
indu (see endo).
induydetrict, 583.
indu, 475.
indicator, 583.
industria, 189.
inebrae aves, 191.
infans for infandus, 182
inferrebis, 494.
inferebist, -fer, 374; -fro, Prep., 585; -fer, 181; infinitus, imus, 407.
Infinitive, 535 sqq.; as Imper., 517:
Pres. Act., 535, 537; Pass., 536 sqq.;
Fut. Act., 536 sq.; Pass., 536, 538;
Perf. Act., 536; Pass., 536; Hist., 524.
infl, 546.
inflteor, 615.
ingens, 274, 541.

inger, Imper., 526.
ingratia (- hit), 551.
indite, 567.
inple (?) 198.
Initial Syll. (see First Syll.).
inlucite, the scansion, 475.
inpeitorator, 22.
inguam, 524; Conj. of, 545 sq.
inqui, -ctus, 182.
inquinlus, 227.
insane, -im, 550.
insulae, -us, 540.
insigna, -eo, 566; decl., 545.
insou, pronunci. of, 136.
instar, 205.
instigo, 284, 471.
institit, Perf., 508.
Instrumental, 548 (see Declension);
Adv. use of, 559 sqq.
insuper, 593.
int (?), 3 Pl., 456.
nintellexi, Perf., 505.
intemperies, Sg., -ae, Pl., 347.
inter, 585.
interatim, 556.
interilvus (-s), 555.
interim, 556.
interim, 609.
inter du, 515; -im, 515.
interdici, accent. of, 162.
interbi, 567.
Interjections, 616 sqq.; from Gk., 617; Imper., 618; accent. of, 164.
interim, 570.
Interrogative, Particles, 605 sq.;
Pron. (see Pronouns).
intervias, 563.
intolerans for -andus, Laev., 543.
infra, Prep., 585; -fro, Adv. 561.
inrare, 474.
itus, Adv., 561; Prep., 585.
invictus, 524.
invito, Vb., -us, Adj., 299.
-ium for -enum, 23.
inunt, 3 Pl., 531.
inuorium, 359.
-imus (see Suffix -NO-).
jocus, 264.
-tolum, accent. of, 164.
-tor (see Comparison).
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

Iotacismus, 27.

Iones (Dvros Inser.), 264.

ipse (-tae), 430, 440 sq.; esse, 79; ipsima, -issimus, ipsippe (-ipa, -ippe), 441; capse (-a), 441.

ira, spelling of, 245.


Irregular Verbs, 545 sqq.

-is of Cornelis, &c., 375.

is, Pron., 430; decl. of, 437 sqq.; ejus, pronunc., of, 53.

-isco for -esco, Incept., 480.

Istae, 79.

-issimus, Superl. (see Compar.).

-isso, Vb., 488.

istae, Adv., 569.

iste, 430; decl. 435; pronunc., 122.

accent, 167.

istis (-i), Adv., 567.

istae, Adv., 568

-it, 3 Sg. Perf., 527 sq.

itae, 571; -item, 571.

Italia, the scansion, 127 n.

-ittis, e.g. Abder-., 327.

itaque, 604 sq.; 571; scansion, 604.

itare, 482.

item, 571.

-iter, Adv., 549. 553.

iter, decl. of, 349.

Iteratives, 478, 482 sq.

iterum, 330; 550.

-itta (-am) (see Suffix -IO-).

itur, Imperps., 520.

ju- pronounced jii-, 15.

jubee, 481; jussi, pronunc. of, 110 sq.; O. Lat. joussai, 498.

jucundus, 545.

juder, 182.

Jugatimus, 325.

jugi, 338.

jugementum, -gum-, 336, 292.

juger-, 245; iugra for-era, Lex Agr., 184.

jugum, 237, 264.

Julius, 250.

ium, 'eum,' Luceria inser., 437.

jumentum, 336.

jungus (?), 471.

junior, 408.

juniperus (-pir-), 374; 192; ji-, 35.

junix, 345.

Jupiter (-pp-), 246, 389; spelling, 116; decl., 377; Jov-, 263 sq.

jurigo, O. Lat., 173.

jus, 'broth,' 237; 'law,' 264.

-jus, Compar., scansion of, 406 n.

jusurandum, 358.

justus, 356.

juvenalis, -illis, 340.

juvenus, 264.

juvenis, 239; Compar., 408.

juvent. 334 n.; -tas (-tus), 341.

juxta, 585.

-ix of felix, &c. (see Suffix -KO-, Gutt.); of cornix, &c. (see Suffix -I-)


kadamites, 286.

Kappa in Lat., 72.

Karmadháraya, Comp., 360 sq.


L, pronunc. of, 89 sqq.; bef. cons., 96 sq.; I.-Eur. L, phon. changes of, 275 sq.; L, 276 sq.; Lat. i for d, 80, 82, 265 sq.; for r, 92 sq.; for n, 96; for l, 109 sqq.

-i for il-, 283 sq.

-i, vow. shortened bef., 213; decl. of Nouns in, 376.

Labials, phon. changes of, 281 sqq.

Labiovelar Gutt., phon. changes of, 299 sqq. (see Qs, Æ, ÆH).

labes, 345.

labium, 261.

labo, 303.

librum, 180.

lac, spelling of, 122; lact (-te), 378.

lacca, 307.

lacer for -ratus, 540.

lacteas, 462.

lacio, 191.

lacrima, 223; spelling, 57 sq.

lacus, 301.

lacusta for loc-, 201.

laerus, 242.

lambero, 479.

lamb, 471; -bi (?), Perf., 501.

lambrosus for lab-, 65.

lammina, -mn- (-mn-), 184.

lana, 279.

lancinu, 470.

lanugo, 306.

lanius (-io), 348.
INDEX.

lanterna (-mpt-), 70.
lapis, 353.
larignus, 293.
larinum, 288.
larix, 286.
larva (-rua), 46.
latus, 258.
later, 355.
laticlaurus, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355.
laticlaws, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
larix, 286.
larval, 355.
laticlaurus, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355.
laticlaws, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355.
laticlaws, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355.
laticlaws, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355.
laticlaws, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355.
laticlaws, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355.
laticlaws, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355.
laticlaws, 361.
Latona, 349.

larus, 286.
lavina, 268.

tow, 355. 
M, the letter, 7; pronunc., 60 sqq.; final dropped, 68 sq., 123; assimilated, 121; L.-Eur. M, phon. changes of, 268 sqq.; M, 273 sq. Lat. m for w, 269; bef. r-, /-, 50 sqq., 66, 99 sqq.; for p, 281; for b, 282 sq. -m, vow. shortened bef., 213; final syll. dropped, e.g. nihil(um), 216 sq.; of 1 Sg., 524.

macer, 223.
macho, 488.
madeo, 223; 473.
magis (-e), 558.
magister, 232.
magistratus, 343.
magnanimus, 361.
magnipere, 362.
magnus, 261.
Main, -dit-, 8; -dit-, 105.
major, 292, 408; pronunc., 53.
male, 551; mai(e), -e, 184; -icus, 51.
malignus, pronunc. of, 138.
malo, 547; -il-, 111 sqq.; malim, 515.
malegranatum, 364.
malius, 307.
Mamres, 95.
mamilla, 113.
mamma, 118 n., 363.
mamor for marm-, 95.
mampurr (?), 197.
mandare, 485.
mandere, 472; Perf. of, 501.
mane, 396.
maneo, 476; -nsi, 505.
mani- (-no-), 183; Manes, 339.
manico, a handle, 337.
manifestus (-nuf-), 193.
maniplus, pronunc. of, 94.
manus (-tus), 182.
mantle (-llum), 117.
manualis, 340.
mareverat for -cidat, 288.
mars, 338.
marelius for -didus, 288.
maritimus, 405.
Marius, 320.
marmor, 18; pronunc., 95.
Marpesius (-pessus), 117.

Marpor, 185.
marshupium (-p-), 117.
Marsus, 84.
mascel, 375.
Masculine (see Gender).
Maspius, 278.
masse, 104.
mateola, 19.
mater, 219.
matertera, 405.
matrius, 340.
*multimus for -lat-, 184.
mattiarbatus, 197.
mattus, 185, 309.
mattarrime, 407.
mavolo, 547.
mavocinus, 407; pronunc., 139.

Media Prosodia, 161.
Mediae, pronunc. of, 71 sqq.; M., Tenues and Asp., phon. changes of, 279 sqq.
mediastinus (-n-), 330.
mediacimus, 407.
medipontus (-p-), 287.
meditor, 521, 287.
Meditrina, 347.
medius, 226.
medius fidius, 618.
medullitus, 561.
mehe, O. Lat., 422.
meheroe (-cules), 618.
mejo, 466.
med, scansion of, 122.
medes, 346.
Melica for Med-, 287.
melior, 406.
melotum (?), 406.
melum for mel-, 18.
membrum, 270.
enimini, 270; -mento, 517.
memor, 541.
mendicus, spelling of, 245.
medium, N. (-da, F.), 400.
menetris, for meretrix, 96.
mens, 274; -mente, Adv., 549, 552.
mensa, pronunc. of, 67.
mentio, the scansion, 212.
-mentum (see Suffix -TO-).
mercediteriae, 540.
mercenarius (-n-), pronunc. of, 118.
merda, 306.
mero, -evut 3 Pl., 519; meribatur, the scansion, 202.
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modus in word-groups, 169, 564.
moës, O. Lat. for mu- in moerus, &c., 248.
moës, 345 sq.
mollëbit (?), 493.
monedula (-er-), 288.
moneo, 477; moneris, -int for monu-, 506.
-moniûm (-iu-) (see Suffix -IO-).
Monosyllables, shortening of, 215 sq.
monstrum, 331.
Months, Gender of, 369.
monumentum, -nom., 201; -tus, 370.
Moods, 511 sq.; Subj., 511 sq.;
Opt., 511 sq.; Imper., 516 sq.
mordax, 303, 482; Perf. of, 505; mo-
mordi, 497; mem-, 503.
moregor, 485.
morior, 473; -injur, -iri, 475; -tus,
324; -tus, 174.
mors, 278.
morœs for -bus, 52.
mostellum, 331.
movo, Perf. in Romance, 509.
mox, 555.
Mr, phon. change of, 270 sq.
-ma, phon. change of, 270.
mucus (-cc-), 116.
mulceo, -isi, 505.
mulgeo, 296; -isi, 505; -lactus, 279.
mulier, 287; -órem, accent. of, 164.
multimodis, 362.
multus, Compar., 408.
Mummìus, dedicatory inscr., ii.
-mungo, Vb., 471.
munus, 247.
-mur, i Pl. Pass., 534.
*murca for mu-, 107.
muriola, spelling of, 117.
murrur, 315.
-mus, i Pl. Act., 529; scansion, 529.
mus, 237.
musca, 239.
muscipula, 365.
musino, 71.
Mutation of Vowels (see Gradation).
Mute and Liquid, vow. lengthened
bef., 94; accent. of penult with, 164.
muto, 247; for -tor, 522.
mütus, 58.
mütus, 324.
ymysor for mis-, 29.
N, phon. change of, 60 sqq.; I.-Eur. N,
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phon. changes of, 271 sqq.; N, 273 sq.; Lat. n for l, 96; for m, 270; for gn-, 292, 294.

N-particle (see Particles).

Nepeor, 183.

Naeusias, 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.

nancisor, 261, 480; -cio. 480; -ctus ('-ctus'), 471.

naris, 272.

narro, 483; pronunc., 118; -r, 118 sq.

Nasal, pronoun of, 60 sqq.; Gutt., 10 sq., 60, 65; Vb., 469 sqq.; 3 Pl., e. g. damnd, 530 sq.

nassifera, the spelling, 112.

natus, 259; -ssum, 112.

nexit, 355.

nautus (ga-), 541, 219 sq., 294.

navfragus, 180; -iim, 252.

nævis, 221, 252.

-net-, pronoun of, 64, 70.

-ni-, pronoun of, 64, 70.

-ni of unde, &c., 551.

-nio- of Gerund, 543 sq.

-ne, Interrog., 605 sq.

-ne, Affirm., 615.

nē, Neg., 615.

nē, nec, Affirm., 614 sq.

nē, Neg., 614; accent of, 166.

nēbula, 226.

nec, 'non', 616.

ne (see neque).

necterim, 'nee eum', 440.

neclo, 481; -avi (-wi), 499.

necto, -xii, 509.

negi, 446.

negmensum, 570.

necum, 614.

nefas, 615.

Negatives, 615 sq.

neglego, 616; -xi, 505.

nego, 486.

negotium, 616.

nemo, 449.

nempe, 604; scansion, 63; pronunc., 122.

neo, 476, 225; venti, 519.

nepos, 351, 272; -vis, 32.

neptis, 351; lept., 96.

nequalia, 571.

nequam, 571.

nequaquam, 569.

neque (neg), 122.

nequeo, 547; -quipont, 531; -quitur, 522.

Nero, 271.

nescio, 547.

nesciocide, 446.

nesi, 592.

nerv (nerv), 614, 122.

Neuter (see Gender); in -r, decl. of, 349; in -ss, 355 sq.

neuter, 450; pronunc., 143.

neutilquam, pronoun of, 143.

-ns-, lengthening of vow. bef., 136 sqq.

ni, 611.

nicto, 293.

Nigidius, on /, 55; Agma, 65; accent of Valeri, 163, 390.

nihil (nihil), 216 sq., 144, 57.

nimis (-iam), 558.

nisi, 611; -se, 25.

nitedula (elleda), 333, 353.

nitor, Vb., 521; -tio, 519; -tus, 294.

nittio for -et-, 89.

nitt, Vb., Paeuv., 455.

nix, 272.

-nm-, phon. change of, 271 sqq.

no, 476.

nobilis, 334.

necio, 481; -itus, Adj., 323.

necuo, 555.

nomen (-d), 615.

nolo (from nolo), 318.

nolo, decl. of, 547; -ll, 111 sqq.; -lim, 515.

nomen, 294; -clator, 364.

Nominative (see Declension); Adv.

use of, 553 sqq.

non, 615, 216 sq.

nonaginta, 417.

nondum, 570, 609.

nongenti (-henti), 419.

nomen, 605.

nomus, 416.

*nuptia for nuptiae, 37.

nos, decl. of, 424 sq.; -ss, 112.

noso, 479; gm-, 294; -vi, 500.

nostrás, &c., accent of, 163.

*nolo for no-, 15, 17.

nōtus, (gn-), 233.

novem, 415 sq.; -decim, 416; -venus, 416.
INDEX.

Novensiles (-d-), 286.
novicius, 338.
novitas, 341.
novus, 226.
nox, 234 sq.; Adv., 555.
-nus-, pronunc., 63 sq., 69; for s after long vow., 69; from -nss-, 112; vow. long bef., 136 sqq.
-nus of triens, sextans, &c., 409.
-m, 3 Pl., 529; -mto, 531; -mto, 535; -mtr, 534.
nubes, 346 nubes, 182.
nudipes, 361.
nuditis tertius, 260, 377.
nudus, 260, 235, 179.
nudus, 449; pronunc., 113.
nun, 605.
Numasioi, Praen. fib., 305.
Number, 366; Dual (see Dual).
Numerals, 408 sqq.; Fractions, 409; accent of, 165.
Numerius, 560; -ri, Gen., 383 n.
numerus, 270; numero, Adv., 560.
nnummum, Gen. Pl., 402.
nunc, 570.
mancubi, 446.
mundinae (nond-, nound-), 251, 180.
nunquam, 570.
-munt, 3 Pl., e.g. danunt, 530 sq.
mantis, 180; novent-, non-, 250 sq.; pronunc., 141.
numper, Adv., -rus, Adj., 180, 553.
nurus, 239; -ra, 343; no-, 37.
-nus, e.g. facinus, 356.
nuscius (-citius), 96.
nutrio, 249.

O, pronunc. of, 30 sqq.; phon. changes of, 232 sqq.; ə in e-roots, 258; ə in é-roots, 258; ə-0, 260; ə-ə, 259; Lat. ə for lengthened ə, 233; Lat. ə for a, 17 sq.; for e with w, l, 225 sqq.; for atomic vow. bef. Lab., 192 sqq.; after gu, 300; Lat. ə for au, 40 sq.; for ou, 248 sqq.; not weakened to u, 199.

O-stems, blend with U-stems, 343 sq. (see Suffix -O-, -YO-, &c.)
-ō, 1 Sg., 524; of Rvō, &c., 348 sq.; of qvo, Adv., &c., 551; of vero, Adv., &c., 550; for ə in Adv., 559; shortening of, 212 sq.
ob (obs-), Prep., 585; ousted by ab-, 574.
ob vos sacro, 573.
obiunt, 531.
obiter, 563.
oblitterus for -atus, 543.
obliviscor, -isc-, 52; -itus, Pass., 543.
obeatis, 196, 246.
obrussa, 198.
Obscure Vowel, 185 sqq., 257.
obsequium, 321.
obsolesco, 481.
obsono, 488.
obstetrix, 191.
obstino, 472; obstinatus, 310.
obstringillo, 487.
oblineo, spelling of, 78 sq.
obviam (us, Adj.), 563.
occanui, Perf., 509, 198.
occiamus (?) for -redi-., 199.
ocillo, 487.
oculo, 227; oyqwolod, S. C. Bacch., 227.
ocupe, 470, 486.
ocor, 259, 406.
oeris, 259.
octo, 415; -ecin, 416; -giuna, 417 sq.; -aug-, 418; -augg-, 418; -tingenti, 419; -turus, 220.
ocibus, 234.
odium, 259.
odor, 235.
OE, pronunc. of, 39 sqq.; spelling, 246. (See Ol.)
oenus, 248, 410.
öffa, 113.
offendices, 272.
öffendo, 486; -sa, Noun, 542.
öfficina, 174, 349.
Ol, phon. changes of, 246 sqq.; ÕI, 252 sq.; Ol, OE on inscr., 247 sq.
öier, Interj., 39.
oinor, 410.
oinumama, 193.
oinursor, 178.
-ol- from el, 228 sq.; l, 278 sq.
olentica, 337.
oleo, 287.
oina, 570; o. oliorum, 436; olitasus, 436.
oira, 228; -un (olium), 196.
olla (aula), 41.
olle (-us), 436; oles, olorum, 436.
Olympus, accent. of, 155.
Omega, Lat. transer. of φ, 44.
Omicron, Lat. transcr. of, 33.
omito, 113 sq., 202.
omeno, 86.
ominimos, 362.
ominis, 430; ominio, 325.
Onomatopoetic Verbs, 483, 476.
-onsus (-ossus), 353.
-ont, 3 Pl., O. Lat., 529.
-onus, O. Lat. for -ō, 348 sq.
onusus, 306.
-opera, 400.
-operto, 475; for ap-, 18.
-operor, 485.
-opificina, 174.
-opilón (up-), 34.
-opinor, 472.
-opiparus, 192.
-opiter, 180.
-opitular, 485.
-opituma, 174.
-opito, 566.
-opportunus, 362.
-opportunity, oper-, 114.
Optative (see Moods).
-optimus, 406.
-optio, 369.
-optidens (-dentus), 352.
-opus, 485.
-or, 1 Sg. Pass., 533; Nom. Sg., e.g.
color (see Suffix -S-).
-opra, as a nickname, 40.
-orbus, 239; orbs, 182.
-orbus, 258.
-orca, 239.
-orbus prima for primord-, 362.
Ordinal Numerals (see Num.).
-orde, pronun. of, 141.
orde, 261.
orichalcum, 202.
orida for auricula, 40 sq.
orino, 33, 310; pronun., 141.
orrum (-rum), Gen. Pl., 402.
or, Nom. Sg., e.g. O. Lat. colos, 356.
or, mouth, 358.
-or, bone, 405.
or- (aus), e.g. osculator, 41.
oscus, 310.
os, osteo, 310.
estium, 262; ust-, 34.
-onsus (-ossus, -ossus), 112, 353.
OU, phon. changes of, 248 sq.; ÔU, 253; Lat. ou for eu, 245 sq.; on
insert., 246; written for û, 246; for
û, 246.
-ov- for -ue-, 33.
ovifer, 361.
ovis, 235.
*ovum for õv-, 34.
-ov (see Suffix in Gutt.).
oxime, 407.
P, pronun. of, 78 sqq.; phon.
changes of, 281 sq.; dial. from q
ty, 299 sq.; not final, 77; bet.m-nt, &c., 70.
P-particle (see Particles).
pacunt or pāp-, xii Tabb., 465; pacisco,
465; -pescisco, 200.
Facuvius, use of Compds., 360.
paedora for -res, 356.
Paedogus, pronun. of, 138.
paeone, 558 n.
paeninsula, 360.
-paenula, 197.
Paenultima Accent.-Law, 160 sqq.
pagina, 326.
palam, 386.
Palatal Gutt., phon. changes of, 295 sqq. (see K, ĺ, G, GH).
Palatalization of Cons. bef. y, 263;
of t, 81 sqq.; of c, 87 sq.; l, 91, 98;
r, 91, 98.
palea, 279.
palma, 279, 328.
palor, 586.
palpebra (-tra), 331.
palumbes, 346.
palus, -us, the scansion, 214.
palus, 293.
Panda, 318; -āna porta, 318.
pandiculor, 488.
pando, 472; -di, Perf., 502.
pange, 259; Perf. of, 504; panxi, 504;
pegi, 497; pēpīgī, 495-.
ponis, 339.
pannucia, 337.
pannus, pannus, 117.
papae, accent. of, 164.
papaver, 541.
Papirius Crassus, his use of r for s, 6.
Parasitic Vowel, 145 sqq.; with l,
r, 93 sqq.; in Gk. loanwords, 70
sq.; in bef. l, 193 sq., 197 sq.
parcarpus (?) for pæce, 273.
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pelegrinus for per-, 93.
pelez for paile-, 115.
pell, 472; pepuli, 504.
peltuciae, 285.
pendo, pendo, 473.
penes, Prep., 586.
pentro, 586, 594.
penna, 313.
pemuria, 558 n.
penus, 586.
-per, e.g. paulisper, 562.
per, Prep., 586 sqq.
peragro, pronunc. of, 94.
percello, 486; -culus, 542.
percussi, Perf., 545.
percre, 596.
perde, 191.
peremo, 587.
perendie, 560, 588, 192.
perendina (see compereundino).
peres for per-, 81.
perfalc, 198.
Perfect (see Tense-stems); quant.
of penult of S-perf., 134 sq.; accent.
of -it, &c., 163; scansion -itt, 214.
perfidus, 587.
pergo, 587.
periculum, scansion of, 175 sq.
perjero (see pej-).

Periphrastic Tenses, 510 sq.
perna, 251.
pernix; 354; pærn-, 141.
permex, 561, 555.
perperam, 557.
perplovere, 466.
perquam, 571.

Personal Pron. (see Pronouns).
Person-endings (see Verb).
perstru, 172.
pertine, 476.
pertisus, 195.
pervenat, 464.
perecus, 317 sqq.
pes, 286.
pesna (?), 313.
pressum, 539.
petesso, -issa, 462.
peticus (?), 76.
peto, 468; -ivi, 566.
petrorhithum, 300.

Petrieus, 300.

pars, 278; partem, Adv., 555.
Participles, 539 sqq.; Pres. Act.,
540; Fut., 540; Perf., 541; Pres.
Pass., 540; Perf., 541 sq.; -tus (-sus),
542; truncated, 543; used as Adj.,
549 sq.

Particles (see Conjunctions); T,
597; D-, 597; DH-, 597; P, 597;
N-, 597; -ce, 432 sq.; relation to
Case-suffix, 597 sq.; to Pers.-suff.,
597; Imper. used as, 600.

partim, 556.
parum, 562; parumper, 562.
pareus, 562; Compar., 466 sq.
pasco, pastum, 310.
passer for -er, 201.
pasim, 556.

Passive, 519 sqq.; Imper. use, 520
sq., 523; with Acc., 521; Person-
endings (see Verb); Inf. (see Inf.);
Part. (see Participles).

pastillus, 339.
pates, 475, 222.
pater, 222; P. familias, 381.
Patricolus, 197.
patriosis, 488.
patrocinor, 488.
patronus, 349.
patrialis, 340.
paucus, 243.
paveo, paveo, 473.
paulatin, 556; -isper, 562; -hom,
spelling of, 111 sq.

pax, 259.
-pe, Particle, 597.
pedan, 349.
petino, 488.
peto, 479; -xi, 505; -xui, 509.
pceo, 281; pecus, 354.
pedepressim, -temptim, 556.
pedaster, 320.
pédo, 307; pepedi, 501.

pejero, 48, 199; perj-, 313, 587.
pejor, pronunc. of, 53.

parcopromus, 360.
petulcus, 337.
phalerae, 190.
phasellus, -i- for -i-, 115.
Phi (see Aspirates).
Philippus, accent. of, 155.
Pi, Lat. transcr. of, 75.
piaculum, 333; O. Lat. -colom, 193.
pilato (pilato), 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.
pmso, 471; -/o, 470.
JttVi, 374
piscis, 232.
piscosus, 353.
pitch-Accent, 148 sqq.
pituita, pronunc. of, 52.
piws, 265; scansion, 131.
placenta, 190.
plaga, 318.
Plancus, 179.
plano, 471.
plano, 41.
planum, planum, 41.
Plautus, use of Compds., 362; dial.
Plotus, 242.
plubes, 376.
plecto, 496.
plenus, 324.
-pleo, to fill, 458, 473, 223.
pleris (?), Carm. Arv., 408.
plerunque, plerus, Adj., 559.
pico, 200, 468.
Plinius, 225.
plisma (?), Carm. Sal., 408.
plodo, 41.
*plopus for popus, 98.
plustrum, 41.
plae (plaeo), 486.
Pluperfect (see Tense-stems).
plurimus, 408.
plus, 408, 558; -ra (-ria), 401.
pô-, Prep., 575, 588.
podex, 397.
poella for pv-, 37.
poena, 246 sq.
Poenus, 246.
poeta, 373.
pol, 618.
polio, 575.
Polla, 41.
pollen, polenta, 367.
Pollio, spelling of, 112; -i-, 212.
Pollux, 179, 182; -ces, O. Lat., 245.
polubrum, 575, 331.
pomerium, 588.
Pompeius, 300.
pondo, 258.
pondus, 336.
pone, Prep., 588.
pone, 178; posui (posivi), 499; -ss-, 115.
Pontius, 300.
popina, 300.
populus, scansion of, 146; -loi Romanoi, O. Lat., 387.
pójorus, in Romance, 98.
-por for puer, 183, 185.
por-, Prep., 590.
porea, 279.
poreo, 588.
poreus, 277.
porricio, 485.
porrygo, porygo, 545, 178.
porro (O. Lat. porod), 568.
porrum, 279.
Porsenna, spelling of, 23.
posco, 477; popasci, 501; pep-, 503.
Position, length by, 129 sqq.; bef.
Mute and Liq., 94, 129 sqq.
Possessive, Compd., 360 sq.; Pron. (see Pron.).
possum, decl. of, 546; Inf. in Romance, 535; postestur, 522.
post, pos, pôr, poste, postid, 588 sq.; postea, 559; postecae, 437; posthaec, 569; postibi, 567; postmodum (-o), 559.
posterior, N., 378.
posticus, 337.
postmeridianus, spelling of, 589.
postridicus, 560.
Post-tonic, Syncope (see Syncope); Vow.-change (see Weakening).
postulo, 179.
postumus (-remus), 407.
*poteca for apoth-, 107.
Potina, 349.
potior (-io), 484, 546.
potis, 233.
potis (pole) sum, 546.
pota, 232.
potus, 520, 542.
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pra, 589; prae et tremonti, Carm. Sal., 530.
pvaeo, scansion of, 143.
prescipes (-cepe), 182.
presco, 180, 187.
presco (-coquus), 358.
preda, 143.
predopint, Carm. Sal., 189, 472.
presaminio, 517.
prescinini, 192; -ne, 396.
preamium, 143.
Praenestine, cinea, 22, 106, 177; hum modo, 613; Sync., 177; fibula, 188.
pres, 180, 187.
presagio, 517.
presenimia, 517.
presertim, 517.
presidius, 517.
presidus, 180.
pri, 488.
pri,-, 13 sqq.; Pronunciation, 326; -nis, 339.
priapages, 346.
priapagmen, 292.
priap, 591; -medium (-o), 559.
Proper Names, Italic, 319 sq.
priapur, 374.
priapino, 590, 488.

pricicles, Carm. Sal., 403.
prigius, 181, 325; pronune. of, 138.
pro, Prep., 590; -d, 590.
pro, Interj., 618.
probant, 519.
probus, 590; -bourn, 246.
procopis, 182.
procestria, 191.
Procop, 107; (e)st, 121.
procul, 590.
procos, 258.
prodi-, Prep., 590; prodiius, 590.
prodigium, 291.
prodinuul, 531.
produt, 515.
profestus, 199.
proficio, 590.
proxicior, 480.
proficientino, 519.
proficirgare, 470, 486.
profecies, 345 sqq.; progenie (Scip. Ep.), 48, 506.
propredinno, 519.
prochide, scansion of, 143; -bessis, 462.
procircidad, Luceria inscr., 519.
proinde, 570; proin, 122.
proles, 345.
prolixus, 590.
profemero, 293.
prolegus, 590.
promaverat, Carm. Sal., 194.
promesatn, 557.
prompsii, Perf., 505.
promundaturium, spelling of, 197.
prenis for -nus, 339.

Pronominal, Adverbs, 567 sqq.; in -bi, 567; -i, 567; -a, 568 sq.; -â, 569; -am, 570; -nde, 570; -am, 570; -am, 570; T-suffix, 571; D-suff., 571; Adjectives, 449 sqq.


Pronunciation, 13 sqq.
prions, 326; -nis, 339.
propages, 346.
propagmen, 292.
prope, 591; -medium (-o), 559.

Prepositions, 572 sqq.; written with Noun, 168, 572; ost Case-suff., 573; Compound, 573; with many Cases, 573; assim. in Comp. Vb., 312 sq.; accent., 167 sqq.

Present (see Tense-stems).

Pretonic, Syncope (see Syncope);
Vowel-change (see Weakening);
ê, ô changed to ã (?), 159, 222.

pri, Prep., 589.
priade, 550.
primilegiurn for privi-, 52.
primitiua, 362.
primus, 410; primumdum, 609.
princeps, 178; pronune., 141.
principio (-ium), Adv., 560.
prior, N., 378.
priscus, 337.
priusmus, 395.
pristis for pristis, 96.

prius, 589; prae et tremonti, Carm. Sal.
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propinquus, 358.
propitius, 194.
propius for -pri-, 95.
propitium, 556.
propter, 591, 179; -ea, 569.
proterus, 590.
prorsus (-m), 553; cf. 549.
prosa, 553.
Proserpina, 98; Prosepnai, (not -ais) 382, 184.

Prosodical Hiatus, 132, 144 sq., 209 sq.
prosperus, 257.
prosternere, in Romance, 489.
Prosthetic i, 102, 105 sqq.
probos, Vb., 590.
proterrus, 590.
protinus (-tenus), 554, 556, 200; -am, 557; -is, 554.
prothalam for prothyrr-, 190.
proximus, 591.
proriminio, 487.
*psalli, Perf. (?), 501.
-pse. -pte, Particles, 440.
puber, 356.
pubes, 346.
Pubicola (Poptli-), 76.
publicus, 287.

Pulcrus, 287.
puer, -re, Voc., Fem. in O. Lat., 374; -por in Compd., 183, 185.
pueria (-rit-), 174.
pugil, 376.
pulcrer, spelling of, 12, 59 sq.
puleum (-egi-), 48, 292.
pulenta for pot-, 33.
pulce, 355.
-puli of impuli, &c., 501; pulsus, 278.
pullo (-so), 482.
pulcis, 235.
pumex for pem-, 37.
pumilio (pom-), 34.
punge, 471; pepeugi, 593; punctus, pronune., 140.
pupa (-pp-), 116.
puras, 542; purime, 407.
pusillus, 305.
puter, 260; puteo, 260.
pud, 482; -ti, 211, 600.
puttrefaci, scansion of, 212.
pütus, 542.

Q, the letter, 3, 7; qu, pronune., 84 sqq.; length by Position, 87; I.-Eur. Q?, phon. changes of, 299 sqq.
qu (Dvenos inser.), 445.
qu, Adv. (quaqu), 569 sqq.
quadra, 413.
quadraginta, 417 sq.; accent., 165.
quarr-, 418.
quadrans, 409.
quadrigae, 196.
quadrigenti (-ing-), 419.
quadraplex (-plus), 414.
quaequalis, 448 n.
quaeo, 487; -sivi, 506.
quaeo, 462, 487; -numus (-imus), 487
-sis, 112.
quailis, 451.
quallus, the spelling, 112.
quadam, 570, 607; of unaquam, &c., 552.
quandec, 570, 607; -libet, 613; -vis, 613; -obrem, 606; quamquam, 613.
quando, 608, 571; -vi, 213; -que, 571; -quade, 571, 608; quadoc, 608; quandone, 608.
quasac., 607.
Quantity, 126 sqq.; overmastered by accent, 199 (see Shortening, Lengthening, Scansion); changed bef. cons.-group, 133 sqq.; of vow, in close syll., 133 sqq.
quantes, 451; -meiis, 613.
quaprorer, 569.
quare, 606.
quartus, 413.
 quasi, 607; -se, 25.
quassius, 305.
quaterus, 557.
quater, 413; -mus, 414.
quatic, in Comp., 196.
quattuor, 413 sq.; spelling, 414, 113; -tor, 414; -decim, 416.
que, 598 sq.; enelic, 166 sq.; qu( ), 598.
queiostores, 242.
quercus, 291; -mus, 294.
querrilla, the spelling, 112 sqq.
querror, 227.
querruer, 315.
quod for quae-, 142 sq.
-qui- for Gk. ku, 28, 36.
qui, Pron., 443 sqq.; pronune., 39.
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44; cui, pronunc., 39, 44, 446; spelling, 87.
qui, Adv., 446, 568; -qui (-n), 613; -dam, 609.
quia, 610; -nam, 606.
quinque, 448; -dam, -libet, -vis, 447.
quiendem, 602; sig., tig., &c., 216.
quiies, 182.
quienses, pronunc. of, 134; quetus for qui, 142 sq.
quin, 613.
quinque, 414, 229; pronunc., 414; -indecm, 416; -(c)itus, 70; pronunc., 140, 414; -genti, 419; -centum, O. Lat., 419; -myaginta, 417; -nuncx, 400; -nus, 414.
qui, 448sq.; pronunc., 85; -que, -piam, -quam, -quis, 448.
quisquis, 315.
quus, 568; Conj., 613; -ad, 568; -circo, 580; -mundo, -in, 212.
quod, Conj., 610.
quotatis (cujas), 447.
quoeci, Dat., 445.
quoiquodmodi, 445.
quam for cum, Prep., 581.
quominus, 569, 619.
-quinque (-cinque), 598.
quondam, 571.
quoniam, 610.
quoque, 598.
quorsus (-m), 568.
Quota, 417.
quo, 451; -annis, 560; -idie (see cat.), 493.
quotonus, 561.
quotus, 451.
quum, 608, 670.
R, pronunc. of, 89 sqq.; I.-Eur. R, phon. changes of, 276 sqq.; R, 278 sq.; Lat. r for s, 303 sqq., 101, 105; for d, 265, 288, 80 sqq.; for t, 92 sq.; for n, 96: dropped in prac-
stit(ri)gias, &c., 91, 95; bef. cons., 97.
-r, long vow. shortened bef., 213 sq.; of Passive, 523, 533.
rabies, 347; -es, Gen., 383.
rabo for arrabo, 177.
rabula, 177.
racemosus, 306.
radius, 220.
Rauus for Rav., 252.
ramentum, 372.
ratio, 476.
rato, a robber, 475.
ratio, 340.
ratificior, 488.
ratis, 307.
ratus, 259.
ravastellus, 330.
ravus, 180.
Raudus for -vid-, 185.
ravus, 248 sq.
-recid., Perf., 504.
recens, Adv., 554.
recidivus, 322.
reciprocol, 337.
Recomposition, 199 sq. (see Re-
formation).
recordor, 483.
recta, Adv., 559.
recuperor, 488.
reddo, 488, 114; reddibo, 493.
red(d)uco, 114; redex, 591.
redergio for -arg-, 198.
redivius, 531.
redivia, 286.
redivius, 591.
Reduction (see Weakening, Shorten-
ing).
reducere, 259.
Reduplicated, Present, 468; Perfect,
496 sqq., 501 sqq.; form of red.,
502 sq.; assim. of red. vow. to
stem-vow., 503; loss of, 503 sqq.;
Noun, 358, 363.
Reflexive Pron. (see Pronouns).
refriva faba, 178.
regina, 370.
regnum, pronunc. of, 138.
regu, 296; resi, 505; pronunc. of, 139,
496.
regular, 318.
Relative Pron. (see Pronouns).
religius, pronunc. of, 323; -eos,
O. Lat., 46.
relutum, 286.
remex, 358.
remulcum, pronunc. of, 142.
ren, 264.
reor, ratus, 259.
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repandirostro, Paucc., 360.
rependes, 268; Adv., 554; -nte, 551.
repo, 307.
repperi, Perf., 504.
reppuli, Perf., 504.
repulsus, 542.
requies, deel. of, 346.
res, 252, 225; in word-group, 169.
reses, 358.
respondeo, Perf. in Romance, 509.
Res(t)itusus, 176.
retro(r)sunus, 549.
retudti, Perf., 503 sq.
retus for retitus, 543.
recerti, Perf. of -tor, 520.
res, 244.
rec, 260, 276.
Rho, Lat. transcr. of, 12, 59.
-ri, syncop. after cons., 171, 179 sq.
rien, 264.
rigor, 306.
ringor, 471.
-ri, 2 Sg. Pass., 533; and -er in Adj.
M., F., 371.
rite, 560.
ritis, 560.
ritalis, 444.
Rivers, gender of, 368.
ritis for riveus, 52.
-ri, pron. of, 97.
-ri, for nm, 271 sqq.
-ro, e.g. lambere, 479.
robius, 348; rob-, 34.
robur (-or), 356, 379; -us, 379.
robus, Adj., 484.
rodus, 248 sq.
ropiö, 76.
Rostra Columna (see Col. Rostr.), 285.
robus, 544 sq.
Rough Breathing (Gk.) (see Breathing).
-rr for rs, 277 sq.
-rs, pron. of, 91, 96.
rubro, 476.
ruber, 239.
rubicundus, 545.
rubigo for rob-, 34.
rubus, 307.
rustus for rob-, 34.
ructo (see eructo).
rudentes, 467.
rudis, 249, 338.
รูด, 307.
rudus, 248 sq.
rues, 345.
rufus, 248.
Ruga (see Carvilius).
rumen, 307.
rumentum, 'abruptio,' 314.
rumpia, 33.
rumps, 471; rupi, 502; -mptus (see corruptus).
rupes, 246; -pp-, 118.
rurin (e), 396.
rurus -m, (rus-), 549, 553.
-rus, 2 Sg. Pass., 534.
Rustic Latin, e for i, 19, 25, 30.
veha, 22; e for i, 24 sq., 29 sq.;
trundes, 31, 33; tundo, 33; o for au,
40 sq.; e for ae, 42 sq.
rusticus, 337.
S, voiced written z, then r, 6; pro-
nounce of, 101 sqq.; phon. changes
of, 303 sqq.; Lat. s for ss, 305 sq.,
109 sqq.; for n, 136 sq.; 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.
sabulum, 304.
sacena (scena), 261, 184.
sacerdos, 179 sq.
säcri-, äcro-, 183.
sactus for sanct-, 70.
saepe, 559.
sopes (se-), 42.
Saeturni, 242.
Saguntum, 104.
sagus, 259 sq.
sal, 223.
Saliare Carmen (see Carmen Sal.).
salynus, 293.
salio, 223.
salio, 278, 223.
salio, 285, 479.
saltem, 556.
salvaticus for silv-, 201.
sambucus (sab-), 65.
Sanates, 183.
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sanctio, 470; sanctus, pronunc., 140; sanctus, -ant, 70.
Sandhii, 120 sqq.
sanqueis (-en), 377.
sapheus, 104.
sardina, 326.
sarmentum, 310.
satis (sat), 558; satin, 558 sqq.
satur, 558 n.
satura (-ira), 197.
Saturnian Metre, 128 n., 132 n., 159.
satus, 222.
sauius for -afots, 543.
savium, 268.
sawna for sigma, 89.
saxum, 261.
sca& for sc(h)wi, 23.
scaena (se-), 42.
scaeptrum (se-), 42.
scaews, 242.
scalpo, 279.
sclprum, 333.
scommum, 283.
scaudo, -di, Perf., 502.
scape, (scaeptrum (se-)), 42.
secavus, 242.
scrofa, 80.
scrupulus (scrip-), 29.
scuita, 184.
scoli, 279.
sé-, 'to sow,' 224.
se, Pron., 424.
se (sed), Prop., 592; se frauder, 592.
secespitum, 261.
sectus (seo set-), 261.
secos, 298; si-, 23.
Second Pers., Sg. ending, 525 sqq.; Pl., 529.
Secondary Accent, 158 sqq., 161.
sectoris, 592.
secratum for sacr-, 18.
secta, 566.
sectus (?), 566.
secondum, Prop., 591.
secondus, 411.
securus, 592.
secus, Noun, 552; Adj., 591; Adv., 552; Prep., 591.
-secus, 552, 554.
segis, 351.
segmentum, 293.
selfnum, the scansion, 156.
selficastra, 287.
selfa, 287.
semita, 410, 229.
semel, 410, 229.
semmermis, 304.
semi-, 409, 225.
sem(m)i modius, 176.
semissues, 409, 586.
semper, -iernus, 562.
semptem for sept-, 66.
senatus, decl. of, 343; -i, Gen., 380, 384; -ius, Gen., 384.
seneca, 337; senecio, 337.
senecta, 334 n.
senex, 271, 354; decl. of, 367.
Sentence-Accent, 148 n., 165 sqq.
sententia, 352.
senus, 415.
seorsum, 592.
sepem, 415; -decim, 416; -tuaginta, 417 sq.; -tingenti, 419; -imentus, 415; -tensus, 415; -tuennis, 415; sempt., 66.
septentriones, 260.
Septimontium for Septis-, 104.
septimus decimus, accent of, 163.
septem, 334; spelling of, 57. 59 sq.
seques, 566.
sequor, 520.
Serena for Sir-, 30.
sertis, Adj., 267.
sertus, 197.
serra, 277.
serrantia, 234; spelling of, 198 sq.
sessella, 419.
sessentaplagus, 364.
sessuncia, 300; -unc-, 236.
sessuit, 409.
ses for se, 112.
sereni, 409; -ium, Gen. Pl., 402; 418.
senus, 566.
Setus (Zephyros), 104.
set, sive, 122.
severus, 226 sq.
sex, 415; sexaginta, 417.
sexans, 409.
Sextius (-st-), 415.
Shâva, 257.
Short Vowel (see Quantity).
Shortening, of vow. bef. vow., 131 sqq.; bef. n with cons., 141 sq.; bef. l with cons., 142; bef. -l, -m, -n, 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; -e, 25.
Sibilants, phon. changes of, 302 sqq.
sibilo, 76; -f, -s, -v, -v, 30.
sic, 567; pronunc. 121 sq.; sicine, 433.
sicca, 447.
Sicelius, mark of double cons., 4, 8.
sicubi, 446.
sido, 468; sidi (sedil), 503.
sidus, 267.
siem, 514 sq.
*sifilo for sib-, 30, 78, 80.
signum, pronunc. of, 138 sq.
silicernum, 287.
-sim, Subj., 465.
simila, 286.
similis, 338.
simulqu (=tur), 565.
simplici (-pl), 410.
simpliicatiunum funera, 410.
simul, Adv., 533; Prep., 592.
simuliter, 553.
sinus for sumus, 29.
sin, 612.
sinatus for sen-, 200.
sinciniua, 410.
sincipit, 141.
sine, 592; se-, 592.
Single Cons. for Double, 113 sqq.
singifer for sign-, 66.
singuli, 410.
sino, 471.
sins, Carm. Arv., 518 n.
siquidem, the scansion, 216.
sis for si vis, 52; sultis, Plur., 181.
sirempes (e), 566.
sisto, 468; Perf. of, 503.
sive (sive), 122, 600.
so (-se-), 430.
so- for suo, Poss., 426 sqq.
so-, O. Lat. Demonstr., 430, 432.
sobrinus, 393.
sobrius, 592.
soc (?), 'ida', 432.
socer, 192, 227; -erus, 374.
sociennis, 545.
sociofraudus (=uf), 364.
socius, 262.
socors, 592.
socrus, 344; -a, 343.
sodex, 265, 486.
Sofia, scansion of, 150.
soê, the scansion, 215.
solidus for -lid-, 165.
solea, 287.
solennnis for -ill-, 111.
solerare, 'solidare', 288.
solvent, 531.
solitaurilia, 8.
solitus sum, Perf. Dep., 522.
solium, 287.
solennnis (=mn), 70; -mpn-, 70; sole- 111.
sollicitus, 361.
solistumus, 407.
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ssilo-, 8, 16.
solae, 354.
solam, 287.
solve, 592; -bui for -lui, 48; -latus, 260.
solus, 449.
somnium, 319.
somnolentus, spelling of, 192.
sommus, 227.
Sonant I, M, N, R (see I, M, N, R).
soricius, 323.
soro, 488 n.; sonnt, 506.
sorig, 227.
sorbera, 283; -psi for -bui, 509; -billo,
487.
sordere, -ère, 476.
sordes, 345.
soror, 227.
sortis, P. P. P., 542.
sp- lengths final vow., 131; isp- 
(see Prosthetic i).
sparsi, Perf., 505.
spatarius, 534.
spatio, decl. of, 346.
specio, 472; spici, 23.
sperno, 472.
spes, 257, 345 n.
sper, 284.
ssp- for it, 304, 309; for x, 102; re-
duced to s, 110 sqq.
sspere, Inf., 465.
-(s)sum, Subj., 465.
-(s)so, Vb.-forms in, 462 sqq.; Perf.
of, 506.
sta-, 'to stand,' 457.
Staccato pronunciation, 131.
stagnum, pron. of, 138.
staticum, 556; ste-, 15.
Statina, 349.
state (Dven. inscr.), 519.
status, 221; as P. P. P. of sum, 542.
st for ste, 435. 167.
ste (ill), 117.
stella, pron. of, 112.
Stem, Noun and Adj., 316 sqq.; 
suffix (see Suffixes); interchange of 
U- and O-stems, 343 sq.
sterlus, 338.
sterpe, 470, 219; stratus, 219, 306.

sterneus, 471.
sterquilinium, the spelling, 301.
stetum for stat-, 15.
-sti, 2 SG. Perf., 525.
stillicidium, spelling of, 112.
still, 487.
-stingua, 471.
stipendium, 116.
stirca for -crca-, 20, 229.
-st., O. Lat., Stelaborius, Stelaccius, Stellibus,
stitis, stilia, stloppus, 307.
stlattarius, 219.
stis (act), 83. 307.
sto, decl. of, 457; steti, 501; Perf. in 
Romance, 509; status, 221, 542.
stolidus, 235.
storax, 37.
stramen, 279; stratus, 219.
stramma for -n-, 116.
strenuus, 323; -nn, 113.
Stress-Accent, 148 sqq.
strictum, 556.
stridi, Perf., 502.
stringo, 229; strictus, 542.
stridulus, O. Lat. for triv., 196.
Strong, Cases, 367; Root-grade (see 
Gradation).
strux, 345.
struvartii, 361.
struo, in Romance, 489.
struppus (-opp-), 58.
stuado, 476.
stultus, 235.
stupa (-opp-), 116.
stupula for stipula, 37.
suad, 'sic,' 611.
suada, spelling of, 115.
suadeo, 482, 259; pronunc., 53.
Svarabhakti Vowel (see Parasitic).
svaris, 221; pronunc., 53.
svuvishaviad, 361.
sub, sub-, Prep., 593; sub vos placo, 
572.
subauda, spelling of, 195.
subaxet (?), 508.
*subilo for sib-, 30.
Subjunctive (see Moods).
sublimen, 559; -ris, 338.
suboles, 345.
Subordinate Words, 165 sqq.
subrigio, 545.
subrimii hae1, 193.
subscivus, 323.


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(cf)eubii, 176 sq.

supra, 593; -pura, 181, 593.
suremit, 505, 593; -psit, 593.
surgo, 178; surrexi, 545, 595; suregit, 505; sortus, 542.
surpai, Perf., 178; suprus, 178.
sursum (-s), 549, 553.
-sus (-tus), P. P., 542.
sus-, Prep. (see sub); susque deque, 593.
sus, sów, 260.
supicio, 225.
susdui, Perf., 545.
suns, 426 sqq.; monosyll., 426 sqq.;
O. Lat. so, 426 sqq.

swé-, phon. change of, 227.

Sylfa, 29.

Syllable, Close (see Close Syll.);
Division, 124 sqq.; First (see First Syll.);
Suppression of (Suppression; Synecope);
Syllable Writing, 12, 177.
sylfa, the spelling, 11, 29.

Syncope, 170 sqq., 150 sqq.; Praenestine, 177;
by old Accent-Law, 178 sqq.; final syll., 181 sq.; pre-
tonic, 183 sq.; post-tonic, 184 sq.;
final vow. (see Apocope); vow. in final syll., 209 sq.

Synizesis, 142 sqq.

T, pronoune. 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 Sg., 526 sqq.; vow. shortened
bef., 214.

-1a of ita, &c., 552.
tales, 346.

Tables, Twelve (see Twelve).
taceo, 476.
taefer, 289.
talis, 451.
talus, 293.
tate, 570; -me, Carm. Sal., 570; -etsi, 602; tane, 602, 69.
tamen, 601; -etsi, 602.
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tango, 471; tago, 464; tetigi, 495.
tangam, 570.
tanhus, 451: -tadem, 571; -tisper, 562; -tunntodo, 564.
Tarenurn, accent of, 155, 197.
tarpehsita, 104.
tata, 118 n., 363.
Tatpurusha, Comp., 360 sq.
*taxitare, 482.
-te, 2 Pl. Imper., 529.
tector, pronunc. of, 139; -tum, 542.
Temceussa, 64, 71, 145 sq.
ted, 423.
teges, 351.
tego, 303; tezi, 505; pronunc. of, 139.
tegua, 318.
teta, 293.
Telesia, 287.
Telis for Thetis, 75.
telem, 293; -te, 112.
-tetm of item, &c., 552.
temere, 560.
temperi, spelling of, 192, 356.
temperies, 344.
temperint (?), 515.
tempestas, 342; -tsus, O. Lat., 342.
templum, 565.
Tempus, Tenenses, 181.
tendo, 486; -sus, 542.
tenbrae, 270.
teno, 476; -tus, 542; tetini, 501.
tenor, tenusa, 355.
tento for -mpt-, 70.
Tenues, (Lat.) pronunc. of, 71 sqq.; (Gk.) Lat. transcr. of, 74 sqq.; (I.-Eur.) phon. changes of, 279 sqq.; Ten. Asp., 280, 308.
tenuis, 274; pronunc., 46, 174; -ria, 144.
tenus, Prep., 593; hactenus, &c., 569.
tenus, Noun, 355.
-tar, Adv., 549, 553.
ter, 412; scansion, 119; termus, 412.
terebra, 331.
teres, 351.
terius, 302.
terius (see Comparison).
terminus, 269; termo, 327.
ter, teri for trivi, 509.
terreo, 481.
terrimodum, 362.
terruncius, 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.
Thetis, for Thetis, 286.
Thematic, Conj. (see Verb); Vowel, 453.
thesaurus for theses, 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).
tibican, 364.
ticus (see Suffix -KO-).
tilia, 225.
-tim, Adv., 548.
tingo, 225; tinctus, pronunc., 140.
tinnia, pronunc. of, 118; tintinio (-no), 483.
-tinus, Adj. (see Suffix -NO-); Adv. (see tenus).
tis, 2 Pl., 529.
tis, Gen., 423.
ticus (see Suffix -UO-).
Tnesis, 187, 573.
-to, ‚this,‘ 430.
togns, 255.
Toltesiai, Dvenos inser., 305.
tolero, 498.
tolle, sustuli, 545.
toludin, 556.
tondeo, 486; totondi, 496.
Tone-Accent, 148 sqq.
tonger, 259.
tonguillum, 556.
topper, 562.
torculus, 300.
-torium (see Suffix -IO-).
tomentum, 310.
torpedo (-ido), 23
torpeo, 476.
torquero, 482; torsi, 310; tortus, 310.
torreo, 477.
torris, 339.
tot, 451; totidem, 451, 571.
-tote, Fut. Imper., 517.
töhus, 450; -it-, 116.
töhus, 451.
-tr- for dr, 81, 289.
-tra, Adv., 569.
-træ-, 'to go through,' 458.
trabes, -tra, 376.
trado, -nsat-, 594.
trahæa for -ha, 318.
traho, in Romance, 489.
tramitès, -nsm-, 594.
trans, træa, Prep., 594.
transmarinus, 362.
transstineo, 476.
Trasimennus for Tars-, 97.
Trees, gender of, 368.
(remo, 499; tremblēt, 494; tremonti, 530.
tres, 412 sq.; trē-, træ-, 412; tredecim, 416; trecenti (-sum), 418 sq.; triginta, 417 sq.; accent., 165; triveta for triγi-, 418; tricēnas (-γ), 418; tricies (-γ), 418; trīnas, 412; tripexus (-ut), 412.
tribunāl(ē), 202.
tricē, 58, 116
tric(h)ūminium for tricl-, 94.
trienes, 409.
trigintā dies, accent of, 169.
tripodare, 256.
*tripa, 119.
tristis for -is, 368.
trītocus (stric-), 196.
triumphus, spelling of, 59.
-tro, Adv., 568.
Trioje, pron. of, 53.
*troño for lono, 95.
trudis, 338.
trudo, 486.
-trum, (see Suffix -TRO-); with ę, 191.
-itt. for ct, 86, 89; by Sync., 284.
tu, decl. of, 423 sq.
-tu, a Sup., 538 sq.
tuber, 270.
tubercinosum, 488.
tudes, 351.
-tudo (see Suffix -TÜT(I)-, -D-).
tuor (-tor), 476.
-tulās, attulās, 464.
tuli (see ferō).
-tum, 1 Sup., 538 sq.
tum, 570; tun-, 570.
tumba, 36.
tundo, tūtudi, 496; tunsus (?), 471; tu-sus, tusus, 471; tundo for londo, 33.
-tur, 3 Sg. Pass., 534.
turba, 239.
turbinēs, the scansion, 399.
turdo, 308.
turīo, Desider., 478.
turnus for ùv-, 31, 33.
tūv-, Fut. Inf., 537; Part., 540.
turtur, 353.
-tus, -sus, P. P. P., 542; of funditus, &c., 548.
tus, 58.
Tuscus, 278.
tuē, Pron., 423 sq.
tuēla, spelling of, 115.
tuēus, 426 sq.; monosyll., 426 sqq.
Twelve Tables, 7, 565.
tympanum (typ-), 272.
Tyranno, taught Accent., 151, 154.

U, V, the letter, 3, 7 sq.; V and VV, 267 sq., 52; uu for ā, 10; Gk. (see Upsilon); U, pronunc., 34 sqq.; V, 44 sq.; ù sound, 25 sqq.; I.-Eur. Į, phon. changes of, 237 sqq., 260 sq.; V (W), 265 sqq.; Lat. ā for o, 235 sqq., 31 sqq.; for atomic ve-, 196; in weak-grade of root with labiovel., 239; for atomic vow. bef. lab., 192 sqq.; for ę, 33 sq.; Lat. ā for ā, 233; for ā lengthened, 237; for eu, 245 sqq.; for ou, 248 sqq.; Lat. v from gb, 381 sqq.; for b, 47; 49 sqq.; dropped bet. vowels, 52; dropped after cons., 52 sq., 144.
-ā, shortening of, 213; of cornu, &c., scansion, 377 sq.
ā-ē and l-āē, e.g. stupēs, 37.
V-perfect (see Tense-stems).
INDEX.

U-stems, blend with O-stems, 343 sq. (see Suffix -U-).

vado, 467.
vadum, 467.
va, 618.
valde, 561; -lid-, 174.
Valeri (Voc., Gen.), accent of, 164.
vapor, 299.
vapulo, 522.
Variation of Vowels (see Gradation).

Varix, 279, 355.

Varro, i and ei, 9; deriv. of Gruccus, 147 n.; on dolus, 244.

vas, a surely, 290.

vast, a vessel; vasa, Pl., 112.

vades, 346 sq., 221; O. Lat. catius, 375.

cattium, spelling of, 51.

ubba for obba, 33.

uber, 290, 250.

ubi, 567; -e, 25.

ubi, e.g. lugubris, 196.

uc, Adv., 551.

utus (see Suffix -KO-), 180.

utus, 599 sq.

Velar Gutt. (see Gutt. Proper, Labiovelar).

velatula, 308.

velin (see volo).

velia for vi-, 29

vellicio, 488.

vello, older re- (?), 228; -ii, 502; vulsi, 509.

velut, 266

velar, 354.

velrahus for -trag-, 93.

velum, 333; -il-, 112.

vendo, 472, 488; -ditus, in Romance, 542.

verecusius, bene, 51.

venenum, 326.

rener, 488, 539; -iri, 522.

vendo, 173; veni, 500; Perf. in Romance, 509; -remat, 464; -ventio, 274.

vendus, 251.

venum, 539; -do, 472.

Venus, 356.

veres, 346.


veberit (?) 515.

verbam, 290

verecundus for -ar-, 202.

verer, 473; ver démîmi (?) 202.

Vergilius, spelling of, 23.

vermion, 310.

vernus, 339.

Verner's Law, 157.

vernum, 324.

vero (-e), 550.

terres, 277.

terro, 468; ro, 228; -ri, Perf., 502.

terruca, 277, 337.

Verrugo, 337.

-versus (-m), Adv., 549.

cernus (-m), Prep., 595.

Verticordia, 361.

vera, 266; ro, 228; -ti, Perf., 502.

Vertumnus, 327.

vera, 301.

vera, 266; -m, -o, Conj., 602; -o (-e), Adv., 550.

vespa, 266.

vespera, 324.

restis, 305, 341.

reter, 288; ro, 228.

reramius, for -er-, 184.

Verto, the scansion, 212.

rurus, 356; Compar. 407; teter, 356; -tustus, 497.

Ufentina, 250.

-agō (see Suffix in Gutt.), 29.

-ui (-aev), Perf., 506.

UT, pronoun of, 39, 44; vi-, pronoun, 29.
-vix, Syncope of, 171 sq., 180 sq.

vibix, 355.


vicenus, voc., 418; -cessus, 417; -cites, 418.

 viciniae, Loc., 397.

vicissim, 556, 586; -satim, 556.

vidus for -ful, 83.

virginae, N., 371.

virus, 295.

videlicet, 564.

video, 473, 266, 232; -di, 502, 497; 

viden, pronunc., 163; vissus, spelling, 112.

vidus, 268.

viceo, 266.

viceo, 229.

vigil, 376.

vigitandō, the scansion, 213.

vigintī, 417 sq.; accent., 165; vinti, 418.

vite, Adv., 559.

vites, the spelling, 112 sq.

villa, pronunc. of, 112 sq.; ve-, 29.

vildum, 333, 179.

villus, 321.

vinoarius, 470.

vino, 471, 298; vici, 502.

vindemia, 178.

vindex, 362.

vinea (-ia), 22.

Vinvinus, pronunc. of, 118.

vindennus, spelling of, 192.

videns (-tus), 352.

vira, 260; pronunc., 29; -um, Gen. Pl., 402.

virdis, &c., for -rid-, 171, 185.

cirectum, 335.

circuo, 260.

viri, 356.

virus, 267.

vis, Noun, 230; vis, Plur., 399 345, n.

vis, 2 Sg. (see vulo, decl. of).

viso, 462; -si, 502; visso, 112.

vissit for viril, 107.

vita, 179; vitam vititur, 521.

vitex, 230.

vitis, 344.

terredax, 192, 361.

vico, 301; vico, Nov., 429; vixi, 499; 

-ss, 107; vivibur vitam, 521.

victus, 230.

vix, 555; -dum, 614.

-vul- for it, 232; from l, 278 sq.

vicius, ultus, 310.

uligo, 287.

-ulta see Suffix -LI-.

-ultus (-ulūs), 115.

ultus, 449; pronunc., 113.

ultus, 279.

ulta, 260, 179.

uls, ultrax, 594 sq.; pronunc., 142; ol-

timus, 236.

ulula, 363.

ululo, 474.

Ulysses (Ulixes), 286, 200.

-um (orum), Gen. Pl., 402.

umbilicus, 283; imb-, 29.

umbo, 283.

unarius, 236; spelling, 56

unā, Adv., 561.

Unaccented Vow., weakened (see Weakening); Syncope of (see Syn-
cope).

unco, 476.

uncus, 259.

unde, 570; pronunc., 122.

undeem, 416; pronunc., 141.

undeviginti, 416.

uniquē, 570, 206.

-undus (-endus), Ger., 543.

unguis, 293.

unquo, 301; -actus, pronunc., 140.

unicus, 337.

universus, 178; -sim, 554; oinursei,178.

Unomamia, Plaut., 364; Oinumama

193.

unse, 554.

unquam, 570.

unus, 409 sq.; -quisquis, 449.

v-, O. Lat. for ve-, 228.

-v- atonic changed to vu, 567.

-vo, Vbs. in, 484 n.

Vocative (see Declension); of IO-

stems, accent., 163 sq.

* vocitas, empty, 18.

vecius, 18; vocab for va-, 15, 18.

toco, 228.

Voices (see Passive, Deponent).

Voice-Stops (see Mediae).

Voluterrae, 228.

-volo (?) (ve-), 228.

volo, I wish, decl. of, 456 sq.; accent., 

169; velim, 515; volam, 516; volimis, 

456 n.; Inf. in Romance, 536.
INDEX.

Volturnus, 374.
Voluminus, 327; -nius, 228.
Volutus, 541.

Vulpes, 553.
Vulpinus, 342.
Venus, 267, 506 n, 228.
Verple, 426.
Vero, 301, 228.
Vermo (re-), 468, 228.
Verto (re-), 467, 228.
res, decl. of, 425 sqq.

Vowel, Grades (see Gradation); Quantity (see Quant., Shortening, Lengthening).

Vox, 358.

Upilus (op-), 34.
Upsilon, Lat. transcr. of, 4, 11, 36, 248.

Upequa, 315, 363.
Urbeus, 325.
Urbs, 239; spelling, 78 sq.
Urceus, 239.
Urgeo, 239, 482.
Urna, 310.

Ururus (see Suffix -NO-).
Uro, 466; ussi, 497; pronunc., 111; urus, pronunc., 255.

Urrio, Vbs. in, 482.
Urusus, 239.

-Uus, Gen., e.g. Venerus, 384; decl. of Neuts. in, 355 sq. (see -rus, 2 Sq. Pass.).

Usque, 571, 595.
Usitum for ost-, 34.

Usurpo, 173.
Ut, 666, 605; accent., 166; uti, 607.
Uter, Noun, 289.
Uter, Pron., 450; -que, 450.
Uterus (-um), 369.
Utica, 37.
Utinam, 605.
Uter, 247; utarius, 534; ëssus, 112; utando, 519.

Utraque, Adv., 557.
Utriname, Adv., 570.
Utrinque, Adv., 570.
Utrio, Adv., 568.
Utribi, Adv., 567.
Utrum, Conj., 606.
-udatio, Vbs. in, 488.

-utus, P. P. P., 542.
-uu- written for ā, 10.
-ā(ī)2. Perf., 508 sq.
Vinete, 560.
Vulnus, spelling of, 236.
Vulpes, 346.
Vulpiner, 472.
Volutus, volturnus, 374.
Vox, (see Suffix -O-).

Voluntas, written vocor in MSS., 5.

W, Lat. expression of, 7 sq.; L-Eur. W, phon. changes of, 265 sqq.

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 jī, ēā, 196; a, u, i, 196 sq.; Greek 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,' 436 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.; L-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.; L-Eur. Z, phon. changes of, 303 sqq.; Lat. z for j, 49.

Zabulus, for diabolus, 105.

Zeta, Lat. transcr. of, 4, 11, 101, 104.

THE END.
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

p. vii. 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 *illis* read *illis*.


p. 235. l. 7 ab im. .... *on* .... *in*.

p. 238. l. 9 ab im. .... *orbs* .... *orbs*, late Lat. *orbs*.

p. 242. l. 14 .... dēverī .... dēverī.

p. 276. l. 8 .... *cūlāre* .... *calāre*.

p. 291. l. 11 ab im. .... *qēnqē* .... *pēnqē*.

p. 356. l. 4 .... *modes* .... *modes* (whence *moderor*).

p. 415. l. 6 .... sēnus .... sēnus.

p. 420. l. 3 .... *egō* .... *egō*.

1. 4 .... *egōm* .... *egōm*.

p. 528. l. 22 .... *sefaced* .... *sefaked*.

p. 551. l. 19 .... U-stems .... Vow.-stems.
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