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## INTRODUCTION.

The Irregular Greek Verb, though all acknowledge its importance and difficulties, has been hitherto confessedly neglected. On this point both our Lexicons and Grammars are particularly defective and unsatisfactory. In their excuse however it may be fairly alleged, that no work can do justice to so extensive a subject, unless it be confined to the examination of that subject only. I have been frequently struck with the truth and the force of these considerations when consulting the second volume of Buttmann's large Greek Grammar (Ausführliche Sprachlehre), which is dedicated to the examination of the Irregular Verbs, and contains a very extensive catalogue of them. In that catalogue I found all the prominent irregularities of the Greek Verb so fully and fundamentally investigated, that I was convinced a translation of it would prove a most valuable assistant to every lover and student of Greek literature, whether he should be satisfied with a mere superficial knowledge of this part of the language, or might wish to see it traced and explained with the deepest and soundest criticism: and as the catalogue constitutes a distinct part of the original Grammar, there was little difficulty in forming it into a separate work.

In this Catalogue Buttmann professes to have two objects in view : first, to enumerate all the primitive verbs, whether regular or irregular, which are in general use, particularly in prose, specifying in each the actual usage of the best writers: secondly, to give a list of all verbs, and all forms of verbs, which are anomalous or irregular. On the former of these points little need be said: in some respects its importance is not at all inferior to the latter, particularly for the composition of Greek prose; but in extent it is comparatively inconsiderable.

The regular verbs occurring in this Catalogue are so few (almost every Greek verb having an irregularity in some part of its formation), that their occasional appearance does not alter the general character of the work; and I have therefore given it a title corresponding with its great leading object, which is, to examine and explain those verbs (with their tenses and persons) which are properly irregular. If it be asked what verbs Buttmann considers to be properly irregular, I answer in his own words, those which do not follow some general analogy. In accordance with this idea, he has omitted in his Catalogue one numerous class of verbs ending in -á $\zeta \omega$, -i $i \zeta \omega$, - $\alpha i v \omega$, -úv $\omega$, $-\varepsilon \dot{v} \omega,-\sigma^{\prime} \omega,-x^{\prime} \omega \infty$, and $-\varepsilon \in \omega$, because they are derived from other words (not verbs) according to a fixed analogy, because they are all formed in the same simple way, have all a perfect active in $-x \alpha$, and are invariably defective in the aor. 2. active and passive. For the same reason he has excluded those also which are formed in $-\infty$ with the preceding syllable of the radical word strengthened; consequently those ending in - $\alpha$ ip $\omega,-\lambda \lambda \omega,-\pi \tau \omega$, $-\tau \tau \omega$, and $-\sigma \sigma \omega . *$ Where, however, we find a verb with either of the above terminations not derived from a noun or other word, but only a lengthened form of some simple stem or root, it is manifestly a deviation from general analogy; and as an aor. 2. may be formed from the original root,-e. g. in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda_{1} \tau \alpha i v \omega$,
 verbs have a place in the following Catalogue; as have also all those ending in - ${ }^{2} v \omega$, that termination being invariably of the same kind. Within these and the like restrictions almost every irregular verbal form occurring in any known writer will be found, either expressly mentioned or sufficiently referred to in the present work.

- In the prosecution of Buttmann's first object, all verbs, whether regular or irregular, which are common in the best prose writers, are distinguished in this Catalogue by a larger type, so that the pure Attic usage of each verb is seen at one view. But any point requiring a more minute disquisition, any thing which seldom occurs in prose, which belongs to the

[^1]language of poetry or to the dialects, is added in a smaller character and in a separate paragraph. Those verbs also whose whole usage brings them under this second class are inserted in the same smaller type.

All themes and forms not actually occurring in any known writer, but which must be supposed in order to class with precision different verbs according to their respective families, are distinguished by capital letters, that the eye may not become accustomed to such unusual forms by seeing them printed in the common character. And, to spare the ear as much as possible the formation of these verbal stems into a present in $-\infty$, they are generally distinguished merely thus, ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \Delta-, \mathrm{AHB}^{\prime}$, \& c . If a theme however occurs but once in any genuine remains of antiquity, it appears in the Catalogue in the common character. At the same time it must be understood, that such an appearance does not necessarily prove the actual occurrence of the first person singular of the present. If there be found in actual usage any person of the present, or even of the imperfect (at least in most cases), it is considered quite sufficient to warrant this grammatical use of the whole or any part of the present tense.

The object of this Catalogue requires, strictly speaking, that the usage of every verb inserted in it should be given, wherever it does not follow of itself, at full length. As yet however this has been done very imperfectly; and it must therefore be premised, that wherever in the present work no future, aorist or perfect is expressly mentioned, the common fut. active, the aor. 1. or the perf. 1. (as the regular formation of the verb), is presumed to be in use, at least there is nothing to prove that it is not so. But as soon as, instead of either of the above, an aor. 2., or a perf. 2., or a fut. middle occurs, such tense is added by name. The word "Midd." standing alone, means that the middle voice of that verb is in use. The expression "Att. redupl." shows that the perfect has the Attic reduplication. Where it is said that " the pass. takes $\sigma$," it is to be understood as referring to the perf. and aor. 1. passive; this expression is however used only where that circumstance does not follow of itself. The frequent references to Buttmann's Lexilogus are to the English translation published in 1836.

The deponents are generally noticed as such, although properly speaking that point comes within the province of the Lexicon. When however they take in the aorist the middle form, they belong to this Catalogue, and the anomaly is marked by "Depon. midd.;" whilst "Depon. pass." added wherever the meaning appears to require the remark, shows that the verb still adheres to the passive formation.

Single forms occurring in any writer are generally referred back to the first person singular of the indicative of the particular tense. Occasionally, however, a person of the plural, a conjunctive, or a participle, is quoted alone; and this is done in many of the Epic, and rarer forms for the sake of greater accuracy and certainty; because it does not necessarily follow from the occurrence of any certain form, that the first person singular of the indicative of that tense must have been in use. And in general it is much more advantageous to the student, who has made a little progress in the language, that some forms actually occurring should be laid before him, which he understands grammatically, and which he may remember to have met with in the course of his reading, than that he should find one indicative grammatically framed, without being able to see to what forms of known and actual occurrence it is intended to lead him.

Whatever meaning - active, passive or middle, transitive or intransitive - is given to the present, the same is supposed to belong to every succeeding tense not expressly marked with a different meaning. If, for instance, under $\beta$ oúropal we find the
 passive, this shows that these are the only two forms which occur in the sense of the present $\beta$ oú $\lambda о \mu \alpha$, and consequently that there is no instance of an aorist $\dot{\varepsilon} 6 o u \lambda \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, or of a future


The insertion, in their alphabetical places, of supposed verbal stems or roots, is intended less for the accommodation of the student, than to complete the plan of the work: and this may be said not only of those which must necessarily be supposed in every methodical treatise of this kind, as $\Lambda H B-$ for $\lambda \hat{n} \psi o \mu \alpha!$, \# $\lambda \alpha \mathrm{B}_{\circ} \mathrm{v}$, but of many which are merely apparent, i. e. where a change, for which there is no foundation in the regular in-
flexion, but which has been effected by the operation of syncope or metathesis, is referred back to a root formed by that same figure; e. g. KMA-relates to Ká $\mu \nu \omega$.

As long as a form shall occur in any of the genuine remains of ancient Greek literature which is not to be found classed or explained in this Catalogue, it will not have attained that completeness which ought to be its aim. On the other hand, whatever occasional information may be gathered from dialects not used by any authors extant, belongs to the plan of this work no further than as it may elucidate the connection between forms and dialects.

The attempt, however, to make this Catalogue etymologically complete might, in some particular cases, produce confusion; as, for instance, when certain verbs, springing from the same stem or root with different yet cognate meanings, are placed together as belonging to one and the same verb. In such cases it is rather the province of grammar to keep separate what usage has already separated. Thus it is certain that $\left.\chi^{\alpha} \sigma x \omega, \chi^{\alpha}\right\} о \mu \alpha$, $\chi^{\alpha v \delta} \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ are etymologically the same, and yet each must be preserved distinct from the others, to render the explanation of
 the sense of containing, $\chi^{\dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota}$ to that of yielding, and $\chi \alpha \nu$ eiv to that of standing open; in order that, where it is not sufficiently clear from the context which of these different senses a form has, we may not be led to give it a meaning which does not belong to it.

I have extracted most of the preceding remarks and directions from Buttmann's Grammar, in which they form a kind of introductory chapter to his Catalogue of Verbs: to these I have prefixed a few observations explanatory of the work, and of my object in undertaking it; thus making them perform the double office of introduction and preface.

Of the work itself, I need only add, that, like the Lexilogus, of which $I$ offered to the public a translation about two years ago, it is a most extraordinary specimen of Buttmann's extensive research, and deep yet sound criticism. In some instances, indeed, he has only sketched an outline of the inflexions of a verb, which Passow in his Greek and German Lexicon has filled up. In these cases, or wherever else I found that the latter had
added any valuable information, I have availed myself of it, and, where it was possible, have attached the name of the author. When, however, that could not be so easily done, from the shortness of the quotation, or from its breaking into the middle of a paragraph, I have merely inserted it within brackets. Beside a few occasional remarks, entirely explanatory, and always distinguished by "Ed.," I have myself added nothing : it would have been indeed the height of presumption in me to imagine that I could improve, by adding to or taking away from, a subject which has been handled in so masterly a manner by Buttmann and Passow.

J. R. FISHLAKE.

Little Cheveret, Nov. 1837.

## IRREGULAR VERBS.

## A.

'Aáw, I harm, lead into error. Of this verb Homer has the 3. pres. pass. äãтaı*, the aor. 1. act. äara, cont. ã $\sigma a$ (Od. $\lambda, 61$.), and of the pass. and midd. áá $\sigma \theta \eta \nu$, ảa ${ }^{2} \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$, ä $\sigma a \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. Both alphas are common. Verbal adj. áãóg, whence with ả priv. áááoç (־_ニ~) inviolable.

Immediately from áá $\omega$ comes the subst. är $\eta$ with $a$ long; and from this latter, but with $a$ short $\dagger$, come two new forms, viz. 1.) $\dot{d} d \dot{d} \omega$ synonymous with $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \omega$, found only in the pres. and imperf. pass. ; $\dot{\tau} \tau \tilde{\omega} \mu a \iota$, I suffer harm, used by the Attic poets: 2.) áré $\omega$, with intrans. meaning, found only in II.v, 332. and Herodot. 7, 223. in the particip.


It may perhaps be thought that $A \Omega$ is the original form of this verb, and d $\dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \omega$, díd $\sigma \omega$ a resolution of it: but general analogy is contrary to the idea of a resolution, unless where there has been previously a contraction. As little disposed am I to consider $\dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\alpha} \omega$ the original, and that the $\tau$ was dropped afterwards. The true original form is $A F A \Omega$, as is evident from the Pindaric aüára (Pyth. 2, 28.), and the Laconian áábaktos (Hesych.) for dáarog. On the other hand the meaning of to satiate is classed under $a \omega \omega$, because in that meaning the double $a$ is rare and even suspicious. This is the only way of marking clearly the distinction between the two Homeric epithets dáaros (ááw) inviolable, and $\mathfrak{a}$ roç (á $\omega$ ) insatiable.
${ }^{*} \mathrm{AA} \Omega, I$ satiate. See "A $\omega$.
'A ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \ddagger, I$ deck, adorn: fut. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \check{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega}$; aor. ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \eta \lambda \alpha$,

[^2]Soph. Aj. 269. and Eurip. Suppl. 182. The former is decisive in favour of the length of the $\alpha$, in the latter it is uncertain. - ED.]
[ $\ddagger$ The active does not occur in Homer, Hesiod, or Herodotus. Pindar is the earliest writer in which it is found. - ED.]
arท̃ $\lambda \alpha \iota$（Eurip．Med．102\％．Lex．Seguer．p．328．）－Midd． á $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda о \mu \alpha$ ，I pride myself on，delight in：the aor．of this voice is nowhere found．
＂A ${ }^{\prime} \alpha \mu \alpha, I$ admire：Depon．Pres．and imperf．like

 ${ }^{\eta} \gamma \alpha \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ，but found also in Demosth．pro Cor．59．and Aristid．，and in Il．$\gamma, 181$ ．$\dot{\gamma} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha \tau 0$ ．

This family of verbs has in the Ionic dialect the collateral sense of to envy，to be indignant；but in the pres．it is only in the form aráo⿰亻⿱丶⿻工二十凵
 araiouat has it in Ionic prose also．The other tenses have both meanings in common，e．g．Il．$\rho, 71$ ．á $\gamma$ á $\sigma \sigma a \tau o$ ，he envied ；Od．$\sigma, 71$. á $\gamma$ á $\sigma$ avoo，they admired．
＂A 1 apact is used by all writers in a good sense．The above induc－ tion appears sufficient to confine $\dot{a} \gamma \tilde{\omega} \mu a \iota$ to the other meaning；to which one passage only，Od．$\pi, 203$ ．，seems at first sight to be an ex－ ception．But á $\boldsymbol{j}^{\prime} a \sigma \theta a \iota$ in that passage would be utterly superfluous， if we understand it in the sense of merely admiring（ $\mathrm{O} v i \tau \varepsilon$ Эav $\mu$ á $\varepsilon \varepsilon \iota$
 is heightened to the collateral idea of envy，i．e．Ulysses represents the excessive admiration of his son as bordering on envy or jealousy．

## ＇A ${ }^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \overline{\lambda \lambda} \lambda \omega$ ，I announce ：fut．${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \equiv \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ；aor．1．${ }^{\gamma} \gamma \gamma \leqslant \iota \lambda \alpha$ ． －Midd．

Besides the aor．1．we find not unfrequently both in act．and pass． the aor．2．also ；this tense however is not free from suspicion，as it de－
 Iph．A．353．（ $\delta o \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma^{\varepsilon} \lambda o \nu$ ），and in Thuc．8，86．（ $\left.\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma^{\varepsilon} \lambda o v\right)$ both the sense and the manuscripts are decidedly in favour of restoring the pres． and imperf．；and a little further on in the same chapter of Thucydides the aor． $1 . \dot{a} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda_{\varepsilon \nu}$ is actually restored to the text from the best manuscripts．The same has been done in Xen．Anab．3，4，14，where，con－ trary to Xenophon＇s usage，$\pi a \rho \eta \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon$ formerly stood．But in Lycurg． 18．p． 150,8 ．and 87．p．158，26．the manuscripts offer no alternative for $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\varepsilon} \nu,{ }_{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon}_{\xi} \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma_{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon$ ，but the imperfect，which does not suit the con－ text＊：and so in Plat．Meno 2．á $\pi a \gamma \gamma^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \lambda \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，though otherwise weakly

[^3][^4]supported, may be defended by the sense against the present, which is found in a great majority of the manuscripts. In Soph. CEd. T.955. the reading $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu$ is from Triclinius only; the Codd. and the old editions have $\boldsymbol{a}^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu$, which the glosses in the Cod. Lips. explain to be the aorist (see Hermann*), a tense much more natural in that passage than the future. Compare also the various reading $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \lambda \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$ in Eurip. Or. 1539. (1533. Matth.) and my note on Demosth. Mid. 11, 2. Least of all should I have thought of altering $\pi a \rho \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \dagger$ in the Ionic writer Herodotus, 9, 53., where Schweighäuser has adopted from the single Florentine manuscript an imperfect for which there are no grounds in the context. The aor. 2. pass. occurs in Eurip. Iph. T. 932. ( $\dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \lambda \eta \mathrm{\eta}$ ) without any various reading, although $\eta \gamma \gamma \gamma^{\varepsilon} \lambda \theta \eta \varsigma \ddagger$ would be admissible. In ÆI. V. H. 9, 2. occurs $\delta \imath \eta \gamma \gamma^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \lambda \eta$. In Plut. Galb. 25. $\dot{a} \pi \eta \gamma \gamma^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \lambda \eta \eta$. In $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \nu$ and ${ }^{\prime} \nu \varepsilon \gamma \kappa \varepsilon i v y$ the two aorists are so easily confounded, that great caution appears to me advisable in this verb also. Nor is it unworthy of consideration, that a form which undoubtedly existed (for this I think is proved by the number of instances adduced), should never have been branded as objectionable by any Atticist.

## 'A $\boldsymbol{\gamma s i} \rho \omega$, I collect together; Att. redupl.-Midd.

Of the aor. 2. midd. the Epic language has á $\gamma^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \rho \frac{1}{}$


From $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \theta o \mu a t$ an Epic sister-form of the perf. and imperf. midd. come $\eta^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rho^{\prime}$ धिovaat, -ovтo; to which we may without doubt refer the reading of Aristarchus $\eta \gamma \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, Il. $\kappa$, 127. instead of the common


We may certainly feel some hesitation in explaining á $\gamma^{\text {f }}$ poyтo II. $\beta$, 94. to be an aorist, and $\eta \gamma \varepsilon$ ípovтo $\beta$, 52. an imperfect, as there is no appearance of any thing in operation but Epic prosody, and Epic indistinctness between imperfect and aorist. But if the grammarian is not to be deterred in a similar case from distinguishing at II. $\beta, 106$. 171. है $\lambda_{c-}$ $\pi \varepsilon \nu$ and $\lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\pi} \pi \varepsilon$ (at least according to form) as aor. and imperf., as little must we hesitate here. And when at Il. $\beta, 52$. we read toì $\delta$ ' $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \ell \rho o v i o$
 identity of sense, while the tenses are unquestionably different. We must also recollect, that not only the accents, but even the very turns of thought, adapt themselves to the metre. At II. $\beta, 52$. $\eta$ уєipoveo at the side of $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \dot{\eta} \rho v \sigma \sigma o \nu$ is a very natural imperfect, and at v.94. áर'िovтo,

* [Hermann says this aor. is never used in tragedy - perhaps never at all by the older writers. On referring to the passage in question in Sophocles, the sense so plainly requires the future, that I feel cer-

[^5]it is true, stands in the midst of imperfects. But when it is said oi $\delta^{\prime}$
 now they were assembled [not assembling]: the crowd heaved restlessly." Besides, as áypó $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ (by syncope for à $\gamma \varepsilon \rho o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu \circ s$ ) is undoubtedly an aor. particip. assembled, so ajर́fovтo must in every instance be considered an aorist also. Nor is there anything in $\mathrm{Od} . \beta$, 385. to prevent our accenting, with Barnes and Porson, aj $\gamma \varepsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a l$, as this form is in all its relations a common aor. 2. (compare $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime} \iota \tau \varepsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ ), and the silent traditionary accent on an infinitive occurring but once. can be of no authority.-Compare ${ }^{\text {T}}$ Eypeo日at.

 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \nu 0$ र́ $\sigma \omega$, Demosth. c. Zenoth. p. 885. Conon. p. 1266. Theocrin. p. 1337. whence the passive sense of $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \neq 1$ in Demosth. pro Cor. p. 310. is less surprising. [Vid. Hemsterh. ad Thom. Mag. in v.]
'A ${ }^{\prime} \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ Od. $\psi, 95$. has a various reading $\alpha^{\gamma} \nu \omega$ ' $\omega \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \kappa$ as old as itself. These iteratives are sometimes formed from the aorists, some-

 Epic poets a instead of $\varepsilon$ after the characteristic of the present, as $\dot{\rho} i \pi \tau \alpha \sigma \kappa o v, \kappa \rho v ́ \pi \tau \alpha \sigma \kappa o v$, in which case they correspond in meaning with those formed from the aorists. Now there is nothing in the sense of Od. $\psi, 95$. to induce us to prefer either form. If we take $\boldsymbol{a} \gamma \nu \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$, it must be from the imperf. of $\boldsymbol{a} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ : if we decide in favour of the aorist, nothing appears more natural than á $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma a \sigma \kappa \varepsilon}$ for $\boldsymbol{a}^{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$, as Homer uses elsewhere the verb $\dot{a} \gamma \nu o \varepsilon \in \omega$ only, and this explanation. is supported by the $a \lambda \lambda{ }^{\prime} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma a \mathrm{~g}$ of Herodot. 1, 85.

${ }^{*}$ A $\gamma v{ }^{\prime} \mu$, I break (trans.): fut. ${ }^{\alpha} \xi \omega{ }^{*}$; the past tenses nave the syllabic augment: aor. act. ${ }_{\xi} \alpha \xi \xi \alpha$ (Il. $\eta, 270$. contr. $\eta_{\eta} \xi \alpha$, Il. $\psi, 392$. Od. $\tau, 539$.), aor. pass. ह́ $\begin{gathered}\alpha \\ \eta \nu \\ \text { with } \alpha \text { long: }\end{gathered}$ the perf. 2. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \bar{\alpha} \gamma \alpha$ (Sappho), Ion. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \eta \gamma \alpha$, has the passive or intransitive sense, I am broken $\uparrow$. - Midn.

The $a$ in this verb is originally long, as shown particularly in its derivatives ' $\bar{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\eta}, a^{\prime} \bar{a} \gamma \bar{\eta} s$, which are connected with ' $\varepsilon \dot{a} \gamma \eta \nu$ in the same way


[^6][^7]root is long in the aor. 2. pass. éćy $\eta \nu$, as we see from some passages of the Attics (Brunck on Aristoph. Ach. 928.), and from II. $\lambda, 558$. But it is also found in Epic poetry short; although, by the disappearance of the digamma, which belonged originally to this verb, as will be seen below, we cannot now ascertain in some passages the true Homeric form of this tense. See Heyne on I1. $\gamma, 367$., who tries to establish and not without probability, the digamma and the long a uniformly. In the latter poets, as Theocr. 22, 190. it is most certainly short. Compare $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$, of which the aor. 2. pass. retains its original length, but shortens the syllable when used in one particular sense.

The digamma, whence the irregular augment comes, is proved beyond a doubt to have originally belonged to this verb by the Hesiodic form каváそaıs ( $\varepsilon, 664.691$.), which can be explained in no other way. That is to say, FAzAI became in composition KAFFAzAI, as $\beta \dot{Z} \lambda \lambda \omega$ каGGá $\lambda \lambda \omega$. This spiritus, thus doubled and united by the metre, was of necessity retained here, while the digamma disappeared every where else. But by the intimate affinity, and in some respect identity, of the sounds U and $\mathrm{V}, \mathbf{r}$ and F , it passed over into $v$, and consequently with the $a$ into the diphthong av. See the same process in $\varepsilon v a \delta \varepsilon v$, under ${ }^{\text {A }} \mathrm{A} \nu \delta \alpha^{2} \nu \omega$.

This makes the occurrence of $\bar{\eta}^{\prime} \xi$ for $\begin{gathered} \\ \varepsilon\end{gathered} \xi_{\varepsilon}$ twice in Homer (Il. $\psi, 392$. Od. $\tau, 539$.) the more remarkable. In the same way Hippocrates has $\kappa a \tau \tilde{\eta} \xi a$ (Epidem. 5, 13.) ; but as he writes the substantives also ка́тŋ $\xi$ ¢я, ка́т $\eta \gamma \mu \alpha$ (De Artic. 16. 17. De Fract. 16. 28.), it would appear that in the Ionic dialect the whole formation, with the exception of the pres. and aor. 2. pass., had the $\eta$ in the root: in Homer on the other hand, who elsewhere invariably uses ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} a \xi a$, and, dropping the augment, $\ddot{\xi \xi \alpha \nu \tau o}$ Il. $\zeta, 40 . \pi, 371$. (see below the same form under 'A $\gamma \omega$ ), $\bar{\eta} \xi \alpha$ can be only the augment. If however we compare ár $\eta$, which comes from AFATA, we shall be the less surprised at $\bar{\eta} \xi a$ as a contraction from EFAZA.

It is far more astonishing to find that in this verb the augment is carried on even to forms in which it is naturally inadmissible, and that this takes place in very old writers. Thus Hippocrates has very commonly катєаүй, катєaүघi؟, as for instance in De Artic. 35. bis. Vectiar.


[^8]1．2．－Apollon．Rh．4，1686．has $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi \varepsilon a \gamma \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma a$ ，which metrical passage，in a poet of some antiquity and a learned grammarian，is of great weight． The passages quoted from the Attic writers must be left for future criticism ：Plat．Gorg．p．469．e．，see Heind．and Bekker；Lysias c． Sim．p．99．кateayєis，according to Bekker＇s MSS．кarayغis；ib． p．100，5．кareá $\check{\text { avteg without any various reading．}}$

In the other verbs which have this kind of augment，and which were in common use quite as much as the above，this irregularity is not found
 in Theod．Prodr．p．17．，$\dot{\varepsilon} \omega \nu \eta \sigma a \mu \dot{\epsilon} \eta \eta \nu$ in an inscription of a still later time in Chishull＇s preface to his Travels，p．6：and this gives additional importance to the antiquity of the examples from a $\gamma v v \mu \mu$ ，in which verb thisirregularity was probably introduced and sanctioned by usage earlier than it was in others，in order to avoid confusion with äy ${ }^{\circ}$ and ärт $\omega$ ．

Of the latter forms ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ and кará $\sigma \sigma \omega$ for ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \nu v \mu$ ，Schneider in his Lexicon quotes the Schol．Hom．，Celsus ap．Orig．7．p．368．，Hesych． v．äभvutov and $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \nu \tilde{\eta} \lambda a u$, Artemid．sæpe；and from Æisop．August．F． 3. 55．and 213．the form катєáббш．
＇A ${ }^{2}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \sigma a \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$

＇Aropfíw．See Eineiv．
 common interjectional particles，like age in Latin and tenez in French． The rest of the verb disappeared before aip＇$\omega$ ，leaving some derivatives． One instance of the indic．remains in a fragment of Archil．in Br ．Anal． 1，41．For a more detailed account see Buttm．Lexilog．p．20，\＆c．
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \gamma \chi^{\omega}$, I choke，transitive．Midd．intransitive．
${ }^{*} A \gamma \omega$, I lead：fut．${ }^{\prime} \xi \omega$ ；takes in the aor．2．the redu－



[^9]$\dagger$ With dyhoxa we may class some other anomalous forms which change their vowel to o in both perfects ：${ }^{1} \beta \rho \sigma=\gamma \alpha$（perf．
 ПЕТ $\Omega, \pi i \pi \tau \omega$ ．e $\dagger \omega \theta \alpha$ for $\epsilon i \theta \alpha$ from $\theta \omega$ ．

 （whence in N．T．à申é $\omega \nu \tau a i$ ）for Eľa，

 evhnvoxa from ENEKA．And the very defective Epic perfects औvova，àŋضvo日a，

midd. rं ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \nu$, seldom in the Attic, but its compounds frequent in Herodotus: perf. pass, クั $\gamma \mu \alpha \iota$. - Midd.

For a full account of $\dot{a} \gamma^{n} o \chi^{\alpha}$ see Buttm. Lexilog. pp. 116. 139. The use of this form in the letter of Philip and in the resolution of the people in Demosth. pro Cor. p. 238. 249., in Lysias ap. Phrynich. p. 121. and in Aristot. EEcon. 1, 7. shows that it was an old and familiar form, which, being in no respect worse than $\varepsilon \in \delta \dot{\partial} \delta o k a$, recom-
 place of $\tilde{\eta}_{k a}$.* The Attic writers, however, preferred the shorter form. See $\pi \rho o \tilde{\eta}^{\alpha}$ a in Reisken's Ind. ad Demosth. $\sigma v \nu \bar{\eta} \chi{ }^{\text {as }}$ in Xen. Mem. 4, 2,8. note. In general the perfect was avoided as much as possible; and hence the later grammarians sometimes marked $\tilde{\eta} \chi^{a}$ as obsolete, sometimes rejected árnoxa as bad Attic. See Dorvo ad Charit. p. 481. (494.) Lob. ad Phryn. p. 121.

An aor. 1. $\bar{\eta} \xi a$, ảzac was also in use, but rejected by the Attics. It is found however in $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \tilde{\eta} \xi a \nu$, Thuc. 2, 97., in $\ddot{\xi} \xi \alpha \iota$, Antiph. 5, 46.

 many other passages which need the examination of the critic. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 287. 735. In Aristoph. Ran. 468. $\dot{a} \pi \tilde{\eta} \xi{ }_{\xi}{ }_{c}$ is from $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\prime} \tau \tau \omega$; hence the latest editors have distinguished it by the $\iota$ : see áï $\sigma \sigma \omega$.
 is one of those aor. 2. which take the characteristic $\sigma$ of the aor. 1 . but are commonly mistaken for anomalous derivatives of the fut. 1. Homer uses it instead of áyáy $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$, which would not be admissible in the hexameter; ä $\gamma a \gamma \varepsilon$ he does use at II. $\omega, 337$. With this form we may join $\dot{a} \xi \in \mu \varepsilon \nu$, Il. $\omega, 663$. as inf. aor. for $\mathfrak{a} \xi a \iota$ or $\dot{\alpha} \gamma а \gamma \varepsilon \tau \nu$.
'ALEOMAI. The reading á $\gamma \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \mu \varepsilon v o v$ in Herodot. 3, 14. might be adopted without hesitation, if Schæfer's opinion, that this too is cor-

'A $\delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma a$, to feel dislike. Of this verb Homer has in the Odyssey the forms $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\delta} \eta \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon$ and $\dot{a} \dot{\delta} \eta \kappa \dot{o} \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon$, which are generally connected with тò ádoc, II. $\lambda, 88$.; and as this last has the first syllable short, but the two others have it always long, they are written, according to the example of some of the grammarians, $\dot{\alpha} \delta \delta \dot{\delta} \eta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu, \dot{a} \delta \delta \delta \eta \kappa \dot{\sigma} \tau \varepsilon$. See this point discussed in Lexilog. p. 22. : see also $\tilde{\alpha} \sigma a t$, to satiate, under "A $\omega$.

[^10][^11]The future midd. is Attic (Aristoph.) ; see Piers. ad Mœr. p. 38. : $\dot{d} \varepsilon \dot{\theta} \sigma \omega, \stackrel{q}{q} \sigma \omega$, is in other dialects, Theogn. 4. Theocr. 7, 72. 78. The imperative ádicoo is one of those aor. 2. which take the characteristic $\sigma$ of the aor. 1. See above ${ }^{2} \xi \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$, under "A $\gamma \omega$.

Hermann has very properly defended áeiaro in the 17th Hom. Hymn against $\dot{d} \varepsilon \dot{\delta} \delta \varepsilon o$ (in Hymn 20., where $\dot{d} \varepsilon i \delta \delta \varepsilon o$ stands without any known various reading, it must remain); for áeíoouat as active is an unheard-of form. Now as the aor. midd. of ásióo and $\alpha_{\alpha} \delta \omega$ is equally unknown, this ásiofo may be an imperative formed from the future $\dot{\text { двiбонаи. But there are as little grounds in common usage for the }}$

 does to $\tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha$ and $\ddot{q} \sigma o \mu a \iota$, it appears that the aor. midd. of some verbs, as well as the fut. midd., had in the old language a purely active meaning. See also Lexilog. p. 226. note.

'Aєíò. See "Å̀ $\omega$.
'Аєíp. See Aíp
'A $\mathrm{A} \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$. See $\mathrm{A} \mathrm{u}^{\prime} \xi \omega$,
"A $\eta_{p}$ R. See "Aw.
 aor. 1. pass. $\gamma \dot{\gamma} \hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; aor. 1. midd. $\eta \dot{\partial} \delta \sigma \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$. The aor. pass. and midd. have the same meaning; but in the Attic language $\alpha i \delta \varepsilon ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha!$ refers to the person who has committed a shameful action with the meaning of to pardon. [See Demosth. Aristocr. 72.]

An old poetical form of the present is ai $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \mu a \iota^{*}$, from which arose the one in common use. It never has the augment : aidíro. Of the


Aivé $\omega \dagger$, I praise : fut. aiv $\varepsilon \sigma \omega \ddagger$; aor. ท้้ $\nu \in \sigma \alpha$; perf. act. ク้้นย $r_{2}^{2} \nu \eta \sigma \alpha$, in the Epic poets and Pindar.

Aivíбооць, I speak enigmatically: Depon. midd.

[^12][^13]A'vvpau, I take. Only pres. and imperf. : without augment therefore, ailvvio. [Hom. and Hes.]


 -Midd.-Verbal adj. aiperós, -śos. Compare ‘A入íбхоцци.

A less frequent future is $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \tilde{\omega}$; thus we find $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega}$, Aristoph. Equ.
 guer. p. 80, 12., and occasional examples down to the latest writers.

The aor. 1. $\eta$ ip $p \sigma a$ too is found in the common language; and even
 as a false reading. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 716.

The Ionians have a peculiar reduplication for the perfect, úpaip $\eta \kappa \alpha$, dipaipquat with the spir. lenis, the usual form in Ionic prose for the


 writers, as the Alexandrine, the Orphic poems, \&ce., are regula gor. 1. by virtue of the characteristic ; but as only the aor. 2 . of these verbs, Eĩov, $\varepsilon^{u}$ are instances of the change of termination from the aor. 2. to the aor. 1. which took place in some unformed dialects. Other terminations beside the 1. pers. sing., as for instance the 2. pers. in as, the infin. in $a t$, the part. in ag, are seldom found, but in their place the regular terminations of the aor. $2 .+$ Hence it is clear that the indiscriminate use of $\varepsilon \bar{i} \pi \sigma \nu$ and $\varepsilon i \pi a$, of $\eta \dot{\eta} \nu \gamma \kappa \circ \nu$ and $\eta \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \kappa \kappa a$, in the oldest and best writers, arises from the same change: all which tends to prove the original identity of the two aorists. - In the aor. 2. midd.

 26., we have the same mixture of termination ; of this the later writers furnish most frequent instances, but the older Ion. dialect is not without them. On these two forms, and the 2. pers. $\varepsilon$ il $\lambda \omega$, see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 139. 183. The Homeric $\gamma^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau o$ will be found in its alphabetical place.

## Aipw (Att. and poet. $\dot{\alpha} \varepsilon i p \omega$, I raise) is formed regularly

[^14]chius. In the above examples we must not overlook one thing, that only the terminations of the aor. 1. are adopted; the formation of the root remains the same,

according to the rules of verbs having as their characteristic


The Attics were enabled to use the $a$ of the fut. long because $\dot{\alpha} \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$ is contracted from á $\varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \omega$. As the same thing is expressly mentioned by one of the grammarians with regard to $\phi$ aiv $\phi \quad \phi \quad \nu \hat{\omega}$, there is no doubt of it in the present instance, although most of the cases that occur are still under the consideration of the critic. In many passages, where for instance the text has the present of aip or aipé $\omega$, all becomes correct by adopting some form of 'āן : and in Eurip. Iph. T. 117. the emendation of $\dot{\alpha} \rho o \tilde{v} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ is indeed confirmed by all the manuscripts.* In Æschyl. Pers. 797. ápoṽ $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ is likewise the old and acknowledged reading : and in Eurip. Heracl. 323. ápw̃, in Iph. A. 125. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi a \rho \varepsilon \tau$, and in Tro. 1148. ápoũ $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ are, according to this analogy, placed beyond a doubt both by the sense and context. $\dagger$ This however need not make us doubt the correctness of the form ápẽ with a short ; as in Soph. Aj. 75. ápeĩs and in ©ed. Col. 460. á $\rho \varepsilon i \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, stand in the Iambic place.

The aor. 2. active is never used in any of its forms; but in the middle, Homer has the aor. 1. in the augmented indicative only ( $\quad$ ifá$\mu \varepsilon \theta a$, йрaтo), and without the augment the aor. 2. á $\rho \dot{\rho} \mu \eta \nu$; in all the
 Tragedians were able to use the same moods when the metre allowed
 1. of which the $a$ is long.

For äшpтo see note on áynoxa under "A $\gamma \omega$, and Lexilog. p. 135. \&c.
 lengthened from ásípoual, with the quantity of the root changed.


And lastly by resolution into - $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \omega$ comes the form aipєvi $\mu \varepsilon \nu 0$ g for aipó $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ in Hes. $\varepsilon 474$., where however it has been hitherto obscured by a mistaken reading in almost all the manuscripts of 及ıóroo épév$\mu \varepsilon \nu o \nu$, and still more by the present $\beta$ oórov aipéjusvov. The poet is speaking of the vessels being all full, and he then says, kai $\sigma \varepsilon$
 from the stores which are therein :" this is the only natural construc-


[^15][^16]certain by comparing it with both the earlier and later Ionisms $\pi \tau \in \in \xi \varepsilon v \nu$, $\pi \tau \varepsilon \zeta \varepsilon \dot{v} \mu \varepsilon \nu \circ \varrho, \pi \iota \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \varsigma, \& c$. And this, which is the only true reading, is actually preserved in the Etym. M., but in an article disfigured by mistakes.*
 $\mu \eta \nu$; fut. $\alpha i \sigma \theta \eta \dot{\gamma} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. $\gamma^{\prime} \sigma \theta_{o}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu . \dagger$ [Later writers have also a passive form $\alpha i \sigma \theta \gamma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, as the LXX.]

Aí $\sigma \theta$ ouat also must have been in use, as some grammarians have wished to distinguish it from aiఠӘávo $\mu$ at ; see Lex. Seguer. pp.183. 216. 359. : and in Plat. Rep. 10. p.608, a. Bekker has adopted from the manuscripts ai $\sigma \theta o \dot{\mu} \mu \theta a$ instead of ai $\sigma \theta \dot{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \theta a$, which does not suit the passage. See also Isocr. Nicocl. p. 28. Steph. according to Bekker's reading; Fronto, Epist. ad Marc. 1, 8, 4. where see the Add.
'A $\bar{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \omega$ (in Hom. a depon. pass. also), I rush, hasten. In the Attics a dissyllable, and even in the Tragedians



From the subst.äises we may conclude that the $\iota$ in the complete form is long by nature, and therefore the infin. aor. must be accented áḯat.

The pretended syncopated form $\sigma v \nu a i k \tau \eta \nu$ in Hes. $a$, 189. must now yield to the true form $\sigma v v^{\prime} \gamma^{\gamma} \delta \eta \nu$, as Gaisford reads it.

## Ai $\sigma \chi^{\dot{u} \nu \omega, ~ I ~ m a k e ~ a s h a m e d, ~ t r e a t ~ i n ~ a ~ s h a m e f u l ~ m a n n e r: ~}$

[^17]now comes aipoúpevov or aipé́uevov. Whether the reading of the Hesiodic manuscripts from which Grevius quotes be aipeúpevoy, or whether it be aipev́uevov, which he rejected without mentioning it, is uncertain.

+ Verbs of three or more syllables in ávow and some in alyo come from a redical form without the alpha, which supplies it with some tenses as formed from
 aor. $\mathrm{E}_{6} \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau 0 \nu$, fut. $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \omega$ : see also



$\ddagger$ Most probably the iota subscript in the Attic forms may be ascribed to the accuracy of the grammarians. See Hemst. ad Plut. 733. Valck. ad Phœeniss. 1388. and compare the various readings of the passages there mentioned. In pronunciation it was naturally distinguished by lengthening the $\alpha$.
pass. $I$ am dishamed; perf. pass. $\gamma_{1} \sigma \chi \nu \mu \mu \iota^{*}$, part. $\gamma_{j} \sigma \chi \nu \mu-$ $\mu^{\prime} \nu$ vos, Il. $\sigma, 180$. with a genuine various reading $\gamma_{n} \sigma \chi^{\cup} \mu$ évos.


## Aitśc,$I$ ask.-Midd.

Aitıর́opкィ, I accuse: Depon. midd.

## 'Aîu, I hear. Used only in pres. and imperf.

Verbs beginning with $a, a v$, and $o u$, followed by a vowel, have no
 but the $a$ if short becomes long, therefore "äöv, \&c. O"o are exceptions; as is also $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\eta} \dot{i} \sigma a$ (from $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi a \hat{i} \omega$, Herodot. 3, 29. Heind. Plat. Hipp. Maj. p. 289. E.), Herodot. 9, 93. Apoll. Rhod. 1, 1023. 2, 195. with the augment and $\iota$ short.
[Passow in his Lexicon marks áte $\omega$ - --, and says that in Hom. the first syllable is short whenever the third is long. In the Tragedians it is common, Seidl. Eurip. Tro. 156. The iota is much oftener short than long, Heyne Il. o, 252. Spohn Hes. E, 215.]
'Aках ${ }^{\prime} \zeta \omega$, transit. Igrieve, vex any one. The theme AX $\Omega$ gives the fol-
 mon use. From the same aor. as a new theme $\ddagger$ came the fut. áкaх $\eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega$, Hymn. Merc. 286., and again an aor. 1.ảкá $\chi \eta \sigma$, I1. $\psi, 223$. - Midd. äरo-


 is most probably a corruption of ák $\begin{aligned} & \text { f́arat, which is a various reading, } \\ & \text {, }\end{aligned}$ is regular, and supported by áкахєiato, Il. $\mu$. 179. (while for the $\delta$ there are no grounds whatever). -To the same intransitive meaning of the middle "belongs also the part. pres. act. á $\chi^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} \omega \nu$, -ovaa, grieving, lamenting.
'Aках $\mu$ '́vos, sharpened, pointed. Hom. - If this perf. part. pass. (the only part of the verb which occurs) be compared with the substantive $\dot{a} \kappa \dot{\eta}$ and $\dot{a} \kappa \omega \kappa \eta$, a point, it leads us to a verb AK $\Omega$ (acuo), because the

[^18]tense, were taken very naturally new


 never in existence.
§ The perfect passive, as well as the other perfects, is intimately connected with the present; and as the terminations are similar in the infinitive and participle, this affinity can only be shown by adopting the accent of the present; thus $₹ \lambda \eta \lambda \lambda \alpha \mu a t$,
 many others.
$\chi$ of the perf. act. before the $\mu$ is not changed into $\gamma$. For the $a$ instead of $\eta$ in the second syllable see below, note*.
'Ахє́онаı, I heal, cure: Dep. midd. Fut. $\alpha x$ '́ о $\mu \alpha$; the perf. takes the $\sigma$. [The act. is found once in Hippocr. Loc. in Homin. c. 5. The aor. pass. $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \varepsilon \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ has a pass. sense in Pausan. 2, 27, 3. 'Аxeıó $\mu$ vyog is a false reading for
 ह, 383. Il. $\pi$, 29.-Passow.]
'Aкŋ́бєбєข. See Кй $\delta \omega$.
'Ажоv́ш, I heart: fut. midd. ג́хои́боцдı; perf. Att.
 The pass. takes $\sigma$, and the perf. pass. is formed without re-

'Ахроќонки, I hear: Depon. midd. The fut. is dंжpoó$\sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$, not - $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, an exception to the general rule. Of this verb the 2. pers. $\dot{\alpha} \times \rho о \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha l$, $\dot{x} \times \rho о \tilde{\alpha} \sigma$, for $\dot{\alpha} x \rho о \tilde{\alpha}$, $\dot{\eta} x \rho о \tilde{\omega}$, was also in use among the Attics: the former occurs in Lex. Seguer. p. 77, 22., and the latter at p. 98. is quoted from Antiphanes. See Piers. ad Moer. p. 16. Lex. Seguer. p. 18, 10.
'Алала́ $\omega \omega, I$ shout: fut. - $\xi \omega$, \&c.

'Алалúктпиаи. See 'Аликтє́ш.
 aor. $\eta^{\lambda} \lambda \eta \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$, poet. $\alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$.-Passow.]

The Epic form $\dot{a} \lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \mu \mu \iota, \dot{a} \lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \sigma a l, \dot{a} \lambda a \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, with the meaning of a present, is supposed to be a form in $\mu$, according to the analogy of á $\eta \mu a \iota, \delta i \zeta \eta \mu a \iota$ : but there are no grounds for such an idea; for the accent of the present in these forms is no proof, being found also in



[^19][^20]similar to that of the perfect，that usage is constantly confounding them．See Buttm．Lexilog．pp．112．and 202．note．
＇Adoai ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ，I make large and strong．The present is found in the later Epic poets，as Nicand．Alex．402．Homer has $\eta \hat{\lambda} \delta{ }^{2} a v \varepsilon$, Od．$\sigma, 70$. $\omega, 768$ ．where，particularly in the second passage，it appears to be com－ pletely an aorist．At II．$\psi, 599$ ．stands the intransitive ád $\delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega \dagger$ ，to grow，increase．Other forms are not found in the older poets；Schneider in the Supplement to his Lexicon has collected those which occur in the later $\ddagger$ ；among them is the intransitive ä $\lambda \delta \partial \mu a t$ in Nicander，for which undoubtedly he had an older precedent：compare $a ̈ \lambda \theta o \mu u t, \dot{a} \lambda \theta a i \nu \omega$ ． From this came the verbal adj．$\dot{a} \lambda \tau o ́ s$, whence in Homer ${ }^{\text {äv } v a \lambda \tau o s, ~ i n s a-~}$ tiable，literally whom nothing fills and nourishes，Od．$\rho, 228 . \sigma, 113.363$.
＇$А \lambda \varepsilon i \phi \omega$, I anoint：［fut．$-\psi \omega$ ，aor．$\eta^{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon \iota \psi \alpha$ ；aor．pass． ク่ $\lambda \varepsilon^{\prime} \phi \theta \eta \nu$ ；aor．2．conjunct．$\varepsilon^{\prime} \xi \alpha \lambda \iota \emptyset \tilde{r}$, Plat．Phædr．p．258， B．as restored by Bekker from the best Manuscripts．Midd．
 भ้ $\lambda о \iota ф \alpha$ ，the Att．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\gamma} \lambda \backslash \emptyset \propto$（Demosth．in Callipp．29．），and the pass．$\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \dot{\gamma}^{\prime} \lambda \iota \mu \mu \propto \iota$ were in post－Homeric use．－Passow］．

In the Attic reduplication á $\lambda \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \phi \omega$ ，like á $\kappa o v i \omega$ ，takes a short vowel in the third syllable，even shortening the vowel of the root：á $\lambda \varepsilon i \phi \omega$ ，
 $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon \epsilon \pi \tau a l$ ；but whether this be a correct form，or a false reading for $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \pi \tau a \iota$ or $\ddot{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon \iota \pi \tau a \iota$ ，is uncertain．
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \lambda \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \xi \mathrm{\xi}, 1$ ward off，and in the midd．I ward off from myself：fut．act．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \xi \dot{\xi} \sigma \omega$ ，fut．midd．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \xi \xi_{\dot{\gamma} \sigma o \mu \alpha ı ; ~ a o r . ~}^{\text {a }}$


See Schneid．on Xenoph．Anab．1，3，6．From the aor．1．act．，formed according to the analogy of the future，come the Homeric $\dot{d} \lambda \varepsilon \xi \xi^{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ and $\dot{a} \pi a \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\xi} \eta \sigma a \iota \mu$ ．There are no grounds in Pind．Ol．13，12．for a


[^21][^22]and is thought suspicious（see Schneid．）in Xenophon，appears certain in Sophocl．©Ed．T．171．and particularly 539.

The Poets have in the active the aorist ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \kappa \kappa \nu \nu, \dot{a} \lambda a \lambda \kappa \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu, \dot{a} \lambda a \lambda \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu^{*}$ ， with the reduplication $\dagger$ from $A \Lambda K \Omega$ ，whence $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$ and $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \alpha ́ \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ ．
 $\dot{\Delta} \lambda a \lambda \kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ．

A present $\dot{\alpha} \lambda e ́ r \kappa \omega$ appears to have been actually used by the epigram－ matic poet Diodorus（Epig．1．Anthol．6，245．），although it is only as a conjecture instead of the á $\lambda$ ह́ $\gamma o \iota s$ of the manuscript．Still，however，the early existence of this theme would not even then be proved，as these later poets occasionally made a form from analogy．But this $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \kappa \kappa$ bears the same relation to the forms which we have seen above from
 p．132．From the aorist of this verb ${ }^{\lambda} \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \xi\{a \iota$ was formed the present in common use $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \dot{\xi}, \omega$ ，which then took again its own proper inflexion $\dot{a} \lambda \varepsilon \xi \dot{\xi} \dot{\eta} \sigma$ ．In the same way the similar verb $\mathfrak{d} \tilde{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$ ，av̀ $\mathfrak{\xi} \omega$ ，arose from the root AEL－AYF－，which beside that has produced only the Latin verb．
＇A $\lambda$＇$\omega \ddagger$ ，I bruise or stamp to pieces，grind：fut．$\alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \omega$ ， Att．$\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ；imperf．$\eta^{\eta} \lambda \frac{u \nu}{}$ ；perf．act．Att．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \alpha$ ；perf． pass．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \mu \propto \iota$［altered by Bekker in Thucyd．4，26．to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon \mu \alpha!$ ，but still an undoubted form in Amphis ap． Athen．14．p．462，A．and in Herodot．7，23．－Passow．］ The later writers used in the present $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \omega$ ，which how－ ever was still an ancient form．See Piers．ad Moer．p． 17. Lobeck ad Phryn．p． 151.
 doubtful．From this present we find $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \mu a t$ for－oũ $\mu \alpha$, Theogn． 575.
 $\varepsilon, 533 . \dot{v} \pi a \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \sigma$, ib．758．The aorist is the aor．1．without $\sigma: \dot{a} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$
 therefore is as to form undecided between the pres．and aor．At Od．$\xi$ ， 400．$\dot{a} \lambda \varepsilon v \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau a t$ is the conjunctive shortened according to the custom of

[^23][^24]the Epic poets＊；and at $\omega$ ，29．the same form standing instead of the future may serve for the pres．indic．as well as the conjunctive．

In the Attic poetry occurs also an act．${ }^{\lambda} \lambda \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega$ with the regular aorist （ $\eta \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon v \sigma a) \dot{a} \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{v} \sigma a \iota$ ．Its exact causative meaning，as deduced from that of $\dot{d} \lambda \varepsilon \dot{v} \rho \mu a t$ ，is to snateh away，protect；and in this sense $i t$ is quoted from Sophocles in Lex．Seguer．6．p．383，4．（ả入є́vo $\omega, \phi u \lambda a ́ \xi \omega)$ ）．In Æschyl． Sept．141．also nothing is wanting to ä $\lambda \varepsilon v \sigma o \nu$ but to supply $i \mu a ̃{ }_{s}$ ：while ib．88．and Suppl．544．have the accus．of the evil to be warded off；and at Prom．567．with ád $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon$ either sense is admissibile．

An Epic present is $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon i \nu \omega \dagger$ ，but with the meaning of the middle $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ éo $\mu \alpha \iota$ ．Compare épeєiva．

${ }^{*} \mathrm{~A} \lambda \theta o \mu a t$ ，to heal，i．e．become healed［there is no known instance of the pres．act．or pass．－Passow．］：imperf．pass．$\ddot{\lambda} \lambda \theta_{\varepsilon \tau \tau}$, Il．$\varepsilon, 417$ ．；fut． $\dot{a} \lambda \theta \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, Il．$\eta, 405$ ．，but in this latter passage there are doubts both of the sense and reading ：see Heyne．To this intransitive sense was added a causative one，I heal，i．e．I cure，which assumed different forms； $\dot{a} \lambda \theta a i \nu \omega, \dot{a} \lambda \theta \dot{i} \sigma \kappa \omega$ or $\dot{a} \lambda \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ or $\dot{a} \lambda \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \omega \ddagger$ ，whence the fut． $\dot{a} \lambda \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．；which forms are found in the Ionic prose of Hippocrates and others，but still need the help of the critic．See Foës．CEc．Hippocr．
＇A入ivò ．See Kv入ivò $\omega$ ．
 verb．the active is not in use，but its place is supplied by $\alpha i \rho \varepsilon \tilde{\nu}$, of which again $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \pi o \mu \alpha \iota$ is used as the passive，and always in the same or a cognate sense．It forms its other
 additional irregularity，that aorist and perfect have the passive sense in the active form §：aor．${ }^{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$（Herodot．3， 15．Xen．Anab．4，4，21．），Att．é $\alpha \lambda \omega \nu \|$ ，with $\alpha$ long；the other moods with $\alpha$ short，as opt．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ oinv（11．$\chi, 253$ ．），and Ion．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega^{\prime} \eta \nu$（Hom．sæpe），conj．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\omega} s$, ，\＆c．，infin．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \alpha u$ ，

[^25][^26] Thucyd．and Demosth．］；Ion．and Att．$\eta$ ク̈шж $\alpha$ ．The fut． is from the middle voice，$\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ．－See＇Ava入i $\sigma \varkappa \omega$ ．

The augment of $\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu$ deserves particular attention．It is not merely the syllabic augment before the vowel of the root；but，as this vowel is long in $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{a} \lambda \omega \nu$ while it is short in $\dot{a} \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu a t, \& c$ ，the length of the $a$ must be looked upon as a parallel case to the $\omega$ in $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \omega \rho \omega \nu$ ．Be－ sides，in $\eta \dot{j} \lambda \omega \nu$ the regular augment is as old as the other，and as early
 is properly the Attic form．In the perfect this is reversed；$\eta \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha$ is a strict Atticism，and éá $\lambda \omega \kappa a$ the common form．See Dawes＇s Misc． p．315．and Piers．ad Moer．p．178．But this éá $\lambda \omega \kappa \alpha$ is distinguished from $\varepsilon \in \lambda \omega \nu$ by the quantity of the $\alpha$ ，the reason of which it is difficult to ascertain．＊Compare éópaка and note under＇Opá $\omega$ ．

Homer has once（Il．$\varepsilon, 487$ ．）the long $a$ in a form which has not the augment，the part．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda o ́ v \tau \varepsilon$ ，which appears to be the original quantity： compare ávä入iбкш．
＇A $\lambda \iota \tau a i \nu \omega$ ，to commit a fault，sin against：fut．ả $\lambda \iota \tau \eta ́ \sigma \omega$ ；aor．act． $\eta \eta^{\prime} \lambda$ erov $\dagger$ ，aor．mid．á $\lambda \iota \tau$ о́ $\mu \boldsymbol{y}$ ．The act．and mid．have the same meaning．［Homer uses only the above two aorists．］

The Epic language has also a participle used like an adjective， $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \varsigma \ddagger$ in an act．sense，sinning，Od．$\delta, 807$ ，Hes．$\alpha, 91$ ．§ This form may be considered as a shortened perf．（for $\left.\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \tau \eta \epsilon \varepsilon \nu^{\prime}\right)$ ），or a syn－ copated aorist（like $\left.\beta \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\boldsymbol{\prime}}\right)$ ：as regards its active sense we may compare it with the similar passive part．$\pi \varepsilon \phi v \gamma \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu o s, ~ \grave{\text { ¿ó } \mu \varepsilon \nu о \varsigma . ~}$

[^27]But considered accurately I cannot ac－ knowledge it to besuch．The utmost we can draw from the Schol．of Tzetzes is that some old grammarians thought there was mean－ ing enough in the common reading $\alpha \lambda$－ тhuevov to explain it as synonymous with $\zeta \lambda \iota \tau \delta \mu \eta \nu o \nu$ ，which Homer uses with refe－ rence to the same Eurystheus（but not as an epithet），so that $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \tau \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \eta \nu=s$ or $\dot{\alpha} \lambda เ \tau \eta-$ $\mu \in \nu o s$ might be each formed from $\mu \eta \nu$ ac－ cording to the difference of the rhythm． Let any one read now the gloss in the Etym．M．and he will see at once that the statement there given is the same，and that àıt $\eta$ uepos is an error of transcription； for in the whole passage nothing is men－ tioned but the derivation from $\mu \eta \nu$ ，where－ as if the etymologist had really used the other word，he must have given his rea－ sons for it．
'A入íw. See Kv入ívo $\omega$.

'A $\lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \alpha \sigma \omega,-\tau \tau \omega$, I change. [Aor. 1. pass. ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \chi{ }^{\theta} \eta \nu$, always in Herodot., frequently in the Traged., sometimes in Aristoph.] Aor. 2. rj $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu$, common in Attic prose.
"A $\lambda \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota, I$ leap. Usage seems balanced between the two aorists, $\dot{\gamma} \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \nu, ~ \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha r$ (with $\alpha$ long), and $\dot{\gamma} \lambda \dot{o} \mu \eta \nu$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha l$ (with $\alpha$ short); but the forms $\eta_{\eta} \lambda \alpha \tau 0, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 c$ and


The Epic language has the syncopated aorist, which takes the lenis, and from which come the 2. and 3. pers. ${ }^{\mathcal{3}} \lambda \sigma \sigma$, ${ }^{\tilde{a}} \lambda \tau o$; part. ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \mu \varepsilon \nu o \varsigma$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi t a ́ \lambda \mu \varepsilon \nu o s . \dagger$ The long a of the indicative of this form, which is shown by the circumflex, is an augment after the Doric manner; whence $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tilde{a} \lambda \tau o$ not $\ell \notin \pi \lambda \tau \sigma$. The conjunct. which does not admit of such a syncope, is the conjunct. of the regular aor. 2. $\alpha \lambda \eta \tau \alpha \iota$, and this shortened (according to note on 'A $\lambda$ éo $\mu a \iota$ ) becomes ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda_{\varepsilon \tau}$, , which some of the grammarians have likewise written with the lenis, but on false grounds. $\ddagger$
> ' $А \lambda о \alpha ́ \omega, I$ thrash : fut. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \circ \gamma \dot{\sigma} \sigma$, and in the older Attics - $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$. The greater number of examples are in - $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \omega$ : see

[^28]the oldest times, as is clear from the Scholia on the Homeric passages (II. $\lambda$, 192. $\phi .536$.) and the copies of the Grammarians. In this however it is to be observed, that those who wrote $\alpha_{\lambda \eta \tau a t}$ derived the word, inverting the usual way, from à̀n̂vas; although they could not decide between the two spiritus; see Schol, on both the above passages :-but those who classed the word with $\alpha \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, did not change the aspirate ; see Eustath. and Schol. Min, ad $\lambda$, 192. Now as the grounds for the spiritus of $\overline{d x o}$, which were touched on in the last note, cannot (look at them in what light we will) be applicable to $\alpha \lambda \eta \tau \alpha t$, so neither is there any thing throughout to direct us to $\% \lambda \eta \tau a s$ with the lenis; and analogy therefore requires us to write da $\alpha \lambda \tau a t$, and to join it to the regular aor. 2., which had as good a title, through that ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \tau 0$, to be admitted
 belongs б̈рचтаи) has through ఙิрто. Beside the above, Homer has also once the aor. 1.


Valck. ad Ammon. 1, 4. p. 21. s. Lex. Seguer. p. 379, compared with p. 16. p. 270, 27. and Thom. Mag. in voc. [Att. $\alpha \lambda \lambda_{0} \alpha \omega$; Poet. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda o \Delta \alpha ́ \omega$. -Passow.]

 Beside Homer, Hippocrates, according to Erotian, used this present
 á $\lambda v \kappa \tau$ á $\zeta \omega$ (Herodot. 9, 70.) are analogous sister-forms. We abandon therefore all analogy when we attempt to make $\dot{\alpha} \lambda a \lambda \dot{v} \kappa \tau \eta \mu a \iota$ a present; while as perf. pass. it can still have the sense of the present increased in force; compare кє $\chi \dot{\rho} \rho \eta \mu a \iota, \tau \varepsilon \in \tau v \gamma \mu a t, \delta \varepsilon \delta \delta \alpha \kappa \rho \nu \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s$; see also note on
 may trust to a form of such a poet, is a nearer approach to the original theme. This verb must not however be classed with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \kappa \omega, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{v} \xi \omega$, but rather with $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$, which also mean a confusion and uneasiness of mind.
 and aor. 1. $\eta \not \lambda \nu \xi a$; in Hes. Fr.22. we find $\ddot{\mu} \lambda \nu \xi \varepsilon \nu$; the midd. occurs only in Hes. $\varepsilon$, 365. - Passow.]

This verb is evidently formed from $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} o \mu a t$ : the $\kappa$ therefore is not a radical letter with $\sigma$ inserted, as in $\lambda$ á $\sigma \kappa \omega$, т七tú $\sigma \kappa \omega$; but it is the appendant verbal form in - $\sigma \kappa \omega$ (as in фá $\sigma \kappa \omega$, \&c.) which in its inflexion rejects the $\sigma$, as in $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\delta} \sigma \kappa \omega$.

The lengthened form $\dot{d} \lambda \nu \sigma \kappa a^{\prime} \zeta \omega^{*}$ is a frequentative like $\dot{\rho} \iota \pi \tau a ́ \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu$,
 been the general reading of Od. $\chi, 330$. ; and Wolf was therefore right in adopting (from the Lex. of Apollon. and the Harl. MS.) the reading $\dot{d} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \boldsymbol{v} \varepsilon$; for the context requires the imperfect, and $\dot{a} \lambda v \sigma x^{\prime} \nu \omega$ is lengthened in a perfectly analogical manner without any change of meaning.
'A入úv, I am beside myselft, has only the pres. and imperf.

[^29]meaning, there is a verb of such a sense
 fers only to distraction of mind. - On the doubtful aspirate, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{v} \epsilon เ \nu, \quad \dot{\alpha} \lambda ย ์ \in เ \nu$, see Lex. Seguer, 6. p. 380. [Passow calls $\dot{a} \boldsymbol{v}$ ect the Attic form, but says that the latter Atticists kept to the older form $\alpha \lambda \dot{\chi} \in a \nu$, Locella Xen. Eph. p. 172.]

This verb must not be confounded with the former one, as its meaning is always decidedly different. But the Homeric present $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$ (Il. $\chi, 70$.) appears to belong to it, although with some deviation or additional force of meaning.
'A $\lambda \phi$ áv $\omega$ or $\boldsymbol{a} \lambda \phi a i \nu \omega$, Ifind, obtain. It forms its tenses from $\alpha \lambda \phi \omega$
 has both $\dot{a} \lambda \phi \alpha i v \omega$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \phi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ as presents, and cites in proof of the latter Eurip. Med. 301., the only passage of the Tragedians in which it is found; adding, on the authority of Elmsley, that it is more frequent in the Comedians. The Grammarians have also $\alpha \lambda \lambda \phi \dot{d} \zeta \omega$,

 aor. $\eta^{\prime} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \nu$, infin. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \tau \varepsilon \tilde{\nu}$; [the fut. act. $\alpha \mu \alpha \rho \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ is found only in the Alexandrians; the aor. 1. ทј $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \sigma \alpha$ only in later writers, Lobeck. Phryn. p. 732.-Passow.]
 formed by transposition, by the change of $a$ to $o$, and the necessary insertion of $\beta$. See Buttm. Lexilogus, p. 82. \&c. On the change of the spiritus compare the note on "Adro.
'A $\mu \alpha ́ \omega, I$ (mow and) collect together, bind up in sheaves. - Midd.

The first $\boldsymbol{a}$ is long (II. $\sigma, 551$. Hes. $\varepsilon, 390$.) and short (II. $\gamma, 359$. Hes. $\varepsilon, 763$.) ; but the augment is always regular, $\eta \mu \mu \omega \nu, \& c$. [According to Passow the first $a$ in Hom. is long in the act. and short in the midd., while in later writers, as in Theocr. 10, 7. 10, 16. 11, 73. it is common.]
'A $\mu \dot{\text { 'í } \sigma \varkappa \omega, ~ I ~ h a v e ~ a n ~ a b o r t i o n, ~ m i s c a r r y: ~ f u t . ~(f o r m e d ~}$
 perf. $\eta^{\prime} \mu$ К $\lambda \omega \boldsymbol{\alpha} \alpha$.

Euripides, among the older writers, has the pres. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \lambda \boldsymbol{o}^{\omega} \omega$ in Androm. 356. ; and from this passage, viewed on one side of the question only,
 arose the supposition that $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi a \mu 6 \lambda o ́ \omega$ had a causative meaning with reference to the female, to cause to miscarry. But if we compare together the different passages of the simple and compound verb, the result is such a variety of relations, that a distinction so decided as the above disappears at once. The most common meaning is that where the female about to bring forth is the subject, as Plat. Theæt. p. 150. e


 кเขסขvยvยєข. But one who helps or injures may also be the subject, and then the production is generally the object expressed. In Plut. Arat. 32.



 seem to have the midwives as their subject. And so in the passage of Euripides the phrase $\tilde{\varepsilon} \xi a \mu 6 \lambda_{o} \tilde{v} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \nu \eta \delta o ́ v$ is very intelligible, particularly as a poetical expression, without its following as a necessary consequence that $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi a \mu$ В入oũv $\gamma v v a i ̃ \kappa a ~ h a d ~ b e e n ~ a l s o ~ m a d e ~ u s e ~ o f . ~ H o w e v e r, ~$ in all the passages quoted above, and also in the common meaning to have an abortion, the verb may be considered as a causative, if we imagine to ourselves an immediative sense, to miscarry, whose subject shall not be the mother, but the child; and as such we actually find an aor. 2. (or by syncope) in Suid. v." $H \mu E \lambda \omega$ with a fragment of Ælian,
 Pollux, in whose collection of the terms relating to this subject (II, c. 2.), instead of the untenable $\dot{\alpha} \mu \ominus \lambda \tilde{v} \nu a \iota, \dot{\alpha} \mu \boxminus \lambda \tilde{\omega} \sigma a t$, we must read from

'Ausi $6 \omega$, I exchange. - Midd. [The act. is seldom used by Homer, more frequently by the Attic writers. Passow.]

'А $\mu \pi \lambda a к i \sigma \kappa \omega$, I commit a fault, err: fut. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \lambda a \kappa \eta \quad \sigma \omega$; aor. 2. ${ }^{\prime} \mu-$ $\pi \lambda a \kappa o v, \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \lambda a \kappa \varepsilon i v . \dagger$ The Doric dialect has $\dot{\alpha} \mu \zeta \lambda a \kappa i \sigma \kappa \omega$, \&c. $\ddagger$

## 

[^30]editor has corrupted the old reading to $\alpha \mu$ $\pi \lambda а к \in ́ \sigma \nu \tau \iota$. Gaisford has given the whole paragraph from his manuscripts with ${ }^{\alpha} \mu$ 6лакiбкр (for so he reads it), three times; but in the first-quoted passage $\alpha \mu \pi \lambda a \kappa i-$ бкоуть. The form àцвлакєì is also in Archilochus, 30. As to the other forms, a $\mu \pi \lambda$ arceiv and some that come from it, found in the Tragedians with the first syllable short, are now written in such passages $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda a \kappa \varepsilon \hat{i} \nu \& c$, in some measure from the representations of the old Grammarians. See Erf. ad Soph. CEd. T. 474. ed. min. Matth. ad Eur. Iph. A. 124.
act. and pass.-Midd.-'A $\mu \dot{v} \nu \alpha \theta_{0 \nu}, \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \nu \alpha ́ \theta \varepsilon เ \nu, \dot{\alpha} \mu v \nu \alpha \theta_{0} \dot{\mu} \mu \nu$, are formed from $\dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, a lengthened form of $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \omega$, like $\delta \iota \sim \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \varepsilon เ \nu, \varepsilon i \rho \gamma \alpha ́ \theta \varepsilon เ \nu$.

On these forms Elmsley (ad Eurip. Med. 186.) was the first to observe that the pres. indic. in -á $\theta$ et $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ never occurs; but he was hasty in adding that they are always aorists, and must therefore be accented in the infin. $-\varepsilon \tau \nu$. It is true that the examples quoted by him of ${ }^{\alpha} \mu v \nu \dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \iota \nu$ have the momentary meaning of the aorist; but $\delta \omega \omega \kappa$ á $\theta \varepsilon \iota \nu$, Plat. Euthyphr. p. 15. d. and $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\sigma} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon$, Gorg. p. 483. a. are quite as plainly in duration the pres. or imperfect. This particular formation belongs therefore to those cases in which the preterit was not clearly separated into imperfect and aorist, and which consequently in this relation take a direction according to the nature of the verb; as for instance the idea of $\delta \iota \omega \in \varepsilon \iota \nu$ contains the duration in itself. *-More certain is it, that ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \sigma \chi \varepsilon \theta o \nu$ is always an aorist, and the same as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \chi{ }^{\prime} \sigma \nu$; and the accentuation of the infinitive of this verb $\sigma_{\chi} \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \tau \nu$ is confirmed by the Homeric ${ }^{\sigma} \chi \in \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota$. But I do not therefore think we are justified in writing
 observations on this verb in its place) ought to check such an arbitrary proceeding, and teach us not to hazard a decision on these traditionary points. See Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 272. Herm. ad Soph. El. 744.


 less frequently $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \varepsilon \tilde{\mu} \alpha \iota$. In prose the compound is more used than the simple.—Passow.] See "Evvvu.
${ }^{\prime} A \mu \phi \sigma_{\eta} \tau_{\tau} \epsilon \omega, I$ am of a different opinion, dispute.
 Demosth.—Passow.]
As $\dot{a} \mu \phi \iota \sigma \emptyset_{\eta \tau \varepsilon \tau} \nu$ is compounded of $\dot{a} \mu \phi i s$ and $\beta a i \nu \omega, \dot{\eta} \mu \phi \sigma \mathscr{Q} \dot{\eta} \tau о \nu$,

[^31]in joining with the aor. 2, merely on account of the termination in ov. As to that part of Elmsley's observation that the pres. indic. of these forms was not in use, the non-occurrence of those in particular, when the others are so frequent, is certainly of great weight; for of the other forms in $\theta w$ the pres, indic. is found pretty frequently, for instance of $\pi \in \lambda a ́ \theta \omega$, the $\alpha$ of which belongs to the root, $\pi \in \lambda a$ -
 Ran. 1265. Thesm. 58.
$-\eta \sigma a,-\eta \kappa \alpha$ are regular formations；but the custom generally observed in compounds with $\dot{a} \mu \phi \dot{i}$ caused quite early a false separation in the word，
 á $\mu \phi \varepsilon \sigma$ Øíтovv actually occurs I know not，but $\dot{\eta} \mu \phi \varepsilon \sigma$ Øíтоvข has been uni－ formly restored to the text of Plato by Bekker from the best manuscripts， and in the Etym．Mag．p．94，37．it is quoted from Plato，though al－ tered by Sylburg without authority．And further，in the passage quoted there from Andocides de Myster．p．4，38．$\dot{\eta} \mu \phi \varepsilon \sigma \mathscr{b} \eta \tau o v \nu$ is the undoubted reading；for the whole context shows that it was so in both passages， as also Fischer ad Well．ii．p．296．has observed，only that he，taking the words of the Grammarians still more literally，reads $\dot{a} \mu \phi \varepsilon \sigma \not{ }^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \tau o v v . ~$
 and in later authors like Agathias frequently dıqүó $\mu \eta \nu$. －


This is a verb in aivw formed from the negation ${ }^{\circ} \nu \nu$（see Buttm．Lexil． p．118．）；its aorist is therefore quite regular，like $\varepsilon \in \lambda \nu \mu \eta \nu \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ．The other tenses are not in use；for in Il．$\iota, 510$ ．Theocr．25，6．，where $\dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \nu \tau a \iota$ is quoted as a perfect，it is the aor．conjunct．
＇Avā̀lбx, I employ，expend，consume ：imperf．גंvท＇$\lambda,-$ $\sigma$ кov．The older form ávāдów is found in Thucyd．and the dramatic poets ：imperf．without augm．$\alpha^{2} \nu \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text {ouv，}}$ Thucyd． 8,45 ．The other tenses are formed entirely according to the old form，as fut．$\alpha v a \lambda \omega \sigma \omega$ ，while the aor．and perf． have sometimes the augment，sometimes not；thus the Att．aor．is $\alpha^{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha$ ，without augm．（Herm．Soph．Aj． 1028．），in the non－Attic writers sometimes $\alpha{ }^{2} \eta^{\prime} \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma$ ， sometimes $\dot{\eta}^{\prime} \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma$ ；in the same way the Att．perf．is $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \omega \kappa \alpha$ ，the non－Att．$\alpha^{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha$ and $\dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \% \alpha$ ，Valck．ad Phœen．591．＊Perf．pass．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \mu \mu \iota$ ，aor．pass．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \bar{\alpha} \lambda \omega \dot{\theta} \vartheta \eta \nu$


This verb is distinguished from $\AA \lambda i \sigma \kappa о \mu a<$ by the second $a$ being in－ variably long．$\dagger$ And thence arises also the uncertainty of the augment，

[^32][^33]as the long $a$ was sometimes read without any（see＇A $\delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma a t$ ）．Which of the two forms was pure old Attic has been always a disputed point among the Atticists themselves，and one not easily to be decided；al－ though among modern critics $\dot{a} \nu a \lambda-$ was long the favourite．See Thom． Mag．with Hemsterh．note；Moeris．p．25．Valck．ad Phoen．591．Fischer ad Well．iii p．33．sqq．On the other side see Elmsl．and Herm．ad Soph．Aj．1049．（1028．）．In Isocrates Coray uniformly wrote，contrary to the preponderating authority of the manuscripts，àva入－；and Bek－ ker，following the Codex on which he places most reliance，has uni－ formly restored $\dot{a} \nu \eta \lambda$－．For $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu a ́ \lambda \omega \sigma a$ in this semi－compound form there appears to be no authority whatever；but кatך ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{a}^{\lambda} \omega \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ in Isocr． Euag．22．（Bekker，73．），and кат $\eta \nu a \lambda \omega \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu a$ ，Nicocl．9．（Bekker，37．）， are，established firmly by the same manuscript．

## 

 グv $\quad$ avov in Homer ：aor．हैa Hom．and $\tilde{\alpha} \delta o v$, Poet．；infin．$\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \tau v, \& c$ ．，all with a short；fut．$\dot{\alpha} \delta \hat{\delta} \tilde{\sigma} \omega$ ， Herodot．5，39．；perf．＂モ̄ठa．$\dagger$ A passive voice does not occur；but in the Doric dialect is found a synonymous middle á $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ in Fragm． Pythagor．p．749．Gale．［We find also åv $\delta a ́ v e \tau a \ell$, Archias Epig． 16. －This verb is mostly Ion．and Poet．－Passow．］

The Homeric aor．عvajov is to be explained by the digamma E－FADON $\varepsilon$－ádov źaiov．But F might be doubled on account of the metre．EFFA $\triangle O N$ ，and，as it could not therefore entirely disappear from the verse，it passed over into the cognate $v$ ，єv̉aסov as in кavá $\xi a t s$ under＂A ${ }^{2} \nu v \mu \mu . ~ \ddagger$
 and therefore undoubtedly there were grounds for it in the old language， though hardly in the Homeric，in which the aor．was EFA $\triangle$ ON，EA $\triangle O N$ ， $A \triangle O N$ ．This was caused by the uncertainty of tradition in the old times of those dialectic forms ；and from the same cause arose the con－ fusion of éáv $\delta a v \varepsilon$ and $\eta \eta \nu \delta a v \varepsilon$ in Herodotus．The pure Homeric forms， as soon as the digamma disappeared，were without doubt $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\sim} \nu \delta a v \varepsilon \nu$ ， and，where $\ddot{\eta} \nu \delta a v \varepsilon$ now stands，$\tilde{\omega} \nu \delta a v \varepsilon$ ；while that of Herodotus was ทีv $\delta a v o v$ ，according to the analogy of $\tilde{\omega} \rho \omega \nu$ ．

We have merely to add that this verb，which is used only in the

[^34][^35]dialects and poets，is properly the same as $\eta j \delta \omega$（compare $\lambda a \nu \theta$ áv $\nu$ ， $\lambda \dot{n} \theta \omega)$ ，and distinguished from it by nothing more than a slight devi－ ation of meaning and a difference of construction．
＇Av＇̇єєє［3 sing．fut．of áví $\eta \mu$, Od．$\sigma, 265$ ．；äv $\nu \sigma a v, 3$ ．plur．aor．2．， II．$\phi, 537$ ；$\dot{a} v \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma a \mu \mu$, opt．aor．1．act．，11．$\xi, 209$. －Passow．］．These Epic forms compounded with ává，and which，if we judge by their meaning， can be joined only with $\dot{a} v i \eta \mu$ ，have this peculiarity，that they take $\varepsilon$ instead of $\eta$ in the future，with which they unite the regular formation of the aor． 1 ．in $\sigma a$ instead of $\kappa a$ ．This form however appears to be used only where the preposition has the meaning of again，back，as to bring back，send back；while at II．$\beta, 276$ ．$\xi, 362$ ．à $\nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \iota$ ，à $\nu \tilde{\eta} \kappa \varepsilon \nu$ have merely the sense of to excite．［＇A ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma a \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$, Il．$\nu, 657$ ．，is called by the best of the old Grammarians the part．aor．1．act．of àvé $\zeta \omega$ ，although both in form and meaning it belongs to the above．－Passow．］
＇Avirooa，I press forward：a perfect with the sense of a present， the third person of which was also used as an aorist．＊For its theme we must take ANO $\Omega$ or ANE日 $\Omega$ ，a detailed account of which see in Buttm．Lexil．pp．110．133．\＆c．
 Passive with fut．midd．I grieve or vex（myself）．［＇Avı๗́aто， 3．plur．opt．pres．pass．in Herodot．4，130．This form is more frequent in prose than $\alpha^{2} \iota \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ ．In Homer the $t$ is always long，in later writers short also．The $\alpha$ of the pe－ nult．in pres．is always short，in fut．\＆c．always long；whence by the Ionic writers it was changed to $\eta$ ．－Passow．］
＇Avoíyw．See Oïrш．
＇A $\nu \tau \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega$ ，I meet．In prose its compounds only are used， particularly $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha ́ \omega, \alpha \pi \alpha \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \rho \mu \iota_{1}$（Xen．Hell．1，6，3．）， $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \tau \eta \sigma \kappa$ ，\＆c．

For the Homeric $\eta \nu \tau \varepsilon \sigma \nu$ we must not suppose any form in $\varepsilon$＇$\omega \dagger$ ：like
 $\omega$ we find only the passive ${ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \tau \mu a \iota$ ，${ }^{\eta} \nu \tau \varepsilon \tau \circ$ ，with the same meaning as à $\nu \tau \dot{d} \omega$ ，but with no other tenses．

[^36]סeifit pres．Od．$\pi, 306$. －imperf．II．$\sigma .34$. $\hbar_{\nu \omega \gamma \epsilon}$ pres．Il．$\omega, 90$－aor．Od．$\epsilon, 276$. むขhvo日e pres．Od．$\rho, 270$ ．－imperf．Il．$\lambda$ ， 266.
evflyote pres．Od．N，365．－imperf．II．B， 209.
$t$［Passow however has $\alpha \nu \tau \in(\omega$ ，Ion．for àvtóc．．］
'Avú $\omega$, Att. $\alpha y \dot{u} \tau \omega$ *, I complete : fut. $\alpha \nu u ́ \sigma \omega$, \&c. The pass. takes $\sigma$. Midd. - [The $\alpha$ and $u$ are always short. -Passow.]

A more restricted Atticism was $\dot{a} \nu v v^{\omega} \omega$ with the aspirate, кa $\theta a v v i \omega$. See Piers. ad Moer. v. йvvaa. Lex. Seguer. p. 14. Hesych. v. кäavíáas.

Theocritus, 7, 10. has a syncopated form (or, which comes to the same, one formed from $\left.{ }^{\circ} \nu v \mu i\right)$, ăv $\nu \check{v} \mu \varepsilon$, imperf. act., and at 2,92 . äv $v \tau 0$, imperf. pass. or midd. To the same formation belongs also the opt. pass. ä $\nu \bar{\nu} \tau 0$, on which see the following.
"A $\nu \omega$, an older form of $a^{2} \nu \dot{v} \omega$ : used only in pres. and imperf. ảv $\nu \iota \nu$, Plat. Cratyl. p. 415. a. च̃vov, Od. $\gamma, 496$. ävovzos, Aristoph. Vesp. 369. ávouat, I draw to a close, I1. к, 251. Æschyl. Choeph. 788. (795.) Valck. Herodot. 7, 20. ทั $\nu \varepsilon \tau о$, Herodot. 8, 71.

This verb, with regard to quantity, is a solitary exception to the
 473. must be left as an instance of Epic uncertainty : compare ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$. But the opinion of Barnes is more probable, that the various reading $\ddot{a} \nu \bar{v} r o$ is the true reading, as optat. of ă ${ }^{\circ} \nu \mu \mu a \iota$ (see the preceding), like
 т $\dot{d} \delta \varepsilon$ êp $\rho \gamma a$.
"A ${ }^{\prime} \omega \gamma$ a, I command; an old perfect, but which never has the augment of the perfect. Of the sing. are found only the 2 . and 3 . pers.; of the plur. only the 1. pers. with syncope, äv $\boldsymbol{a} \omega \gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu$, Hymn. Apoll. 528. Pluperf. with the force of an imperf. ( $\dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\omega} \gamma \varepsilon \iota \nu) \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\omega} \dot{\gamma} \varepsilon a, 3$. pers. $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ - To the perf. belong, according to the general analogy of perfects,
 imperat. ävciqє, Eurip. Or. 119. Callim. Fr. 440. But the more com-
 $\kappa \rho a \gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu$; and again, by a similar formation, from $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \gamma ร \tau \varepsilon$ (Od. $\psi$, 132.) and $\dot{a} \nu \omega \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \omega$ (Od. $\beta$, 195.) came, by imitating the passive termination, ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \omega \chi \theta \varepsilon$ (Hom.) and Eurip. and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega{ }^{\omega} \chi \theta \omega$ (Hom.). $\dagger$

The sense of the present introduced also the inflexion of a present; thus Homer and Herodotus (7, 104.) have 3. sing pres. $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega} \varepsilon \varepsilon$, and
 578.) or äv $\nu \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ (II. $\varepsilon, 805$. Od. $\iota, 331$.) is imperf. or rather aor., of

[^37][^38]which the 3. pers. ทlvตyє stands full and complete in the Hymn. Cer. 298. and Hes. $\varepsilon, 68$. : elsewhere it is always without an augment, consequently like the present (or perfect) ä้ $\nu \omega \gamma \varepsilon \nu$ or ${ }^{\circ} \nu \omega \gamma \varepsilon$, Herodot. 3, 81. To these were added a fut. $\alpha^{\nu} \nu \dot{\omega} \xi \omega$ and aor. $\eta \nu \omega \xi a$, Od. $\pi, 404$. $\kappa$, 531. Hes. a, 479.

It were unnecessary to suppose a theme $\dot{\boldsymbol{a} \nu \omega \gamma} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \omega$, from which to form the 3. sing. perf. $\eta \nu \dot{\omega} \gamma \varepsilon \iota$; for this belongs to $\eta \nu \dot{\omega} \gamma \varepsilon a$ : but at Il$\eta, 394$. we read also the 3. pl. そv'́yєov. This form however certainly crept into the text after the digamma, which followed in $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon i v$, had ceased to be perceived; whence Bentley proposed the simple alteration to $\eta \nu \omega \gamma \sigma \nu$.*

A striking want of symmetry, and at the same time an uncertainty, but probably not attributable to the old poet, arises from the usage of the third person as it now exists in his writings. For we find not only as a pres. sometimes $\alpha \ddot{\alpha} \omega \gamma \varepsilon(\nu)$ from $\alpha ้ \nu \omega \gamma a$, sometimes $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \dot{\gamma} \varepsilon \iota$ (II. $\zeta, 439 . \eta, 74$.) from a theme in $\omega$, but also as a preterit either
 $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\omega} \gamma \varepsilon a$. To reduce all this to uniformity and rule would be perhaps now impossible without some very arbitrary proceeding. At the same time there are strong grounds for suspecting $\dot{a}^{\nu} \omega^{\prime} \gamma \varepsilon \iota$ as a pres. to be not Homeric, as it stands (without any reason for it) in the same ex-
 I1. $\xi, 195$. Svuòs ávéyยย, $\chi, 142$., and in every instance it can be changed for ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \omega \gamma \varepsilon \nu$, which has the oldest and surest analogy in its favour, and which in many cases is the reading of the manuscripts instead of the other, for instance in Il. o, 180. $\sigma, 176 . \dagger$

Among the singularities of this verb we would call attention to its striking analogy with oij $\delta a$. Both unite the sense of the present with the form of the perfect; neither of them has the augment, äv $\nu \gamma a,-a s$, $-\varepsilon$, like $\boldsymbol{o}^{i} \delta \alpha,-a \varsigma,-\varepsilon$; the 1. plur. äv $\nu \gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu$ answers to $i \delta \mu \varepsilon \nu$, and in the imperat. ${ }^{\prime} \nu \omega \chi \theta \iota,-\theta \varepsilon,-\theta \omega$, answer to ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \theta \ell \iota$, $\iota \sigma \tau \varepsilon$, $\mathfrak{i} \sigma \tau \omega$, only changing the $\tau$ into $\theta$ in the latter. The pluperf. with the force of an imperf. is
 $\eta \delta \varepsilon \iota$. All these are original forms; the transitions to the pres, and
 later usage. "Av $\omega$ 年a is therefore without doubt in sense as well as form

[^39][^40]an old perfect like oiida, although it may be impossible to disentangle it etymologically from the present, and discover from which sense of the present it comes. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 135.

'Aтavpáa. See AYP-.
 $\dot{a} \pi a ́ \phi \omega$, \&c.: the middle has the active sense, as in the opt. aor. $\dot{a} \pi a ́ \phi o u t o, O d . \psi, 216$. These aorists are reduplications from ' $А \Phi \Omega$, whence $\dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\eta}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \sigma \mu a t$, properly to handle, stroke down, caress, palpo. From these aorists was formed the present ámaфiokw (Od. $\lambda, 217$. Hes.
 of a new formation arising out of the same aorist (according to the rule laid down in a note on 'Акахі $\zeta \omega$ ) nothing has been preserved except the aor. 1. $\varepsilon$ é $\xi \pi a ́ \phi \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$, Hymn. Apoll. 376. All the rest disappeared before the new verb $\dot{a} \pi a \tau \dot{\alpha} \omega, \dot{a} \pi a \dot{\tau} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma, \eta \dot{\eta} \pi a ́ \tau \eta \sigma a$, which are now the only forms in Homer. $\dagger$
 Lucian, but more generally] $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \lambda \alpha u ́ \sigma о \mu \alpha$, Xen. ; aor. 1. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha \alpha \sigma \alpha$, and aor. 2. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \alpha v o \nu$, Thucyd. and Xen.: but in later writers these aor. took, in addition to the syllabic, the temporal augment, thus $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \lambda \alpha u \sigma \nu, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \neq$, Isocr. ad Demon. c. 3. Elian. V. H. 12, 25. Alciphr. 3, 53. It is true that Herodian in Hermann, p. 315., disapproves of these latter aorists; but when we see the other forms which that writer objects to, it only shows that these were very old and in common use. [An aor. midd. $\alpha \pi \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ nowhere occurs. The perfects are formed regularly, and are in Attic usage. A simple $\lambda \alpha u^{\prime} \omega$ is not found; and probably $\dot{\alpha} \pi \Delta \lambda \alpha u^{\prime} \omega$ comes from the same root as $\lambda \alpha \mu 6 \alpha^{\prime} \nu \omega$, $\lambda \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \pi \sim .-P a s s o w$.
$$
\text { 'A } A \text { ó } \chi \rho \eta \text {. See X } \quad \text { ท'. }
$$
'Aสov́pas. See AYP-.

[^41]than that these forms expelled at some later æra the old and genuine $\alpha \pi a \phi \eta \sigma \omega$, $\alpha \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \sigma \in \nu$. Homer certainly had only the subst. $a \pi a, \tau \eta$, which was formed by itself from ' $A \Phi \Omega$, $\dot{\text { add }} \mathbf{d}$ (see Buttm. Lexil. p. 117.), and from which again came the new verb à $\pi \alpha \dot{a} \tau \underset{y}{y}$ used in prose.
$\ddagger$ See note under Boúлора..
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{A} \pi \tau \omega^{*}$, in both its senses, I set fire to and I fasten, is regular. From $\alpha \dot{\phi} \dot{\eta}^{\prime}$ we see that its characteristic letter is $\phi$. Its second meaning is the causative one of to hold firm, which is the proper sense of the middle $\tilde{\alpha} \pi \tau о \mu \alpha \iota$ (II. 9, 67.), and from which came the common meaning, to touch.
'Eá $\phi \theta \eta$, or $\varepsilon$ ' $a ́ \phi \theta \eta$ (for the aspirate is doubtful), which occurs twice in Homer, viz. Il. v, 543. $\xi, 419$., appears to belong to this verb; for if we compare at II. $\beta, 15 . \eta, 402 . \phi, 513$. the perf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi \tilde{\eta} \pi \tau \alpha \iota$ (necessity, evil, death) is fixed upon, we must then take for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i$ - $\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \phi \eta \eta$ in both passages the physical meaning of inficta est, was struck upon. But there are objections to this sense; and a very strong one as regards the form is this, that the separate augment $\varepsilon a$ is found in those verbs only which had the digamma, of which there is nowhere any trace in $\ddot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$, ä $\pi$ roцac. This form requires therefore a further examination. [It is fully examined in Buttm. Lexil. p. 242-246.]
> 'A ${ }_{\rho}$ 'o $o \alpha<$, I pray, curse. The first $\alpha$ in the Epics is long, in the Attics short. $\uparrow$ - Depon. midd.

There is one instance, Od. $\chi, 322 .$, of an act. infin. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota$, which, as the context requires a past tense, like Od. $\delta, 378$. and $\xi ; 134$., must be an aorist. And the only way in which I can arrive at such a one is by supposing an old depon. pass. from the simple root (" $\bar{\alpha} \rho \rho \mu a \iota$ ), of which there remains nothing but this solitary instance of the aor. 2.
 Homer uses elsewhere both the aor. pass. and aor. midd. of other
 see it in its alphabetical place.
'Aрарiбкн, I fit. The simple theme APS is one of the most fruitful of the Greek radical verbs : from it are derived immediately the fol-
 pres. áp $\rho$ never occurs. Its meaning is both transit. and intransit. according to which the tenses may thus be divided:-

[^42]meaning a prayer or curse (as at 11. o, 598. Od. $\rho, 496$. ), and d $\rho \eta$ with a short, in the sense of evil, destruction (as at II. $\mu, 334$.). We must however remark that a third Homeric form apein, hargh words, threatening (II. $\rho, 431$.) has $\alpha$ short. [Pas. sow makes the above difference depend not on the meuning but on the position of the word in the verse; viz. in the arsis long, in the thesis short.]

1. Transit.—Act. fut. ápẽ, Ion. ä $\rho \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\tilde{\eta} \rho \sigma a$, Ion. ${ }^{\circ} \rho \sigma a$, infin. áprat part. äprac, Hom. More used than the aor. 1. is the aor. 2.
 and from this aor. 2., which in Hom. is twice intransit. also, comes the transit. pres. $\dot{\operatorname{p} \rho a \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega}$ (see note on $\dot{\mu} \mu \pi \lambda a к i \sigma \kappa \omega$ ), which we see in
 be joined both in formation and sense the new pres. ápé $\sigma \kappa \omega$; aor. 1. $\eta ँ \rho \theta \eta \nu$, of which Homer has only 3. plur. áp $\theta \varepsilon \nu$ for $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, Il. $\pi, 211$. Of the midd. we find the aor. 1. part. á $\rho \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s$, Hes. $a, 320$.
2. Intransit. - This sense, as arising from the continuity of action represented by the perfect, belongs to that tense almost exclusively;
 ${ }^{\text {ás }}$, fem. á $\rho \overline{\rho a ̈ p v i ̃ a, ~ b u t ~ i n ~ t h e ~ E p i c s ~ a ̀ p a ̆ p v i ̃ a §, ~ w i t h ~ t h e ~ s e c o n d ~ s y l l a b l e ~}$
 has generally the sense of a present, the pluperf. that of an imperfect. But beside the perfect we have also two instances of the aor. 2 with an intransit. meaning, viz. Od. $\delta, 777$. ท̄papev $\dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{\nu}$, was pleasing to us; and II. $\pi, 214$., where we find both the meanings of this form within a
 both passages we must not overlook the momentary sense of the aorist; in the former passage, "the proposal which was pleasing to us all," that is to say, recommended itself at the time of consultation : and in the latter it is a mere repetition of $\alpha \rho \theta \theta \varepsilon \nu$ which is in the preceding line, and which would have been literally repeated but for the intentional repetition of ès ápáppŋ-ŵs ăpapov; consequently the sense is, "so the helmets fitted themselves to each other" (compare II. $\mu, 105$. oi $\delta^{\prime}$ ' $\varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \dot{\iota}$ $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o v c ̧ a ́ p a \rho o v)$; and the description then follows correctly in the

"Aphevos, fitting, suited, is a syncopated aor. 2. midd., used as an adjective, exactly like the part. ápnpés, Hom. - And in the same way as ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\mu} \rho \mu \varepsilon \nu \rho s$ and ${ }^{\mu} \rho \theta \varepsilon \nu$ with a passive formation had an intransitive or re-

[^43][^44] hrown back on the antepenult．according to the note on áкй $£ \mu a \ell$ under＇Акахі弓．The same perf．as a midd．with transit．meaning occurs in Hes．є，429．тообарйрєтац．$\dagger$

For the aor．part．ápпа́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu \frac{s}{\text { see }}$ see last note．
The Greek verb，like the German fügen［to fit，and not unlike the English to fit and to be fitting］，makes a metaphorical transition to the mind，with the meaning of to be pleasing．Thus Od．$\delta, 777$. ô $\delta \eta$



 á $\rho \varepsilon \sigma \sigma$ ，which is used in the same sense，comes from this AP $\Omega$ with the inflexion－モ́ $\sigma \omega$ ．
 the passive neither perf．nor aor．For its meaning see Buttm．Lexil．p． $15 \%$
＇A $\rho$＇́ $\sigma \varkappa \omega$, I please（compare＇A $\rho \alpha \rho i \sigma \varkappa \omega$ ）：fut．$\dot{\alpha} \rho$＇́ $\sigma \omega$
 $\dot{\eta}_{p} \rho \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu s \nu$ ，Poet．$\alpha^{\alpha} p \in \sigma \sigma \alpha, \dot{\alpha} \rho \leq \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ；aor．pass．ท่ $\left.\rho \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu\right]$ ； perf． रै $^{\prime} \in \sigma \mu \alpha$ ．－Midd．

Sextus（adv．Gr．10，266．）quotes the perf．act．á $\rho \hat{\prime} \rho \varepsilon к а$ as in com－ mon use．
＇Apquévoc，hurt，injured：a solitary part．perf．with a long，Od．८， 403．$\sigma, 53, \& c$ ．［The ancients explained it by $\beta_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \lambda a \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s . ~ I t ~ i s ~ o f ~$

[^45]But in such a context as＂after he．．．has fitted together，＂the perf．of the conjunct． is in Greek contrary to all analogy，and only the conjunct．aor．（ $\epsilon \bar{\partial} \tau^{\prime} \hat{a} v . . . a p a p p \eta$ ） is admissible．In this case aptperat must therefore be the conjunct．of apmpd－ $\mu \eta \nu$ ；which Brunck indeed thought he had found in Apollonius，though he had not only no grounds for it，but the sense was intransitive．If we look for an aor． which might supply the place of ápdpp in the metre，a comparison of dopráuevos in Hes．Scut．320．used likewise of fitting a piece of workmanship，will furnish us with

 Gon̂t．Some Codd．of Lanzi have троба－ рクбета．
doubtful origin : the derivation from ápá, , ápáo $\mu a t$ is very uncertain, but its connexion with àpatós undoubted.-Passow.]
'Apı $\sigma \tau$ á $\omega,-\eta \sigma \omega$, \&c. Of this verb we find two remarkable forms used in familiar Attic quoted from some lost comedies by Athenæus
 $\delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \epsilon \pi \nu a ́ v a t$, which appear to have been formed similarly because they were words of similar meaning; for the $u$ in $\delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \iota \pi \nu$ ává cannot be regularly derived from $\delta \varepsilon \iota \pi \nu \varepsilon \in \omega, \delta \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \pi \nu \eta \kappa \varepsilon ́ \nu a$. See Mus. Antiq. Stud. I. p. 249.
'Архє́ $\omega$, I suffice: fut. $\dot{\alpha} \nsim \varepsilon ́ \sigma \omega, \& c$. The passive, which has the same meaning as the active, takes $\sigma$.

Many verbs with $\sigma \sigma$ or $\tau \tau$ have for their characteristic letter a labial instead of a palatic, which in most of them can only be known by their taking in the inflexion a single $\sigma$ instead of the $\xi, \gamma, \kappa, \chi$ of the other verbs in $\sigma \sigma \omega$. The principal verbs of this kind in prose are $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$,

 add two which partake of both characteristics, viz. vá $\sigma \sigma \omega$, fut. $\nu$ á $\xi \omega$, \&c.;
 word of which Homer has the fut. á $\phi \dot{\prime} \xi \varepsilon \iota$, but in the aor. $\eta \neq v \sigma a, ~ \& c$.
 (Eurip. Ion. 1026.), and aor. pass. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \nu \eta \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$; the aor. midd, $\dot{\alpha} \rho \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ is generally Poet. but occurs also in Herodot. 3, 1. Eschin. Ctesiph. 81.
"Apvuんas, I acquire, gain by my exertions, a lengthened form of $\alpha^{l} \rho \omega$, as $\pi \tau \alpha \dot{\rho} \nu \nu \mu \alpha \iota$ is of $\pi \tau \alpha i \rho \omega$ : it is a defective deponent, used only in the pres. and imperf., and takes its other tenses from $\alpha l \rho о \mu \alpha \iota$, fut. $\dot{\alpha} \rho о \tilde{u} \mu \alpha \iota:$ compare Il. $\zeta, 446$. with $\sigma, 121$., and $\chi, 160$, with $\iota, 124$.
'Apóco, I plow: fut. ápórw, \&c.; but, contrary to analogy*, it takes no $\sigma$ in the passive. It has the Att. reduplication. The Ionic perf. pass is apńpoper, part. apnpopévos, Hom. and Herodot. The Ionic. inf. pres, is


[^46]${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A}_{\rho} \pi \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, I carry off by violence : fut. Att. $\alpha \rho \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, Xen. Mag. Eq. 4, 17., also fut. midd. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma о \mu \alpha$, , Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 5. Aristoph. Pac. 1120.; aor. 1. act. ทีp $\pi \alpha \sigma \alpha$, aor. 1. pass. रं $\boldsymbol{\eta} \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$. Also in common use, but later than the former, a fut. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \xi$. aor. 1. act. $\eta_{p} \rho \alpha \xi \alpha$, aor. 2. pass. ทोрт $\alpha$ д̀». Homer has both formations.
 \&c.) is found in the later poets, as in Nonnus and the Anthologia (Cod. Vat. pp. 462.516.).

'Aрúco, Att. व́pútc, I draw or dip up: fut. ג́pú⿱㇒日, \&c. See note under 'Avv́w. The pass. takes $\sigma .-$ Midd. The $v$ is always short.
"А $\rho \chi^{\omega}, I$ am the first, take the lead, command. The midd. has the same meaning; but in the Attics (with the exception of Soph. El. 522.) that voice alone has the sense of to begin. The act. is common in Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus, and Pindar.
$\mathrm{AP} \mathrm{\Omega}$. See 'Арарі́ткш.
'А $\sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} о \mu$, I feel disgust or dislike: generally a depon. pass. [The aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \theta \tilde{\eta} y \alpha \iota$ occurs in Herodot. 3, 41., the aor. 1. midd. ${ }_{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha_{l} \phi_{\rho}{ }^{\prime} \nu \alpha$ in Theogn. 567.] The act. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ is more rare, Theogn. 593., Bekker. Galen. ap. Foes. in voc. 'A $\sigma \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \alpha \iota$, Hippocr.
'А $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ \zeta о \mu \alpha$, , I greet: fut. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha$, \&c. - Depon. midd.

Aúdó $\omega$, I speak: fut. - $\eta \sigma \omega$, Att. -á $\sigma \omega$. The tenses principally in use are the imperf. 3. pers. $\eta \dot{v} \delta \alpha$ as aorist, and the aor. 1. $a \dot{v} \delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma a t$. Pindar.

[^47]ting APOMENAI is to be read. Now surely the same criticism, which in Homer
 could not in Hesiod from גpow, d́póco,

 from some old critic, deserves therefore, on account of its analogy with those Homeric forms, our maturest consideration.
(Ol. 2, 166.) uses aviס́óopaı as a depon. midd., as does Soph. Aj. 772. Phil. 130.852.

As the Doric dialect is not used by Herodotus, aí $\alpha^{\prime} \xi a \sigma \theta a t, ~ \eta u \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\xi}$ aro in Ionic prose must be formed from a pres. avóá̧opau. The act. avóá $\zeta \omega$, -á $\xi_{\omega}$, occurs in Lycophr. 892.
 \&c.: see note under Ai $\sigma \theta$ ávopur. Pass. with fut. midd. $I$ increase, grow. [Passow says the act. has a transit. sense, but in the Poets frequently intransit. Musgr. Soph. CEd. T. 1085. Erf. and in N.T.e. g. Luc. i. 80. The fut. midd. has a pass. meaning. The regular fut. act. $\alpha u \xi \alpha v \omega ̃$ is found only in the LXX.]

In the Epic language the sound of this av̉ $\xi_{\omega}$ is $\mathfrak{a} \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$; but it occurs only in the pres. and imperf. See 'A入é $\xi \omega$, toward the end.

AMP-. To this root, with the original idea of to take, belong two compounds*:-

1. á $\pi a v \rho a ́ \omega, I$ take away. Of this verb we find only the imperf. (with the meaning of an aorist) $\dot{a} \pi \eta v \rho \omega \nu, a \pi \eta v \rho^{\prime} \alpha, a i \pi \eta v \rho a$, all three
 $\delta, 646$. , but with a various reading $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \dot{v} \rho$. Connected by meaning with the above forms are also the participles aor. 1. act. $a \pi$ ov $\rho \alpha \mathrm{s}$, and midd. with a passive sense aंтovoá $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ (Hes. a, 173.), by a change of vowel which never occurs elsewhere. $\dagger$
2. $\varepsilon$ в $\pi \cup \rho / \sigma \varkappa о \mu \alpha s$, I reap advantage or disadvantage from; enjoy; depon. midd.: fut. є̇таupŕбоцаь, II. ఢ, 353.; aor. act. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \eta$ ũpov, Dor. ह̇ $\pi \alpha$ ũpov, Pind. P. 3, 65. [of this aor. Homer has only 3. pers. conjunc. ह̇ส $\alpha u \neq \lambda$, Il. $\lambda, 391$. $\nu, 649$. and infin. غ่ $\pi \alpha \cup p \varepsilon \tilde{\nu}, ~ \varepsilon ่ \pi \alpha u \rho \varepsilon ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu, ~ I l . ~ \lambda, ~ 573 . ~ \sigma, ~ 302 . ~$ Od. p, 81.] ; aor. midd. є̇тทиро́ $\quad \eta \nu$, Eurip. Hel. 476. [of this aor. Homer has only the 2. pers. conjunct. E่ हаúprat, غंтаúp, Il. o, 17. Od. $\sigma, 10 \%$. and 3. plur. غं $\pi \alpha u ́ p \omega \nu \tau \alpha$, Il. $\alpha, 410$.$] ; infin. ह̇ \pi \alpha u p \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \alpha$, Eurip. Iph. T.529. and in nonAttic writers є̇ $\alpha u ́ p \alpha \sigma \theta \propto \star$, Hippoc. Jusjur. 3. and elsewhere.
[^48][^49]The infin. pres. émavpíкєбӨaィ (II. $v, 733$. ) occurs frequently in Hippocr. The pres. émav́popaı, which was supposed for some other purpose (whence the accentuation $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \dot{v} \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta a i$ ), does not occur; $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \dot{v} \rho \omega \mu a t$ is conjunct. aor. The pres. act. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi a v \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega$ is found only in
 $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \pi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon$ й from $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi a v \rho \varepsilon ́ \omega$. The active forms are found only in the Epic and Lyric poets; the midd. passed over to the usage of the Attics also.

Compare the different tenses of this verb and its meaning with the verb єípiok $\omega$, which differs from it only in the diphthong, as єv้ $\chi \circ \mu a \ell$ and av̉ $\chi^{\varepsilon} \omega$.

Av̌ $\omega$, I call out, sound aloud. This present occurs only as a dissyllable; but the other tenses (as if formed from áviv) are fut. âṽ $\sigma \omega$, aor. ท̈̈̈ra, infin. $\dot{\alpha} \tilde{v} \sigma \alpha t$, with $v$ long. From the subst. aüríl, a cry, comes in the Epic and Tragic poets a new pres. aivié $\omega$, also with long $v$.
 Arat. 1035. (Diosc. 333.) Thence in prose
'Eváu, I kindle. Herodot. 7, 231. Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 22. The pass. probably takes the $\sigma$, whence ${ }_{\xi}^{\varepsilon} \nu \alpha \nu \sigma \mu \alpha$. - Midd.


This compound has, I believe, no augment; a point however not


This verb is incorrectly supposed to be the same as av́w, or av́ $\omega, \boldsymbol{I}$ roast, but which in the common language was $\varepsilon v ี \omega$ : see this verb. Akin to aṽ is avaiv $\omega^{*}, I d r y$; and therefore this third aṽ must be considered as a separate verb from the two others.
'A $\dot{\prime} \dot{\omega} \omega$ or á $\phi a \omega$, I handle: á $\phi$ ó $\omega v \tau a$, Il. $\zeta, 322 . ;$ but in the later Ionic writers $\dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, as we find the part. pres. á $\dot{\operatorname{con} \sigma \sigma o v \sigma a, ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ a o r . ~} 1$. 3. pers. ท̉ $\phi a \sigma \varepsilon$, imperat. äфaбov, Herodot. 3, 69. A pres. à $\phi a \sigma \sigma a ́ \omega$, and some other forms which have not yet been examined critically, occur in Foes. CEc. Hippocr. in voc.-Compare 'Aлафiбкш.
 165., poet. also ä $\varphi v \sigma \sigma a$; aor. midd. ท̉фvбá $\mu \eta \nu$, Od. $\eta, 286$. For the rule of formation see 'Ар $\mu$ óттш.
"A $\chi$ 丹ouar, I am loaded, metaph. vexed: pass. without any act. in use ; generally with fut. midd. $\alpha \chi \chi^{\theta} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma$ o $\mu \alpha$, , Aristoph.

[^50]short becomes long, as "ãöov, aủaìveco,
 stoph. Ran. 1089.), we see that aủalva in the Attic pronunciation had the aspirate.
 1. $\eta \chi^{\theta} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ (Od. o, 457.), whence also the pass. fut. $\alpha^{\circ} \chi \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma о \mu \alpha!$ : see Piers. ad Moer. p. 21.

*A $\omega$. This theme appears under four different meanings:-

1. I blow. 3. pers. imperf. ä́v, Apollon. Rh. 1, 605. But the pres. ä $\eta \mu \iota$ is more usual, of which 3. sing. ä $\eta \sigma \iota$, Hes. $\varepsilon$, 514., infin.
 at $\varepsilon, 478 . \tau$, 440. we find סíáє. Midd. ä $\eta \mu a \iota$, ảŋ́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu o s ; 3$. sing. imperf. äqтov. In the dual pres. äךтov (II. ८, 5.) and the infin. pres. we find the $\eta$ retained, contrary to the analogy of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu$. This passive form has the active sense except at Od. $\zeta, 131$. where it means to be blown through.

In the Etym. M. is quoted 3. pl. ázıat, and the explanation of its being Æolic for á $\varepsilon i \sigma t$ is proved by reference to Hes. $\uparrow$, 875. Much the same is said by the Schol. Il. $\varepsilon, 526$. , in Heyne vol. 5. p. 712. *A入入aı ä $\varepsilon \iota \sigma \iota$ was therefore an old-established reading there (see the various readings), and $\dot{\alpha} \varepsilon \iota \sigma \iota$ without doubt a genuine form.
2. I sleep: aor. ${ }^{\text {á } \varepsilon \sigma \alpha, ~ c o n t r . ~} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$, Od. $\tau, 342 . \pi, 367$. [This verb is the root of $a^{*} \omega$, iav́ $\omega$, $\boldsymbol{a}^{\prime} \omega \tau \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$. - Passow.]
3. I satiate. From the pres. come the following infin. act. " $\bar{a} \mu \varepsilon v a \iota$
 and by resolution ăăтal, Hes. a. 101., where it stands as a future.*
 though the active form also occurs in the intransitive or middle sense,
 $\psi, 157$. \&c. Verbal adj. árós, and with a priv: äaros, contr. ảtos, insatiable. On these forms see Buttm. Lexil. p. 2.

By old grammatical tradition the conjunct. $\varepsilon \begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \mu \\ \varepsilon\end{gathered}$ or ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (II. $\tau$, 402.) is attached to this verb, consequently it is for ${ }^{\alpha} \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$ or $\tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ : see Etym. M. v. ád$\eta \nu$, and Buttm. Lexil. p. 26.

There are no grounds for adopting the radical $A \Delta$ - as is generally done; on which, and on the relations of this verb to ai $\delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 22. \&c.
4. I hurt ; aor. 1. ả́ба. See Aáw.
${ }^{*}$ A $\omega \rho \tau$. See Aifp,

* There are sufficient grounds for this future, but some doubts about the resolution: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 142. where
he has enlarged on the probability of the ã $\tau \alpha$ of Hesych. being taken from this passage.


## B.

 408.

Baivш, Igo: fut. $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, Dor. $\beta \bar{\alpha} \sigma \varepsilon \tilde{y} \mu \alpha \iota$; perf. $\beta \in \in \eta \eta \varkappa \alpha$ (whence the syncopated forms $\beta_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^{\alpha} \alpha \alpha \sigma t, \beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \tilde{\alpha} \sigma t$ ); infin.
 $\beta_{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C i}^{\circ}$ s, which forms are rare except in the poets: Homer has the Epic $\beta_{\varepsilon} 6 \alpha^{\prime} \alpha \bar{\alpha} \sigma t$, part. $\beta_{\varepsilon} 6 \check{\alpha} \dot{\omega} \dot{s}, \beta_{\varepsilon} 6 \check{\alpha} \cup \tilde{\alpha} \alpha$, infin. $\beta_{\varepsilon} 6 \alpha^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu$. The aor. 2. ${ }_{\xi}^{\prime 2} \varnothing_{\eta \nu *}^{*}$ is like ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, therefore ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} 6 \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu$, \&c., imperat. $\beta \tilde{\eta} \theta_{l}$, conjunct. $\beta \tilde{\omega}$, optat. $\beta$ airv, infin. $\beta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha l$, part.
 and in 3. plur. $\beta \alpha^{\prime} \nu$ and ${ }_{\xi}^{\prime} 6 \alpha \nu$ for ${ }_{\xi}^{\prime \prime} \xi \eta \sigma \alpha \nu . t$ Aor. midd.
 also a passive, e. g. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha 6 \alpha i v \omega, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma^{\prime} \varepsilon \alpha \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \alpha \rho \in \delta^{\alpha} \dot{\theta}^{\prime} \eta \nu$. Verbal adj. ßaróg.

The pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon}_{\hat{\varepsilon}}^{\boldsymbol{\beta} \varepsilon} \mathscr{E}_{\dot{\eta} k \varepsilon \iota}$ has in Homer almost always the sense of went, for which as imperf. the plainest passages are Il. $\zeta, 313.495$. 513. $\pi$, 751. Od. $\rho$, 26.; while at Od. $\nu, 164$. it must be understood as an aorist; and the only clear instance of its pluperfect sense is in the
 ס, 492.

In addition to the perf. pass. $\pi a \rho a b$ ह́bapal we must mention $\pi a \rho a-$ bebarرac in the spurious oration of Demosth. De Fœd. Alex. p. 214. extr., and in later writers $\beta \eta \sigma \omega$, $\varepsilon^{\prime \ell} \ell \eta \sigma a$, in a causative sense and also in the common language; e. g. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \in \dot{G} \sigma \varepsilon \iota \nu$, Lucian Dial. Mort. 6, 4.

On the unusual particip. pres. of $\beta$ á $\omega$ we have only to say, that it occurs in anapæstic verse in Cratinus ( $\pi \rho \circ \rho_{\tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma) \text {, and in a causative }}$ sense in the Doric treaty in Thucyd. 5, 77. ( $\varepsilon \kappa 6 \varpi \nu \tau a \varsigma)$.

The 2. pers. imperat. of the aor. 2. was also shortened by the Attics
 $\pi \rho o ́ b a, ~ A c h a r n . ~ 262$.


 therefore have been a rule in the lonic language, as it is not done on

[^51]D 3
 vowel is also shortened. These and other abbreviated forms of this verb
 are seldom found except in the dialects and poets. The conjunct.



In the aor. 2. Homer has some forms with $a$ instead of $\eta$ short,
 pare many other words in which the Ionians changed the $\eta$ into short
 $\mu \varepsilon \mu$ c̆кvĩa from $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$. On the other hand $\beta \tilde{a} \tau \varepsilon$ in Æschyl. Suppl206. in the iambics is one of the solitary instances of a Doricism $\dagger$ in the Tragic language. In Theocr. 15, 22. $\beta \tilde{a} \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon$ for $\beta \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ is an unusual Doricism. The 1. sing. aor. 2. conjunct. $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ and $\beta \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega$ for $\beta \tilde{\omega}$, and 3. pers. $\beta \dot{\eta} \eta$ for $\beta \tilde{\eta}$, \&c., are Ionic and Epic resolutions, like $\sigma \tau \varepsilon i(\omega$,


Besides the fut. midd. the Epics have also the aor. midd. in the same
 Of these the second would appear to be the only correct form in Homer, according to a note in Buttm. Lexil. p. 226.; the first might have been used in a causative sense for $\varepsilon \in \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$, but for this I find no other authority in Homer than ávaß $\eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu o \iota$, Od. o, 474.

See the form $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} о \mu \alpha \iota, \beta \varepsilon i o \mu \alpha t$, in its place.
This verb has in the Ionic dialect and the Poets the causative sense also I cause to go, i. e. bring, carry, remove, a meaning which otherwise belongs to $\beta_{\iota} \mathrm{b}^{\prime} \zeta \omega$. The fut. act. and the aor. 1. are the only tenses which have this meaning; but in the compounds it appears to belong also to the aor. 1. midd., as $\nu \grave{\omega}$ áva民 $\eta \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o t$, taking us into his vessel, Od. o, 475. Of other forms I know of enly two instances, ${ }^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \pi \iota}$
 and such kind of expressions (see Seidler on Eurip. El. 94.) appear to me only a liberty taken with the syntax, in which the Greek poets occasionally indulged themselves, and no change of meaning in the verb $\beta$ aiv $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. The Epic sister-form $\beta$ á $\sigma \kappa \omega$ has also both senses;


The Epic language has also the form $\beta_{\iota} b^{\prime} \omega, \beta i b \eta \mu$, which it uses in the sense of $I$ stride, of which however we have only the pres.


[^52]Tragedians 'A $\theta a ́ v a, ~ \pi о \delta a \gamma o ́ s, ~ к v \nu a \gamma o ́ s, ~ a n d ~$ sometimes vab́s, the Doric gen. of $\nu a \hat{v} s$.
$\ddagger$ See ėvívєco toward the end of $\Delta \dot{v} \omega$.

Od．$\lambda, 539$ ．），ßı\＆ás（II．$\eta, 213$. ）．［To these Passow adds ébibaoke，Ion． imperf．Hymn．Apoll．133．］Now if we take this as a present instead of $\beta a i v \omega$ ，the whole verb corresponds exactly in formation with $\ddot{i} \sigma \tau \eta \mu$, ， and both have the fut．and aor． 1 ．in the causative sense．

B $\alpha \lambda \lambda \omega, I$ throw：fut．$\beta \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ，and sometimes（but not in the early writers）$\beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ，Aristoph．Vesp．222． 1482. with the aor．1．$\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$ ；the usual aorist is the aor． 2.


$B a \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \nu$ is an Ionic resolution of $\beta$ á $\lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota \gamma$ ；thus we find $\dot{v} \pi \varepsilon \rho b a \lambda-$ $\lambda \varepsilon \in \varepsilon \iota \nu, \sigma \nu \mu$ हa入入єо́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu о \varsigma$, Herodot．

From a syncopated aor．$\dagger{ }^{\ell} € \lambda \eta \nu$ come the Epic forms $\xi \nu \mu 6 \lambda i i_{\tau} \eta \nu$
 $\&$ c．，$\beta \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota, \beta \lambda i \not \mu \varepsilon \nu о$ ；；conjunct．$\beta \lambda$ 亿́єтаи for $\beta \lambda i$ íqтає，Od．$\rho, 472$. ； optat．$\beta \lambda \varepsilon i \mu \eta \nu, \beta \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ \neq, \& c$ ．；and a future $\beta \lambda \eta \sigma \circ \mu \alpha \iota$, Il．v， 335.

All these forms，beginning with the perfect $\beta_{\varepsilon} \ell \ell \lambda \eta \kappa a$ ，arise from the metathesis of BAA to BAA§；nor is it any objection to this that the optat．has the diphthong $\varepsilon$ ，as we see the same change from the vowel of the root $a$ in other cases，for instance in a precisely similar one under $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ and in $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$（ $\chi \rho \dot{\rho} \omega)$ ）．Besides in the verb before us the old original form was BEA（by metath．BAE），as shown in the deriva－ tive $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda o s$ ，and more particularly in the verbal adjective $\beta \varepsilon \lambda \bar{\varepsilon} \tau \eta$ § in


From the same old stem or root too，by that change of vowel which is the most usual，come the verbal substantive 反ódog，and the common Epic perf．pass．$\beta_{\varepsilon} \mathcal{G} o ́ \lambda \eta \mu a \iota$
$\mathbf{B} \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \dot{\sigma}, I$ dip：fut．$\beta \dot{\alpha} \psi \omega$ ；perf．pass．$\beta \in \in \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor． 2．pass．$\varepsilon \in \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi$ rv．The characteristic letter is $\phi$ ．
＊We know that in general there is no conjunct．or optat．of the perf．pass．，partly from the difficulty of forming them，partly from their being seldom wanted，but that they are made up of the participle and a tense of eivar．There are cases however where，for the sake of greater expression，of clearness，or of conciseness， such moods are formed．Thus $\delta$ iabe－
 Plat．Rep．7．p．564．c．Compare Té $\mu \nu \omega$ ．
＋See note under $\Gamma^{\Gamma} \imath \gamma \omega \sigma^{\sigma} \kappa \omega$ ．
$\ddagger$ The various reading $\beta \lambda \hat{n} \frac{1}{o}$ arises from a twofold opinion of the old Grammarians ；
${ }^{2} 6 \lambda \eta \mu \eta \nu$ ，optat．$\beta \lambda \hat{\jmath} \mu \eta \nu$ or $\beta \lambda \epsilon i ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ；but the connexion of these passive with the corresponding active aorists，as shown in a note near the end of $\Gamma$ t $\gamma \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \kappa \kappa \omega$ ，and the prevailing form of the optative $\sigma \in \in i \eta \nu$ ， Bainv，रvoinv，are decisive in favour of $\beta \lambda є i o . ~ C o m p a r e ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu$ under $\Pi l \mu$－ $\pi \lambda \eta \mu$ 。
 тє́धข

 M $\Lambda 0$ ）．

Bápuva, I load, takes in the pass. the perf. of the otherwise nonAttic $\beta a \rho \varepsilon ́ \omega, \beta_{\varepsilon}$ bá $\eta \eta \mu a \iota$, I am loaded, Plat. Symp. 203. b., for which
 article on Baiva, paragraph 6.
$\mathbf{B} \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, I bear or carry: fut. $\beta \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, \&c.; but in the pass. it changes its formation, and makes the aor. 1.


BA , $\beta i{ }^{6} \eta \mu$. See Baivш.
Béo $\mu a \iota$, or $\beta \varepsilon i o \mu a \iota$, 2. pers. $\beta \varepsilon ́ p$, an Epic future, I shall live, which there are quite as strong grounds for our explaining to be a real but irregular future (like $\pi i$ iopaı or like кé $\omega$, кєí $\omega$ ), as there are for our calling it a conjunctive, for $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \mu \alpha$, used like a future. A more important question is, whether it belongs to an old verb BEI $\Omega$, whence
 usage the sense of I walk, i. e. live, in which case $\beta$ हio $\mu$ a will correspond with the active $\beta \varepsilon i \omega$ for $\beta \tilde{\omega}$. This investigation will therefore prevent the necessity of altering, as Wolf has done, the traditionary form ßio $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a(\mathrm{Hymn}$. Apoll. 528.) to $\beta \varepsilon o ́ \mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$.

Bı́́ఢоцки, I force: depon. midd., from which however is not only formed with a passive meaning the aor. pass. ébı́́ $\sigma \neq \eta \nu$, as in many similar verbs $\dagger$; but the other tenses (for instance the pres. and imperf. frequently, and the perf. perhaps always) are used passively.

The active is sometimes used by the poets, as Od. $\mu$, 297. Alcæus ap. Aneed. Bekk. p. 86. For the passive use of $\beta$ úg бодà see the passages of Thucyd. in Popp. Prolegg. 1. p. 184. and those of Xenoph. in Sturz. Lexicon. See also Hymn. Cer. 68. Soph. Ant. 66.

The Ionians have the form in -áoцal; e. g. in Herodot. ßeã $\sigma a t$,
 $\beta \iota \eta \theta \varepsilon i \underline{c}$. Homer has $\beta \varepsilon \mathcal{E}_{i \eta \kappa \varepsilon \nu}$ actively.

Bıbá $\omega, \beta i \ell_{\eta \mu}$. See Baìv.

# Bıடо́́бнш, I eat. From this synonyme of the verb $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta_{i}^{\prime} \omega$ 

[^53][^54]was formed in the Attic and common language neither future nor aorist. In the active voice the only tense in use was the perfect, in the passive all the tenses, $\beta$ ' $\varnothing \rho \omega \kappa \alpha$,


The future midd. $\beta \rho \omega^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ was used only by the later writers; see Lobeck. ad Phryn. p. 347. The future pass. $\beta \varepsilon$ हिюَ́годає occurs in Od. $\beta$, 203. The Epic language had also a syncopated aor. $\dagger{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \ell_{\rho} \omega \nu$, Hymn. Apoll. 127. From the perf. part. $\beta_{\varepsilon} \ominus_{\rho \omega \kappa \kappa}$ s was formed by


The Homeric form $\beta_{\varepsilon} \ell \rho \omega^{\prime} \theta_{0}$ os, II. $\delta, 35$. is not a perf. but comes from a poetic pres. $\beta_{\varepsilon} \ell_{\rho} \omega^{\prime} \theta \omega$, I feed upon, devour, in which the stem or root $\mathrm{BPO} \Omega$ is formed in $-\theta \omega$, like $\kappa \nu \dot{a} \omega \omega \kappa \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, $\dot{d} \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$, $\dot{d} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, and the reduplication prefixed to increase the force of the word, as in $\tau \varepsilon \tau \rho a i \nu \omega$ from $\tau \rho a ́ \omega$, , $\tau \tau \rho \alpha ́ \omega$ and $\tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \varepsilon \mu \alpha i \nu \omega$ from $\tau \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\omega} \omega$.
 271., катаЄр $\epsilon \xi \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon$, Dionys. Perieg. 604. But in these passages the Harpies are described as swallowing a whole meal at once, and the sea-monsters as devouring whole ships with their crews; while all the forms which come from $\operatorname{BPO} \Omega$ have simply the sense of eating up with mastication, and, where they are used metaphorically, of the consumption or waste of property. Hence Struven's emendation катаßро́ңабач, катаßро́乡єє, in the Supplement to Schneider's Lexicon is very probable (see under BPOX-); particularly as Dionysius had undoubtedly in his mind the катаЮро́धєєย of Od. $\delta, 222$. For as all the Homeric forms with o are used to express the swallowing or gulping down of fluids, they were the more calculated for the above sense, as we see from the analogy of катaтıєiv.§

Bóm, I live, is but little used by the Attics in the pres. and imperf. ; these they borrow from $\zeta \tilde{\omega}$, which again does not often occur in its other tenses. We find then in common use the fut. $\beta \iota \omega \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. $\varepsilon^{\prime} \in i \omega \sigma \alpha$ rare ; aor.


[^55]тéfpwछॄย in Schol. Pind. Ol. 1, 38., of the eating up of the shoulder of Pelops. It is difficult to say whether this should be suffered to remain as the incorrect form of a faulty writer, or altered to катध́Gpuęev, upon a supposition that it was copied from an older narrative of the story.
|| See note under 「i $\gamma \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$.
 the expression $\beta_{\varepsilon} \sigma^{\prime} \omega \tau \alpha t$ por.

The pres. Beów, which is very common in Lucian (see Reitz. Ind.) and others, occurs but rarely in the older writers; we do meet with
 Archel. 30. From the time of Aristotle it is found more frequently. In Herodotus 2, 177. the middle has the sense of I subsist upon, victum habeo; and in Aristotle's Ethics 10, 10. p. 105. f. Duv. (10, 9. Wilkinson) the more expressive meaning of I lead a certain kind of life.
[The fut. act. $\beta_{\omega} \omega^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ is used by Diog. Laert.-Passow.]
Somewhat more singular is the very common use of the infin. aor. 2. $\beta_{\iota} \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for


 this usage may perhaps extend to the other moods; as the optat. in



I find but one instance of the aor. 1. in the pure Attic times, viz. in
 tense ( $\beta \omega \dot{\prime} \sigma \alpha \varsigma$, Hippocr. Coac. vol. 1. p. 559.) appears to have taken the place of the cases of $\beta$ coús, (-óvoos, \&c.) which never occur: thus we find ßıov́, Plat. Phæd. p. 95. e. and oi óoíws $\beta$ ィ $\omega^{\prime} \sigma a \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$, p. 113. d. In the older language the aor. 1. had probably, according to the analogy of $\varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a,{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \ell \eta \sigma a, \& \mathrm{c}$., the causative sense of 1 make to live, preserve life, and, to express that meaning, a present $\beta \iota \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, according to the analogy of $\mu \in \theta \hat{v} \sigma \kappa \omega, \pi \iota \pi i \sigma \kappa \omega$. This supposition is confirmed by the pres. $\beta \omega \omega \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \sigma \theta a t$, to be brought to life, revive, Aristot. Meteor. 1. c. 14.; and the aor. 1. (though in the middle voice like
 रáp $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \in \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha o$, thou hast preserved my life.

Bıó $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$, Hymn. Apoll. 528. Wolf has altered to $\beta \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$. See under Béo $\mu$ а.

The compound of this verb with $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \dot{a}$ has only the aor.
 revive; the causative meaning, I resuscitate, is expressed by the aor. 1. midd. $\alpha_{\nu \in \in \iota \omega \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \mu \nu, ~ P l a t . ~ P h æ d . ~ p . ~ 89 . ~ b . ~}^{\text {b }}$ Hence the pres. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha 6 \iota \omega \sigma$ ropal, being both passive and middle, has both senses ; as passive, I am brought to live
 middle, I bring to life again, resuscitate, oi . . . ávabic$\sigma x o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \iota ~ \alpha ้ \nu$, Crito p. 48. c.

The active voice in this causative sense, $\dot{a} \nu a b i \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, is found in Schol. Eurip. Alcest. init.*, and ávebíwoa in Palæph. 41.
Apollon. Rh. 1, 685. has $\beta \dot{\omega} \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ for $\beta \iota \omega \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, an absorption of the iota which takes place also in $\sigma \omega \pi \tilde{q} \nu$ for $\sigma \omega \pi \tilde{\tilde{q}} \nu$, and perhaps in $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega \kappa \alpha$ also.

B $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$, I hurt, harm: fut. $\beta \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \psi \omega$; aor. 1. ٌ $\varepsilon^{6} \lambda \alpha \psi \alpha$; fut. midd. in passive sense $\beta \lambda \alpha \dot{\psi} \boldsymbol{\jmath} \mu \alpha \iota$, Thucyd. 6, 64.; perf. pass. $\beta^{\prime} \dot{E} \delta \alpha \mu \mu \alpha_{\iota} \dagger$; aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon \in \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta_{\eta \nu, ~ T h u c y d . ~ 4 . ~}^{\text {. }}$
 The characteristic of this verb is therefore $\beta$.

From the aor. 2. arose a new present $\beta \lambda a ́ b \omega$, of which we find only
 for $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \nu a ́ \zeta \omega$.

B $\lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, I germinate: fut. $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \gamma \dot{\sigma} \omega$; perf. $\varepsilon \in \AA \lambda \alpha-$ $\sigma \tau \eta ห \alpha \neq$, Eur. Iph. A.594.; aor. 2. ${ }^{\prime} \in \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \tau \%$, see note


The aor. 1. $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}_{\xi} \in E \lambda$ ג́ $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ occurs in Hippocr. De Alim. 1. and in the later writers, for instance Aret. 6, 3. In 厄schyl. Cho. 585. we read $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau o v ̃ \sigma$, which, if the reading be good in other respects, must undoubtedly be accented $\beta \lambda$ á $\sigma \tau 0 v \sigma$, which brings it into analogy with $\alpha \ddot{\imath} \xi \omega$ and $\alpha i \sigma \theta o \mu a t$ : compare also $\delta \alpha \rho \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$.
$\mathrm{B} \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega, I$ see: fut. $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \psi \omega$, \&c. The aor. 2. pass. is irregular. § This verb is not found in Homer.

B $\lambda i \tau \tau \omega$, I take the bees from the hive : fut. $\beta \lambda i \sigma \omega$, Ion.


[^56]those beginning with $\gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda} \dot{v} \phi \omega$ is doubtful; for we have $\boldsymbol{\xi \xi \in \gamma \lambda \nu \mu \mu u ́ v o s , ~ P l a t . ~}$ Rep. 10, p. 616. d. $\Delta t \in ́ \gamma \lambda v \pi r a u, ~ A t h e n . ~$ 3. p. 93. c. $\Delta \iota a \gamma \in \gamma \lambda \nu \mu \mu \in ́ y o s, ~ E l i a n . ~ V . ~$ H. 3, 45.
§ Some verbs, whose radical vowel is $\epsilon$, do not change their vowel in forming the aor. 2. pass.: thus from $\phi \lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega, \beta \lambda$ ém $\omega$, $\lambda$ é $\omega$, we find é $\phi \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \eta \nu$, and the participles $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon i s, \sigma u \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon i s ;$ compare also $\lambda \in \pi \omega$, пле́кш, 廿'́ $\gamma \omega$.
an instance of the present with $\sigma \sigma$ ，probably because it was originally a pure Attic word．See Buttm．Lexil．pp．84．189．

## B $\Lambda$－．See Bá $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ．

$\mathrm{B} \lambda \omega \sigma \kappa \omega, I$ go．This verb comes by metathesis from the root MOA－ （see Bád $\lambda \omega$ with note，and Buttm．Lexil．pp．84．189．），whence the
 tenses Homer uses the aor．and perf．，the Tragedians the future， Eschyl．Prom．694．Soph．CEd．C． 1742.

That $\beta \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ is the real present to those tenses we have proofs enough in the indexes of Homer，Aristophanes，and Euripides． Wherever the present $\mu_{0} \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$ occurs it is suspicious：see Schæfer on Soph．CEd．C． 1742.

## Boá $\omega$ ，I cry out：Attic fut．ßoŕбoucs．

The Ionians always contract the on of this verb to $\omega$ ，making in the fut．$\beta \omega \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ，and throw back the accent，as aor．1．${ }^{\ell} \in \omega \sigma a .{ }^{*}$ The same takes place in vot́c．For that this is the correct explanation of these verbs may be learnt from comparing them with $\beta \omega \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \nu$ for
 accent takes place in other similar cases．In the passive voice $\beta$ oá $\omega$ inserts the $\sigma$ in the aor．1．of this contraction，but not in the perfect；


BOA－．See Bádлш and Bov́入oцaı．
 according to which the other tenses are formed．－Midd． $I$ feed（in its intransit．sense）．

Boúroucl，I wish：depon．pass．；with fut．midd．ßou入n＇－



[^57]imperf．and aor．by the addition of the temp．augm．，and use both ėסvעá $\mu \eta \nu$ and
 and $\bar{\eta} 6-, \dot{\varepsilon} 60 \nu \lambda \eta \theta \eta \nu$ and $\bar{\eta} 6-, \epsilon_{\mu} \in \lambda \lambda o \nu$ and $\eta_{\mu} \mu$－The aor．$\epsilon^{2} \mu \in \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma a$ ，which is found only in the sense of delaying，has never this augment．Nor is it confined to the Attics， but occurs in the Epic and Ionic dialects； see Hes．N，478，888．Herodot．1，10．It does not however preponderate until the times of the later Attics，as it is never found in the Tragedians，and but little in the older prose or Aristophanes．Compare Poppo on Thucyd．vol．1．p． 225.
 prefer : see note under " ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \nu v \mu$. On the form $\beta$ ódouaı, $\beta$ ód $\varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, which occurs twice in Homer, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 196.

BO-. See Boáw.
B $\rho \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, more commonly $\beta_{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, $-\tau \tau \omega, I$ boil (in its intrans. sense), $I$ ferment, $I$ throw up (as the sea does), $I$ winnow: fut. $\beta \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }_{\xi}^{6} 6 \rho \alpha \sigma \alpha$. The passive has again frequently the intrans. sense.

Some wish to confine the sense of boiling and fermenting to the pres. $\beta$ pá $\zeta \omega$, but all the different meanings run too much into each other for this to hold good: Bpátre appears to be the Attic form for all. See Ruhnk. Tim. p. 64. Stephan. Thesaurus and Schneider's Lexicon* with the Supplement and the compounds with á $\nu \alpha{ }^{\prime}, \dot{a} \pi \boldsymbol{a}^{\prime}$, and $\bar{\varepsilon} \xi$.

Bpaŋeiv, ${ }^{\text {ébpaxov, an Epic aor. with the meaning of to rattle, to }}$ crack, to roar (as the sea or a wounded combatant is said to do).

B $\rho \dot{\xi} \mu \omega$ and $\beta_{\rho} \rho_{\mu}^{\prime} \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, fremo, I roar (as the sea or thunder does), I resound. Used only in pres. and imperf.




Pindar has the perf. pass. $\beta \varepsilon \ell_{\rho \varepsilon \gamma} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \circ$ o̧, Ol. 6. 62. - The doubtful

[^58]the compound ${ }^{\xi} \xi \in \epsilon$ pdarovio, of vessels cast on shore, Herodot. 7, 188. Again
 Also, to throw up and shake corn in order to winnow it, Ruhnk. Tim. p. 64. Mó $\quad$ रos शेท入ทิs xúvty Bpàrtet, sucks by pushing and shaking the teat, Meand. AI. 359. Lycophr. 461. And in the passive, $\beta \rho \alpha \sigma$ бठиеvos vind रéncetos, shaking with laughter, Lucian 5, p. 213. Aneed. Bekk. 1,66 . The passive voice has also the in-
 бouévๆ, Leonid. Tar. 57. Apoll. Rhod. 2, 323. HóOoเгı Bрабббиєעos, Greg. Naz. Carm. 20, 4. But the compound $d \nu$ aCpárтw has an active sense, to boil up, $\kappa \rho \in ́ \alpha$, Aristoph. Batr. 510. Pac. 1197.
 oscor.; and so has the other compound $\delta$
 Ніррост. 531, 20.-Ed.]
 BPOX-, below.

 is found in II. $\delta, 223$. Hesychius has $\beta \rho \iota \sigma \theta \varepsilon i ́ s$.
 врїб $\alpha$.

The Poets have also $\beta \rho i \theta o \mu a \iota$ and $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} 6 \rho \iota \theta a$, both with the same meaning as the pres. active.

BPOX-: a stem or root from which we find only some forms of the aor. 1. act. and aor. 2. pass. in the Epics with the meaning of to suck
 again), Od. $\delta, 222 . \mu, 240 . \lambda, 586$. See Вıछрю́шккш; and àvabébpoха under $\mathrm{B} \rho v \chi$ а́o $\mu$ ц. These forms are also treated of more at length in Buttm. Lexil. p. 200, \&c.

Bри́кш and Bри́х ${ }^{\omega}$ * are generally distinguished by the former meaning to bite, feed on, the latter to gnash the teeth; but the distinction is not sufficiently certain : see Buttm. on Soph. Phil. 745. and compare $\hat{\rho} \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \kappa \omega$ and $\rho \dot{\rho} \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \chi^{\omega}$. Of these two verbs no other tenses are found $\dagger$ except that Hesychius has $\beta \rho \tilde{v} \xi a t$, $\delta a \kappa \varepsilon \tau v . \quad$ [In Buttm. Lexil. p. 203. will be found a detailed account of these verbs as well as Schneider's articles (translated from his Lexicon) on $\beta \rho \dot{\prime} \kappa \omega$, $\beta \rho v \chi^{\boldsymbol{\chi}} \boldsymbol{\omega}$, ávaßpú ${ }^{\omega}$,

 aor. pass. but we sometimes find also the aor. midd., Plat. Phæd. p. 117. d. BpuZy日ei!, Soph. Ed. T. 1265.

Of the more simple form the perf. $\beta_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \rho \bar{\nu} \chi \chi^{a}$ with the sense of a pres. is used by the poets: for that this tense belongs here, and not to $\beta \rho^{\prime} \chi^{\omega}$, frendeo, is proved in Buttm. Lexil. p. 200. \&c. Compare the similar forms of $\mu v \kappa \alpha ́ o \mu a \iota$ and $\mu \eta \kappa$ ќодає.
 The short $v$ in this perf. is contrary to the general analogy of the perfect 2 ., in which all the vowels except o are long. This form also is

[^59][^60]treated of fully in Buttm. Lexil. p. 200., and the alternative left of considering it either a mere onomatopoeia $\beta_{\varepsilon ́ \ell p u ̆ \chi ~}$, it spouts forth, or an
 reading) from dंvaßpé $\chi \varepsilon \tau$, which also may mean to spout forth.

Bóve, I am full, appears only in the pres. and imperf.
["Epvos äv日eï ßpúe, II. $\rho, 56$. With gen. Soph. CEd. C. 16. But it has also a transit. sense, Xápıres póóa $\beta$ pv́ovoıv, produce in plenty, Anacr. 37, 2. - Passow.]
 long; but the passive takes the $\sigma$.

The pres. $\beta \dot{v} \omega$ was not used by the Attics. In Aristot. H. A. 9, 37, 3. Schneider's Codd. have $\beta v \nu o v ̃ \sigma v$, and in Aristoph. Pac. 645. the
 rected to $\mathfrak{e ́ b i v o v v . ~ H e r o d o t . ~ 2 , ~ 9 6 . ~ h a s ~ \delta ı a b i ́ v e t a l , ~ a n d ~ 4 , ~ 7 1 . ~ \delta ı a b v - ~}$


## $\Gamma$.

Гa $\mu^{\prime} \omega$, I marry, i. e. take a wife, forms from ГAM $\Omega$ a future of similar sound with the present ; thus, Ion. fut. $\gamma \alpha^{\mu} \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$, (Il. ı, 391.) Att. fut. $\gamma \alpha \mu \tilde{\omega}$ (Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 12.);
 - Pass. I am married, i. e. taken to wife ( (z $\gamma \alpha \mu \dot{\gamma} \hat{\theta} \eta \nu$ ). Midd. I marry, i. e. take a husband.
The fut. $\gamma a \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ and aor. 1 . $\dot{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \sigma a$ belong to the later writers.
 whence уанє́ббєтat I1. $\iota, 394$., which however has in that passage the causative meaning to give a woman in marriage, in which sense Menander used also the aor. 1. є́ $\gamma$ á $\mu \eta \sigma a$ : see Schol. Ven. ad Il. ı, 394. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 742. Meineke Menand. Fr. 303. p. 274. Buttm. in Friedem. and Seeb. Misc. Crit. 2, 4. p. 712. Compare also Reisig De â $\nu$ Partic. p. 127. The $\gamma \alpha \mu \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \sigma \alpha$ of Theocr. 8, 91., for the aor. 1. part. pass. $\gamma a \mu \eta \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \sigma a$, is grounded on the old future $\gamma$ रa $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega$.

Гávvuat, I am glad : depon. Beside the pres. and imperf. it has a fut. yavíбәoнaє [used only by the Epics and Anacr. 8. and formed

[^61]ever this form occurs there are reasons for suspecting it to be spurious.]
from an obsolete verb $\gamma^{2} v v^{\prime} \omega$ ，which occurs only in the perf．pass．$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma a-$ $\nu \bar{v} \mu$ évos．－Passow．］consequently it does not follow the general ana－ logy of verbs in $v v \mu$ ．＊

## 「A－．See 「EN－．

「 $\varepsilon \gamma \omega \nu a$ ，a perf．2．with the meaning of a present $\dagger, I$ call aloud： infin．$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \omega \nu \varepsilon ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu$（for－$\varepsilon^{\prime} \nu a \iota$ ）；part．$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \omega \nu \omega$ s ；conjunct．$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \omega \nu \omega \omega$（Soph． CEd．C．213．）；imperat．$\gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \nu \varepsilon$ ，used by the Tragedians．The 3．sing． perf．2．$\gamma \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu \varepsilon$ is in Homer both pres．and aor．（see＇Avńvo日a and note）．The other tenses are inflected as from a pres，in－$\varepsilon \omega$ ，formed from the above perf．2．，as the infin．pres．$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \omega v \varepsilon i v$（Il．$\mu$ ，337．Eurip．
 the 3．sing．$\varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \gamma^{\omega} \omega \varepsilon \varepsilon$ is to be classed with these，although it may with the same sense be the pluperf．also．The fut．$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \omega v \eta \sigma \omega$ is used by Euripides；the aor．$\gamma^{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \nu \tilde{\eta} \sigma a i$ by Æschyl．Prom．989．，and the verbal adj．$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \omega \nu \eta \tau \varepsilon$ 完 by Pind．Ol．2，10．Even Xen．Ven．6，24．has the
 by the Tragedians and also by Thucyd．7， 76.
$\Gamma \varepsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \omega$ ，I laugh，with fut．midd．$\gamma \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ，more rarely $\gamma \equiv \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ ，Monk Eurip．Alc．158．Popp．Xen．Cyr．1，4， 16. Bornem．Xen．Conviv．1．16．The $\alpha$ is short in the in－ flexion．The pass．takes $\sigma$ ．
 form all verbs in $-\zeta \omega$ with a fut．in $-\xi \omega$ ，we have the Dor．fut．$\gamma \varepsilon \lambda$ á $\xi \omega$ and the Dor．aor．$\varepsilon^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \lambda a \xi \alpha$ ．

The regular contr．part．is $\gamma \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ，plur．$\gamma \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \varepsilon \xi$ ，but in some con－ tracted verbs the $\omega$ is resolved into $\omega_{0}$ ：which takes place only where a syllable long by position follows the $\omega$ ，or it has the $\iota$ subscript，in

 cording to the metre $\gamma_{\varepsilon \lambda}{ }^{\circ} \omega \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$ or $\gamma \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\omega} o \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$, Od．$\sigma, 40.110$ ．$\ddagger$

[^62]most usual，and the most common mode of lengthening a syllable was by changing it into ot，like d $\lambda$ oiaw，गे $\gamma \nu o i \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ ，so $\gamma \in \lambda d \omega \nu$ became $\gamma \in \lambda o i=0$ whenever the verse re－ quired it（Eust．ad v．347．）．But in that case we must read $\gamma \in \lambda o f \omega \nu \tau \epsilon s$ at $\mathrm{Od} . \sigma$ ， 110．also，where there is no such various reading．We are led to view the word however in another light by the meaning of $\gamma \in \lambda \sin \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha$ at Hymn．Ven．49．where the context points not to mere laughing，but rather requires laughing and joking，（ $\gamma \epsilon-$
rEN-. This stem or root, which answers to the Lat. verb. gigno, genui, unites in Greek the causative meaning to beget, with the immediate or intransitive to be born, to become. The forms are mixed together anomalously. Of the active voice the perf. 2. $\gamma^{\text {ǵrova }}$ is the only tense in use ; all the others, in both meanings, belong exclusively to the middle. The whole may be classed from usage under the following two presents:-

1. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\text {livouat }}$ has the proper and simple sense of to be born; its present, which belongs to the Epic poets only, is used in both meanings, to be born (Il. $x, 71$.), and to beget (Od. u, 202. where we have $\gamma \in i v \varepsilon \alpha$, the 2. sing. conj. aor. 1. midd. for $\gamma$ siin $\alpha$ s). The aor. 1. midd. è $\gamma \varepsilon \iota \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\gamma \varepsilon i \nu \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, is transitive, to beget, bring forth, and belongs to both prose and poetry.
2. $\gamma$ i $\gamma$ vopul, old and Attic ; in the common language
 $\gamma_{\varepsilon} \gamma^{\prime} \nu \eta \mu \alpha l$, or in the active form perf. 2. $\gamma^{\prime}$ ' $\gamma o v \alpha$.* All these forms are without exception intransitive, not only in their proper meaning, to be born, but also in the general sense to become, fieri, and in which they are most commonly used. To these we may add the meaning of to $b e$, as ह́ $\gamma \varepsilon \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime} \dot{\mu} \eta \nu$ and $\gamma^{\prime}$ '́ova serve at the same time for preterites of the verb siui. $\dagger$ Not unfrequently however the perf. $\gamma^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}$ rovo may be also taken as a present, $I$ am; yet so that the meaning always comprehends the more exact idea of I have been, I have been born. $\ddagger \quad$ Compare $\pi$ т́фuxa.
 $\gamma^{\ell} \in \lambda o t o v$. And this meaning is most suited to Od. $v, 390$., where the suitors get ready for their banquet $\gamma \in \lambda o f(\omega y \tau \in s$, laughing and joking; which therefore, according to this second analogy, must be written $\gamma \in-$ $\lambda$ дotwryes. On the other hand at $\sigma, 110$. ( $\gamma \in \lambda \ldots \delta y \tau \epsilon s$ ) we want nothing more than simple laughing ; and so at $v, 347$. instead of $\gamma \in \lambda o i \omega y$ we must restore the old reading $\gamma \in \lambda \omega \omega \omega \nu$ for $\grave{\text { Eे }}$ '́ $\lambda \omega \nu$.
[^63]With these we may join the verb $\gamma \varepsilon \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, which takes entirely the causative meaning to beget, as well as its more general sense to produce; while the above-mentioned aor. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \gamma \in \iota \dot{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ is used only with the strict and simple idea of begetting and birth, and for that sense is the higher and better expression.

From the root TEN- arise in strictness of analogy no other presents than $\gamma \varepsilon i \nu o \mu a \iota$, like $\tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$ from TEN-, and $\gamma^{i} \gamma \nu o \mu a t$, like $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega, \mu i \mu \nu \omega$. The form $\gamma$ ivoua might, indeed, as $\varepsilon \iota$ and $\iota$ were in very ancient times almost the same, be reckoned identical with $\gamma \varepsilon i \nu o \mu a!$; but the analogy of $\gamma \iota \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$ shows that it arose in the course of pronunciation from rírooual. That grammatical decision appears therefore to have been correct, according to which the old Epic poets admitted those two forms only, and used $\gamma \varepsilon i v o \mu a \iota$, on account of the established usage of $\gamma \varepsilon i v a-$ $\sigma \theta a t$, in the sense of being born, yifvouat in that of to become. With re-
 or yivouas $^{*} \gamma_{\iota \nu} \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$, in favour of the former orthography; see Valck. ad Phoen. 1396.; but we learn from Athenian inscriptions that the other mode of writing these verbs was likewise an old and Attic usage.

In the Doric dialect the verb $\gamma^{i} \gamma \nu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ was a depon. pass., therefore ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \gamma \varepsilon \nu \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ was used for ${ }^{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 108. and Archyt. ap. Gal. p. 674. $(\gamma \varepsilon \nu a \theta \tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu)$; and thence it came into the common language of the later writers. But the future $\gamma \varepsilon \nu \eta \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (occurring twice in Plat. Parmen. p. 141. e.) presents difficulties of another kind: see Heind.

Callimachus (in Cer. 58.) uses reivato in the exact sense of
 Archimedes has frequently, p.48, 28.35.38. p. 127, 23. The form which Callimachus uses is therefore nothing more than an Epic lengthen-

 Pindar, and other poets. Theognis, 640., has $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \nu \tau o$.

For $\gamma^{\varepsilon ́ \gamma o v a ~ w e ~ f i n d ~ a ~ p o e t i c a l ~ f o r m ~(\gamma e ́ \gamma a a) ~ p l u r . ~ \gamma ย ́ \gamma a \mu \varepsilon \nu-\gamma \varepsilon ́ \gamma a ́ a-~}$

[^64][^65]


With these are united three other forms：1．）$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma$ व́ät $\varepsilon$, Batrach． 143. Hom．Epigr．ult．for $\gamma \varepsilon \gamma$ ăăt，on account of the metre，perhaps formed according to a false analogy from $\gamma \varepsilon \gamma$ áā $\iota$ ：see Buttm．Lexil．p．142．－ 2．）Éxyєүáovzat，they will be born，Hymn．Ven．198．，a future which bears the same relation to $\gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \alpha \alpha$ as $\tau \varepsilon \theta v \eta \xi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu a \iota$ does to $\tau \varepsilon \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$ ，is used like the latter as a simple but express future，and formed without the

 －$\varepsilon$ vat），Pind．Ol．6，83．，which supposes the existence of the more com－ plete perfect $\gamma^{\varepsilon} \gamma \eta \kappa a$（as $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} \ell \eta \kappa \alpha, \beta \dot{\varepsilon} b a a$ ）of which Hesychius quotes the conjunct．$\gamma \varepsilon \gamma$ áкш．

「évoo，he took，an old verb in Homer，of which we find only this one form．It appears to be a dialect of $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \tau о$ ，as $\kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \ell \tau \sigma$ for $\kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \tau o$ is quoted from Alcman by Eust．ad Il．, ，756，32．Rom．（658，29．Bas．）．The $\gamma$ in－ stead of the aspirate is preserved in many glosses of Hesychius and others．

「eúw，I cause to taste，give to taste：Midd．I taste， enjoy：Perf．pass．$\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \varepsilon \cup \mu \mu \iota$ ，Eurip．Hipp．663．：aor．1．pass． probably with $\sigma$ ；for though we find $\gamma \varepsilon \tilde{v} \mu \alpha$ ，we say also $\gamma \varepsilon \cup \sigma \tau \varepsilon \in \downarrow, \gamma \varepsilon \cup \sigma \tau$ เหós，\＆c．；and some verbs have the $\sigma$ in the aor．pass．although they have none in the perf．，as


In Theocrit．14，51．we meet with a singular form $\gamma \varepsilon \dot{v} \mu \varepsilon \theta a$ ，which unless forced can only be called a perfect without the reduplication ： and as there are few or no undisputed instances of the reduplication （i．e．the real syllabic reduplication）being omitted in the pure times of the language，this form arose most probably from the faulty lan－ guage of common life；as the similar one $\varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon \iota \pi \tau 0$, A poll．Rhod．1， 45. and 824．（which can be nothing but a pluperf．）is perhaps to be ascribed to an inaccurate imitation of the old Epic language．
$\Gamma \eta \theta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \omega$, I am glad，fut．$\gamma \eta \theta^{\prime} \sigma \sigma$, \＆c．The perf．$\gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \eta \theta a$ is the same as the present，only in more common use，and that not merely in Homer （who always has the former，never the latter），but in prose also（Plato）．


бр $ө \alpha$, ，particip．бриеуоs，imperat．бобо：


＊The Epics allowed themselves the li－ berty of pronouncing the accented $o$ in the oblique cases of the part．perf．long，as $\tau \epsilon-$ трıү⿳亠二тas for－ठ́тas．

There is no authority for a present $\gamma \dot{\eta} \theta \omega^{*}$; consequently none for $\gamma_{n} \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon$, a various reading of $\gamma \eta \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\imath}$ at $\mathrm{Il} . \xi, 140$.; on the other hand we

 thius quotes $\gamma \eta \theta \dot{\theta} \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{og}$, which is found also in the later Epies $\dagger$ who probably had some older precedent for it: this however proves nothing in favour of the active form having been used ; compare á $\chi$ モ́ $\omega$

 is inflected regularly according to the first form; only the Attics have in the infin. aor. beside $\gamma \eta \rho \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota$ a syncopated form $\gamma \eta \rho \tilde{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota \S$, preferred by the Atticists.

This infin. either comes from an aor. 2. or is formed by syncope
 $\gamma \eta \rho a \tilde{v a t}$, \&c. In the older language this was undoubtedly the only aorist; hence also in the Epics the part. $\gamma \eta \rho a^{c}($ Il. $\rho, 197$.), $\gamma \eta \rho a ́ v-$
 and кatєүท́pa (Herodot. 6, 72.), are not imperf. but this same aorist; for in both passages the sense requires, to make it complete, that "he
 as well be the 3. plur, of $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \dot{\eta} \rho a v$. The long a\| in $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \dot{\eta} \rho a$ and $\gamma \eta \rho a ̃$ vą answers to that in $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \\ \delta \rho a v \\ \text {, and corresponds as in all IT such aorists with }\end{gathered}$ the vowel of the perfect.-A particip. in $\varepsilon i \varsigma$, $\varepsilon$ évoç, consequently as coming from a sister-form in $\varepsilon$ é , is quoted in the Etym. M. from the later Ionic poetry of Xenophanes. Compare the note on $\Pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu$.

The aor. 1. $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \eta\end{gathered}{ }^{\prime} \rho a \sigma a$ occurs in Æschyl. Suppl. 901. in a causative
 Xen. Mem. 3, 12, 8. as intransitive. According to Passow there are doubts of the reading in Æschylus; but even supposing it to be true, there are many instances of the aor. 1. having a causative sense, while

[^66][^67]the pres. was intransitive, and vice versa: for instance, $\mu \varepsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \omega, I \mathrm{am}$


 stances of the opposite kind we have in $\tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \phi \omega$, I nourish, $\begin{gathered}\text { è } \tau a \phi o v, ~\end{gathered}$
 - With regard to the reading of the infin. $\gamma \eta \rho a ́ \sigma a t ~ i n ~ X e n . ~ M e m . ~$ [both Moeris and Tho. M. prefer $\gamma \eta \rho \tilde{\sim} \nu a l$, and] certainly nothing was easier than the change of this latter word to the common form, as in Herodot. 7, 114. yńpaбay might have been easily corrupted to the present reading $\gamma \eta \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$. See a similar case in the aor. of $\delta \iota \delta \rho a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$.
Гіуроцаи, біродає. See TEN-.




 infin. $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, part. $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \varepsilon i ́ g$. Verbal adj. $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau o ́ s$, old


The $\omega$ in ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \gamma \nu \omega \nu$, corresponding with the vowel of the perfect (according to the preceding note), continues through the aorist with the exception of the optat. and participle. Indeed $\gamma$ voi $\nu \nu$ is become the established
 Hence $\sigma v \gamma \gamma v \varphi_{\varphi} \eta$ in the old Atticism, Æsch. Suppl. 230., deserves our attention. In the later Attics this is again found: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 347. - The 3. plur. ${ }^{\ell} \gamma^{\prime} \nu^{\prime} \omega \nu$ for ${ }^{\prime \prime} \gamma^{\nu} \nu \omega \sigma a \nu$ is (if the reading be correct) an exception : for when the syllable - $\sigma a v$ is abbreviated to $\nu$,

 137. Isthm. 2,35 . ${ }^{\prime \prime} \gamma \nu \omega \nu$ stands without any various reading; but as the

[^68] סрâval, ठраînv, ठิ $\alpha$ d́s.
 ктаínv, ктd́s.

Other instances equally or even more complete may be seen under $\dot{a} \lambda\{\sigma \kappa о \mu \iota$,
 $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} v a s, \phi \theta d \nu \omega$, and $\phi \dot{v} \omega$; while single torms of this aorist will be found under
 $\pi т \eta \sigma \sigma \infty$; and some imperatives, as $\beta \bar{\eta} \theta t$,

syllable is long in both cases by position, we cannot in either of these instances attain perfect certainty from the metre. [Passow however, in his Lexicon, quotes at once ${ }^{\text {en }}$ ' $\gamma \nu o v$ as from Pindar, without stating whether on any authority.] In Æschyl. Pers. 18. «ย6av is by its position in the anapæstic metre long. See Lachm. de Chor. Syst. p. 28.The occurrence of the passive aor. opt. $\sigma v \gamma \gamma v o i ̃ o *$, and of the active aor. $\sigma v \gamma \gamma v \varphi^{\prime} \eta$, both in the same passage of Eschylus (230, 231.), and in the same active sense, is very singular.

The compound $\dot{a} \nu a \gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$ has, beside its common meanings, the sense of to persuade, particularly in the Ionic writers (see Hemst. ad Tho. M. in v. and Koen. Greg. p. 503.); and in this alone, as being a causative meaning, do we find the aor. 1. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma a$, Herodot. 1, 68. 87 . and in many other passages of this author $\dagger$.

Гגúф $\omega$, more rarely $\gamma \lambda u ́ \pi \tau \omega$, Eurip. Troad. 1306. On the augment of the perf. see note under B $\lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega$.

In this verb, as in $\phi \rho \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega \phi \rho \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$ (Theocr.), in $\delta \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega \delta \dot{\rho} \varepsilon \dot{\pi} \tau \omega$ (Mosch.) \&c., the former, which is the more simple present, is the more usual, while the latter, which is the more forcible one, was indeed formed, but not in general use.
 aor. ${ }^{\text {E }}$ yoov, II. $\zeta, 500$. [which Passow calls an imperf.].

Г $\rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega$, I write.—Midd. The aor. 2. pass. É $\gamma \rho \alpha \dot{\phi} \eta \nu$ is formed, not regularly from the aor. 2. act., but from the

 2. is preserved, that the long vowel becomes short.

Beside the perf. үध́ $\gamma \rho a \phi a$ there was also in use $\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \rho{ }^{\prime} \phi \eta к a$ (see Archim. De Spiral. Proœm. extr.) which, when occurring in the cominon language of the time, is censured by the Grammarians : see Phot. v.

[^69][^70]тєтíX $\eta \kappa \alpha$, who quotes it from Theopompus, Herodian ap. Herm. p. 317. Lob. ad Phryn. p. 764.*

$\Gamma \Omega N$-. See $\Gamma$ ́́ $\gamma \omega \nu$.

## $\Delta$.

$\Delta A-, \Delta A I-$. The verbs belonging to these roots have four leading senses; to divide, to give to eat, to burn, to teach.

1. $\delta$ ai $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, I divide, has in this form and meaning the pres. and imperf. only, and is exclusively poetical. To the same sense belong, from the root $\Delta \mathrm{A}$-, the fut. $\delta$ á $\sigma \boldsymbol{\mu} a l$, the aor, $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta a \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ with $a$ short, both used in prose as well as verse, and the perf. סédar $\quad$ acı with a passive meaning, I am divided (Il. a, 125. Herodot. 2, 84.), of which the 3. pl. on account of the sound follows again the root $\Delta \mathrm{AI}-$, $\delta$ eoalazat, Od. a, 23. The analogy † of $\mu$ aio $\mu a \iota ~ \mu a ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota, ~ \nu a i ́ w ~ v a ́ \sigma a \sigma \theta a \ell, ~ s h o w s ~$ that the Lexicons have no occasion to bring forward a pres. $\triangle$ AZOMAI from which to form $\delta$ ároual, \&c. This pres. is nowhere found, but another poetical one does occur, $\delta a \tau \varepsilon \in \rho \mu a \iota$ (see it in its place), which bears the same relation to those forms as $\pi \alpha \tau \dot{\varepsilon} o \mu a \iota$ does to $\pi$ á $\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$.
2. סaivvر, I receive at my table, give to eat. Midd. סaivpuat, I eat at table as a guest, feast on ( $\delta a \tilde{\tau} \tau a$, кр'́ $a, \& \mathrm{c}$. .), forms according to the analogy of all verbs in $v v \mu$ its tenses from $\delta a i \omega$, which however in the pres. never has this meaning. Therefore fut. act. $\delta a i \sigma \omega$, aor. 1. $\varepsilon^{\prime} \delta a u \sigma a$ ( $\mathrm{He}-$
 we may add $\dot{\delta} \delta a i \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ also see note on $\Delta a^{\prime} \zeta \zeta_{\omega}$. - The Ionics, without any contraction, omit the $\sigma$ in the second pers. sing.; thus imperf. סaivoo $\ddagger$, imperat. $\mu$ ápvao, ф́áo, શ̌́o, \&cc. [Callimachus has $\delta a \iota v v ่ \omega$, -~-.-Passow.]
3. סai $\omega$, I burn, set fire to.§ Midd. I burn, am on fire. [Of the act. the pres. and imperf. only are in use. - Passow.] Of the midd. we find the pres. and imperf., the aor. 2. $\varepsilon \delta a o o f \eta \nu$, whence 3. sing. con-


[^71] $\kappa \in \delta$ aí,$\sigma \kappa \in \delta \alpha \nu \nu \nu \mu$, and in prose $\kappa \nu \alpha i \omega$, $\psi$ aía.
$\ddagger$ This form occurs indeed only in I1. $\omega$, 63. $\Delta a l v v^{\prime} \epsilon_{\chi} \boldsymbol{\prime} \omega \nu$, where there is a various reading $\Delta a\left(\nu v \sigma^{\prime}\right.$ : but it is one so little worthy of credit, that it is justly disre-

§ The intrans, sense, to blaze, has been given to the active voice from a misinterpretation of II. $\epsilon, 4$. and 7. Compare II. $\sigma, 206.227$.
|| See note under "A $\gamma \nu \nu \mu$.
$\delta_{\varepsilon \delta \delta \varepsilon \iota}$, belong to the intrans. meaning of the middle, with the sense of the pres. and imperf. The future, which is nowhere found, appears, according to the analogy of kai $\omega$, to have been $\delta \boldsymbol{a} \sigma \sigma \omega$, whence $\delta \varepsilon \delta \dot{a} v-$ $\mu^{\prime} \nu o \mathrm{~g}$, burnt, in Simonid. ap. Etym. M. v. $\delta \alpha^{\prime} \dot{v} \omega$, and (by a very good emendation) in Callim. Epig. 54. (28.)
4. $\Delta \mathrm{A}$-, with the ideas of to teach and learn. To the former belongs the aor. 2. act., of which ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta a \varepsilon$ occurs in Theocr. 24, 27. Apollon. 4. 989 ., and the same form with the reduplication $\delta \dot{\delta} \delta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \varepsilon$ is found occasionally in the Odyssey.* The perf. has the sense of to learn, of which Homer has only the particip. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \bar{\sigma} \omega \mathrm{s}$ ( one who has learnt), other writers have $\delta \in \delta \delta a ́ a \sigma t .+$ To this we may add the aor. pass. éóánv (I was taught, I learned) ; from which comes, according to the note under 'Акахi' ${ }^{\prime} \omega$, a new formation $\delta a \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, ~ \delta \varepsilon \delta \dot{a} \eta \kappa \alpha$ or $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta \dot{\eta} \eta \mu a \iota$ ( I have learnt). Another Homeric form $\delta \varepsilon \delta \dot{a} a \sigma \theta a t$, to try and learn, inquire into, examine ( $\mathrm{Od} . \pi$, 316.), can only be a pres. in -áo $\mu a t$ formed from $\delta \dot{\delta} \delta \boldsymbol{\partial a}$ (just as from
 which we find no other trace of the present of this merely poetical verb; though it is the stem from which branches the common verb ס亢 $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \dot{\omega} \omega$, having its own proper inflexion: see below.

The Epic future $\delta \dot{\eta} \omega$ ( $\delta \eta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varsigma, \delta \eta o \mu \varepsilon \nu, \delta \eta \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ ) belongs to this stem or root $\Delta \mathrm{A} \Omega, I$ learn $\ddagger$, consequently has the meaning I shall learn, find out, and comes undoubtedly from the future $\delta$ ać $\omega$ by contraction of the two first vowels, as the similar Epic future $\kappa \varepsilon \epsilon \omega$ or $\kappa \varepsilon \epsilon \omega$ is formed from $\kappa \in \epsilon \in \omega$ §: see Кєĩцаи.
$\Delta a i ̈ \zeta \omega$, I divide, cut in two, kill: fut. $\delta a i \xi \omega$, \&c.
In Eurip. Heracl. 914. stands $\delta \varepsilon \iota \nu \tilde{q} \phi \lambda o \gamma i \sigma \bar{\omega} \mu a \quad \delta a i ̈ \sigma \theta \varepsilon i \varrho$, whilst everywhere besides, even in the Tragedians, we find $\delta a i ̈ \chi \theta \varepsilon i \varrho, \delta a i k a c, ~ \& c$. Elmsley reads, to answer with the verse in the antistrophe, $\delta a u \sigma \theta \varepsilon i$, thinking to form it from $\delta a i \omega$, I burn, but which appears to me contrary to the above analogy. Nor are there any grounds for forming oat$\sigma \theta \varepsilon i c$ from $\delta \alpha i \zeta \omega$, as there was nothing to hinder the use of $\delta a u \chi \theta \varepsilon i$, , like ঠeঠac $\gamma \mu \dot{\varepsilon}$ vos in Pind. Pyth. 8, 125. (see Hermann and Boéckh on that passage). If then we read $\delta a \iota \sigma \theta \varepsilon i$, I can place it only under $\delta a i-$ $\nu v \mu a \iota$; and I see no reason why the language of Lyric poetry might not have formed from the transitive sense of this middle voice, to eat, consume, an aor. passive, was consumed.

[^72][^73]$\Delta a i \rho \omega$. See $\Delta \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega$.

 passive the perf. $\delta \delta \delta \delta \eta \gamma \mu \alpha$, is the tense most in use. Passow.]
$\Delta \alpha \pi \rho v^{\prime} \omega$, I weep, has no passive: but the perf. pass. $\delta \varepsilon-$ $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sim \bar{\jmath} \mu \alpha$ s takes the idea of I am weeping, I am in tears, II.



$\Delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega, \delta a \mu a ́ \omega, \delta a \mu \nu a ́ \omega$. See $\Delta \varepsilon ́ \mu \omega$.
$\Delta \alpha_{\rho} \partial_{\alpha}^{\nu} \omega, I$ sleep: fut. $\delta \alpha \rho \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha t$; perf. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \dot{\alpha} \rho \theta \eta \alpha \alpha$;


The Poets transpose the letters of the aorist, making ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \dot{\rho} \alpha \theta o v$.
We find also in the shape of an aor. pass. катадар $\theta^{\prime}$ ยга, Aristoph. Plut. 300., and катaঠap $\theta \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (which however depends entirely on the accent), Thesm. 794. Again кaтé $\rho a \theta \varepsilon \nu$ for $-\eta \sigma a \nu$, Apollon. Rh. 2, 1229. We may suppose these forms (as Bekker does in his criticism on Wolf's Homer) to have taken a passive shape merely from mistaking the $\theta$. But as they occur principally in the compound with kará $\dagger$, the aor. of which certainly has in itself something of a passive nature, as in German ich habe geschlafen, and ich bin eingeschlafen, in English I have been asleep, and I was fallen asleep; I would rather suppose this to be the true reason: and $\kappa a \tau \varepsilon \delta$ a $p \theta \eta \nu$ will then be the perfectly regular form of the aor. 2. pass.; and thus the traditionary reading катаঠिра日ิै (Od. $\varepsilon, 471$.) appears to me unobjectionable, i. e. I believe it to have been the reading in the time of the Attics $\ddagger$.

In Aristoph. Nub. 38. the Scholiast quotes karadóp $\theta \varepsilon \tau$, instead of $-\varepsilon \tilde{\nu}$, as the Attic mode of writing. I would observe that the aorist certainly does not appear to suit that passage, which requires the idea of duration ; whence also $\tau i$ is added. The natural idea of a person disturbed in his sleep is not, 'let me fall asleep a little,' but 'let me

[^74]as to meaning, stand pretty much on the same ground as the compounds of kard.
$\ddagger$ I think that the account which I have given above is one which may fairly stand valid as long as no historical grounds can be adduced to the contrary, and notwithstanding the mere unsupported objection of Porson on the passage of Plutus.
sleep a little.' Katǻápөıv may therefore very possibly be an Attic sister-form of катаסар $\theta a ́ \nu \omega$, like aï $\sigma о \mu a \iota$ or aṽ $\xi \omega$.
$\Delta a \tau \varepsilon ́ o \mu a t$, depon., used only in pres. and imperf., while the other tenses are taken from $\Delta a i \omega$, No. 1., which see. Hesiod $\varepsilon$, 795. has the aor. 1. infin. of this verb without the $\sigma, \delta a \tau \varepsilon ́ a \sigma \theta a \iota$, like à $\lambda$ éa $\sigma \theta a$,


Déarau, it appears, occurs only once, Od. $\zeta, 242$. סéaro. But to this verb belongs also the aor. with its vowel changed סoáarato, conj. סoá $\sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}$ ( for $-\eta \tau a \iota$ ). In that passage of the Odyssey the common reading was סóaro, but the unanimous consent of Grammarians and manuscripts has now restored ס́́aro. Both forms however indisputably belong to each other, as $\varepsilon-o$ is a common change of vowel. Apollonius uses the 3. optat. act. סoáarat and סoá $\sigma \sigma a \tau o$ personally, and writes also $\delta o t a ́ \zeta \varepsilon v,-\varepsilon \sigma \theta a t$; as he, with the majority of the Grammarians, derived the Homeric verb from סoon, doubt, and understood it in the sense of to conjecture, reflect. But in the Homeric passages either there is no doubt, or, if there is one, it lies in the former part of the
 See a full account of these forms in Buttm. Lexil. p. 212., \&c.
$\Delta \varepsilon \delta i \sigma \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota .-\tau \tau о \mu \alpha \iota, I$ affright: depon. midd. [Poet. for $\delta \varepsilon \iota \delta \delta \sigma \sigma 0 \mu \alpha t$; but the part. aor. midd. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \iota \xi \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 s$ is found in Demosth. de Fals. Leg. 291.-Passow.]

In Homer we have $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta i \sigma \sigma \circ \mu a l$ frequently, and in a transitive sense; but once it occurs intransitively, to be afraid, II. $\beta, 190$. The verb
 ad Moer. p.119.), which must not however be confounded with the

$\Delta \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} . \quad$ See $\Delta^{\epsilon} \omega$.
$\Delta \varepsilon i \delta \omega$. See $\Delta \varepsilon i \sigma a \iota$.
$\Delta s i x \nu \cup \mu$, , and $\delta \varepsilon เ x \nu \cup ́ \omega, I$ show: fut. $\delta \varepsilon i \xi \omega$; aor. 1. $\varepsilon^{*} \delta \varepsilon \iota \xi \alpha$.
The Ionians spoke all the forms which came from the simple root
 154.* That is to say, all these forms preserve their original length by position, like $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \zeta \omega \nu$, крє́ $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu$. Compare also $\pi \varepsilon i \kappa \omega$.
The midd. $\delta \varepsilon i \kappa v v \mu a \iota$ has in the Epics (Il. $\iota$, 196. Hymn. Ap. 11.) the additional meaning of to salute, welcome, drink to. $\dagger$ Consequently to

[^75]Compare Koen. Greg. Cor. in Ion. 36. Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. in סeíkv. and àжoōelkv.

+ [ In this sense Homer uses only the perf. and pluperf. - Passow.]
it belongs the perf. $\delta \varepsilon i \delta \varepsilon \gamma \mu a t$, which has the same meaning, and is used as a present: 3. plur. $\delta \varepsilon i \delta \hat{\chi} \chi a \tau a \ell, 3$. sing. pluperf. (as imperf.) $\delta \varepsilon i \delta \varepsilon \kappa \tau \sigma$. The syllable of reduplication $\delta \varepsilon \iota$ is found here, merely because $\delta \varepsilon \iota$ is also the syllable of the stem or root, as in $\delta \varepsilon i \sigma a t . *$
 see 'Aрıбтáw.
$\Delta \varepsilon \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \alpha l$, to fear: aor. 1. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \delta \varepsilon \iota \sigma \alpha$; fut. $\delta \varepsilon l \sigma o \mu \alpha l$ [the act. fut. $\delta \varepsilon i \sigma \omega$ is found only in Aristid. 2. p. 168. - Passow.]. Homer has the present $\delta \varepsilon_{i}^{\prime} \delta \omega$, but only in its first person: instead of it we find the perfect (with the meaning of the present), with two forms in use, $\delta \leq \delta \circ \iota \pi \alpha$ and $\delta \leq \delta \iota \alpha$, the choice of which depended on the one or the other sounding more agreeably to the ear. $\dagger$ Of $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta \alpha$ and its pluperfect the plural takes the syncope; thus $\delta_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \delta \iota \mu \varepsilon \nu, \delta \varepsilon \delta \iota \tau \varepsilon$, for



The infin. is not formed according to this analogy, but remains $\delta \varepsilon-$ $\delta \iota \varepsilon \operatorname{lot}$; the Epics however form it in - $\iota \mu \varepsilon \nu, \delta \varepsilon \iota \delta i \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (see below); compare the same formation in the pres. of $\varepsilon \bar{i} \mu$, I go. - In the indicative
 long to the later writers: whence however they have frequently been transferred to the copies and editions of Attic authors. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 180.

In Homer the $\delta$ is always doubled after the augment or the preposition in composition, as $\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \delta \varepsilon \iota \sigma \varepsilon, \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \delta \delta \varepsilon i \sigma a \varsigma$. Now as this verb, with its compounds and derivatives, very frequently makes the preceding

[^76]$\uparrow$ The form $\delta$ ह$\delta$ ivia deserves our attention, which the Antiatticist, p. 90, 1. quotes from the Comic writer Eubulus, and which Bekker from evident traces in the manuscripts has restored to the text of Ylat. Phædr. p. 254. extr. But the form of the optative $\delta \in \delta \iota \in\{\eta$, which that critic hes adopted from nearly the same manuscripts, at p. 251 . a. of the same work, I cannot admit. If the optative be there indispensable, analogy requires $\delta \in \delta \omega i(\eta$,
 $\pi \in \pi о เ \theta \circ i \eta$. But the syntax of the com.
 ty ... appears to me admissible.
short syllable in the cæsura of the old hexameter long (e, g. Il. $\lambda, 10$. $\xi, 387$. ); and the $\delta$ of its stem or root is scarcely ever* preceded by a short syllable, it is clear that there must have been something peculiar in the old pronunciation of this verb to have produced such a general coincidence: and Dawes with great probability suspects this to have been the digamma after the $\delta(d w)$, to supply the place of which the $\delta$ was afterwards doubled. See Dawes, Misc. Crit. pp. 165. 168. and Buttm. Lexil. pp. 355. 375.
 $\delta \epsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu$, the reason of which was, as in $\delta \varepsilon i \delta \varepsilon \kappa \tau o$ under $\delta \varepsilon i \kappa \nu v \mu$, that the diphthong was in the stem or root. $\dagger$ Now as the fem. particip. of סeioica could not be admitted into a hexameter, Apollonius Rh. ( 3,753 .) has, and undoubtedly not without a precedent from some older poet, $\delta_{\varepsilon \iota} \delta v i a a . ~ \ddagger$ There arose also a regular present $\delta \varepsilon i \delta \delta \omega$, which however is found only in its first person. §

On the 3. pers. of the perf. $\delta \in i \delta i \varepsilon$ used as imperf. see 'Avínooa and note. $\Delta \varepsilon \delta o i \kappa \omega$ is a Doric pres. formed from the perf. in Theocr. 15, 58., like $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \kappa \omega$ in the Ionic epigram of Posidippus ap. Athen. 10. p. 417, e.
$\Delta$ éouka is formed from the theme $\Delta \mathrm{EI} \Omega$, with the change of vowel usual in the perf. 2.; and $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta a$ is shortened from it, as $\pi \varepsilon \phi v ̌ a \sigma t$ is from $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \bar{\chi} \kappa \alpha$, i $\delta \mu \varepsilon \nu$ from oii $\alpha$. But that theme also was still in existence in

[^77]ready touched on in the last note but one.
$\oint$ In the epigram of Antagoras, Cod. Vat. p. 379. n. 147. (in Brunck. Simonid. 62.) we ought undoubtedly to read $\delta \in\{\delta \iota \tau$ instead of $\delta \in\{\delta \in \tau \varepsilon$. Compare the various readings $\delta є เ \delta \grave{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu, \delta \epsilon \iota \delta \in ́ \mu \in \nu, O d ., 274$. As the verse can in every instance dispense with the form $\delta \in(\delta \omega$, the poets appear to have been swayed in their preference of that or $\delta \in i \delta \iota a$ by merely metrical reasons. Compare I1. $\kappa, 39$. with $\phi, 536$.-On $\delta \in โ \delta \omega$ we have only further to observe that in many Lexicons [Schneider's and Passow's for instance] it serves as the theme for the whole verb: but our statement must have made it sufficiently clear that it originally took its rise from $\delta \in\{\delta i a$. And it is equally clear from the above-mentioned סeเovia (as a substitute for which $\delta \in$ i $\delta$ ovaca must have been at once apparent), and from $\bar{\delta} \in \delta i ́ a \sigma \iota y$ in so old a poet as the author of II. $\omega$ must at all events have been, and who would therefore certainly have used $\delta \in(\delta \delta o v a s$, that this present was unknown to those old writers further than in its first person.
the Epic language in this its shortened form, whence Homer has more than once the imperf. $\delta i \varepsilon$ ( $\varepsilon \delta \check{\varepsilon}$ ), e. g. II. $\lambda, 556 . \rho, 666$. *

This Epic díw contained also the idea of to fly, run, סiov Il. र, 251. Hence the causative idea of to frighten away; but this is expressed in Homer, contrary to the analogy of other writers, by the passive form $\delta i \varepsilon \sigma \theta c u, \delta i \omega \mu u \iota, \& c$. (II. $\mu, 276 . \eta, 197$.) But there must have been also an active transitive $\delta i \eta \mu \uparrow \dagger$, pretty nearly corresponding in meaning with this, from which two Homeric forms come: 1. 'evoísoav, they urged (the dogs) on, II. $\sigma, 584$. 2. $\delta i \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha$, , pass. or midd. with a neuter sense, they run, II. $\psi, 475$. Hence the infin. $\delta i \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \varepsilon$ may belong to both forms and both meanings, as in II. $\mu, 276$. and 304 .

In Ætschyl. Pers. 697, 698. (in both which verses the present reading is $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \mu a \ell$, a theme formed without any authority,) the old editions and the majority of the manuscripts have סєiopat, contrary to the metre. But three manuscripts, according to Hermann, give סiopat; which must therefore be the true reading concealed under the above corruption; and what in Homer is expressed by $\delta i \omega$ is thus represented in Æschylus by $\delta i o \mu a t$, which with $\delta$ ह́oca has in its favour the analogy


## $\Delta \mathrm{EK}$-. See $\Delta_{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{i} \kappa \nu \nu \mu$ and $\Delta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \chi о \mu \alpha$.

 perf. 1. $\delta \hat{\varepsilon} \delta \mu \eta \kappa a \ddagger$, perf. 2. $\delta \varepsilon \in \delta \partial \mu a$, perf. pass. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta \mu \eta \mu a \iota$.

The pres. and imperf. are rare even in the poets. The pres. is found only in the part. $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu о \nu \tau a$, Hymn. Merc. 188.; the imperf. $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu o \nu$ in Od. $\psi, 192$.; but the aor. act. and midd. occur in the Ionic writers, and later in common prose. The perf. pass. is used by Herodot. 7, 200. The form $\delta \varepsilon i \mu \circ \mu \varepsilon \nu$, Il. $\eta, 337$. is the conjunct. aor. 1. act. shortened from $\delta \varepsilon \ell \mu \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$.

Of the sister-form§ $\delta o \mu \epsilon \epsilon$ we find principally the aor. and perf., but their usage is also limited; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 587. sqq. The


[^78]\&c., under $\delta i \eta \mu$, which he says is contracted from sit $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu$.
$\ddagger$ It may be doubted whether this perf. be formed by metathesis like ßé $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \eta \kappa \alpha$ (see Bd $\lambda \lambda \omega$ and note), or by a mere syncope: on the former hypothesis it will run thus, $\delta \in \mu \omega$ ( $\triangle \mathrm{EM}, \triangle \mathrm{ME}$ ) $\delta$ é $\delta \mu \eta \mu \alpha$; by the latter, like $\nu \epsilon \in \mu \omega \quad \nu \in \nu \epsilon \not \mu \eta \kappa \alpha, \delta \in ́ \mu \omega$ ( $\delta \in \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$ ) $\delta \epsilon \in \delta \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$.
§ Many dissyllabic barytone verbs, whica have $\epsilon$ in the syllable of the stem or root, make sister-forms by changing the $\epsilon$ to $o$, and taking the termination éc ; as, $\phi \in ́ \rho \omega \phi$.


The same stem or radical word $\Delta \hat{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$ has also the meaning of to tame in the following forms ；perf．$\delta \hat{\varepsilon} \delta \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$ ；perf．pass．$\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \rho \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor．］．pass．
 formed the present in the following manner：1．$\delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega$ and $\delta \alpha \mu a ́ \omega$ ． 2．by the insertion of the syllable $\nu a, \delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \eta \mu \iota$ and $\delta a \mu \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega . \dagger$ Of these $\delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega$ has become the usual form in prose as well as verse，and is in－ flected regularly through all its tenses like the derivative verbs in á̧ $\omega$ ： $\delta a \mu a ́ \omega$ ，as a present，is the Epic sister－form of $\delta \alpha \mu a ́ \zeta \omega$（like àv $\tau \dot{a} \dot{\omega} \omega$ for $\dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \dot{\prime} \zeta \omega)$ ，Il．$a, 61$. ；but its forms are at the same time the Ionic and Attic future of $\delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega ;$ e．g．$\delta a \mu a ́ q, ~ I 1 . ~ \chi, ~ 271 . ~ \delta a \mu o ́ \omega \sigma \iota v, ~ I 1 . ~ \zeta, ~ 368 . ~ \ddagger ~$

$\Delta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho к о \mu a t$ ，or perf．with the meaning of the pres．$\delta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \delta \rho \rho к a$ ，（see Buttm． Lexil．p．202．note，）I see，look．Aor．by transposition é̇̇дăkov，which act．form is used particularly by the Epics；the other poets use the two aorists belonging to the deponent $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \kappa о \mu a t$ ，viz． $\bar{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \chi \theta \eta \nu$ ，Soph．


There are no grounds for a pres．act．ঠé $\rho \kappa \omega$ ．The perf．$\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta о \rho к а$ has in Pindar（Ol．1，153．\＆ce．）a pass．or intrans．meaning also，ф́́ $\gamma \gamma$ os， фáos $\begin{aligned} & \text { édopкe，is seen，shines．} \\ & \text { ．}\end{aligned}$
$\Delta$ épw，I skin，I beat，is inflected regularly according to the rules of verbs whose characteristic letter is one of the four liquids，$\lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho$ ．Thus it has no fut．1．but a fut． 2．$\delta \equiv \rho \tilde{\omega}$ ；its aor．1．is not formed in $\sigma \alpha$ ，but in $\alpha$ ，as ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \rho \alpha$ ； its perfect 1．is（with the change of $\varepsilon$ to $\alpha$ ，like $\pi \equiv i \rho \omega$ ， $\pi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}, \pi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \rho x \alpha$, ）$\delta \varepsilon ́ \delta \alpha \rho x \alpha$ and its perf．2．$\delta \varepsilon ́ \delta o \rho \alpha$ ．In the pass．it has a fut．2．$\delta \alpha \rho \dot{\gamma} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ ，and an aor．2．é $\delta \alpha \dot{p} \gamma \nu . \S$

An Attic sister－form of the present is $\delta a i \rho \omega$ ，［whence the infin．aor． ס亢̃ $\rho a \iota$, ］Aristoph．Nub．442．Av．365．See Heind．ad Plat．Euthyd． 35. Passow mentions also a later Ionic pres．$\delta \varepsilon i \rho \omega$ ，as probably formed


[^79]$\nu \eta \mu t$ ，$\pi\{\tau \nu \eta \mu t$ ，and $\sigma \kappa(\delta \nu \eta \mu\}$ ，from $\pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ， ПETA ，ミKE $\triangle A \Omega$ ．These derivatives occur mostly in the dialects and poets．
$\ddagger$ Thus we have as futures $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \in \varepsilon, 11$ ．$\uparrow$ ， 415．$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Plat．Protag．p．311．b．$\kappa a \lambda \varepsilon \hat{\imath}$ ， Xen．Symp．1，15．ка $\lambda \in \imath \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，Demosth． Lept．5，коре́єts，II．$\nu, 831$ ．These futures in $\epsilon \omega-\omega$ ，and $\alpha \omega-\omega$ ，with a similarly sounding present，are not very numerous． Compare é $\lambda \lambda a v ́ v \omega$ and $\pi \in \rho \alpha \omega$ ．
§ The aor．1．also did however exist ； see $\delta a p \theta$ és in Lex．Seguer．2．p．89， 5.
$\Delta \varepsilon v ́ u, ~ I ~ w e t, ~ i s ~ i n f l e c t e d ~ r e g u l a r l y . ~ T h e ~ E p i c ~ \delta ̀ \varepsilon v o \mu a \iota ~ s e e ~ u n d e r ~ \Delta \varepsilon ́ ~ i ́, ~$ $I$ am wanting.
$\Delta$ ย́ $\chi \circ \mu \alpha$, Ionic (but not Epic) $\delta$ éropaь, I receive;

 $\hat{\varepsilon}^{\dot{\partial}} \hat{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \chi^{\theta} \eta \nu$, part. $\delta \varepsilon \chi^{\theta \varepsilon l_{\xi}}$ (in a pass. sense), taken.

The perf. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta \gamma \mu a \iota$ has in the Epics another peculiar sense of a pre-
 ticularly of one who stands to receive an attack, or waits for game; e. g.
 to which belongs with a similar active sense the fut. $\delta \overline{\delta \varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \xi_{\sigma} \mu a \iota$, II. $\varepsilon, 238$. But $\delta \varepsilon i \delta \varepsilon \gamma \mu a \iota$, I welcome, similar as that idea may seem to be to the above meaning, belongs to $\delta \varepsilon i \kappa v v \mu$, as we have shown under that verb.

The syncop. aor. ( $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \mu \eta \nu)$ 旼єктo, $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \chi \theta a \iota$, imperat. $\delta \hat{\varepsilon} \xi \%$, has been mentioned before in a note under the root TEN-. According to the analogy there laid down it has the sense of an aorist, and therefore means received, exactly synonymous with éoŋध $\dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \eta$; compare Il. o, 88.
 occur in this meaning but only with that of an imperf., I was waiting for, expecting (e. g. Od., 513 .), and in the same way the particip. $\delta_{\varepsilon} \gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu$ оs, $\pi о \tau \iota \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu$ os has only the sense of waiting, expecting (e. g.
 given in the last paragraph ; in which therefore these forms differ from the analogy of the syncopated forms laid down in the above-mentioned note under TEN-. But since at II. $\mu, 147$. סéxatal, which is not a historical form, is used in speaking of the waiting for an attack, consequently in the exact meaning of $\delta \varepsilon \delta \dot{\delta} \chi a \tau \alpha$, , it is clear that the perf. $\delta \dot{\delta} \delta \varepsilon \gamma \mu a t$ in this its peculiar sense (as a present), which sense the present $\delta$ éx oual never has, was able to throw off the reduplication, - a rare occurrence, of which we find but two or three instances, and those in the later writers *; we must therefore lay down for $\delta \hat{\chi}$ रouat in the old Epic writers a twofold usage : viz. -


 or $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu 0$.

From the form $\delta \hat{\delta} к о \mu$ а would come (see the 2 d note under $\Delta \hat{\varepsilon} \mu \omega \dagger$ )

[^80]might be formed סoxtouar, from which would come regularly $\delta \in \delta о \kappa \eta \mu$ е́vos.
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also the Epic perf. $\delta \in \mathcal{E} 0 \kappa \eta \mu \varepsilon^{\prime} \nu o$ os, II. o, 730. Hes. a, 214. in the sense of the above-mentioned $\delta \delta \delta \varepsilon \gamma \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} v o \varsigma$. We find in Apollon. Lex.
 guished from the Attic $\delta \varepsilon \delta o ́ \kappa \eta \mu a \iota$ under $\delta o \kappa \varepsilon ́ \omega$.
 perf. pass. $\delta \delta \delta \delta \varepsilon \mu \alpha \iota ;$ aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon^{\delta} \delta \varepsilon^{\prime} \theta_{\eta \nu}$ - Midd. The fut. 3. (or paulo-post fut.) $\delta \varepsilon \delta \partial \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ generally supplies in Attic writers the place of the non-Attic fut. 1. pass. $\delta \equiv 0$ riбo $\mu \alpha$, which however is occasionally found, e. g. Demosth. c. Timocr. 126. 131. 190. - Dissyllable contracted verbs do not in general take the contraction, except in $\varepsilon \iota$ : thus we
 however an exception; for we find $\tau \grave{\delta} \delta о \tilde{u} \nu, \tau \tilde{c} \tilde{o}$ סои̃ข $\downarrow \iota$, Plat. Cratyl. (i) $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \delta \tilde{\omega} \nu$, Aristoph. Plut. 589. бь $\alpha \delta о \tilde{u} \mu \alpha l, ~ \& c . ;$ in which respect it differs from $\delta \varepsilon ́ \epsilon$, I am in want of, which makes $\tau \grave{o} \delta \delta \varepsilon \iota \nu, \delta \delta_{0} \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, and even sometimes $\delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$.

On the above-mentioned usage of the future see Moeris and Thom. Mag. in v. We will only remark that it is not to be considered as an aberration of the pronunciation from $\delta$ to $\theta$, for the future 3 . is used in some other verbs in the same way : see particularly Пıтр́íбк.

Instead of $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ the older Ionic and Attic language had a present of a more distinct and intelligible sound, $\delta i \delta \eta \mu$; e. g. imperf. $\delta i \delta \eta$, Il. $\lambda$, 105.; $\delta \iota \delta \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, Od. $\mu, 54$. according to the reading of Aristarchus; סiot́át, Xenoph. Anab. 5, 8, 24. as taken from the most credible sources. See Porson ad Schol. Od. l.c.
$\Delta \varepsilon ́ \epsilon, I$ am in want of, I fail: fut. $\delta \varepsilon \eta \dot{\gamma} \sigma \omega$; aor. $\bar{\varepsilon} \delta \varepsilon^{\prime} \eta \sigma \alpha$, for which Homer has once $\delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \nu$, Il. $\sigma, 100$. This verb is generally impersonal ; $\delta \varepsilon \tilde{\imath}$, it is wanting, it is necessary, (il faut), conjunct. $\delta \in \hat{\eta} \eta$ (contr. $\delta \tilde{\eta}$ ), optat. $\delta \in o \kappa$, infin. $\delta \varepsilon \iota \tau$,
 é $\delta$ ह́n
 This voice is never impersonal.

[^81]aor. 1., but others with $\epsilon$, viz. its perfects and aor. passive.

This verb, with respect to its contraction, differs from the preceding merely in the forms which in $\delta \varepsilon \tau \nu$, to bind, are contracted to ow.* But the contraction also to $\varepsilon$, which is regularly found in all verbs of this kind, was partly omitted in the one before us; for instance in the 2. pers. sing. (which is of rare occurrence) toбov́zov סé $\varepsilon \iota$, Isocr. Busir. 5. p. 222.; and Xenophon uses $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \tau a \iota, \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, perhaps always, as it is still preserved in many passages. $\dagger$

The conjunctive of the impersonal is frequently found in verse as a monosyllable, because according to some $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon_{\imath}$, though written as two syllables, was pronounced as one. See Meineke on Menand. Fr. Inc. 28. and 39., and a fragment of Philetærus ap. Athen. 10. p. 416. f. But there is an old precept, well deserving attention, according to which $\delta \varepsilon \tau$ and similar monosyllables are said to have had at the same time the force of conjunctive as well as of indicative. See Reisig on Aristoph. I. p. 44. $\ddagger$

The Grammarians mention as a contraction of a peculiar kind the neut. part. of the two verbs $\delta \varepsilon \tau v$, to be in want of, and $\delta o \kappa \varepsilon \tau v ;$ that is to say, for $\delta_{\varepsilon} \rho \nu$ (which is otherwise never contracted) $\delta_{\varepsilon i} \nu$, and for סoкéov $\delta$ окєiv, the same in sound as their infinitives, and which they

[^82]p. 431.) at a time when certainly every one pronounced $\delta \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \theta a l$, is a single affected imitation of Xenophon. Among the instances of similar resolution in other verbs mentioned by Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 220. sqq. are only two from pure writers of $\pi \lambda \in i \hat{\nu}$, which may be seen under that verb. These make it probable that the Ionicism was still familiar enough in those short verbs, to cause it to be preferred in the case before us.
$\ddagger$ Dobree (on Aristoph. Plut. 216.) rejects much too disdainfully this precept given in the Hort. Adon. 187. b., for the truth of which I certainly cannot answer, but which is undoubtedly taken from one of the older Atticists: for this writer quotes (exactly as Phrynichus often does, e. g. pp. 70.84. 120.250. Lob.) the $\beta$ भ́ropes, that is to say the later ones, as using the common form. If now we compare $\delta \eta \lambda \dot{\sigma} \in t$ $\delta \eta \lambda 0 \hat{i}$, we have an analogy for $\delta \epsilon \in \neq \eta \delta \epsilon i$. The passages quoted by Reisig from Aristophanes Plut. 216. Ran. 2̀65., where the reading in many, and those the best manuscripts, is $\kappa \bar{t} \nu \delta \in \hat{i}$, " and even if it must be," give the above-mentioned precept great weight. Still this usage, if I have stated it correctly, cannot be the same as a similar one in $\kappa \epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu \iota$, as $\mu \eta$ סьdкєєцaı does not arise from contraction.
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even call Attic forms．See Greg．Cor．in Att．72．with the notes． Apollon．de Adv．p．542，33．，and the Exc．Paris．at the end of Schæfer＇s Gregorius，p．678．Phavor．vv．$\delta \varepsilon \tau \nu v$ and $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \tau v . ~ B u t ~ t h e r e ~ a r e ~ n o ~ i n-~$ stances quite free from doubt；which warrants our suspecting that the existence of these forms arose entirely from the syntax of the sentences being mistaken，and that the forms are really infinitives standing el－ liptically or used as substantives．＊

Homer has this verb with the stem or root $\Delta E Y$－instead of $\Delta \mathrm{E}$－
 active $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \varepsilon v ́ \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$, Od．$\iota, 540$ ．，both voices in the sense of to be wanting； so that the poet，in speaking of a momentary event，appears to have used the aor．act．instead of the common prose form $\delta \varepsilon \eta \theta \tilde{\eta} v a t$ ．In the midst of this great unanimity of meaning in the root $\triangle E Y-$ ，we find two pas－ sages which are very striking：1．11．, ，337．which has the impersonal $\delta \varepsilon \tilde{l}$ ，whereas in all the other passages $\chi \rho \eta$ is used in a similar sense； 2. O $\delta . \sigma, 100$ ．$\varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \imath \circ \delta^{\prime \prime} \varepsilon \delta \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ in the sense of the above－mentioned $\varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \dot{u}-$ $\eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ ，where the common form $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ therefore is shortened in a way which we meet with nowhere else．$\dagger$


#### Abstract

＊In the first place，it is very remarkable that the Lexicons of Atticists and rheto－ ricians which have come down to us，and which do not overlook the comparative  in question：beside which，some of the manuscripts，even that of Gregory，mention only $\pi \lambda \epsilon i v$ ，and have not the addition of ठєì \＆yтl тov̂ ôє́ov：while бокєiv depends entirely on the most uncertain authorities， Phavorinus and the above－mentioned Exc． Paris．Hence it is highly probable that some of the very late Grammarians were the first to make use of the well－known case of the comparative $\pi \lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \nu$ for $\pi \lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, in order to understand $\delta \in \overparen{\imath} \nu$ and $\delta o \kappa \epsilon i v$ in certain phrases as participles．Whence under the word $\Delta \in i v$ in the Etym．M． we find after that explanation the fol－  itself may be compared with those on $\Delta \in \hat{i} \nu \varphi^{2} \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\Delta \in \hat{i} \nu$ in Hesychius．And how suitable the article is to the infinitive  grapher，is clear．Under these circum－ stances the example from Lysias c．Al－ cib．1．p．140．12．（the only one which has been hitherto adduced）is of no weight，as the passage is otherwise corrupted，and those manuscripts which are well known have only $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ ，while $\delta \in i ̂ v$ as well as $\delta \in \in ⿱ 亠 乂$ is an arbitrary correction ：one of these we must choose，and our choice will of


course be regulated by a consideration of all that has been brought forward．As to סокєìv，I have no doubt that it depends entirely on a comparison of the expression
 comparison is most uncertain；for the meaning of the latter is，＂since it seems good and pleasing to him，＂that of the former＂as it appears to me，＂which in Herodotus is evidently an infinitive，$e^{\prime} \mu \mathrm{ol}$ סокє́єเข（see Herm．ad Vig．not．204．）． We have now therefore to consider the contraction as stripped of all analogy；for $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ ，if that be the only instance，is suf－ ficiently explained as shortened from $\pi \lambda \epsilon i ̂ o \nu$ ，which in a phrase of daily oc－ currence like $\pi \lambda \in i o v$ 分 $\mu$ v́ptot，is very conceivable．But in $\pi \lambda$ eioy the pure sound of the stem or root is $\epsilon$ ，which in $\delta \epsilon ́ o \nu$ or $\delta$ окє́oy is unheard of even in the Ionic dialect．Further，the name K $\lambda \in l_{-}$ $\sigma \theta \in ́ v \eta s$, which the Grammarians introduce also in the comparison，is compounded not of $K \lambda \epsilon 0-$ but of $K \lambda \in \epsilon L$ ，from $\kappa \lambda \in$ éos，as obefivouos from opos；and，not to omit any thing bearing on the question，the name Neil $\ell$ ews is not from Neó $\lambda e \omega s$ ，but a dia－ lect from the old name N $\eta \lambda \in v^{\prime} s$ ，the head of the family of that old colonist．

+ If criticism were not bound to con－ sider as sacred whatsoever the old rha－ psodists and critics have handed down as the text of those primaval monuments of


## $\Delta H K$-. See $\Delta a ́ \kappa \nu \omega$.

$\Delta \eta ं \omega$. See $\Delta \mathrm{A}-4$.
$\Delta$ ıı $\tau \alpha$, , $I$ arbitrate: pass. with fut. midd. I live in a certain way, lead a certain kind of life. The only irregularity in the formation of this verb is in the augment, as it makes sometimes $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \iota \alpha i ́ \tau \eta \sigma \alpha$, sometimes $\delta เ \gamma_{i} \tau \eta \sigma \alpha$, and has even the double augment $\kappa \alpha \tau \delta \delta \cdot \hat{\eta} \tau \eta \sigma \alpha$. Compare the following.
 Like the preceding verb its irregularity consists in the



On the derivation of this word, which is indisputably not compounded of óá, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 231.
$\Delta$ воибжш, I teach, loses the $\sigma$ in the formation; thus fut. $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \xi \xi \omega$; aor. 1. $\varepsilon^{\delta} \dot{\delta} \delta \alpha \xi \alpha$; perf. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta \delta \alpha \chi \alpha$; perf. pass. infin. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \iota \delta \alpha \chi^{\dagger}{ }^{\dagger}$, Il. $\lambda, 831$. \&c. - Midd.

It comes from $\Delta A \Omega$, and is exactly like $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega$, which may be compared with it. In the poets we meet with another future $\delta i \delta a \sigma \kappa \eta \sigma \omega$, e. g. in Hes. $\varepsilon$, 64. Hymn. Cer. 144.
$\Delta i \delta \eta \mu$. See $\Delta \varepsilon \in \omega, I$ bind.
$\Delta \iota \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$, I run away, generally occurs in composition
 with $\alpha$ long ; hence Ion. $\delta \iota \delta \rho \dot{\gamma} \sigma \varkappa \omega, \delta \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \mu \alpha \iota, \& c .-A o r .2$. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu,-\bar{\alpha} \mathcal{S},-\bar{\alpha},-\bar{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu,-\bar{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon, \quad \bar{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} \delta \rho \alpha^{\nu} \nu$; conjunct. $\delta \rho \tilde{\omega},-\tilde{\alpha} s,-\tilde{\alpha}, \& c . ;$ optat. $\delta \rho \alpha i \eta \nu ;$ imperat. $\delta \rho \tilde{\alpha} \theta_{t}$; infin.
 $\& c .:$ but $\delta \rho \alpha i \eta \nu, \delta \rho \alpha_{s}$ retain the $\alpha$, according to the analogy of ${ }^{\varepsilon}$ हैт
antiquity, it would be easy to alter the one passage to $\chi \rho \dagger$, and the other to $\ell \mu \in \hat{v}$ § èdè $\eta \sigma e v$. If however the Homeric formation $\delta \in \cup \eta=\omega$ be compared with the common $\delta € \dagger \sigma \omega$, there will be great probability in the conjecture of some moderns, that this verb had originally a digamma, which in some cases produced the diphthong $\varepsilon v$, as in e̛aōev; while in others it was entirely omitted, as in $\delta \epsilon \hbar \sigma \omega, \tilde{\epsilon} \alpha \delta \epsilon \nu$. Hence
also we may find it easier to explain how סé $\epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, \&c., remained longer than others in a state of resolution ; and, to bring $\pi \lambda$ é $\epsilon$ within the same analogy, we may adduce the formation $\bar{e} \pi \lambda \in v \sigma a$. But the steps by which we advance here are not so sure as in єर้aঠev and ravákas: we will therefore content ourselves with merely pointing out the probability.

The form ${ }^{\text {a }}$ тoditópávat in Thucyd. 4, 46., which would come from ঠiíp $\mu$, Bekker has now amended (from the reading of several manu-

 grounded on such a precedent as the above passage of Thucydides.

The aor. 1. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \delta \rho \bar{a} \sigma \alpha$, which is the regular aorist of $\delta \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega, I d o$, was also that of $\delta \iota \delta \rho a \operatorname{\sigma \kappa \omega }$ in the common dialect, and after the time of Aristotle in the written language; here and there it is found also in some copies of the earlier authors. $\dagger$

The formation of the aor. 2. in $\bar{a} \nu, \& c$., detailed above not only arises completely from the analogy laid down in the note under $\Gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, but is also expressly given in the same way by Phrynichus in the Appar. Sophist. p. 11. Two instances of the 1. sing. occur also in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 419, 31. The quantity of the $\bar{\alpha}$ is evident from the Ionicism ${ }^{\prime \prime} \bar{\varepsilon} \rho \eta \nu$, and from the following conclusion of an anapæstic verse of Aristoph. in
 may join the unquestionable amendment of Reiske in Eurip. Heracl.
 3. plur. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \delta \rho a \nu$ should be short, is only according to the general rule of the aor. 2. of verbs in $\mu$, with which this aorist corresponds. $\ddagger$ We have only to add one remark, that according to the grammarians Phrynichus and Herodian, this form must have been used by the Attics also; Thucydides and Xenophon however have only the regular $\dot{a} \pi \varepsilon ́ \delta \dot{\rho} \alpha \sigma a v$.



Homer has in the pres. 2. and 3. sing. $\delta i \delta o u ̃ s, ~ \delta i \delta o i ̃, ~ a s ~ f o r m e d ~ f r o m ~$ סióóv, Il. 九, 164. 519., which forms occur also in Herodot. and Hippocr. But $\delta i \delta o \tau \sigma \theta a$, or rather $\delta i \delta o i \sigma \theta a$, is found only in Homer, e. g. Il. т, 270. The following forms are also Homeric only ; the imperat. pres. $\delta i \delta \omega \theta_{c}$ (Od. $\gamma, 380$.), the infin. pres. $\delta \iota \delta o \tilde{v} v a i$ (Il. $\omega, 425$. ), the fut. $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma \varepsilon \iota v, \delta \iota-$

[^83]\&c. The same takes place in other anoma-
 є $6 \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, Hom.
§ This irregular aorist in - $\kappa \alpha$ is principally used in the sing. in good writers: in the plur., particularly in 1. and 2. pers., the Attics generally preferred the aor. 2. There are neither moods nor participles of the form in -ka, except the participle of the middle, which however with its indicative belongs to the Ion. and Dor. dialects. Except this indic. and particip. the other moods of the middle are never met with. In Attic prose we find, of the middle, the aor. 2. only.

$\delta \omega \sigma \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (Od. $\nu, 358 . \omega, 314$. ), and the aor. 2. $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa o \nu$ for ${ }^{\prime} \delta \delta \omega \nu$ (Hom.).* -The imperat. pres. $\delta i \delta o u$, as from $\delta i \delta o \mu \mu$, is an unusual Doricism for $\delta i \delta o v$, in Pind. Ol. 1, 136. The infin. pres. $\delta \delta \delta \tilde{\omega} \nu \dagger$ (Theocr. 29, 9.) is also Doric. Instead of $\varepsilon \delta \delta i \delta o \sigma a v$, the Dorics and Epics used $\left.\varepsilon \begin{array}{c} \\ \delta \\ \delta \\ \delta\end{array}\right), \delta i \delta o v$, Hymn. Cer. 328.437. On the unusual accentuation of the conjunct. pass. סiówtat and the opt. pass. ámóòovto, which look like Atticisms (Fischer quotes some instances from Ionic writers), see the second paragraph under $\Delta$ ívapau.

The form $\delta o \dot{\theta} \ell$, and Tér $^{\prime}$ from $\tau i \theta \eta \mu t$, are never used. The former was once the reading in Nicand. Th. 562 ., but is now rejected by the discovery of better manuscripts. $\Delta \tilde{\varphi} \sigma$ is 3 . sing. of the conjunct. for $\delta \tilde{\tilde{\eta}}$, as $i \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \sigma$ is for $i \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta}$. As the conjunctive arises from contraction, it is again resolved by the Ionics; thus for $\delta \iota \delta \tilde{\sigma}, \delta \tilde{\omega}, \delta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$, \&c., they use $\delta \delta \delta \dot{\omega} \omega, \delta \dot{\omega} \omega, \delta \dot{\omega} \eta \underline{ }, \delta \dot{\omega} \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu, \delta \omega \eta \tau \varepsilon, \& c .:$ and in this resolved form the Epics shorten the vowel, thus $\delta \omega о \mu \varepsilon \nu$ for $\delta \delta^{\prime} \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, \&c.
$\Delta i \zeta \eta \mu u \iota, I$ seek, an Ionic depon. midd. according to the formation in $\mu$, but retaining the $\eta$ in the passive : thus $\delta i \zeta \eta \mu a \iota$, $\varepsilon \delta i \zeta \eta \tau o, \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} i \zeta \eta \nu \tau o$, $\delta i \zeta \eta \sigma \theta a \iota, \delta \iota \zeta \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, Herodot.; $\delta i \zeta \eta a \iota$, Od. $\lambda, 100$. ; ̈̀v $\delta i \zeta \eta$, Callim. Epig. 11. The shortened forms $\delta i \zeta \varepsilon a \iota$ (Theocr. 25, 37.) and $\delta i \zeta$ 乡о (in a hexameter in Etym. M. v. $\dot{a} \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \gamma a i v \varepsilon \iota \nu)$ are perfectly regular. But the forms of the proper theme in -ouai $\ddagger$ are also frequently found. In Herodotus however those in $-\varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota,-\varepsilon \tau \sigma,-\varepsilon \sigma \theta a \ell$, are now, according to the manuscripts, universally changed into those with $\eta$ : and in Callim. Epig. 17., where hitherto has stood $\delta i \zeta$ ovaat, Jacobs has adopted from the Vatican manuscript (vii, 459.) $\delta i \zeta \eta \nu \tau a l$, so that the other formation in general, at least in the older writers, may be
 Heraclit. ap. Plut. adv. Colot. 20. p. 1118.

The verb $\delta i \zeta \omega$, which occurs in 11. $\pi, 713$. and in an oracle in Herodot. 1, 65. with the meaning of to doubt, is supposed to be the
 Suidas from some lost writer.
 the lyric and tragic poets, with no other tenses except the aor. 1. ${ }^{*} \delta 0 .\{\xi$ in Simmias Br. Anal. 1, 208. In Lycophr. 531. is $\pi \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \mu a ~ \lambda a \iota \psi \eta \rho o ̀ v$ $\left.\delta_{0 \kappa \omega} \nu.\right]$

[^84]$\Delta / \sigma \tau \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega, I$ doubt (like $\beta \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ and $\nu \cup \sigma \tau \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ ), seems to partake of the two formations of verbs in - $\zeta \omega$; its future is $\delta \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, and though I know of no examples of the formation in $-\xi \omega,-\gamma \mu \alpha b$, \&c., yet the verbal substantive is $\delta_{\iota} \sigma \tau \alpha \gamma \mu{ }_{\rho}$, and still we find $\delta i \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \varsigma$.
 $\Delta i ́ \omega$. See $\Delta$ єĩaı.
 13. Anab. 1, 4, 8. and Demosth. p. 989. ; but the general Attic fut. is $\delta \iota \omega \in \xi o \mu \alpha \iota$, Aristoph. Equ. 368. Elmsl. Ach.
 from $\partial \iota \omega \nsim \alpha ' \theta \omega$, see ' $A \mu \dot{\mu} v \omega$ and note.
$\triangle \mathrm{ME}$ - . See $\Delta \hat{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$

$\Delta_{\text {oxś }} \omega$, I seem, appear; also I think: it forms its tenses from $\Delta \mathrm{OK} \Omega$, as fut. $\delta 0$ 家 $\omega$, aor. 1. ${ }^{\prime} \delta \hat{\partial}_{0} \xi \alpha$; but takes its perf. from the passive $\delta \in \delta \delta o \gamma \mu \alpha$, I have seemed.

The regular formation $\delta \sigma \kappa \eta \sigma \omega$, aor. 1. " $\varepsilon \delta \delta \dot{\kappa} \eta \sigma a$, belongs to the poets. Thus deঠórquat in Pind. Nem. 5, 36. Eurip. Med. 761. Aristoph. Vesp. 726. (also Herodot. 7, 16, 3.) must be distinguished from the Epic $\delta_{\varepsilon} \delta o \kappa \eta \mu$ évos under $\Delta \dot{́} \chi о \mu a \iota$

For a full account of the supposed neut. part. $\delta o \kappa \varepsilon \tau \nu$ for $\delta o \kappa o v ̃ \nu$, see $\Delta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \omega$, I am in want of, with note.
 غंס̀ón $\eta \sigma \alpha$ and (II. $\lambda, 45$.) $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \delta o u ́ \pi \eta \sigma \alpha$ from a stem or root Г which appears to bear the same relation to $\delta o v \pi \varepsilon \in \omega$ as $\kappa \tau \cup \pi \varepsilon \epsilon \omega$ does to ти́лтш.*
$\Delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\delta \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega$, I seize, grasp; but the middle is more usual in the same sense.

Hence the 2. pers. perf. pass. $\delta \dot{\delta} \delta \rho \alpha \xi a c$ is used in Eurip. Tro. 745. as a middle. [So also $\delta \varepsilon \delta \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v o c, ~ I 1 . ~ \nu, ~ 393 . ~ S o p h . ~ A n t i g . ~ 235 .-~$ Passow.]

[^85][^86]$\Delta \rho \alpha^{\prime} \omega, I d o$, is inflected regularly with $\alpha$ long; hence the perf. $\delta \bar{\varepsilon} \dot{\rho} \rho \bar{\alpha} \varkappa \alpha$ is common to this verb and to $\delta \dot{\delta} \rho \dot{\rho} \sigma x \omega$.

Beside $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \rho \bar{\rho} \mu a \iota$ we find $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \rho a \sigma \mu a \iota$; see Thucyd. 3, 54. Hence the verbal adj. ঠрабтó؟, $\delta \rho a \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varsigma$.
[ $\Delta \rho \omega \omega^{\prime} \iota \mu$ is an Epic form produced from the optat. pres. act. $\delta \rho \tilde{\omega} \mu c$ (Od. o, 317.), and the only instance in Homer of this verb in its simple form ; it was most frequent in the Doric dialect, in which it was used like the Attic $\pi \rho$ átro, Aristot. Poet. 3, 6.—Passow.]
$\Delta \rho \xi ́ \pi \omega$, I pluck, is inflected regularly; thus fut. $\delta \rho \rho^{\prime} \psi \omega$, $\& c$. The midd. is frequent : [ $\alpha i \mu \alpha \alpha \rho \varepsilon \rho^{2} \psi \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha t$ is an unusual expression in Æeschyl. Sept. 720. Verbal adj. סрел $\pi$ ós. - Passow.]

In Pind. Pyth. 4, 234. $\delta \rho a \pi \omega^{\prime} \nu$ is the particip. of the aor. 2., and perhaps the only part of that tense to be met with; but such solitary forms are not unusual in this aorist. $\Delta \rho \tilde{\epsilon} \pi \tau \omega$ is less common than $\delta \rho \tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$; we find it in Moschus 2, 69. The middle $\delta \rho \varepsilon$ éroдat is of more frequent occurrence; $\delta \rho \varepsilon \pi т о \mu \varepsilon ́ v a v$, Anal. 1. p. 241. No. 81. Compare Г $\lambda u ́ \phi \omega$.
$\Delta \rho \dot{\pi} \pi \tau \omega$, I tear the flesh, scratch, is inflected regularly: fut. $\delta \rho \dot{\psi} \psi \omega$;
 153.

That ámodoúфoc in II. $\omega, 21$. cannot be an aorist, as some have explained it to be, is evident from the construction of the sentence. It must therefore be the pres. optat. of a sister-form $\dot{a} \pi o \delta \delta \dot{\rho} \phi \omega$; and we know that it is not unusual for the more simple form of a verb to have been retained in the poets only, or formed by them on account of the metre, while the other passed into general use.*
$\Delta_{\text {úvaucı, }}$ I can, forms the pres. and imperf. like ï $\sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha$;

 others) never takes the augment ; aor. 1. midd. غ $\delta \partial \nu \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$, Hom. ; perf. ósòv́vnual. Verbal adj. ouvarós, possible.

In the passive of all verbs in $\mu t$ there are instances in the common language of a formation in the conjunctive and optative moods, by which they assimilate, sometimes in sound but always in accent, to the common conjugation. Instances in $\tau i \theta \varepsilon \mu a t$, í $\sigma \tau a \mu a t$, $\delta i \delta o \mu a \iota ~ m a y ~$

[^87]be seen under their respective verbs : in the present case we have as proparoxytons, the optat. סívauto and the conjunct. $\delta \dot{v} \nu \omega \mu a \imath$ (Ion.), ¿ı́vnat, ¿óv $\quad$ тaı*, which have undoubtedly been introduced into Homer from the common language.

The shortening of the 2. pers. sing. -a $\sigma a t$ by the Attics into $-\underline{q}$ does not apply to this verb, which took rather the Ionic form סívn $\dagger$ (Ion. ס́verai) and was used thus by the Tragedians (Eurip. Hec. 253. Androm. 238. Soph. Phil. 798. ed. Buttm. with the notes). In prose Sivaral only was in use. But in the imperf. the Attics preferred even in prose the form $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \nu \omega$, $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\partial} \nu \omega$, to that in -a $\alpha \sigma$. Moeris, p. 182. Xen. Anab. 7, 5, 5.

Of the three forms of the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta v \nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ is the only one in Homer : it is preferred by Herodotus (see Wessel. on 7, 105.), and is frequent in Xenophon. The Attics prefer the double augment $\dot{\eta} \delta \partial \nu a ́ \mu \eta \nu, \eta \dot{\eta} \delta \nu v i \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$; the former occurs also in Herodot. 1, 10. But in Thucyd. and Xenoph. the simple augment is the more common. Homer generally uses the aor. midd. $\delta v \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \tau 0$.
$\Delta \dot{v} \omega$. Of this verb some tenses have the immediate meaning to go into, and others the causative meaning to put into, envelope in; while in all essential points it follows the examples of $i \sigma \tau \eta \mu t$ and $\phi \dot{v} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{i}$, and the analogies laid down in sect. 113. of my Grammar. $\ddagger$ The pres. act. סúw, $\varkappa \alpha \tau \alpha \delta \dot{v} \omega$, \&c., has the causative meaning to envelope in, to sink anything, and retains it in the fut. and aor. 1. act.
 $\delta \dot{v} \mu \alpha \iota$, $\delta \dot{v} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \partial \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \nu$ has therefore the meaning to wrap one's self up in, which then very naturally makes a transition to the intransitive or immediate sense, to go into, go under, sink under. But this again takes a

[^88][^89]transitive meaning, e. g. to put on (a garment). All these meanings belonging to the immediate sense join with the middle voice the active perf. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta u x \alpha$ and the aor. 2. " $\varepsilon \dot{\delta} \dot{0} \nu .{ }^{*}$ In addition to the above confes a new active form סúve, which properly speaking is synonymous with the middle
 certain constructions and in the compounds these active forms are preferred.

Such is the foundation of the usage in this verb: the modifications arising out of the various deviations of its sense, particularly in the compounds, belong to the lexicons and lexicographers.

The aor. 2. of this verb ${ }^{\varepsilon} \delta \bar{v} v$, like $\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \phi \bar{v} v$, retains the $v$ long through all the persons ( $\varepsilon \in \delta \bar{v} \mu \varepsilon \nu, \& c$.) ; but the 3. plur. $\varepsilon \in \varepsilon \check{v} \nu$, shortened by the Epic and Doric writers for $\varepsilon \delta \bar{\delta} \sigma a v$, has the $v$ short according to the regular analogy. See $\varepsilon \delta \delta \rho \alpha \nu, \& c$, under $\Delta \iota \delta \rho \alpha \sigma \kappa \omega$ with note. Of the conjunctive and optative moods we must however make particular mention. To form a conjunct. according to the analogy of $\varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \nu, \sigma \tau \tilde{u}$, is not pos-
 and thus we find a conj. $\delta v v^{\prime}$, $\delta \dot{v} \eta \varsigma$, $\delta \dot{v} \eta$, from $\varepsilon \in \delta v v$, not only in Homer
 ס́vp, Plato Cratyl. 64. p. 413. b. ; which forms therefore must not be derived from the present $\delta \dot{v} \omega$, nor must we attribute to this latter an immediate sense. Of the optat $\delta \dot{v} \eta \nu \dagger$ ( $\bar{v}$ for $v \iota$ ) I can produce but one example, viz. $\varepsilon \kappa \delta \delta \tilde{v} \mu \varepsilon \nu \ddagger$ for $\varepsilon \kappa \kappa \delta v i \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (like $\sigma \tau \alpha i \eta \nu$ — $\sigma \tau \alpha \tilde{\imath} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ) in II. $\pi, 99$. But according to Bekker's observation, the construction in Od. t, 377. $\sigma$, 348. $v$, 286. requires the optative, and consequently in those passages instead of $\delta v{ }_{\eta}^{n}$ we must write $\delta \dot{v} \eta$.

The Epic $\delta \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \nu$, Il. $\uparrow, 271$. is the 3. sing. aor.2. act. for ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \delta v$, and formed according to the regular analogy of iteratives, like $\sigma \tau$ á $\sigma \kappa v$, סórкov, \&c., consequently it means, he drew back each time.

The Epic sister-forms of the aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{v} \sigma \varepsilon \tau o \S$, imperat. $\delta \dot{v} \sigma \varepsilon o$ (like є́மj̄бєтo, imperat. ß $\eta \sigma \varepsilon o$ ), are some among many instances of the aor. 1. taking the termination of the aor. 2 ., or, which is the same thing, the aor. 2. taking the characteristic $\sigma$ of the aor. 1 ., of which

[^90]crept into it from common analogy, and that the true reading in the Epic poets is
 time it is possible that usage might have attached a distinct meaning to each form, and that Homer might have said in every



the most complete instance is the well-known aor. $\begin{gathered}\text { en } \\ \pi \varepsilon \sigma o v, ~ \\ \pi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon i v, ~ \& c c . ~\end{gathered}$ See Buttm. Lexil. p. 226. note. The Epic participle $\delta \boldsymbol{v} \sigma \delta \boldsymbol{\mu} \varepsilon$ vos, used in the sense of a present in Od. a, 24. Hes. $\varepsilon, 382$., is certainly not a future; and as it does not describe one in particular, but the general setting of some of the heavenly bodies, it may be explained as

Later writers form $\delta \dot{v} \nu \omega$ an aor. 1., at least in the participle, indiov
 dotus inflects the form $\delta \dot{v} v \omega$, as he does many other barytones*, as if it were a pres. in $-\varepsilon \omega$; thus 3,98 . $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \nu \nu \varepsilon$ évot, they put on.

## E.

${ }^{\text {E Eá }} \phi \theta \eta$. See "A $\pi \tau \omega$.
${ }^{\prime}$ Eá $\omega$, I permit, \&cc. : fut. ${ }^{\text {ċa }} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$; but in the augment it changes the $\varepsilon$ not into $\eta$, but into $\varepsilon \iota \dagger$, e. g. imperf. $\varepsilon$ हॉ $\omega \nu$; aor. 1. $\varepsilon^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha, \& c$.

The Ionics leave out the augment; thus imperf, $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \omega \nu$ for $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \omega \nu,\left[\begin{array}{l}z \prime \\ \sigma\end{array} a\right.$
 midd. éáopyac is ysed in a passive sense, Thucyd. 1, 142.-Passow.] 9.2 anl:331.
'Erүuów, I give as a pledge; Mind. I pledge myself. This verb is inflected regularly, but is uncertain in its augment : thus we have in general use the imperf. $\dot{\gamma} \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \omega \nu$, and the aor. 1. $\eta \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \eta \sigma \alpha$, yet the perf. is equally common as $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \gamma u ́ \eta x \alpha$; and again we find without any augment at all

 perf. with Attic redupl. $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \dot{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \rho \varkappa \alpha$; perf. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \dot{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \rho \mu \alpha<$. Midd. I waken (myself) ; to which we must add the syncopated aor. ท่ $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ о́цәข.

[^91] explains this to be merely the augment; which is singular, as analogy would require èvevúnox. Others place it as without the augment under Ever $\gamma$ vầv. I consider it to be an anomaly in the augmentation; and that daily pronunciation, deceived by ear and sense, strayed from èverúvoळ into the double compound eveqথúク

This aorist has been mistaken by the Grammarians, at least the later
 a one however is never met with, and the remaining forms are in every
 $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \eta \mu छ \rho \iota \nu \grave{c}$, ov̀ס₹íc $\sigma^{\prime} \dot{a} \pi о к \lambda \varepsilon i \sigma \varepsilon \iota$, Aristoph. Vesp. 774. In the same way the infin. also expresses universally the moment of waking; and hence it was a very easy step to substitute the accentuation of ' $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \bar{\varepsilon}-$ $\sigma \theta a u$, and ascribe ${ }^{\ell \prime} \gamma \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ to the above-mentioned mistake of the Grammarians. But in a form which has always remained in the common language, and of which the infin. for instance occurs frequently (Od. $\nu, 124$. Apollon. Rh. 4, 1352. Lucian Dial. Mar. 14, 2.), more than usual circumspection is necessary. In a similar case under $\dot{a} \gamma \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \omega$, where $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \rho о \nu \tau 0$, á $\gamma \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \theta a \iota$ occurred only in the old Epic language, and the latter but once, grammatical decision was necessary, and the perfectly regular aorist form required the accent agreeably to the general rule. Here on the contrary it is possible that the form being altered by syncope had caused a deviation from analogy even in the earlier times, an instance of which we shall see in the unquestionable and very similar aorist $\varepsilon$ ह$\zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ u n d e r ~ " I \zeta \omega . ~ C o m p a r e ~ a l s o ~ \Pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \nu \omega \nu . ~$

## 

whose anomalous reduplication was probably caused by the
 immediate meaning, and expresses the being in a certain state or situation, I am watching.* The pluperf. èrpnyó$\rho_{s!\nu}$ has the force of an imperfect.

That no other part of the verb but this perfect (with the force of a present) occurs in the Attic writers, with the meaning of to watch, has been sufficiently proved by Fischer (iii. p. 65.), by Porson, by Schneider on Xenoph. Anab. 4, 6, 22., and by Lobeck ad Phryn. p.119. From it however arose in the common language a present $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \circ \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$, and in the writers of the N. T. $\gamma \rho \eta \gamma 0 \rho \bar{\varepsilon} \omega$. But we find as early as Homer (Od. $v, 6$.) a participle é $\gamma \rho \eta \gamma o \rho o ́ \omega v$, as if from an indicative in $\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{q} \varsigma, \tilde{q} \cdot \dagger$

In Homer we have further, in the place of the 2. plur. $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma$ ópate, a form more convenient for the metre with a passive termination, $\varepsilon \quad \varepsilon \rho \rho^{\prime}-$ $\gamma \circ \rho \theta \varepsilon \ddagger$; and to this we may join the corresponding infinitive $\varepsilon \gamma \rho \eta-$

[^92]although we find just before as a present,

$\ddagger$ In the same way from $\alpha \nu \omega ́ \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega-$
róp日at．We find also in the same poet a very peculiar deviation in the active form of the 3．plur．（likewise with the $\theta$ ），$\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \theta a \sigma \iota \nu_{*}^{*}$
${ }^{2}$ E $\delta \omega$. See＇E $\sigma \theta i ́ \omega$ ．
${ }^{\text {E }}$ Eঠoũ $\mu a$ ．See＂I $\zeta \omega$ ．
＂Ецодан．See＂I $\zeta \omega$ ．
 $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\gamma} \sigma \omega$ ；but aor．1．$\eta^{\theta} \theta \varepsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$ ；imperf．$\eta_{\theta} \theta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \Delta \nu$ ；and perf． $\eta_{\eta} \theta^{\prime} \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \alpha$ in good prose writers；$\tau \in \theta^{\prime} \lambda \eta \not \eta \alpha$ is an Alexandrine perf．；see Lobeck ad Phryn．p． 332.
［These two verbs are the same in meaning，and differ only in form ： $\vartheta \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega$ is not found in any Epic poet before the Alexandrine æra，${ }^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \hat{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega$ on the other hand never occurs in the iambic trimeter of Attic tragedy： the latter is the regular form in Attic prose，although the former is occasionally met with in the best writers，in such a combination as $\varepsilon i$ $\vartheta_{\dot{\varepsilon}}^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \bar{\varepsilon} \iota \varsigma$, Lobeck ad Phryn．p．7．Hence the Attics naturally preferred the imperf．$\ddot{\eta} \theta_{\varepsilon} \lambda o \nu$ and the aor．1．$\dot{\eta} \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma a$ ，in which the augment comes regularly from $\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega$ ；consequently these forms are not to be compared with $\dot{\eta} b_{0} \nu \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ ，$\dot{\eta} \delta \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu, \ddot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu$ ．On the difference of meaning be－

${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \theta_{i}^{\prime} \zeta$ ，$I$ accustom，is regularly inflected ；e．g．fut． $\dot{\varepsilon} \theta_{i} \sigma \omega$ ，Att．－ヶॅ̃，Xen．Cyr．3，3，53．；but it takes $\varepsilon \iota$ for its augment，like $\dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ，which see with its note．Compare also the following．
${ }^{3}$ EAco．From this old present（of which we now find no remains in the Epic writers except the participle ${ }^{\prime} \theta \omega \nu$ ，being accustomed to）comes the very common perfect $\varepsilon_{i} \omega \theta \alpha$, ，I am accustomed to．The other tenses are furnished by the pas－ sive of $\dot{\varepsilon}^{\hat{\prime}} \hat{i} \zeta \omega$ ，of which the perf．pass．$\varepsilon^{\prime} \theta_{\imath} \sigma \mu \alpha_{l}$ is nearly the same as $\varepsilon$ l $\omega \theta$ ．

[^93]the perf．pass．quite as well as the perf． active，just as in ${ }^{2} \nu \nu^{\prime} \varphi \gamma \alpha$ and $\dot{d}^{2} \nu^{\prime} \varphi \gamma \mu a u$ ： but this passive might，according to the analogy of そшрто（भорто），retain the o； and thus érpiryopuat，－ор $\theta$ ，－－$p \theta a, ~ a r e$ regular．That the active form eyp $\gamma \gamma \delta \rho$－ $\theta a \sigma t$ arose again from this erpinyopet， might have been only an appearance，but

 and ev $\epsilon \rho \theta \infty$ ；of which latter theme the


The perf. $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \omega \theta a^{*}$ is a lengthening of the stem or radical form, exactly as we see from $\varepsilon i \delta i \omega, \eta, \eta \partial \varepsilon \epsilon \nu, \eta, \eta \eta$, the lengthened form $\eta \in i \delta \eta$. The object in the formation of this perfect was to preserve both the augment and the change of vowel; it was therefore properly $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\circ} \theta a$ : hence arose, by transposing the quantities, the Ionic $\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} \omega \theta a$ in Herodotus, and thence again came the common $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \omega \theta a$. The Doric writers had another formation, similar to the perf. 1 . but with the change of vowel, ${ }^{*} \theta \omega \kappa \alpha$ See Buttm. Lexil. p. 138. 'E ${ }^{\prime} \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon$ (like $\dot{\delta} \pi \bar{\omega} \pi \tau \varepsilon$ ) is according to the regular Ionic formation a pluperfect, and so it is used in Herodot. 4, 127.; but both are used also as perfects, the former in 2,68 . the latter in 3,37 . It has been wished to do away this irregularity by substituting in these cases the regular perfect in $\varepsilon$; but as we find also in Herodot. $\ddot{\varepsilon} \psi \varepsilon \varepsilon$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \varepsilon \varepsilon$, and $\check{\varphi} \varphi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon$, it appears to me most probable that the Ionics, accustomed to insert their $\varepsilon$ not according to well-known analogies, but from a dark and uncertain feeling, lengthened the historic forms $\ddot{\eta} \psi \varepsilon, \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\boldsymbol{Z}} \chi \varepsilon, \tilde{\omega} \phi \lambda \varepsilon$, as well as these two perfects, contrary to true analogy. Compare "E $\psi \omega$.

Ei $\delta \omega$, iiow, video, an obsolete verb, whose place has been supplied by $\dot{\delta} \rho a \omega$ : the tenses formed from it compose two distinct families, of which one has the meaning of to see, the other exclusively the meaning of to know. $\dagger$

1. to see: the only tense which retains this meaning is the aor. 2. $\varepsilon i \delta o v$, and Epic without the augment $i \delta \delta \nu$; infin. $i \delta \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu$, Ep. $i \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \nu$; conjunct. $i \delta \omega$, Epic ${ }^{i} \delta \omega \mu$; ; part. $i \delta \omega \nu$ : all these forms are Homeric. The aor. 2. midd. has the same meaning, $\begin{gathered}\text { i } \delta \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu \text {, in Hom., more frequently }\end{gathered}$ without the augment $i \delta \delta \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$; infin. $i \delta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$; conjunct. $i \delta \bar{\partial} \omega \mu a \iota$; imperat. $i \delta o u ̃$. See also 'Opácu.
2. to know: oil $\ddagger \ddagger$, I know, to which we may add the part. cióws;

 frequently and mostly Epic $\varepsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \omega$. The aor. and perf. are supplied from $\gamma<\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$.

Of the regular persons of oi $\delta a$, the 2 . sing. and the three persons of the plur. oì $\delta a \mu \varepsilon \nu$, oi $\delta a \tau \varepsilon$, oi $\delta a \sigma t$, occur but seldom, and, with regard to Attic usage, are disapproved of by the Atticists, while their places

[^94][^95]are supplied by syncopated forms: we will therefore first give the pure Attic usage of this verb in oi $\delta \alpha a$ and its pluperf. $\not \partial \delta \delta \varepsilon v$.

## ATTIC USAGE.

Pres. S. oìio
of $\sigma \theta a$
oĩ $\delta(\nu)$
Imperat. i $\quad \sigma \iota$, , $1 \sigma \tau \omega, \& \mathrm{c}$.
D.

Conj. घiठ $\bar{\omega}$

Part.
$\varepsilon i \delta \omega \varrho,-v \tilde{u} a,-$ ós.



D.


P. $\tilde{\eta}_{2} \delta \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu$ - $\bar{\eta} \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu$,


Fut. हírouat, less frequently $\varepsilon$ ยiठ $\eta \sigma \omega . \dagger$
Aor. ( $\varepsilon i \delta \eta \eta a), \varepsilon i \delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma a u . \ddagger$
Verbal adj. (neut.) íctéov.
In both the Ion. and Dor. dialect we find the regular oildaç, Od. $a$, 337.; in the Att. sometimes oifotac, Cratin. AB. 3. p. 1295. Piers. Moer. p. 283. Br. Aristoph. Fr. 143. Meineke Menandr. p. 122. The Ion. and
 ${ }{ }^{\prime} \delta \mu \varepsilon \nu$ as shortened from $\varepsilon i \delta \delta \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$. -They have the same shortening of the radical vowel in the conjunct. io $\delta \omega$ (Il. $\xi$, 235. where however others read $\varepsilon i \delta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ as a dissyllable) for $\varepsilon i \delta \delta \tilde{\omega}$, and in the fem. part. iòvia for
 for $\varepsilon i \delta \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$, Il. $a$, 363. For $ク \boldsymbol{\eta} \partial \varepsilon \iota \nu$ the Epics have a lengthened form, by which the separation of the augment from the radical syllable is made more distinct (compare $\eta_{\eta}^{\prime} \in \tau \nu$ under $E \hat{\mu} \mu, I g o$ ), and of which we find 2.
 Rh. 2, 822., and Herodotus (1, 4.5.) has with the termination short j̄ँє $\delta \varepsilon$ for $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \delta \varepsilon \bullet . \|$ To these we must add a form as quoted in this verb only,

[^96]$\oint$ The Iun. $\boldsymbol{z} \delta \mu \in \nu$ did not come from $\chi \sigma \mu \in \nu$; general analogy requires just the converse : $\tau \delta \mu \in \nu$ and the infin. $\tau \delta \mu \in v a l$ belong evidently to $\epsilon$ tow, and not to tonu. See last note but one under elkw, Eокка.
|| This shortened termination is certainly remarkable in a dialect which in other cases adds vowels without reason or
$\ddot{\eta} \delta \varepsilon \tau \nu$ for $\eta_{\eta} \delta \varepsilon \sigma a \nu$, Apollon. Rh. 2, 65. and lengthened to $\bar{\eta} \varepsilon i \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$, ib. 4, 1700. On the other hand Homer has (Il. $\sigma, 405$. Od. $\delta, 772$.) the 3. pl. 'izav, in sound the same as the 3. plur. imperf. of $\varepsilon \bar{i} \mu$; and it is to be explained in the same way, for it bears the same relation to the
 $\eta_{\eta}^{\top} \sigma a v$. Lastly Homer uses both futures, less frequently however $\varepsilon i \delta \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega$, Il. a, 546. The Epic infin. $\varepsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \varepsilon ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu$, Od. $\zeta, 257$.

In order to distinguish correctly where forms of this verb belong to the one or the other meaning, we must observe that many ideas which really relate to internal knowledge, but which we express by the sense of seeing, are given by the Greeks to the verb $\varepsilon i \delta i \hat{v} v a$. So in particular, $\omega_{S} \varepsilon i \delta \bar{\partial} \tilde{c}$, , $\tau \nu$ ' $\varepsilon i \delta \tilde{\partial} \tilde{\tau} \tau$, in many combinations, where there is danger of our being influenced by custom to alter it to "i $\delta \eta s$, " $i \delta \eta \tau \varepsilon$, e. g. in Demosth. Mid. 23. (p. 539. Rsk.) "I will lay it before you, "ı" $\varepsilon i \delta \bar{\eta} \tau \varepsilon$, öт каi
 (p. 541. init.): see other examples in Sturz. Lex. Xenoph. under $\varepsilon$ ยiठ $\varepsilon \iota \nu$ 6. To the above we may add also the verbal adj. iov $\varepsilon$ ov, which is never used properly of seeing, though there are cases where we cannot translate it otherwise; see Heind. ad Plat. Thert. 141. In the same way the Homeric conjunct. $\varepsilon^{i} i \delta \rho \mu \varepsilon \nu$, which always stands for $\varepsilon i \delta \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (as at Il. $v, 327$. Od. $\zeta, 257$. where we should say "that we may see... let us see..."), would be more accurately translated by know; nor can there be any doubt that the only passage where $\varepsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \omega$ according to the context might express the physical idea of seeing, Od. $\zeta, 257$. , belongs, like all the other cases, to eidévat; "thou wilt there know the most illustrious of the Phæacians." The later poets were the first, from misunderstanding perhaps the Homeric language, to use $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{i} \delta \omega$ in the exact sense of to see; $\varepsilon i \delta \quad \delta \quad \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon$, as a present, Theocr. 2, 25., or they


But there is one part of the verb which really belongs to $\varepsilon i \delta \omega$, video, viz. the Epic middle $\varepsilon^{\prime} i \delta o \mu a t$, $\varepsilon i \sigma$ á $\mu \eta \nu$, used exactly as the Latin verbs appareo and videor, as at II. $\vartheta, 555 . a, 228 . \mu, 103$.; and by a particular deviation it is joined with a dative in the sense of to be like to, eioó $\mu \varepsilon v o s$


As $\varepsilon i \delta \omega$ had originally the digamma, which we see in videre and the frequent hiatus in Homer before $\varepsilon i \delta \partial s, ~ i \delta \varepsilon \tau v, ~ \varepsilon i \delta \delta \varepsilon v a t, ~ \& c$. , it had also the syllabic augment. This is the true explanation of the aor. $\varepsilon i \delta o \nu$, $i \delta \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \nu$, in the common language; thus $\varepsilon^{i} i \delta \omega$, $\varepsilon \in-i \delta o \nu$, i $\delta \varepsilon i \nu$, like $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \omega$,
analogy. It is easy enough to conjecture that Merodot. wrote $\overline{\eta \in \delta} \delta \epsilon \epsilon$; but the various reading $\tilde{\eta}^{\circ} \delta \in \epsilon$, from which this must
be deduced, is very doubtful. The best manuscripts have $\boldsymbol{j}_{\boldsymbol{j}} \in \delta \in$, the others $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \delta \bar{\epsilon}$.
${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \lambda \iota \pi o v, \lambda \iota \pi \varepsilon \tau \nu$ : and (after the total disappearance of the digamma) by contraction $\varepsilon \mathcal{I}_{\delta} \delta \nu$. This $\varepsilon \iota$ is therefore different from that in the pres. $\varepsilon^{\prime} i \delta \omega$, where it was added to strengthen the radical syllable i $i \delta-$ as in $\lambda \varepsilon i ́ \pi \omega$ from $\lambda \iota \pi-$. Hence in the Epic language the aor. عioá $\mu \eta \nu$ occurs with that augment $\varepsilon \in \varepsilon \iota \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$. But Homer has also the particip. $\varepsilon \in \iota \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon-$ $\nu$ vя, Il. $\beta$, 22., and Pindar (Nem. 10, 28.) é $\varepsilon \iota \delta o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s, ~ f o r ~ w h i c h ~ i t ~ i s ~$ necessary to suppose a theme $\varepsilon \varepsilon i \delta \omega$, as such an $\varepsilon$ is found in many verbs which had the digamma according to the analogy of $\varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \lambda \omega . *$

Eixáלఉ, I conjecture, is regular, except in sometimes taking the augment, contrary to the analogy of verbs in $\varepsilon \iota$;
 and compare Ruhnk. ad Tim. v. єixá̧ $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{y}}$. In Plato it is found thus augmented in good manuscripts. See the following.

Eirco, I yield, is regular, and like other verbs in $\varepsilon \iota$ does not take the augment : thus imperf. Eiroo ; aor. 1. sig $\alpha$, where the place of the augment is supplied by the accent. The same is still visible in many compounds; thus ${ }_{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon_{\varepsilon} \rho \gamma \varepsilon$ can only be the imperat. of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \gamma \omega$, the imperfect is $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \tilde{i} \rho \gamma \varepsilon$. But wherever in the written text of Homer the augment can be known only by the accent, it necessarily depended on the Grammarians whether to express it or not: and some of these appear to have been induced by an Ionic analogy
 is the present reading of Il. $\pi, 305$. in Wolf's Homer,
 Etym. M. v. $\kappa \alpha \theta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \tau 0$.

Homer has the fut. midd. Il. $a, 294$. Od. $\mu$, 117.; for at Il. $\delta, 62$. ${ }_{v}^{\boldsymbol{v} \pi o \varepsilon i} \xi^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ is the shortened conjunctive: in others we find the fut. act. as in Herodot. 7, 160. Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 45. Demosth. de Rhod. 197.


Eiro. We never find the present of this verb in the sense of to be like to, to appear, but the perf. 2. yorra $\dagger$ with


[^97]and in Homer（Il．ע，102．）once，3．pl．ėoixs $\sigma \alpha \nu$ ；perf．infin．
 once вioькй́a，Il．$\sigma, 418$ ．The Attics preferred a sister－
 larly in its neuter eixós，although soorós still remained always a good form．Homer has once sixćs，Il．$\phi, 254$. and very frequently the fem．sixuĩa：the Ionics，but not Homer，always use oixa，oixćs，oixós．Fut．ะ＂ぞそw（Ari－ stoph．Nub．1001．）．

The same abbreviation which we find in $\varepsilon$ iкк $\omega$＇s takes place on account of the metre in other forms of this perfect；as $\varepsilon$ eik $\varepsilon \nu^{*}$ ，he is like（Ari－ stoph．Av．1298．），$\pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon \kappa$ évą（Eccl．1161．）；hence this infinitive is now written so in Nub．185．and Eurip．Bacch．1273．，although it is possible that in all these passages it might have been written in the usual way and pronounced thus to suit the verse．

The Homeric $\varepsilon^{\tau} \kappa \varepsilon$（Il．$\sigma, 520$ ．）is imperf．，and the only instance of the pres．or imperf．of हikw．

 3．dual pluperf．for $\dot{\varepsilon} \varphi \kappa \varepsilon \in i \tau \eta \nu$ ，II．$a$, 104．This perfect made a further transition（without however changing its meaning）to the passive form $\dagger$ ，of which Homer has only the pluperf．$\jmath_{i}$ ктo，and without the augm．光iктo，II．$\psi, 107 . \ddagger$ ．The perf．हैiypat is found in composition in the post－Homeric poets，but with an irregular augment：thus

radical vowel $\epsilon$ ，and the $\epsilon$ at the beginning is the syllabic augment instead of the re－ duplication，like eava and some others；
 ঠ́́ঠоркк，Again in the three pluperfects to－would by the temp．augm．be jo－，which again by Attic and Ionic analogy would
 $\nu \eta o ́ s$, Att．$\nu \in \omega \dot{s}$ ，and many others．
＊［Whether the perf．elica be a good Atticism or not，has been doubted；see Piers．ad Moer．p．148．or Brunck Ari－ stoph．Nub．185．－Passow．］
＋Compare the same thing in $\begin{aligned} & \text { ryphropa }\end{aligned}$ －$\ell \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \delta \rho \beta a l$ ．
$\ddagger$ In order to understand clearly the augment of the pluperf．in these forms

this is not the way of writing them which existed in Honer＇s time．Eľc is one of those verbs which had originally the digamma ；the perfect therefore with the reduplication was FE－FOIKA，conse－ quently équct was in his language FE OI－
 EFEFIKTO；which forms，if substituted for the others，suit the verse in every in－ stance，by merely throwing aside occa－ sionally a separable $\nu$ ，as in $11 . \psi, 107$ ．
§ These forms appear to have arisen out of the old Epic 莅ксо by analogies imperfectly understood．For if it were wished to form at once from elrew， without going through the perfect Youra， a perf．pass．p into firyuu，the leading analogy which

Lastly we have a complete deviation from the 3．plur．of the perf． in the Attic form $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \xi a \sigma \iota$ ，instances of which are collected by Ruhnk． ad Tim．p．98．We have already shown in the Grammar＊the exact． similarity between this form and＇ivart，and in so doing have refuted the short－sighted and incorrect explanations which have been given of both．The surest way appears to be this，to suppose that as in other inflected forms a $\sigma$ sometimes appears and sometimes disappears be－ tween the stem of the verb and the termination，so the 3．plur．－avtt， $-\overline{\boldsymbol{a}} \sigma \iota$ had a more complete ending－$\sigma a \nu \tau \iota,-\sigma \bar{a} \sigma \iota \nu$ ，of which these two forms are chance remains．$\dagger$

To this stem or root belong also ’əк places．

Eìर́v，$I$ envelope ：fut．$\varepsilon i \lambda \bar{v}^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ；perf．pass．$\varepsilon^{\prime} i \lambda \bar{v} \mu a \iota$ ；aor．1．part．

regulates such cases would be destroyed without sufficient reason．Whilst a lan－ guage still exists in its vigour and purity， it is easy and not uncommon for an old analogy to be inaccurately understood： but to spin out new analogies on mere theory could have been only done by the laterfgrammarian－poets．
＊If we compare the different forms arising out of the two perfects Eoוка and oroa，we shall find a very close analogy
 そouca，Koso ；of the former a shortened form olra is found in the Ionic dialect， of the latter oloa was in common use： the one has a part．eincos，the other ciobs． Of és．the pluperf．（with the augm．
 was єॄ์кєเv；but there existed also the regular pluperf．with merely the of shor－ tened，as is clear from the 3．pluperf．pass． ＊ícto（without the augm．eйсто），which must come from a perf．E＇iryua，pluperf． $\hat{j} \gamma \mu \eta \nu$. In the same way from toto $\alpha$ came the pluperf．（गेเิeav）万ुठิєเ，By syncope from そoル幺 were formed Eor $\gamma \mu \in \nu$
 $\gamma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu, v^{2} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu, y_{\sigma \tau \epsilon} ;$ and in the pluperf．

 Homeric loav（for $\%-\sigma \alpha \nu$ ）by the mere omission of the augment：so that it is not necessary to suppose for this single word that Homer was acquainted with Yбךu，
of which there is no other instance．And lastly，

$$
\text { ol } 8 a-(o t \text { into } t, 20-\sigma \alpha \sigma \iota \nu) \text { Y } \sigma \alpha \sigma \iota y:
$$

both Attic forms instead of the regular eoikaбıy，of\％acıy；and both terminating in $\sigma t v$ ，according to a mutual analogy，in which they differ from all other perfects． Whereas if this 3 ．plur．came from tonut， why is it not accented like i $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \hat{a} \sigma t$ ，and lengthened in the Ion．dialect like $i \sigma \tau \in$＇－ $\alpha \sigma t$ ？
$\dagger$ The great difference between the terminations of the principal and of the historic tenses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ is this，that by the augment $\epsilon$ and the consequent throwing back of the accent toward the beginning of the word， the terminations of the latter were short－ ened；e．g．тúnт－oyti（Dor．for－ovet），
 storic ending rav we may conclude that there was in the principal tenses the ending －$\sigma \alpha v t_{t}(-\sigma \tilde{\alpha} \sigma t)$ ．In this remark I agree ex－ actly with that acute philologist Landvoigt of Merseburg，who has thus resolved to my complete satisfaction a difficulty mentioned in my Grammar，in a note on the 3．plur． pres．indic．of the verbs in $\mu$ ；namely，that in the most ancient mode of inflexion the 3．plur．of the pres．and imperf．ended thus，$\tau t \theta \epsilon-\sigma \alpha \nu \tau t$ ，$e^{\tau}\{\theta \in-\sigma \alpha y$ ．The $\sigma$ in the former dropped out，leaving $\tau \iota \theta$ éalvit $\tau!-$ $\theta \in \alpha \sigma t$ ，which were shortened to $\tau \in \theta \in \underset{\sigma}{ }$ $\tau เ \theta \in ́ \nu \tau \iota$.
a［Buttmann in his Grammar divides the tenses of the verb into principal，viz．pres． perf．and fut．，and historic，viz．imperf．pluperf，and aor．－Ed．］
 used in Homer with the single $\varepsilon$, is distinct from the above, and means, 1.) to compress or draw oneself up together, I1. $\omega, 510$. Od. $\iota, 433$. 2.) to be thrust or pushed, II. $\psi, 393$. The old Homeric language seems to have made a distinction between the forms beginning with $\varepsilon i$ and those with $\dot{\varepsilon}$, using the former in the sense of to envelope, cover up, the latter in that of to compress and to push; but later poets confounded both forms and meanings. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 272.
 together, shut in, envelope, roll up: all the remaining forms, which occur in the common language, come exclusively from the form in $\varepsilon \omega$; as, $\varepsilon i \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \omega \omega$, $\varepsilon^{i} \lambda \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, $\varepsilon i \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon_{i}^{\prime}$.

It would be a difficult task to settle which of the various ways of writing and pronouncing this verb belonged to individual passages, as we find from the occasional remarks of the Grammarians that the same uncertainty prevailed among the ancients themselves. On these points, and on whatever concerns the meaning, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 253 -271. The pronunciation with the aspirate was doubtless in this, as in many similar cases, confined principally to the Attics. In the older language the verb had the digamma, as is evident from many accompanying marks and many Epic forms which will be mentioned.

In Homer, beside the pres. and imperf. $\varepsilon i \lambda \varepsilon i \nu$ and the part. pass. $\varepsilon i \lambda o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o g$, the rest of the formation comes from the simple stem or root $\mathbf{E} \Lambda-$; as, the 3. pl. aor. 1. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \bar{\lambda} \alpha \nu$, the infin. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \sigma \alpha \iota$, and (according to
 ${ }_{\ell}^{\lambda} \lambda$ das with the meaning of to strike, on which, and on the relation
 Perf. pass. ${ }^{\ell} \in \lambda \mu a t, \dot{\varepsilon} \in \lambda \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v o s$.

To this verb and to the same simple stem or root belong, according to all analogy, the aor. pass. $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \alpha \\ \lambda \\ \\ \nu\end{gathered}$ and the 3. pl. without augm. äd $\lambda_{\varepsilon \nu}$

 uncertain, and the editions and passages vary between the lenis and

The imperf. $\begin{gathered} \\ \dot{\theta} \lambda \varepsilon \iota \\ \text { in Pind. Pyth. 4, 414. (according to Boeckh's }\end{gathered}$ undisputed emendation) and the pluperf. pass. éó入ทто in Apollon. 3,

[^98]they join partly with à $\lambda$ éo $\mu$ ar, partly with à $\lambda \in \in s$, conferti, \&c. ; but genuine grammatical tradition agrees with our statement. See Buttm. Lexilogus,
471. are sister-forms of $\varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon \iota$ and ${ }_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \lambda \tau \%$ with the meaning of to press upon, disturb, which bear the same relation to $\mathrm{E} \Lambda \Omega$, घỉ does to трє́ $\mu \omega$, غ́кто́vұка to ктєivш, and other similar forms.*

To this place belongs, according to the writing of the word, the unusual verb with the meaning of to use or treat ill, $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tau ँ \nu$, as it was once written, or $\pi \rho o v \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \nu$, as we find it in authorities on which we can depend. This latter pronunciation arose from the digamma which was originally between the $\sigma$ and $\varepsilon$. There occur but two examples of it with the form of the present, viz. $\pi \rho o v \sigma \varepsilon \lambda o \tilde{\nu} \mu \varepsilon \nu$, Aristoph. Ran. 730., and $\pi \rho o v \sigma \varepsilon \lambda o v ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o \varsigma$, Eschyl. Prom. 435. For a full account of it see Buttm. Lexil. p. 494.

Eífарта. See Mєípoнаи.
Ei $\mu i, I$ am, a defective verb in $\mu$, from a radical form $E \Omega$. Beside the pres. and an imperf. $\tilde{\eta} \nu$, it has only a fut. $\bar{\varepsilon} \sigma о \mu \alpha$, Poet. $\varepsilon$ हैбооиt;

 and the 1. sing. imperf. $\eta \mu \eta \nu$, rejected indeed by the Atticists, but found occasionally in the older writers, and more frequently in the later. $\dagger$ Its other persons are never met with in any of the better authors. The most surprising is عilato for 咅vio, Od. v, 106., where however others read єíazo.

The 1. pers. sing. $\varepsilon \in \mu i$ was Dor. for $\varepsilon i \mu i$ : the 2. sing. pres. $\varepsilon{ }^{i}{ }^{i}$ is only Ionic (Hom. and Herodot.), from which by leaving out the $\sigma$ came the common $\varepsilon \bar{i}: \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \sigma \epsilon$ is Dor. and Ion., nor is it quite unknown to Attic poetry, Eur. Hel. 1246. The 3. pers. $\varepsilon \begin{gathered}v \gamma \ell \\ \text { is Dor. for both }\end{gathered}$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau i$ and $\varepsilon i \sigma i$. The 1. plur. $\varepsilon i \mu \varepsilon ́ v$ is Ion. as $\varepsilon i \mu \varepsilon ́ s$ is Dor. for $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v$, from which comes the unusual poetical form $\varepsilon \in \mu \varepsilon v$, Brunck. Soph. El. 21.


In the Ionic dialect the part. the conj. and the optat. are formed from the theme $E \Omega$, by which the part. has the same irregular accent as the part. $i \omega \cdot \nu$ from $\varepsilon \bar{i} \mu$, thus

$$
\text { Optat. } \varepsilon о \iota \mu \iota: \text { conj. } \varepsilon \in \omega: \text { part. } \varepsilon \in \omega \in \nu .
$$

This participle has in some Doric writers a particular feminine éa $a \sigma a$. The conj. is sometimes in the Epics strengthened by the diphthong $\varepsilon \ell$, as $\varepsilon^{\prime} \iota \omega$, $\varepsilon^{\prime} \eta \eta \varsigma$, $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta$ (from which it is often confused with the optative), Il. 九, 245. $\sigma, 88$. Od. $o, 448 . \rho, 586$. ; $\mu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon i \omega$, Il. $\psi, 47$. $\ddagger$. In the optative the

[^99]Phryn. p. 152. Schæf. ad Long. p. 423. $\ddagger$ Compare Herm. de Legg. quibusd. subtil. Serm. Hom. 1. p. 16. Matth. Gr. Gramm. p. 415. Schæf. Hes. Op. 538. 567. p. 238. Gnom. Gr.
 found however in Plat. Rep. 8. p. 558. d., and has been restored by Bekker in some other passages : $\varepsilon$ itr occurs in Od. $\phi, 195$., and the dual $\varepsilon i \tau \eta \nu$ is found, according to Bekker, in several passages of Plato.

The 3. sing. of the imperat. $\eta^{\prime \prime} \tau \omega$ for $\varepsilon \in \tau \tau \omega$ is found frequently in the N. T., e. g. 1 Cor. xvi. 22., and once in Plat. Rep. 2. p. 361. c. which
 also an unusual sister-form (corresponding with the gen. plur. particip.)


In the infin. we find in the old Ionic $\varepsilon_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu,{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota,{ }_{\varepsilon}{ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \varepsilon \nu,{ }^{\varepsilon} \mu \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota$; the last is the most common in Homer. The Dorics use $\tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ or $\tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \xi^{\prime}$, both which are at the same time 1. pl. imperf.-also $\varepsilon^{i} \mu \varepsilon v$, $\varepsilon^{i} \mu \varepsilon \varsigma$, differing from 1. pl. pres. indic. only in the accent.

The imperfect has numerous sister-forms : e.g. from the radical form $\mathrm{E} \Omega$ the 1 . sing. ${ }^{\ell} o v$ for $\tilde{\eta} \nu, \mathrm{II} . \psi, 643$., but none of the other persons: ${ }^{\prime \prime} \neq \kappa o v,-\varepsilon \xi^{\prime},-\varepsilon$, in Hom. is a mere imperf. as II. $\eta, 158$., but in Herodot. a real iterative like the other forms in -oкov: and lastly the true Ionic
 lengthened $\tilde{\eta} a$, 3. sing. $\tilde{\eta} \varepsilon \nu^{*}$, II. $\mu, 371$.: ${ }^{\prime} \eta \nu \nu$ occurs as 1. sing. in II. $\lambda, 762$. only, where it is most probably false for $\begin{gathered}\text { éo }\end{gathered}$; but as 3 . sing. it is more common, and found in Ionic prose; Homer has also sometimes $\eta \eta \eta \nu$, and in 2. sing. ${ }^{\ell} \eta \sigma \theta a$ for $\tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a$ : the 3. plur. ${ }^{\ell} \sigma a \nu$ for $\tilde{\eta}^{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ occurs both in the older and later Ionic, as well as in the Doric dialect. In Hes. $\varepsilon, 825$. and $\mathcal{\vartheta}, 321$. $\tilde{\eta} \nu$ also appears to stand for $\tilde{\eta} \sigma a v$, but it is there rather a peculiarity of syntax. $\dagger$ From the Ionic ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} a$ arose the old Attic 1. sing. $\eta_{\eta}$ for ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\eta} \nu$, which with regard to the extent of its usage requires still further critical examination. $\ddagger$ For the 3 . sing. $\eta^{\xi} \nu$



All the persons of the pres. indic. are enclitical except the 2. sing. $\varepsilon \tilde{\ell}$, which always retains the accent ; perhaps also $\varepsilon \overline{\mathrm{l}}$, used enclitically by Wolf in Od. $\delta, 611$.

Ei $\mu$, I go. The forms of this verb lead us to a root ' $1 \Omega$, with its radical vowel $c$ occasionally lengthened to $\varepsilon t$; and connected with which are many irregularities both of form and meaning. Only the following moods and tenses are in use :

[^100]$\ddagger$ See Fisch. 2. p. 498, 499. Heind. ad Plat. Protag. 5. In which it is particularly remarkable that Chœerobose. (MS. ap. Bekk, fol. 242. v. and 348. v.) proves from Aristoph. Plut. 29. and Menander, the usage of the l. sing. $\bar{\eta} \nu$.
optat.
iol $\mu, \& \mathrm{c}$.
or
ioinv, \&c.


(The dual follows the analogy of the

## 2. plur.) <br> -

The Midd. (with the meaning of to hasten) is likewise used in pres. and imperf. 'i $\varepsilon \mu \alpha \iota$, $i \varepsilon \mu \eta \nu$, and (like ii $\varepsilon \mu \alpha \iota$ from


[^101][The middle voice of this verb is entirely rejected by some modern critics, as Elmsl. Soph. CEd. T. 1242. and L. Dindorf. Eurip. Supp 699 ., who instead of it write íqual, í\&ขтat, \&c. See however Schæf. Plut. 4. p. 326.-Passow.]
In meaning, this verb has the singular anomaly of its present having often the force of a future. In Homer it stands sometimes as a present, sometimes as a future; but in Ionic prose and in the Attic writers it is, with a very few exceptions*, a real future, I shall go : nor does it again take the force of a present until in such late writers as Pausanias and Plutarch. This however can only be said in its full extent of the indicative mood; the others are used sometimes as futures, sometimes they retain their natural meaning: and thus this verb supplies the

 for iévat is doubtful, as $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \tilde{\nu} v a$ in Hes. $\varepsilon$, 351. may come from $\varepsilon i \mu \ell$, I am. $\dagger$ The 3. sing. opt. $\varepsilon$ in for 'ot occurs in Il. $\omega$, 139. Od. $\xi, 496$. The conj. $\varepsilon i \omega$ for ' $i \omega$ is quoted from the Doric writer Sophron in the Etym. M. p. 121, 29. and 423, 23. Homer has contracted the Ionic

 the 3. dual ${ }^{\prime} \tau \eta \nu$, and the 3. plur. そँ̈a $\sigma \nu$, which, though imperfects, have also the force of aorists. Lastly we find in the Epic poets a fut. midd.
 and a 3. dual $\varepsilon \in \epsilon \sigma a ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, Il. o, 415. 544 . $\ddagger$ A peculiar form, the 3. plur. pres. $\bar{i} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ for ${ }^{i} a \sigma \iota$, is found in Theogn. 716.

Eireiv, to say, an aorist: indic. Eiँov ; imperat. sinध§, compound $\pi \rho^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} / \pi \varepsilon$, \&c. Besides these the forms of the aor. 1 . Ein $\alpha$ were also in use; in the Attic language the most com-
 exchanged for the forms with the $\varepsilon$, so that after all the speaker appears to have been generally guided by his ear. The most unusual are the 1. sing. $\varepsilon$ Ii $\pi \alpha \|$, which is rather

[^102]§ On the accentuation of this imperat. see the second note under "Epxouar. It is used also for cineete, like ä $\gamma \epsilon$, particularly by Aristoph, see Elmsl. Ach. 328. Reisig Conj. p. 35. Demosth. Phil, 1. p. 43, 7. Cherson. p. 108, 13.
 enoinou, the use of the a.r. 1 . is here
 Demosth. c. Euerg. p. 1151. Bekk, and Philem. Inc. 51. a. Eurip. Cycl. 101.

Ionic, and the 2. sing. imperat. $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { in } \\ \pi\end{array}\right)$, which, with the optative*, is perhaps the rarest of all. The part. $\varepsilon \% \pi \alpha,,-\alpha \sigma \alpha,-\alpha \nu$ is peculiarly Ionic. The Midd., which however occurs
 in the same sense as the active, has always the form of the aor. 1. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon i \pi \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. Fut. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \rho \circ \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha \iota$, Posidipp. Epigr. 2.

The 2. sing. imperat. Eifiov has been accented always in the grammars and generally in the text of different writers thus, $\varepsilon i \pi o ́ v$; but it is proved in Buttman's Excurs. 1. on Plat. Meno p. 70. that this latter accentuation was unknown to the pure Greek writers.

The generally acknowledged theme of this verb is $\mathrm{E} \Pi \Omega$, with the augm. $\varepsilon \iota$; but then it is very unnatural for this augment to continue through all the moods, while it is never visible in $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon \\ \epsilon \\ \pi\end{gathered}$ (see below). We certainly recognise the root EП- in the subst. $\left.\begin{array}{l}\prime \pi \\ \pi\end{array}\right)$; but there is nothing to prevent the same root having been changed to EII-. $\dagger$

According to this the verb has in common language no augment : originally it had the digamma, and hence in the Epics the syll. augm. éverov. For the same reason the compounds have the hiatus, $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \varepsilon \iota-$ $\pi \varepsilon \tau \nu$ : see Buttm. Lexil. p. 130. note.

With this aorist єineiv usage has joined, so as to form but one verb, the Ion. fut. $\varepsilon \rho^{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \omega$, Att. $\varepsilon \in \rho \tilde{\omega}$, from the pres. sípw, which in the sense of I say is Epic ; also the perf.
 pronounced also $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \rho \rho^{\prime} E^{\prime} Q \eta \nu$, but probably by those only who
 (paulo-post fut.) $\varepsilon i \rho \eta^{\prime} \sigma \rho \mu \alpha$, , from $\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime \prime} \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, is used as a simple fut. pass. instead of $\rho^{\circ} \theta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \mu \alpha_{\imath} \S$, which is found but seldom in Attic writers (Isocr. Philipp. init.).

The pres. $\varepsilon i \rho \omega$ uccurs in $\mathrm{Od} . \lambda, 137$. : and thence undoubtedly comes

[^103]$\ddagger$ This form is found written in various ways in the manuscript copies of the older writers: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 447. Bekker ad Eschin. 2,34. 124. But the best manuscripts have it not unfrequently in its regular shape; see Plat. Gorg. 36. Theat. 65.
§ This fut. appears to have been used only in its participle. Thuc. 8, 66. Plat. Phædr. 9.
 which we may refer the perf．eip $p<\alpha$ also，on account of the syllable $\varepsilon \iota$ which stands instead of the reduplication．＊The Ionians and the common prose language had also $\varepsilon i \rho \eta \eta^{\theta} \eta \nu$ or $\varepsilon i \rho \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \eta \eta \nu$（see Schweigh． Lex．Herod．in $\rho \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \iota \nu)$ ，in the same way as from $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda \eta \mu \mu a \iota$ ，$\delta \iota \varepsilon \dot{\ell} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu a \iota$ crept into the non－Attic aorists $\varepsilon i \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \phi \theta \eta \nu, \delta(\epsilon \in \lambda \in ⿱ ㇒ 日 勺 \chi \theta \eta \nu . \dagger$

By some $\varepsilon \in \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega$ also is considered a present，but in the Epic writers it is always either a future，or，if a present，it is used with the sense of to ask，instead of ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \rho \rho \mu \alpha$, which see．$\ddagger$ Yet Hesiod $(\vartheta, 38$ ．）has a verb $\varepsilon i \rho \rho$ produced to $\varepsilon \in \omega$ ，in which $\varepsilon i \rho \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma a t$ is the fixed traditionary reading，though the metre would admit $\begin{gathered}\text { ípovara } \\ \text { quite }\end{gathered}$ as well．
$\Phi_{\eta \mu i}$ was used as the present of this verb，but with certain limitations，which will be seen under it：in the com－ pounds however we find sometimes $\dot{\alpha} \gamma o p s u ́ s a y$（which pro－ perly means to harangue），e．g．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \gamma o p s \dot{v} \omega$, I forbid，$\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma \nu$ ， I forbade；and sometimes $\lambda$ ह́ $\gamma \omega, \mathrm{e} . \mathrm{g} . \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \lambda$ 白 $\gamma \omega, \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \varepsilon \tilde{\pi} \pi 0 \nu . \S$

The expression with kakẽs，to speak ill of，was treated in this respect
 $\mu \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$.

The Epics have also an imperat．${ }^{\prime} \in \pi \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ ，which is a sister－form with


The poetical verb $\frac{\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \pi}{} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ，or $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$ ，is shown in Buttm．Lexil． pp．123．131．to be no compound，but a strengthened form of the root


 Here the aorist as compared with the present is，by its long syllable， at variance with general analogy，but still not without example；see

[^104]$\ddagger$ Struve has pointed out two passages
 I say，in Præcept．p．64．，and 彳ैॄоу，they $^{\prime}$ said，Epidem．2．p．691．If the syntax and reading of these passages are to be depended on（which I cannot take upon myself to assert positively），the two forms belong to the analogy of other Ionic pre－ sedts sprung from the future，as $\mu a \chi$ е́o－ $\mu a s$ ；and jpeos $^{2}$ is then a proof that the augm．$\epsilon t$ cannot be used in the way noticed in the preceding note．
 not be used，but the compounds of elfov were far more common．
 in old grammatical tradition this form was considered an aorist. The future was formed, as is frequently the case, from this aorist, and that in two analogous ways: for in $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu i \psi \omega$ the $\sigma$ is dropped, as in the fut. of $\delta_{\iota}^{\boldsymbol{\delta} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \omega}$ and $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega . \dagger$ From this future was formed again another present $\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \nu i \pi \tau \omega$ in Pind. Pyth. 4, 358., which however must be distinguished from the Homeric $\bar{\varepsilon} v i \pi \tau \omega$, to revile, which see hereafter.
 augment, and where the metre would have required $\eta \nu \varepsilon \pi o v$, there ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \nu \nu \varepsilon \pi o \nu$ was introduced. The double $\nu$ in ${ }^{\varepsilon} \nu \nu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$ is besides frequent in the Tragedians; but ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \nu \nu \varepsilon \pi o \nu$ seems not to occur, generally speaking, in their writings. We have supposed this preterite to be, in form, an imperfect, like $\varepsilon_{申} \neq \eta \nu$ under $\Phi \eta \mu i$ : but in usage both are aorists, and the
 compare $\eta \dot{v} \delta \alpha$ under Aidóáw. Hence then we may explain the use of this form in the Hymn to Pan, 29., where êvyenov, answering to the preceding $\dot{v} \mu \nu \varepsilon \tilde{v} \sigma \iota$, stands for $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma o v \sigma$. That is to say, as the indicat. of the aor. has in general, beside its meaning of a preterite, that of doing a thing usually, so this imperf. converted by usage into an aorist has the same secondary meaning, exactly like èv

The Grammarians deduce from $\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \nu \sigma \pi \varepsilon \tau \nu$ a twofold imperative, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \nu \sigma \pi \varepsilon$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\nu} \sigma \pi \varepsilon g$. If this latter be genuine, we must suppose $\dot{\varepsilon} v \in \sigma \pi \varepsilon \pi \nu$ to be a compound $\ddagger$, perhaps of $\dot{\varepsilon} v i$ and $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu$, which would then correspond in form with $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu$ from $\tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$, and of which the imperat. would be $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\varsigma}$,
 Some manuscripts have also $\frac{\tilde{y} v i \sigma \pi \varepsilon g}{}$ or $\dot{\varepsilon} v i \sigma \pi \varepsilon_{\mathrm{S}}$ (for the accent is uncertain) wherever the word stands at the end of the verse; on the other hand at Od. $\delta, 642$. in the middle of the verse $\varepsilon$ ยvarat could be the only reading. I would observe however that the aor. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{e v i \sigma \pi o v}$ as a compound is contrary to analogy, for in that case it ought to be $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi o \nu$, like $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \chi{ }^{\circ} \nu$; and further, that in the two passages of the Iliad, $\lambda, 186 . \xi, 470$., where the Cod. Ven. has in the text $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \sigma \pi \varepsilon \varsigma$, the scholium does not mention this reading, but has in the lemma (as far as

[^105][^106]the lemmata of Villoison are to be depended on) ยैviore. I would not therefore recommend the adoption of this form with a view to strengthen the last syllable of the hexameter.

E!pq $\omega$, I shut out, вip from each other in their tenses merely by the breathing; thus, $\varepsilon \ell \rho \xi \omega$, $\varepsilon โ \rho \xi \alpha:$ sip $\xi \omega$, $\varepsilon i \rho \xi \alpha$. This verb, according to the analogy of verbs beginning with $\varepsilon$, does not take the augment, which is supplied by the accent : see Eix $\omega, I$

 language, as we shall see below, had the digamma, and consequently corresponded exactly with the same stem or root under $\bar{\rho} \dot{\varepsilon} \zeta \omega$. The distinction of out or in is not marked in Homer by the absence or presence of the aspirate; because in that early stage of the language the word had instead of the aspirate the digamma, the loss of which was supplied in the dialects by the one or other of the breathings; in the Epic language, according to general tradition, by the lenis; consequently the sense of Od. $\xi, 411$. was to shut in, rès $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ (the swine)
 was undefined; it meant nothing more than to separate, shut off, and the context showed whether it was in or out. But in the Ionic dialect
 ஸs катабкóтovs éóvтas, and no doubt from old tradition: whence the
 in the common language it was also a standing rule: see Eust. ad Od. a, 27. (p. 14, 25. Bas.), and the directions of an old grammarian in Hermann (at the end of De Em. Gr. Gr.) p. 337. $\dagger$ Nor is $\dot{a} \pi \varepsilon i \rho \gamma \varepsilon \iota \nu$ (with the exception of á $\phi \varepsilon \rho \kappa \tau o s$ in the last note) ever found with a $\phi$; on the contrary, the compound with kará, the most usual in the sense

[^107]Bekker on Thuc. 1, 35.) : the reason of which was, that other grammarians ascribed elp\% without distinction to the Attics, but elp $\boldsymbol{\text { c }}$ to the кouvois (see Etym. M. 377, 48.), as is indeed the case in many other words. And certainly $\quad \phi \in \rho$ $\kappa \tau o s$, shut out, quoted in the last note from Eschylus, leads to the same conclusion. If now we suppose (as was said before, and is certainly the more probable) that originally there was no distinction, but that one established itself by degrees, yet without ever becoming universal, all that can occur is satisfactorily explained.
of to shut in，is almost always written with the 2 ；while in Thucyd．1， 76．，where катєipyєc，has the general sense of to constrain，keep down by force，the $\tau$ stands without a various reading．Further，that the sense of shutting in is expressed by the pres．$\varepsilon i \rho \gamma \nu v \mu \iota$ ，is evident from the grammarian above mentioned，who observes that＂$\varepsilon i \rho \gamma \omega$ in the present is not used；＂for $\varepsilon$ e $\rho \gamma \omega$ is a very common present．

As to the digamma，the same conclusion results from the Epic aug－
 superfluous $\varepsilon$ in the present）${ }_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \gamma \omega$ ，in the same language，from which is contracted the common $\varepsilon$ i $\rho \gamma \omega$. ．The digamma is therefore very

 pluperf． $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \varepsilon\end{gathered} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ aro does indeed seem by its syllabic augment to have the same marks of the digamma：but there is one point opposed to it； namely，that in both passages where it occurs the digamma with redu－ plication is inadmissible，because in Od．$\kappa, 241$ ．it is preceded by a consonant，in Il．$\varepsilon, 89$ ．by a shortened diphthong．These two passages belong however to the numerous instances where the digamma has disappeared from our Homer．The forms ${ }_{\varepsilon} \rho \chi \chi a \tau \alpha \iota,{ }_{\varepsilon}{ }^{\ell} \rho \chi a \tau o$ ，are much more striking，particularly in Od．九，221．$\kappa$ ，283．，where they begin the verse，and where consequently a slight emendation is not to be thought of．Here then the syllable of reduplication has quite disappeared， which in cases of the true syllabic augment（as if $\tau \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}$ 人atal were put for $\tau \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}{ }^{\boldsymbol{a}} \mathrm{a}^{2} \alpha \mathrm{a}$ ）is never the case．Hence in the history of the digamma， and its gradual disappearance，this verb would be a remarkable feature．
 and is therefore a regular perfect，but without the temp．augm．：and this too contrary to Epic usage，but as it occurs in a syllable long by position it is free from suspicion．$\dagger$

## Eipúv．See＇Epúw．

E゙ípo．See Eineĩv．
 rens）and ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \rho \sigma \alpha$（Hippocr．de Morb．2，33．סı́́p $\rho \alpha_{\S}$ ）．Perf．pass．in the
 the digamma is not obliterated；for in the only two passages where the


[^108]it not before the first $\in$ ；compare II．$\beta$ ， 825．èvтds द＇є́pүєı．Bentley＇s emendation of this passage is，therefore，certainly cor－

$\dagger$ The augment is occasionally omitted in syllables naturally long，as ty єлтєто，йрХє，д̈ттєто．
preceded by the separable $\nu$. In Herodotus on the contrary we find the common form, but with the temp. augm. omitted, as is always the case in the Ionic dialect. Suidas quotes from some writer éveıp $\mu$ ह́vos $\pi \varepsilon ์ \delta a \iota s$, consequently with the augm. $\varepsilon \iota$; although it may be taken for the unchanged diphthong of the present, as in the verbal subst. sip $\mu$ ós, on the aspirate of which see Buttm. Lexil. p. 300. For $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\prime} \varepsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon$ see "Eprat.

## Eíca. See ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E} \Omega, 2$.


Eicu日a. See "E $\theta \omega$.
'Eム- See Aipéw.
'E $\Lambda$-. See Eí $\lambda \omega$.
${ }^{\text {'E }}$ E $\lambda \alpha \dot{v} \nu \omega$, I drive: fut. ${ }^{\wedge} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ with $\alpha$ short, Ep. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\eta} \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha$, Poet. ${ }_{\xi}{ }^{\prime 2} \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha$, ${ }^{\xi} \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha$; perf. ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta_{\eta} \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha$, perf. pass. ह̀ $\lambda \eta^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. pass. ท่ $\lambda \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta_{\eta \nu: ~ v e r b a l ~ a d j . ~ ह ่ \lambda \alpha \tau o ́ s . ~}^{\text {. }}$ In non-Attic writers the passive takes a $\sigma$, as $\varepsilon_{\xi} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$,
 $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \tilde{\alpha} \nu$, are in the Attic prose a future, according to the analogy of verbs whose futures end in $-\breve{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ or $-\varepsilon \in \sigma \omega$, and which form a new Attic future by rejecting the $\sigma$ and contracting the remaining termination, thus $\dot{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \omega$, $\dot{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \omega$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \tilde{\omega}_{\text {. }}$ See also last note under $\Delta^{\prime} \notin \omega$. - Midd.

The forms in $-\tilde{\omega},-\tilde{q} c, \& c$., occur also as presents from the simple theme $\varepsilon^{\lambda} \lambda a ́ \omega$. In prose however there is only one example, the imperat. $\alpha \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda a$, Xenoph. Cyr. 8, 3, 32. In poetry there are several;
 ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \lambda a$, Eurip. Herc. 819.

In Od. $\eta, 86$. is a 3. plur. pluperf pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \delta \dot{a}$, for which Wolf writes ép $\overline{\text { pédato, the reading of the old editions. This latter has }}$ however by far the fewest manuscripts in its favour, and it seems to me clear that the true reading must be some form of $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda a v ́ v \omega$, as the expression is much the same as we find in v. 113. in Il. $\sigma, 564$. and $\mathrm{Od} . \zeta, 9$. But the reading $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda$ áóaro is likewise found in very few manuscripts, while by far the majority has $\varepsilon \lambda \eta \lambda$ ह́óato, and some $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda \varepsilon ́ a \tau o . ~ T h i s ~ l a s t ~ h a s ~ b e e n ~ a d o p t e d ~ b y ~ A l t e r ; ~ a n d ~ w h e n ~ w e ~ c o n-~$ sider that it is the regular Ionic form, according to the analogy of $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \varepsilon ́ a \tau a \iota$ for -avтal, and that it does not offend the metre, I cannot but think that it is the true reading of Homer.

In the Epic language we find some participles proparoxytons, as غ́ $\lambda \eta \lambda a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu$ о̧, $\sigma \nu \nu \varepsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o \iota, ~ A r a t . ~ 176, ~ l i k e ~ a ̉ к \eta \chi є ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s ~(I I . ~ \sigma, ~ 29),$.

## 94


 editors have altered this accent，because it was not supported by a scholium，like the passage in Aratus．See note under＇Аках ${ }^{〔} \zeta \omega$ ．
 pres．and imperf．It is found once in a passive sense，Il．$\pi, 494$. Both forms are exclusively poetical．
 perf．pass．Е̇入ウ́ $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha$ ．
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \lambda \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \zeta \omega$, I turn round，tremble：fut． $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \lambda \lambda(\xi \omega$ ；aor．1．$\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \hat{\lambda} \lambda i \xi \alpha$, aor．
 syncopated aorist．See Buttm．Lexil．p． 287.

EлEYӨ－，ЕлӨ－．See＂Eрхоцає．
 $\lambda_{\imath} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ ．In this last perf．three things are to be observed：1．）that the simple augm．$\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda \iota \gamma \mu a \iota$ was also in use ；2．）that the augm．$\varepsilon \iota$ does not take place with the reduplication；3．）that the syllable of redu－ plication does not admit of the aspirate．$\ddagger$
 also from a theme ${ }^{\text {e }} \mathbf{E} \Lambda K \Upsilon \Omega$ ，which is not used in the pres．
 Piers．ad Moer．p．134．But in the aor．$\varepsilon$ โ $\lambda x ย ั \sigma \alpha$ ，$\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda x \cup ́ \sigma \alpha ৷$ is far more common than $\varepsilon \tilde{i} \lambda \xi \alpha$ ，and in the passive $\varepsilon_{i}^{\pi} \lambda$－ $x u \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ，siגxú $\theta \eta \nu$ are the only forms in use．－Midd．

The regular imperf．$\varepsilon \lambda^{\pi} \lambda_{k o y}$ is never found in Hom．nor in Ionic
 $\ddot{\eta} \lambda \kappa \eta \sigma a$（with $\eta$ as augment），$\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \kappa \eta \theta \varepsilon i \varrho$ ，has in Homer the stronger meaning of to drag along．
${ }^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} \lambda \pi \omega$ ，I encourage to hope：Od．$\beta, 91 . \gamma, 380$ ．But it is generally

 note under Eikw ；also the second note under＂Ayvv $\mu$ ，and a note in Buttm．Lexil．p．202．The Epic forms are $\varepsilon \in \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \pi \sigma \mu a \iota$ and $\varepsilon \in \varepsilon \lambda \pi o ́ \mu \eta \nu:$ see＂E入ঠоцаь and note．

[^109][^110]
## ＇Eスv́e．See Eì̀úv，

＇Eféco，I vomit，has $\varepsilon$ in the inflexion and $\sigma$ in the pas． sive：it takes also the Attic reduplication．
［ Eschylus has the fut．midd．єॄ $\mu о \tilde{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\iota}$ in the sense of to vomit，while Xenoph．（Anab．4，8，20．）has the imperf． act．in the same intrans．sense．］

 －Midd，with aor．1．$\varepsilon \quad \varepsilon \eta \rho a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，Hom．［This verb is not a compound： see Buttm．Lexil．p．119．］
＇Evav́u．See Aǘw．
ENETK－，ENEIK－．See Фép $\omega$ ．
＇Evétu．See Eiteĩ．
＇Evívo日a，a perf．with the force of a present，found in the Epic writers in composition only，and in the third person；used at the same time as aorist：thus $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \nu \eta \eta_{0} \theta \varepsilon$ ，кarevivo $\theta \varepsilon$ ，it lies or it lay thereon．As a theme we must suppose ENO, $\operatorname{ENE} \Theta$ ：see this more fully ex－ plained in Buttm．Lexil．p．110．\＆c．

＇Evintw，I reproach，has in Homer two forms of theaar．2．，viz．

 in Buttm．Lexil．p．123．\＆c．This form is the reduplicated aor， 2. with the radical vowel long，which we know from the subst．$\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \bar{i} \pi \dot{y}$ was long in the root also．2．）The 3．sing．$\dot{\eta} v i \pi \check{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon$ ，formed by a pe－ culiar reduplication in the middle of the word，like 引ŋрикаког，infin． غ́puкакє́єь，from épúкш．

Homer has another sister－form ${ }^{\varepsilon} \nu i \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，which bears the same re－ lation to $\dot{\varepsilon} v i \pi \tau \omega$ as $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \omega$ to $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \omega$ ．None of the forms，which are here placed together，ever stand absolutely in Homer with the meaning of to say，but they are sometimes used so with the sense of to re－
 the Pindaric $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu i \pi \tau \omega$（see under ${ }^{`}$ E $\nu \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$ ）；while the long $\iota$ above men－ tioned makes it most probable that they belong to a particular family of verbs，of which a more accurate examination will be found in Buttm．Lexil．p．123．\＆c．
＂E $\nu \nu \bar{v} \mu$ ，or $\hat{\varepsilon} \nu \nu \dot{v} \omega$, I put on，clothe，forms its tenses from a theme




From the pass. $\begin{gathered} \\ \sigma\end{gathered} \mu a \iota$, $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \eta \nu$ (which never occurs in its simple form
 and the compound $\dot{\eta} \mu \phi i \varepsilon \sigma \mu a t, \& c$. The forms with the syllabic aug-
 ह̃єбтo (II. $\mu, 464$.), are Epic only.

The Ionics have another form $\varepsilon i v v \mu \iota$; for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \dot{i} v v \sigma \theta a t$ in Herodotus proves that the $\varepsilon \varepsilon$ in the Homeric eivvov (Il. $\psi$, 135.) is not the augment. The temp. augm. is found neither in the imperf. nor the aorist: the perf. only has the augment $\varepsilon \varepsilon$. Homer has not the temp. augm. in any tense, but the syllab. augm. only, which is to be accounted for by the digamma.

The simple $\tilde{\varepsilon} \nu \nu v \mu c$ is never used in prose, but principally the com-
 $\dot{a} \mu \phi \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \mu a l$; and takes the augment in the preposition, $\dot{\eta} \mu \phi i \varepsilon \sigma a$, infin.
 Nor do the other compounds generally reject the vowel of the prepo-


 the augm. in the second syllable é $\omega \rho \tau \alpha \zeta_{0 \nu, ~ a c c o r d i n g ~ t o ~ t h e ~}^{\text {a }}$

'Eлaî̀, Herodot. 3, 29. See 'Aî́ $\omega$.
'Етаирет̃, \&c. See AYP-.
'Eтsi' $\omega$, I press; pass. I hasten. For proof that this verb is no compound, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 118.
'Eтiбтацаь, I understand, depon. pass. with fut. midd.; imperf. $\eta ่ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu: ~ f u t . ~ ह ै \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota ; ~ a o r . ~ \eta ं \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \theta \eta \nu ;$ verbal adj. $\dot{\pi} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \tau o ́ s$. In the optat. the accent sometimes follows the regular conjugation of barytone verbs, e.g.
 i $\sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$, , $\sigma \nu \downarrow \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha$, , \&c.* See $\Delta$ úvaцas with note, and ${ }^{7} \mathrm{I} \sigma \tau \eta \mu$.

This verb is distinguished from éqiधтадat, the proper compound of iovauat, by the $\pi$, by the augment, and by the aorist retaining the $\eta$ of the formation before the $\theta$.

Instead of the 2. sing. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma a \iota$ the Attic poets have $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau q$ (Æsch. Eum. 86. 578.), the Ionics $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \eta$ (Theogn. 1043. or 1085. Bekk.

* Yet the Ionic conj. is $\mathbf{~} \pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon \propto \mu \mu u$, Herodot. 3, 134.
1081.) Gaisf. See Buttm. on Soph. Phil. 798. The usual form in the imperf. is $\dot{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \omega$ and in the imperat. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \omega$, e. g. Xen. Mem. 3, 4, 9. Cyr. 3, 2, 16. See Moer. 163. 182. Homer has the imperf. without the


${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E} \pi \omega$, I am employed or busy about anything : imperf,
 infin. $\sigma \pi \varepsilon i \nu$, part. $\sigma \pi \omega \dot{\omega}$; compound $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \circ \nu$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \pi \varepsilon i \nu$, $\mu \leq \tau \alpha \sigma \pi \omega^{\nu} \nu$. The augment is $\varepsilon \iota$, as $\pi \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon \nu$, Xen. Mem. 2, 9,5. This verb in its simple form is found only in II. $\zeta, 321 . *$, but its compounds are used both in verse and in prose, $\pi \varepsilon \rho\llcorner\varepsilon ́ \pi \omega, \delta \iota \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega$, \&c.

These aorists seldom occur except in poetry : though Ionic prose has frequently $\pi \varepsilon \rho \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \pi \varepsilon$, Herod. 1. 73., $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \sigma \pi \varepsilon i v$, ib. 115., and the passive of the same compound $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varepsilon \phi \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a u, 5,1.6,15$., and $\pi \varepsilon \rho 1 \varepsilon ́ \psi \varepsilon$ $\sigma \theta a \iota$ for $\pi \varepsilon p \iota \varepsilon \phi \theta \eta \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, 2,115.7,119$.

Midd, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi о \mu \alpha \iota$, I follow: imperf. simó $\mu \eta \nu$, and Poet.
 aorist has this peculiarity that the augment is aspirated,
 '́ $\oint \in ́ \sigma \pi \varepsilon \tau 0$ Eurip. Hipp. 130\%.) t, and as a proof that it is merely the augm. it disappears in the other moods: infin,
 $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \sigma \pi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ Plat. Crit. p. 107. b. \&c. The Ion. imperat. 2. pers. is $\sigma \pi \varepsilon ́ o$, Ep. $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \tilde{\kappa}$, Il. $x, 285$.
 and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \pi \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a l$, we see at once that the former arise from the same syncope as the latter. That is to say, the aspirate in $\tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$ and ${ }^{\top} \operatorname{EX} \Omega\left({ }^{\text {e }} \xi(\omega)\right.$ passed (as it does in so many other words) into a $\sigma$, which immediately attached itself to the consonants following, therefore ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell}-\sigma \pi o \nu,{ }^{\prime}-\sigma \chi^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$. This statement does not however militate against the insertion of a $\sigma$ according to another analogy in the root ${ }^{\circ}$ EI, and


[^111] Pyth. 4, 237. which can hardly be joined with the Pindaric forms in the note fol lowing.

From these, and not from the $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu$ belonging to the former analogy, came the indicative which passed into the common language, while the other moods $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a i$, \&c., remained in the usage of the Epics (II. $\varepsilon, 423$. Od. $\mu$, 349. Il. $\mu$, 395., \&e.). But from the very circumstance of $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu$ being an aorist, the pres. $\begin{gathered}\text { z } \sigma \pi \varepsilon \tau \alpha c \\ \text { which } \\ \text { is a various }\end{gathered}$
 the present old and unobjectionable reading of the text.*
${ }^{\prime} E \rho \alpha ' \omega$, I love, is used only in the pres. and imperf.;
 the sister-form ${ }^{Y} \rho \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$, like ${ }^{Z} \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$, is a deponent synonymous with the active, and in the pres. solely poetical. The aor. pass. however, $\eta_{\rho} \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, fut. ĖpaбӨทं $\sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, with an active sense, is used in prose ; part. Éparөsís.

 Parthen. The 2. pers. pres. Epic with double $\sigma$, êpagoae occurs in
 to the analogy of barytone verbs, Pind. P. 4, 164. compare émiбтaцaı and $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu a \iota$. Lastly épáar $\theta \varepsilon$ in an act. sense, II. $\pi, 208$. is probably a false reading. $\dagger$
'Epóc is used only in its compounds, and with the regular aor. 1. $\varepsilon_{\xi} \xi \rho \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha!$, $\alpha \alpha \tau \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$, to pour or shoot out, बuvepä $\sigma \alpha_{1} \ddagger$, to pour or throw together.
'EpráGouaı, I labour, work, depon. midd. : fut. şp ${ }^{\prime} \alpha$ '-

[^112]there seems to be no doubt of a twofold ancient usage: at the same time it seems hardly possible that such a distinction as that between simple and compound could have existed in Homer's language. Bekker's supposition therefore, if confined to Homer, has great probability.
4. That is to say, the depon. :paote is no more capable of resolution than I\% $\sigma$ $\sigma \theta \epsilon$, ठv́varөє, \&c, ; and zрâनөє can be only passive. The reading must therefore necessarily be Ens тотply $\gamma^{\prime}$ éd́ $\sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$. [Passow however seems to think it may be defended by supposing a theme epdo$\mu a s$ from which will come épâtau, Sappho Fr. 59. Theocr. 2, 149.]
\& Isocr. Phil. p. 110. b., as restored by Bekker. Aristot. de Gen. Animal. 3, 1. extr.
 [The Ion. and Att. generally use the perf. pass. sip $\gamma \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha t$ in the act. sense of the aor. midd. Eip $\alpha \sigma \alpha_{\alpha} \mu \eta$, Valck. Phoen. 1069. Lob. Soph. Aj. 21., but this tense is also found as a true passive, e.g. $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ Épp $_{\mathrm{p}}^{\mathrm{p}} \alpha \sigma \mu_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{s}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, Herodot. 7, 53. compare Plat. Charm. p. 173. c. Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 9. Conviv. 5, 4. CEcon. 19, 8., \&c. And even the indic. of this perf. is found in a passive sense, at least in its compound $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon_{i}^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, Plat. Legg. 4. p.710.d. The fut. pass. $\varepsilon_{\rho} \rho \gamma \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ is seldom found with a really passive meaning which it has in Sophoc. Tr. 1218., Isocr. Epist. 6. Passow.]


'Ерєєіүш. See "Ерони.
${ }^{\text {' }} \boldsymbol{\rho} \rho \hat{\ell} \theta_{\omega}$, I excite, irritate, is used only in pres. and imperf., but we find in Mosch. 3, 85. the aor. with augm. tipetor. Its derivative

${ }^{`}$ Epsî̀, I support by placing one thing against another: fut. $\varepsilon_{p} \rho \varepsilon i \sigma \omega$, \&c. It has the Att. redupl.; thus perf. act.

 329. Od. $\eta, 86.95$. ; for which Apollon. Rh. uses Ėp $\eta$ $\rho s i v \tau \alpha$. Homer has the augm. only in nं $\rho \dot{\eta} \rho s i \sigma \tau 0$, but Hes.
 yos, ह̇psió $\alpha \mu s \nu \nu$, \&c. Hom.
 Midd. I tear my clothes in pieces. Pass. I am torn or broken ; perf. épriparpat, Hippocr.

To the intransitive sense of the pass. (e. g. II. $\nu, 441$.) belongs the




[^113] find in Herodian Hist. 8, 2. катєрйрєıттo.

In this verb as in the last the passive makes a transition to the intransitive meaning to fall over, fall down, and this, as being the immediate sense, belongs to the aor. 2. act. ク̆ $\rho \iota \pi o v$, and the perf. Épй $\rho \iota \pi a$ (see note under Tév ${ }^{\omega}$ ), which however occur only in the poets.* In Pind. Ol. 2, 76. Boeckh has shown from the manuscripts and from Apollon. Synt. p. 277. that the part. aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \iota \pi \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu \tau$, not $\varepsilon$ ह́pt$\pi \dot{o} v \tau$, is the true reading.

The Epic midd. áv $\eta \rho \varepsilon \iota \psi$ á $\mu \eta \nu$ belongs unquestionably to this verb, although in this compound its sense is somewhat different: Homer has frequently à $\nu \eta \rho \varepsilon i \nmid a \nu \tau o$, they have torn away, carried off, II, v, 234. Od. $\delta, 727$. \&c. and Hesiod, $\neg, 990$. has á $\nu \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \iota \psi a \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \eta$, having carried off $\dagger$
'Ерénтонa, I feed, graze, eat, occurs only in the pres. and imperf.
 $\delta \rho \varepsilon ́ \phi \omega, \& c$. ; compare $\gamma \lambda \dot{v} \phi \omega$. This form was long regarded with suspicion in Pind. P. 4, 240. but has been satisfactorily defended by Boeckh.
 $\eta_{p}{ }_{\rho} \sigma \sigma \alpha$ and ${ }_{E \rho}{ }_{\rho}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha$, Il. $\iota, 361$. Od. $\lambda, 78$. The compound
 ${ }_{\varepsilon} \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \mu_{o}{ }_{\rho}$ we may conclude that its characteristic letter was $\tau$.

 whence $\varepsilon^{\ell} p \forall \theta a i \nu \varepsilon \tau 0$, he became red : purely Homeric forms. The subst.
 $\theta a i \nu \omega$ as it did to $\dot{a}^{\lambda}$ ८taive, in which the termination -aive is a mere extension of the original present, according to the analogy mentioned


#### Abstract

* Of this aorist \%ifinov, which is frequent in the poets, we find one instance of a transitive meaning in the latest editions of Herodot. 9, 70. But the old reading hipetrov ought not to have been changed, even though the new reading had been favoured by manuscripts. A fixed line of distinction between imperf, and aor. is not possible in these older remains of antiquity. If Herodotus had intended to use the aor., we cannot but suppose that he would have said tipetquy, as he has E'реїчur at 1, 164. $\dagger$ There are no grounds for the theme a $\nu$ ереіттш in the lexicons; nor must we be misled by the usage of this word in 


you have undertaken, Orph. Arg. 292.). In the old Epic usage there is nothing to lead us decidedty from epeime. Whatever in the word a $\nu \eta p \in \iota \psi \alpha \mu \eta \nu$ seems op-
 in the preposition dyd and the midd. voice. The idea of a $\rho \stackrel{\pi \eta}{n}$ is in $\bar{\beta}\left\{\pi \tau \omega\right.$, in $\epsilon^{2} \rho \epsilon i \pi \omega$, and in àmpeєqúuทv. What is torn avay, falls to the ground; hence the simple $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \in i \pi \omega$ and $\boldsymbol{y}^{\prime} \rho i \pi o y$ contain in themselves this collateral meaning: if we add to this pınth or tearing the sense of $\alpha \nu d$ in composition and the middle voice, we have avipestaunv, I have seized and carried up for myself, a very proper verb to express such a transaction as the rape of Ganymede.
in note under Aiodávopac. On the other hand in the later form $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho v \theta a i \nu \omega,-\alpha i \nu \omega$ is a derivative termination from $\hat{\varepsilon} \rho v \theta \rho o ́ s$, as $\lambda \varepsilon u \kappa \alpha i v \omega$ is from $\lambda_{\text {evkós with the regular flexion } \lambda \varepsilon u \kappa a ̃ y a l, ~ \& c . ~ A n d ~ t h e ~ A l e x a n-~}^{\text {en }}$ drine poets treated $\varepsilon \in \rho v \theta a i v \omega$ in the same way, e.g. $\varepsilon p v \theta \eta \nu \varepsilon$, Apollon. Rh. 1, 791. Compare кє $\overline{\delta a} \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\nu} \omega$.
 Midd. Eur. Bacch. 323. Aristoph. Vesp. 1294. See also 'Ере́лть.
'Eре́ $\chi \theta \omega$, I torment, torture; used only in pres. and imperf.
'Ерє́ш. See Eīєєiv and "Еродаи.
 This verb has in the Epics a middle synonymous with the active, II. $\varepsilon$, 172. Od. $\delta, 80$. Hes. 2,534 ., to which belongs the perf. pass. with Att:
 not belong to this verb, but comes from the pres. épioaive, according to the analogy laid down in note under AírOávopat: only that épıónoa$\sigma \theta a t$ in the passage above mentioned has the second syllable long; whence it has been written with double $\delta . \dagger$


 mon Attic use in all its moods, and the fut. is occasionally found in the best writers, Plat. Lys. p. 20\%. c. 211. d. Apol. p. 29. e. Xen. Hell. 4, 5, 6. but of the infin. pres. ${ }_{\varepsilon}{ }_{p} \rho \in \sigma \theta$ ar there are great doubts, and even in Homer it is most probably the aor. and ought to be accented as such. The other tenses are supplied by ॄ̇pot $\alpha \omega$.-Passow.] Ionic prose has on the other hand a present $\varepsilon^{l} \rho \rho \rho \mu \alpha /$, of which

[^114]properly rejected : and thence we must conclude that the Greeks expressed this lengthening of the vowel, not by merely making it long (as from épis ${ }^{\text {epioidos), }}$, but by the accent or ictus. This however does not appear to me grounded on sufficient analogy : and it is therefore worth remarking, that the old Grammarians, according to the Scholium in Heyne, had another reading $\bar{p} \rho \iota\{\zeta \eta \sigma a \sigma \theta a u$. Compare the double way of writing a $\ddagger \delta \eta \geqslant$ रos and àţ̌n $\lambda o s$ in Buttmı Lexil، p. 58. \&c.
 \&c., are, like the above, used as aorists : fut. єipi $\sigma o \mu \alpha$.

We often meet with the accentuation ${ }^{\text {ép }} \rho \sigma \theta a u$, which is considered as
 is not conceivable. Now, as the manuscripts frequently give us the aoristic accentuation $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \ell$, there is no doubt that this alone is the true way of writing it, and that the other arose from the grammatical custom of supposing a pres. ह̈ро $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \iota$. Compare $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \rho o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ in हो $\gamma \varepsilon$ i $\rho \omega$.* This supposition was very much supported by the actual existence of the Ionic pres. $\varepsilon$ épopat, which was considered to be a mere Ion. production of the common ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \rho \mu a$. But if we examine carefully all that is quoted on the subject and the analogy of the language, there
 the regular aor. from it (compare $a^{\alpha} \gamma \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \imath$ ), which thus takes its natural augment $\eta_{\rho \rho} \rho \mu \eta$. Now when we explain the Ion. єipeто, \&c., to be an imperf., it is not to be denied that we look to its exterior only, as with regard to the meaning there is no room for the exercise of any grammatical acuteness; because, as we see in the syntax, all these verbs belonging to the conversational narrative of the language



 his poems I nowhere find any mention; and, as the sense there is not more decisive than it is in Herodotus, we must consider the forms with $\varepsilon$ and those with $\varepsilon \underline{\varepsilon}$ to be in the Epic language the same, and therefore leave the accentuation of é écöac untouched. Again at Il. $a, 513 . \phi, 508$. we must remain in doubt between the reading of $\varepsilon^{i} \rho \varepsilon \tau \%$ and $\eta \rho \varepsilon \tau \%$; the best manuscripts are in favour of the former. Of this old verb therefore common prose has retained only the historic tense, which by the quantity of the stem and by the accent was pronounced as an aor. 2., whilst the present could be dispensed with on account of $\varepsilon$ है $\omega \tau \tau \tilde{q} \nu$.

Later writers, mistaking the aoristic meaning of $\hat{\varepsilon} \rho \delta \dot{\mu} \varepsilon \nu o s$, have used
 liable to be confounded with the passive fut. $\varepsilon i \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \mu a t$ under $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon i v$;


[^115][^116] Homer，and in éreєрєó $\mu \varepsilon v o s$, Herodot．3，64．，where those manuscripts which give émeıрó $\mu \varepsilon \nu=$ os are not deserving of attention．The Epic lan－ guage had also in this formation the active $\varepsilon \begin{gathered} \\ \varepsilon \\ \epsilon\end{gathered}$, Il．$\eta, 128$ ．Od．$\phi$ ， 31．$\lambda, 229$ ．which must not be confounded with the future $\varepsilon$ é $\varepsilon \in$ from غípь，eĩ lengthened present in the same language is $\varepsilon^{\prime} \rho \varepsilon \epsilon i \nu \omega$ ．Compare $\dot{a} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon i \nu \omega$ ．
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E} \rho \pi \omega$, I creep along，go along：fut．${ }^{〔} \rho \psi \omega$, \＆c．The augm．is $\varepsilon ו$ ．It is used only in pres．and imperf．［The latter meaning was the prevailing one in the Doric writers， Valck．Adon．p．400．，but not unknown to the Attic tra－ gedians，Brunck．Eurip．Hipp．561．Metaph．in Eurip． Cycl．422．—Passow．］
 perf．グр’̀nxa．
＂Epaat is an old aorist，of which we find in Hom．the compound ámó－
 II．$\zeta, 348 . \phi, 283$ ．329．The present for this may be either $\frac{2}{\varepsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \omega$ with a causative meaning，or EP $\Delta \Omega$ ；see Buttm．Lexil．p．156．\＆c．

The more simple theme épév＇r does not occur in an active form；on the contrary Homer，Herodotus，and the non－Attic writers of a later
 has，like the Attics，$\eta_{p u \gamma o v . ~ T h e ~ m e a n i n g ~ o f ~ t h i s ~ v e r b ~ h a s ~ m o d i f i c a-~}^{\text {a }}$ tions which may be seen in the Lexicons，in which however sufficient attention is not paid to the difference of the forms．See Lobeck ad Phryn．pp．63， 64.
${ }^{\text {＇Epv日aiv．See＇Epevi日．}}$
 Eschyl．Sept．1075．Ep．${ }^{\text {Ëpug }}$ ，Il．$\gamma, 113$.

The Epics have also a peculiar aor．2．with the reduplication in the middle of the word，йри́кӑкоv，II．$\varepsilon, 321$ ．Infin．द́pvкакє́єєv，Hom． Compare $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu i \pi a \pi \epsilon \nu$ under＇${ }^{\prime} \nu i \pi \tau \omega$ ．
＇Epúe and cipúv，I draw，a verb used only by the Ionics and Epics， has $v$ short in the inflexion．＇Epvé has the fut．épvo $\omega$, Ep．épívon，but


[^117][^118]forms $\varepsilon i \rho \dot{v} \sigma \dot{\omega}$, \&c. The Midd. passes over to the meaning of to save; see Buttm. Lexil. p. 303. \&c., and in this meaning only we find a form without the $\varepsilon$, viz. $\dot{\rho} \dot{v} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ ac.* This verb is also used in Attic prose, and has in Attic poetry the $v$ always long in the inflexion, $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{\tilde{v}} \boldsymbol{v} \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu_{0}$ But in the Epic poets it is short even there, as pov $\sigma$ á $\mu \eta \nu$, II. o, $29 . ;$ hence, when the metre requires it long, this form also ought to be written by them with $\sigma \sigma$ : but the printed text has generally $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma a r o$, jovaaro, even where the syllable is required to be long. $\dagger$

In the passive form of this verb it is sometimes difficult, particularly amidst the difference of meanings, to distinguish the tenises correctly. The perf. pass. has necessarily by virtue of the reduplication, even if it be formed from ${ }^{\dot{\varepsilon} \rho} \hat{v}^{\omega} \omega$, the syllable $\varepsilon \iota$ as augment. To this tense belong, with some degree of certainty according to the sense, the forms
 the ships which have been or were drawn up on land. In the passage of Od. $\chi, 90$. it may be doubted whether $\begin{gathered}\text { ípüтo } \\ \text { be pluperf. or syncop. }\end{gathered}$ aorist. $\ddagger$ In either case there is this certain result, at least for the Epic language, that as the radical syllable of the syncop. aor. always corresponds with that of the perf. pass., the 1 . sing. of this last tense was not formed with the $\sigma$, but with the $v$ long. §

In the sense of to save, watch over, we frequently find ép $\rho v \sigma \theta a \iota$, épvio,

[^119] mтo入ıs, \&c., having the meaning of to protect, while $\beta \dot{u} r \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho, ~ \beta \tilde{v} \mu o ́ s, \& c .$, have the meaning of to draw. That the Epic language belongs to that period is in itself probable ; the above-mentioned $\beta \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu$ gives it critical certainty.
$\ddagger$ The passage runs thus, 'A $\mu \phi$ lyouos

 el̇EเE rupday. Here elputo appears to stand in exactly the same situation as at
 we may understand the times of the action thus; " he rushed on Ulysses with the sword which he had drawn," and then elpuio is the pluperf. of the same middle of which eipugбazo is the aorist. If the poet had wished to use the aor., he might
 he has done at $\delta, 530$. If this argument be not conclusive, it will at least show that this is a solitary instance of the syncop. aor. elpuro as a middle with transitive sense for eipúócaio, whereas all other instances of those syncop, aorists have a completely passive meaning.
$\oint$ Of єірva $\mu u$, єipúconv, as required by the grand analogy of verbs which shorten

Eiputo, \&c., with $v$ long; but they cannot be reckoned as perf. and pluperf. according to sense, nor, where there is no long syllable for. the augment, according to form. Aorists they could only be (i. e. syncopated aor.) where they meant a saving or snatching away completed in a moment; but the majority of these passages are decisive for
 imperf., Il. $\omega, 499 . \delta, 138 . \nu, 555 . \chi, 507$. in all which instances the sense is thou didst protect, he protected, exactly corresponding with the

 II. $\mu, 454 . \sigma, 515$. Od. $\rho, 201 .:$ and a similar meaning of duration is
 i, 194. Il. o, 141. It is clear therefore that all these forms belong to
 Nay, the indicative itself is used, not only by Apollon. 2, 1208. "́pürat, he watches over, but by Homer also, in as much as the 3. plur. sipúaraє in the passages of II. $a, 239$. Od. $\pi, 463$. stands in the sense of to watch over, observe, and consequently as it cannot in accordance with the above-quoted passages be explained from the meaning of the perfect, it can be only a present.

There remain some passages in which the sense of the aor. appears to
 (lyric), Soph. ©d. T. 1352.: these however are sufficiently accounted for by the greater liberty taken in the older language in the use of the historic tense.

We have mentioned before in the last paragraph of the article on $\gamma^{\prime}$ vo eras and in Buttm. Lexil. p.305. that in the Epic language the future of $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \dot{v} \omega$ becomes $\varepsilon$ ह́ $\hat{v} \omega$ again.* We must consider in the same light the
 of a hope or intention to do some certain thing, never puts the verb following in the present, but always in the fut. or aor.; as we may see by comparing II. $\sigma$, 174. $\chi, 351$. where in a similar combination and meaning we find as in other cases the aor. épíazatat.

There are still two other Hesiodic forms to be mentioned: 1.) $\varepsilon, 816$. infin. $\varepsilon i \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \varepsilon \nu a^{\prime}$ with $v$ short, for épvév, to draw; therefore exactly analogous to the formation in $\mu$, like $\delta \varepsilon \kappa v \dot{v} \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$ for $\delta \varepsilon \epsilon \kappa v i ́ v a \iota$ 2.) $\vartheta$,

[^120]under $\Delta e \mu \omega$, with which these Epic futures in -vow correspond exactly ; thus $\epsilon^{e} \rho u(\omega$, fut. épưow, and dropping the $\sigma$,
 Od. $\phi, 174$. Compare also $\sigma \omega \omega$ unde इ $\omega$ § $\omega$.
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304. "̂puro likewise with $v$ short, and with a passive sense, was watched, guarded.

 other moods are formed, imperat. $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \theta \hat{\varepsilon} \dagger$, inf. $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\nu}$, part.
 $\lambda \varepsilon \cup \sigma \tau$ ย́os).

The Epics lengthen the first and third syllable of this perf. thus, $\varepsilon i \lambda\{\lambda o v \theta a \ddagger$; and in plur. this form suffers the syncope $\varepsilon i \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda o v \theta \mu \varepsilon \nu$, II. $\iota, 49$. Od. $\gamma, 81$. part. $\varepsilon i \lambda \eta \lambda o v \theta \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, and once $\varepsilon$ é $\lambda \eta \lambda o v \theta \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, Od. o, 81 . Of the pluperf. Homer has only the 3. sing. $\varepsilon i \lambda \eta \lambda o v ́ \theta \varepsilon$, II. In Hephæstion pp. 6, 7., quoted from some Comedian, we find two forms $\hat{\varepsilon} \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda \nu \mu \varepsilon \nu$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \tau \varepsilon$, in which the Attics transferred, it would seem, to the language of the common people the same syncope which they applied to $\hat{\varepsilon} \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda v \theta a, \hat{\varepsilon}_{\lambda} \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{v} \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$, but dropped the analogy of the perf. passive.



It has been mentioned under $\varepsilon$ I $\mu, I$ go, that in usage it is connected with this verb. That is to say, instead of the collateral moods of the pres. of ${ }^{\Sigma} \rho \chi \chi \circ \mu \alpha$, those of $\varepsilon i \mu \iota$ are generally used; instead of the imperf. nंp $о$ о $\mu \nu \nu$ the imperf.
 pres. $\varepsilon i \mu s$ : so that if we consider as the ground of our conjugation the almost universally prevailing usage, we shall join these two verbs together thus: pres. Épхoua,


 will be found under that verb.

[^121]nothing more than the proper sound of this perfect, which without the Attic reduplication would be $\bar{\gamma} \lambda o v \theta a$, the ov being the analogous change from the $\varepsilon v$ which we see in èneरбopal. The supposed perfect $\begin{aligned} & y \\ & \lambda v \theta a \\ & \text { would therefore be contrary }\end{aligned}$ to analogy, and there can be no reason for introducing it into Hes. 刃, 660, where the aor, is quite as good: the reading therefore of the old editions and of Gaisford's two manuscripts (Barocc. Medic.) should be restored to the text, $\grave{\eta} \lambda v^{\theta} \neq \mu \in V$.

It is evident that the forms of $\varepsilon \mu \mathrm{c}$ were preferred on account of their slightness (particularly in their numerous compounds) to the corresponding heavy-sounding forms of ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \chi \varepsilon \sigma \theta a t$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$, in addition to which there was the ambiguity of ${ }_{\eta \rho} \rho \chi^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$. Still however the latter were never entirely obsolete, but always introduced where they contributed to the perspicuity or fullness of the sentence. Thus we find
 Soph. Ed. C. 1206. \&c. See Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 210., Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 37, 38.

To this mixture of forms we must add, in adapting it to the custom of other languages, a mixture of the meanings go and come. The forms of $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \theta \in \pi / v h a v e ~ a ~ d e c i d e d ~ p r e-~$ ference for the meaning come, so that ${ }_{\eta} \lambda \lambda A s \nu$ for instance very seldom occurs in the sense of going, going away*; and those of si $\mu$, are as seldom found in the sense of comet. But ${ }^{\xi} \rho \mathcal{\rho} \chi \in \sigma \theta \alpha \downarrow$ partakes almost equally of both meanings. In their compounds on the other hand, where the preposition generally defines the relation, all three themes have no distinction of meaning. $\ddagger$
${ }^{\prime}$ ' $\sigma \theta \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s$, clad, clothed, a defective part. perf., properly Ionic, occur-

[^122]pleted, looks to the point or place at which it is to arrive at last, for which we therefore can only use the word come, "when he came," be it thither or here. In the Future, he will go, and he will come, give indeed two different ideas of time, in as much as the latter again looks only to the place where the arrival is to be. To express this two forms are therefore necessary ; clot means he will go, and for he will come the Greek language has recourse

 I am there); therefore $\begin{aligned} & \eta \xi \in t, ~ h e ~ w i l l ~ c o m e . ~\end{aligned}$ In the compounds these distinctions generally disappear, because the point or place of arrival is expressed by the preposition; $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a u$ in all its tenses gives the idea of coming to us; its contrary $a \pi \in \rho$ $\chi \in \sigma \theta a b$ never has that sense: $\alpha \pi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$ expresses a point of time quite as well as $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$, but it is always the moment of departure, consequently never a coming or arrival. What I have said may suffice to give a general idea of this subject; particulars and exceptions will be seen by individual observation.
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ring in Herodot. 6, 112., but found also, and with the augm. $\eta \sigma \theta \eta \mu$ 自os, in Eurip. Hel. 1555. We meet with $\eta^{\prime \prime} \sigma \theta \eta \tau o$ also in the sense of was. clad in, had on, in Ælian. V.H. 12, 32. 13, 1. For some other instances from the later writers see Stephan. Thesaur.



 фауЕіั.

The poets had also a shorter form ${ }_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \theta \omega \omega$, whence ${ }_{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta$ ovac, II. $\omega, 415$., ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \sigma \theta \omega v, 476$., which was used on account of the metre even by Attic poets; see the passages quoted from some Comic writers in Athen. 7. p. 277. f., 13. p. 596. b., 14. p. 645. a. The radical form ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \omega$ was also frequently used by the Epics and even by Hippocrates De Vet. Med. 9. ${ }_{\varepsilon} \delta \delta \omega \nu \tau \varepsilon \kappa a i \pi i \nu \omega \nu$. The infin. of this verb is by the Epics syncopated
 they use also an imperf. $\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{z} \delta \varepsilon \sigma \kappa o v . ~ T h e ~ p e r f . ~ 2 . ~(w i t h ~ i t s ~ c h a n g e ~ o f ~\end{aligned}$ vowel $\varepsilon$ to o) was $\varepsilon \bar{\delta} \tilde{\eta} \delta o к a$, which change was by the Epics transferred to the perf. pass., consequently instead of the usual $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu a c$ they have


From $\Phi A \Gamma \Omega$, which is not in use, the LXX frequently formed a fut.


${ }^{`}$ E $\sigma \tau \iota \alpha \omega$, I receive as a guest, entertain at my table. The augm. is $\varepsilon$ s. [Pass. with fut. midd. (Plato de Repub. 1. p. 345. c.), I am a guest, feast upon (anything, $\tau \iota \downarrow$ ), Lycophr. 1411. Casaub. Athen. 7.1.-Passow.]

Eủad́c. See "Avóávш.

 ย่ $x \alpha ́ \theta s u \delta o \nu . ~ G e n e r a l l y ~ t h e ~ c o m p o u n d ~ i s ~ m o r e ~ u s e d ~ i n ~ p r o s e ~$ than the simple.

The forms with $\eta v$ are more properly Attic ; $\eta^{\boldsymbol{q}} \boldsymbol{v}^{\varepsilon} \varepsilon$, Plat. Symp. p.

[^123]the paraphrast of Dionys. de Aucupio (Schneid. Oppian. p. 179.), and фаүєocs in the false Phocylides, 145.
 479．Av．495．：हُx́áधviovov is used by Xenoph．and most good writers．


 In verbs beginning with $\varepsilon v$ the augm．$\eta v$ is generally
 found even in the Attics；the common way of writing them is вúpıбxov，вưpov，suṕsinv，and the perf．is always süpクra．－Midd．

Non－Attic writers，as the Alexandrine and others of a later period， form the aor．2．midd．as an aor．1．，єìрá $\mu \eta \nu$ for $\varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \dot{o} \mu \eta \nu$ ：see the last paragraph under aipéw．Wolf．Lept．p．216．，Jacob．Anth．Poet．p． 880．，Lobeck ad Phryn．p． 139.
 núछ$\dot{\alpha} \alpha \mu \eta \nu$ ．The augment follows the general analogy of verbs beginning with $\varepsilon v$ ；compare épí $x \omega$ ．
 ment in Schol．Soph．CEd．C．1375．The pluperf．$\eta \dot{\nu} \gamma \mu \eta \nu$ is in Soph． Tr． 610.

Eü $\omega$, I singe，roast：fut．$\varepsilon \tilde{u} \sigma \omega$ ，Ion．вü $\omega \dagger$ ；aor． 1. $\varepsilon \tilde{v} \sigma \alpha$ ，Hom．In prose generally $\dot{\alpha} \Phi \varepsilon u ́ \omega$ ，$\dot{\alpha} \Phi \varepsilon \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \alpha$ ，and $\dot{\eta} \phi \varepsilon u$－ $\mu_{s}$ vos，Eschyl．ap．Athen．9．p．375．e．

In the dialects we find also á $\phi a v i \omega$ ．In Aristophanes the reading is un－ certain，but the better authorities are in favour of $\dot{\alpha} \phi \varepsilon \dot{v} \varepsilon \iota$ ．So we have
 The pronunciation with the lenis $\varepsilon \dot{v} \omega$ and $a \dot{\nu} \omega$ is known from single forms and derivations，among which are ánevíka⿱⺌兀（Hesych．）in the sense of $I$ dry up，avaive，$I d r y, \& c$ ．But the forms which belong here must not be confounded with avio，I kindle（see that verb），as the radical idea is essentially different．
${ }^{3} \mathrm{E} \chi \chi^{\theta \omega}, I$ hate，used only in pres．and by the poets $\ddagger$ ； hence $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \chi^{\ominus \dot{\alpha} \nu о \mu \alpha ь, ~ I ~ a m ~ h a t e f u l ; ~ f u t . ~} \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \chi^{\dagger} \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha ь$ ．The

[^124]Fr．296．Soph．Aj．459．Phil． 510. Eurip．Med．118．Androm．212，but the pass．＂Xoopat is more common．－ Passow．］
aor. $\dot{\eta} \chi^{\theta^{\prime}} \mu \eta \nu$ is Poet., but $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \chi^{\theta} \dot{\sigma} \mu \eta \nu$ is more generally used. Perf. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \chi \emptyset \eta \mu \alpha \iota, I$ am hated. We find also a perf.

Some have wished to reject the above relation, which has always been supposed by grammarians to exist between the forms of this middle

 perfect. Now the true relation of which we are in search must be grounded on the usage of the older writers. And first then $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \chi \chi^{\theta} \dot{\circ} \mu \eta \nu$, when standing in immediate connexion with the present, eannot be an
 $\pi \tilde{u} \sigma \iota \rightarrow$ धยõ̃兀v, "that he has been hated," consequently "is hated:" the



 hateful to thee." Compare also the following passages in Plato's Apologia: and first the present, p.24. "I tell you everything without con-
 myself hateful to you by these very things." Again p. 21., Socrates relates his going round to those who appeared to be wise, and his endeavouring to convince one of them that he was not so, and then he adds,


 $\nu \delta \mu \eta \nu$, where the relative meaning of the imperfect and aorist is most evident. In Demosth. Olynth. 3, p. 34. "I say it not, iv' $\alpha \pi \hat{\epsilon} \chi \theta \omega \mu a i$ т $\sigma \sigma \nu \dot{v} \mu \tilde{\mu} \nu$, " it evidently refers to the immediate consequences of the sentence ; and just afterwards in a general sense, "for $I$ am not so silly,

 may very well be understood, like other aorists, in the sense of the pluperf. had made himself hateful, had been hated, as I1. $\gamma$, 454. Eurip. Hipp. 1402. Compare partieularly II. $\zeta$, 200. Notwithstanding this however we see the infin. $\dot{\pi} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \chi_{\theta \varepsilon \sigma} \theta a \iota$, not only in every instance as a proparoxytone, but we find expressly in Lex. Seg. 6, p. 423. 25. the
 sufficient confidence to recommend the aoristic accentuation for II. $\phi$, 83. Eurip. Med. 290. Thucyd. 1, 136. Plat. Rep. 1, p. 343. e. Lys. e. Andoc. p. 108, 2.; not so much because the sense is indecisive in favour of aorist or present (it generally is so in the infinitive), but because

I am waiting for manuscript examples of this accentuation．＊Notwith－ standing what has been said，we need not be surprised at finding the
 it is ascertained to be a false reading for $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi a ́ \chi \theta o \mu a r:$ and the usage of Theocritus（ $\alpha_{\pi} \hat{\chi} \chi \theta \varepsilon r a, 7,45$ ．）is not of sufficient authority．
${ }^{*} \mathrm{E}_{\chi} \omega \dagger$ ，I have，hold：fut．${ }^{\text {Eg}} \mathrm{E} \omega$ with the aspirate ；imperf．
 $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \chi \epsilon \mathcal{G}$ ），optat．$\sigma \chi^{o i \eta \nu, ~ c o n j . ~} \sigma \chi \tilde{\omega}, \sigma \chi \tilde{\eta} \tilde{s}, \& c$ ．（comp． $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \chi^{\omega}, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \chi \eta \varsigma, \& c$ ．），infin．$\sigma \chi^{\varepsilon i \nu}$ ，part．$\sigma \chi^{\dot{\omega} \nu . ~ P a s s . ~}$ and midd．${ }_{\xi}^{\xi} \chi о \mu \alpha \iota$ ；imperf．$\varepsilon i \chi \chi^{\circ} \mu \eta \nu$ ；fut．midd．$\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \xi о \mu \alpha \iota$ ； aor．midd．$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \chi^{\prime} \mu \gamma \nu \S\left(\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \chi^{0 \cup}, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \chi^{\xi} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota\right)$ ．From the aor．$\sigma \chi \varepsilon \pi \tilde{\nu}_{\nu}$ comes a new fut．act．$\sigma \chi^{\eta} \sigma \omega \|$ ，and fut．midd． $\sigma \chi^{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ，whence perf．act．${ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \chi \eta \kappa \alpha$ ，perf．pass． $\bar{\varepsilon} \sigma \chi \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ ， aor．pass．$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \chi^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \emptyset_{\eta \nu, ~ v e r b a l ~ a d j . ~}^{\varepsilon} \nless \tau o ́ s$ and $\sigma \chi^{\varepsilon \tau o ́ s . ~}$

From the aor．解 $\sigma \chi^{\circ \nu}$ comes also a new pres．${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \chi \omega$ ，which with its future $\sigma \chi^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ is principally used when the more definite ideas of to hold firm，stop，seize on（which are contained in the less expressive ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \chi^{s}(\nu)$ ，require force and elevation．The aor．${ }^{\xi} \sigma \chi^{\circ \nu}$ also（as the duration naturally implied in the idea of to have little suits the aorist）belongs rather to these more definite meanings，when they are sup－ posed to be transitory，as seized，held on，\＆c．In its com－ pounds ${ }^{\stackrel{ }{\xi}} \chi^{\omega}$ has generally one of these more definite senses， whence also the aor．$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \in \sigma \chi^{\circ \nu} \& c$ ．is found much more commonly in these than any other meanings．

Notwithstanding that the great difference of formation in the passive and middle aorist contributed necessarily to keep up a distinction be－ tween their respective meanings，we still find cases of the aor．midd． used instead of the passive；the most common are oxér日at in the

[^125]§［This aor．sometimes loses the augm． in Hom．in its 3．sing．$\sigma$ रé $\tau 0$, Il．$\eta, 248$. $\phi, 345$ ．We find also its imperat．$\sigma \chi 0 \hat{0}$ ， infin．$\sigma \chi \in \in \sigma a s$, part．$\sigma \chi \sigma \mu \in \nu=s .-$ Pas－ sow．］

II［We find a rare form of the 2．sing． fut．$\sigma \chi \dagger \sigma \in\llcorner\sigma \theta a$, Francke Hymn．Cer． 366 ． like ${ }_{\square} \neq \downarrow \in \sigma \theta \alpha$ mentioned above．－Pas－ sow．］
 $\gamma$, 284. Eurip. Hipp. 27., калаб $\chi^{o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s ~ P i n d . ~ P y t h . ~ 1, ~ 16 . ~ P l a t . ~ P h æ d r . ~}$ p. 244., $\sigma v \sigma \chi$ о́ $\mu$ vos Plat. Theæt. p. 165. b.

The way in which $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \sigma \chi^{\circ \nu}$ comes from $\tilde{\varepsilon} \chi \omega$ may be seen by comparing it with $\tilde{\varepsilon} \tilde{\varepsilon} \pi o \nu$ from $\tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$. In ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \chi \omega$ the $\iota$ supplies the place of a reduplication, as we see fully exemplified in $\mu i \mu \nu \omega$, $\gamma^{i} \gamma \nu o \mu \alpha \iota$, \& c ., where $\mu \nu$, $\gamma \nu$ are the syncopated stem of those verbs as $\sigma_{\chi}$ is of the one before us. This $\imath$ would have the aspirate, as in iб i $\tau \eta \mu$; but here again, as in $\varepsilon$ ย $\chi \omega$ itself, it passed on account of the $\chi$ into the lenis, a change more frequent in the older times of the language: compare $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} s$ from


We find also the analogous imperat. $\sigma \chi^{\epsilon}$, and that in its simple form, in an oracle in Schol. Eurip. Phœn. 641. where however the reading is not certain. It is more frequent as a compound, $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \rho a \sigma \chi \varepsilon$; see Porson ad Eur. Hec. 836. Orest. 1330. Plat. Protag. p. 348. a.

The language of poetry has from a theme $\operatorname{\Sigma xEO} \Omega$ the forms


 may conclude that there was an old Epic part. oै $\mathrm{\chi} \omega \kappa \alpha$, of which the following seems to be a satisfactory explanation. The simple perfect of ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega$, with the usual change of vowel, would be ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi$ a (compare the subst. ox $\chi$ ); which reduplicated becomes, according to the common analogy, ő $\kappa \omega \chi \alpha$. But since of two aspirates the second may be changed, it is very possible that this became ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Z} \omega \kappa \alpha$, particularly as such a change made the derivation from ${ }^{\text {en }} \chi \omega$ more sensible to the ear. And it is clear from the Hesychian gloss $\sigma v v o \kappa \omega \chi o \tau \varepsilon$, either that the old Grammarians explained the Homeric form in this way, or that both stood side by side as old various readings. That a reduplicated form of this kind did exist is certain at all events by the subst. ò $\kappa \omega \chi$ 开, as
 are connected with really reduplicated forms of their respective verbs. Compare also the exactly similar formation of oiz ${ }^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\omega} \alpha$ under oil $\chi \omega$.
 $\pi \dot{\lambda} \lambda a c$ ) with the explanation "were shut" has very much in its favour, both from the sense and construction as well as from the antithesis at $\vartheta, 58, \pi \tilde{a} \sigma a \iota \delta{ }^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \hat{\imath} \gamma \nu v \nu \tau o ~ \pi u ́ \lambda a \iota$. If with Wolf we adopt it, the only way of analogous explanation is this : 'Oxeve, a bolt, has its meaning

 $\gamma \lambda \tilde{\omega} \sigma \sigma a v, \& c$. But as we have shown above that őк $\chi \chi$ a was the perf. act., so is $\dot{\dot{\omega}} \gamma \mu a \iota$ formed as correctly as $\tilde{\eta} \gamma \mu a \iota$ with $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\eta} o \chi a$, and with
the change of vowel continuing into the passive like äcpro. According to this $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega^{\prime} \chi$ aro is the Ion. 3. plur. of the pluperf. pass. from $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \chi \omega^{\omega}$.*

## The following compounds of ${ }^{\circ} \chi^{\omega}$ have other peculiarities :

$\dot{\alpha} \nu \nu^{\prime} \chi \chi^{\omega}$. When $\dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon ́ \chi \sigma \sigma \theta \Delta t$ in the midd. has the sense of to bear, its imperf. and aor. have a double augm., $\mathfrak{\eta v є \iota \chi o ́ \mu \eta \nu , ~}$ $\dot{\eta} \nu \leqslant \sigma \chi^{\circ} \mu \eta \nu\left(\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \sigma \chi^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma}} \boldsymbol{\theta} \alpha \propto\right)$.

The simple augm. does however occur in this meaning of the verb, sometimes in the middle, as in $\dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon \sigma \chi \dot{\chi} \mu \eta \nu$ (Aristoph. Pac. 347.), sometimes at the beginning, as in $\dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon \chi \dot{\delta} \mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$, which excellent emendation of Küster for the unmetrical $\dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon \sigma \chi \dot{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$ (Aristoph. Lys. 507.) has been rejected through a mistake of Porson and others as not Greek.

 $\sigma \chi \nu 0 \cup \tilde{u} \alpha \iota$, I have round $m e$, have on me; fut. $\alpha \mu \not \subset \varepsilon ́ \xi o-$ $\mu \alpha \iota$; aor. $\eta^{\prime} \mu \pi \imath \sigma \chi^{\circ} \mu \eta \nu$.

Here too we find the double augment. In Aristoph. Thesm. 165. indeed, where $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \pi \varepsilon^{\prime} \sigma \chi \varepsilon \tau 0$ stands, the aor. is embarrassing, and probably the true reading was $\dot{\eta} \mu \pi \varepsilon i \chi \varepsilon \tau 0$, which form of the imperf. has been restored from the manuscripts to Plat. Phædo. p. 87. b., and occurs also in Lucian. Peregr. 15.

A present $\dot{a} \mu \pi i \sigma \chi \omega$ has also been adopted, which considered in itself, like ' ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi^{\omega}$ and ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \chi^{\omega}$, is not only admissible, but actually does occur (see Elmsl. ad Eurip. Med. 277.). Still however $\eta^{\mu} \mu \pi \epsilon \sigma \chi o v$, which appears so frequently in the common language, is not the imperfect of it, as $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \tau \sigma \chi^{\varepsilon} \nu \nu$ alone would suffice to inform us. But instead of this another pres. á $\mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi^{\dot{\epsilon}} \omega$ has been supposed, and supported not only by the gloss $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi o v ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \nu$ in Hesychius, but also by the similar various reading in Aristoph. Av. 1090. That a form $\mathfrak{i} \sigma \chi^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \omega$, à $\mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \omega$ should have existed in the Attic dialect, and that $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi i \sigma \chi \omega$ and $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \tau \sigma \chi o \tilde{v} \mu a \iota$ should have become completely confounded together, is most improbable. But in the passage of Aristophanes there is an old reading $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi เ \sigma \chi^{\nu} \dot{\hat{v}} \mu \varepsilon \nu \nu \nu$, which is at once placed beyond a doubt by the parallel $\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi \iota \sigma} \chi^{\nu} v \tilde{\nu} \mu a t$ : it is therefore evident that $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi \circ \bar{v} \mu \alpha \iota$, froma mere misunderstanding of the aor. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi \varepsilon \bar{\imath} \nu$, crept not only into some of the manuscripts of Aristo-

[^126][^127]phanes, but into Hesychius also, where the gloss $\mathfrak{a} \mu \pi \tau \sigma \chi \chi^{\varepsilon} \nu$ occurs just before.* Now that ${ }^{\eta} \mu \pi \tau \sigma \chi{ }^{\nu} \nu, \dot{a} \mu \pi \tau \sigma \chi \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu$, is really an aorist, we learn from the passages of Aristoph. and the following glosses of Hesych.

 therefore it is clear that this form is not resolvable into $\eta_{\mu \pi-\iota \sigma} \chi^{\circ}$, $\dot{a} \mu \pi-\iota \sigma \chi \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu$, but into $\ddot{\eta} \mu \pi \iota-\sigma \chi{ }^{\nu} \nu$, $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \iota-\sigma \chi \varepsilon \tau \nu \nu$; because instead of ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \pi-\varepsilon \sigma \chi \chi^{\nu}$ the augm. passed over to the preposition, $\eta \mu \pi t-\sigma \chi^{\circ} \nu$.
$\dot{i \pi \iota \sigma} \chi^{\nu \varepsilon} \circ \mu \alpha \iota, ~ I ~ p r o m i s e, ~ I o n . ~(H o m . ~ a n d ~ H e r o d) ~. i \pi i ́-~$
 $\sigma \chi^{\circ \nu \dagger ; ~ p e r f . ~} \dot{\text { ús }} \sigma \chi \chi \eta \mu \iota$.
 $\tau o ́ s, \dot{\varepsilon} \psi \eta \tau$ éos. A remarkable form of the aor. is $\sigma u y \eta ̃ \psi a s$ in the comic writer Timocles ap. Athen. 9. p. 407. e.

We find in Herodotus (1, 48. 1, 118. 8, 26.) a resolution of $\varepsilon \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon$

 suppose a pres. $\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \psi \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ from which they may be formed, but except in $\dot{\varepsilon} \psi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, $\dot{\phi} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega$, there are no traces whatever of such a theme, unless we imagine something in $\dot{\varepsilon} \psi \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu$, Hippocr. de Steril. 17. which to me seems to mean nothing of the kind; and in an aor. 2. (as we shall see $\dot{\omega} \phi \lambda o \nu$ is) a form in $\varepsilon o \nu$ would be quite remote from all analogy. Compare the perf. $\varepsilon^{\epsilon} \omega \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon$ under ${ }^{\prime} E \theta \omega$.

The formation of the verbal adj. $\varepsilon \phi \theta$ ós dates from a time when the double letters $\xi$ and $\psi$ were not yet introduced into the Attic writing; consequently the root of $\tilde{\varepsilon} \psi \omega$ was then E $\Phi \Sigma$-: when to this root the termination tos was added, the $\sigma$ necessarily dropped out, as three consonants could not stand together, leaving $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi-\tau$ ós, which, by a change of the second consonant to make the root somewhat more visible, became $\varepsilon$ é $\theta$ ós.
${ }^{'} \mathrm{E} \Omega,{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \Omega,{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \Omega$. The first ' $\mathrm{E} \Omega$ has three leading senses, which form so many verbs: 1 . I send; $2 . I$ seat; 3. Iclothe. The second ' $\mathrm{E} \Omega$ is

[^128]+ An imperat. pass. ข์лоб $\chi$ € $\theta \eta \tau \iota$ has been hitherto the reading in Plat. Phædr. p. 235. d., but there are only weak grounds for it in the manuscripts. See Bekker.
$\ddagger$ The unanimity of the reading sometimes of all, at other times of the majority, of the manuscripts as to these three forms is so convincing, that I am not only unwilling to meddle with them, but I even
 where $\tau \in$ is injurious to the context, is a corruption of $\pm \pi \in i \chi \chi \in \epsilon$.
the root of $\varepsilon i \mu i, I \mathrm{am}$. 'The third, ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{T} \Omega$ is the root of $\varepsilon i \mu, \boldsymbol{I}$ go. As these two last will be found in their alphabetical places, we have here to treat only of the three derivates of 'E $\Omega$.


## 1. " $\eta \mu \iota, I$ send, throw.

The conjugation of this verb scarcely differs from that of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu$; ; whatever tenses the one forms from TIOE $\Omega$, the other borrows from 'IE $\Omega$. The $\iota$ stands, for instance, instead of the reduplication; in the Attic language it is long*, in the Epic generally short. When the short radical vowel $\varepsilon$ begins the word, it is capable of receiving the augment by changing to $\varepsilon$. The simple verb is not of frequent occurrence, and a large proportion of the undermentioned forms occur only in the compounds.

## Active.

 iєīn. Conj. iē. Infin. iévau. $\dagger$ Part. ieíc.
Imperf. ì $\eta \nu$ and (from 'IE $\Omega$ ) $\mathfrak{i o v \nu}$. Comp. á $\boldsymbol{q}_{i o v y ~ o r ~}^{\boldsymbol{\eta} \phi i o v \nu ; ~ 3 . ~ p l . ~}$ йфíє $\sigma \nu$.
Fut. ท̈бw.

Aor. 1. $\eta_{\eta} k a$, Ion. $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \eta к \alpha \text {. }\end{gathered}$
Aor. 2. $\eta^{\eta} \nu$, \&c. (not used in sing. but its place supplied by aor. 1.),


 pounds follow the simple, e.g. áфє亢̃vat, á $\phi \tilde{\omega}$, á $\phi \varepsilon \varepsilon$, \&c. Opt. pl. $\dot{a}^{\nu} \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu, \& c$.

## Pass. and Midd. (compare T $t \theta \eta \mu$.)

Pres. ï $\mu$ аи.
 Apoll. Rh. 2, 372. belongs to the middle of $\varepsilon i \mu$, 'i$\varepsilon \mu a \iota$.
Aor. 1. pass. "̈ $\theta \eta \nu$, generally with the augm. $\varepsilon \ddot{i} \theta \eta \nu$ ( $\dot{\alpha} \phi \varepsilon i \theta \eta \nu$, part.


[^129]$\chi \mu \nu \nu$, but the sense requires a perfect aveivtat, they are given to, devoted to, vacant. What therefore was a mere conjecture of Stephanus, à $\nu \epsilon \omega \nu \tau a t$, now deserves our highest consideration, as the valuable Florentine Codex of Schweighæuser actually has this reading.
§ In these forms of the aor. 2, act. and those of the aor. 2. pass. '̇фeivto, \&c., the accent is not thrown back to the beginning of the word, because the $\epsilon t$ arises from the augment.

## 116

Aor. 1. midd. $\hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu$, which in the indicative is used even in prose*;
The other moods do not occur.
Aor. 2. midd. $\tilde{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \nu$, generally with the augm. $\varepsilon i \mu \eta \nu$, हiँ $\sigma$, हiँo



Verbal adj. غ̇tóg, ėtéoç (ăфєтos, \&c.).
Instances of the imperf. sing. in $-\eta \nu$ are rare, and those which do occur are suspicious; in the 2 . and 3 . sing. we generally find $i \varepsilon \iota c$, $i \varepsilon \iota$ (contracted like $\varepsilon$ eri $\theta \varepsilon$ es), and in the 1 . sing. was formed, at least in the Ion. and Att. dialect, an anomalous form in - $\varepsilon \iota \nu$, as $\pi \rho o i ̄ \varepsilon \iota \nu$, Od. $\iota, 88$. $\kappa, 100 . \mu, 9$. (Wolf's ed.) ; $\eta \phi i \varepsilon \nu \nu$, Plat. Euthyd. p. 293. a. Libanius 1, p. 793. ; àvívv, Lucian Catapl. 4.

On the Attic conj. and optat., which imitate the regular conjugation of the barytone verbs in accent if not in form, as $\pi \rho o ́ w \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \rho o ́ \eta \tau \alpha \iota$, ioıто, $\pi \rho \dot{o} \circ \boldsymbol{\iota} \theta \varepsilon, \& \mathrm{c}$., see the second paragraph of $\Delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu a \iota$. We find in the active voice of this verb corresponding forms, but only in the
 (6.) ; but the genuineness of these two is doubtful. $\ddagger$ The other dialectic forms of both moods correspond exactly with those of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu$,


From the $\iota$ of the pres. $i^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu a \iota$ arose a new theme, ' $I \Omega$, of which we find many forms, but always in the Ion. dialect, as $\dot{a} \nu i \varepsilon \iota$ for $\dot{a} \nu i \eta \sigma \iota$, Herodot. 3, 109. छúvıov frequently for $\xi v \nu i \varepsilon \sigma a v$; Il. a, 273. छúv $\frac{1}{}$, imperat. Theogn. 1240. Bekk. $\mu \varepsilon \tau i \varepsilon \tau o$ or $\varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \tau i \varepsilon \tau o$ for $\mu \varepsilon \theta i ́ \varepsilon \tau o$, Herodot. 1, 12. and the augm. perf. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \tau \iota \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s$ frequently used for $\mu \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \mu \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}$ os: see also 3. pres. $\mu \varepsilon \tau i \varepsilon \iota$ in Schweigh. Lex. Herodut. There are many other such forms which vary only in the accent, and consequently are not to be depended on.§

Lastly we have some Epic forms compounded with ává, which according to meaning can only belong here, and which have this pecu-

[^130]$\pi p o t \in t$ is sometimes pres. sometimes imperfect. See Brunck on Sophocl. Ed. T. 628. and Heyne on II. S, 523. The imperat. $\xi u v_{\nu \in}$ in Theognis becomes suspicious when compared with the Homeric $\xi v \nu i \in!$, Od. $a, 271$. and elsewhere ; while the 3. plur. $\xi \in v^{2}$ iov is rendered doubtful by the various reading $\xi \dot{u} v i \in \nu$ for $\xi v \nu \ell \in \sigma \alpha \nu$ (see Heyne on II. a, 273.). We have quoted these points to show the great uncerlainty of the readings, not to recommend a uniformily, which is impossible if we pay any regard to manuscripts.
liarity, that they take $\varepsilon$ instead of $\eta$ in the future, and have the regular
 II. $\zeta, 209 . \phi, 537$. Od. $\sigma, 265$. But this form appears to be used only where the preposition gives the idea of again, back: compare II. $\beta, 276$. $\xi$, 362. where $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon$, , $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tilde{\eta} \kappa \varepsilon \nu$ have merely the sense of to stimulate.

## 2. $\varepsilon\left\{\frac{1}{\sigma a}, I\right.$ seated, placed; $\bar{\eta} \mu a \iota, I$ sit.

Eīa is a defective verb, of which the following forms are found with the meaning of to seat or place.

 Part. غ́ $\sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o c ~(\varepsilon ́ ф \varepsilon \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s, ~ O d . ~ \pi, ~ 442),. ~ \varepsilon i \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s: ~$
some of which are liable to be confounded with similar forms of $\tilde{\varepsilon} \nu \nu v \mu$.

Perf. pass. $\tilde{\eta} \mu a \ell, \& c$., which see below.
Of these forms $\varepsilon i \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ only occurs in Attic prose in the sense of to lay the foundation of, found, erect; the others belong to the dialects and to poetry, particularly to the Epic. The defective parts of this verb are supplied by $i \delta \rho \dot{v} \omega$ (which is complete in all its moods and tenses), and by $\underset{\alpha \theta i \zeta \omega}{ }$, a word of still more general occurrence. The indisputable connexion of this verb with $i \zeta \omega$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ h a s ~ i n d u c e d ~$ many grammarians to place the above forms under $\tilde{\varepsilon} \zeta \omega$, the pres. act. of which however is nowhere found. But in that case the augm. $\varepsilon$, which does not occur in $\varepsilon \zeta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \nu$, would form in Attic prose a deviation for which there are no grounds. Now as $\tilde{\eta} \mu a c$ seems to presuppose a radical form ' $\mathrm{E} \Omega$, it is more natural to leave all the above forms in this their simplest formation, distinguish them from $\varepsilon$ É $\zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \ell$, (which we shall see presently to be a word in very limited use), and class this latter as a form belonging to $\approx \zeta \omega, ~ \succsim \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota . *$

The $\varepsilon \iota$ in $\varepsilon \tilde{i} \sigma \alpha$, $\varepsilon i \sigma \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \nu$, is indisputably the augment, for we see it dropped in the other moods ह̈ซai, \&c., which double the $\sigma$ on account of the metre in Epic poetry ; hence the imperat. हí $\sigma o \nu$ which occurs but once (Od. $\eta, 163$.) is very remarkable. In a later period however the $\varepsilon \iota$ of the augment certainly does become, and that too in prose, an integral part of the word, in order to strengthen the syllable; whence

[^131][^132]
## 118

eiáá and many other passages. In Thucyd. 3, 58. ¿ $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma$ á $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ is scarcely genuine, and the various reading $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \dot{a} \mu \varepsilon v_{0}$ is undoubtedly the true



In Athen. 4, p. 142. is quoted from Phylarchus, a prose writer of the time of the Ptolemies, a fut. $\varepsilon i \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \varepsilon \tau a \iota$, he will seat himself, in which meaning none of the forms belonging to this verb are found elsewhere. It is probably an Alexandrian provincialism, written in the


The following forms are in use with the meaning of to sit:

 Infin. $\eta^{\eta} \sigma \theta a . \quad$ Part. $\eta_{\mu \varepsilon \nu}$
In prose however the compound ка́ $\theta \eta \mu a \iota$ with the same meaning is much more used, which takes no $\sigma$ in the 3. sing. except when in the imperf. it has no augm., as -

ка́Өŋ $\mu a \iota$, 3. sing. ка́ $\theta \eta \tau а \iota$.

Imper. кá $\theta \eta \sigma o$. Opt. каӨоí $\eta \nu, 3$ sing. кá $\theta o \iota \tau o . ~ \ddagger ~ C o n j . ~ \kappa a ́ \theta \omega \mu a \iota, ~-\eta, ~$

The defective tenses are supplied by ${ }^{\prime \prime} \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ or $" \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ with their compound.

Instead of the 2. sing. in - $\sigma a \iota$ and - $\sigma$ o we find also the shortened forms of the compounds, viz. pres. ка́ $\theta \eta$ for ки́ $\dot{\theta} \eta \sigma a \iota$ and imperat. к $\dot{\alpha} \theta$ ov for кút $\eta \sigma o$, which however are not so good Attic as the others.
 Ion. perf. pass.), and the Epics eiatal, qiaro. In the compound the Ion. use, according to their general analogy, ка́тŋцat, катє́azą, for ка日-.

The same form $\tilde{\eta} \mu a t$ is also the true perf. of $\begin{gathered}\text { ijaa, as used in the }\end{gathered}$ sense of íipu $\mu u \iota$ of inanimate objects, e. g. Herodot. 9, 57., Callim. Fr. 122.: these passages, with the Ion. 3. pl. ziarat, Lucian De Dea Syr. 31. prove decidedly that the reading of Od. $v, 106$. is $\varepsilon$ हiaco with

[^133]§nuat: the former appears to me the more probable. Compare Kєijul.
$\ddagger$ The accentuation of the opt. and conj. moods, from the rarity of their occurrence, is not to be depended on; I have accented these according to the general analogy of barytone verbs.

We must not overlook the difference
 compare the same appearance with the observations made on it under Kєî $\mu$ ou.
the aspirate, not (as it is sometimes written) عilaro the midd. of $\varepsilon i \mu i ́$. See also "I $\zeta \omega$.
3. $\tilde{\varepsilon} \nu \nu v \mu t$, to put on, which see in its place.
${ }^{\prime} E \bar{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ or ${ }^{\nu} \epsilon \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$. See ${ }^{\nu} A \omega, 3$.

## Z.

Zó $\omega$, Ilive, is contracted in $\eta$, like $\delta \iota \psi \dot{\alpha} \omega, \pi \in \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, $\chi \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$; it is used by old writers principally in the pres. and imperf., as $\beta_{\text {óo }} \omega$ is in the remaining tenses : thus pres. $\zeta \tilde{\omega}$, $\zeta_{\tilde{\gamma} s,}, \zeta_{\eta}^{\eta}$; imperat. $\zeta_{\tilde{\eta}}$ (Herm. Soph. Ant. 1154.), or $\zeta_{\tilde{\eta}} \theta_{r}$;

 the usage aside to the formation in $\mu$, so that ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \zeta \eta \nu$ as well as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \zeta \omega \nu$ was used in the imperf., and $\zeta \tilde{\eta} \theta c$ in the imperative. Herodian attempted indeed to defend the former against the latter (see Fr. 42. Herm. or p. 460. Piers.), but he unwisely drew his proofs from $\varepsilon$ " $\zeta \eta \varsigma$, , $\varepsilon \zeta \eta$. He quotes however $\varepsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \xi \omega \nu$ as the usage of Aristophanes, while Euripides, Plato, Xenophon, \&c., have no other form ; and the question is decided by the 3. plur. which never occurs otherwise than $\varepsilon$ ย $\zeta \omega \nu$.* Hence it is remarkable that the same Herodian (Fr. 43.), immediately after having pronounced the above opinion, rejects $\zeta \tilde{\eta} \theta \iota$, which is necessarily connected with ${ }^{\prime} \zeta \eta \eta$. This imperat. occurs in the LXX, and sometimes in the Anthologia†; but $\zeta \tilde{\eta}$ is found in Eurip. Iph. T. 699. and Fr. Phrixi, and in Soph. Fr. Danaës.

Beside the pres. and imperf. there was in common use among the older writers a future, as $\zeta$ Й $\sigma \varepsilon \iota \nu$ (Aristoph. Plut. 263.), らク̆ซovaı (Plat. Rep. 5.

[^134]reading. All things considered I very much doubt whether Herodian ever gave it as his opinion that $\mathcal{E}^{( }(\eta \nu$ was used for E(cosv. Pierson first took it from a manuscript (see his note p. 460, and Lob. post Phryn. p. 457.); but there is another manuscript in which $\int(\omega \nu$ is by no means rejected, and nothing more is stated than that e $\langle\eta \nu$, which belongs to $E\langle\eta s$, ES§V, is used by Demosthenes.

+ That is to say, in the Epig. Incert. 242. where the first six hours of the day are allotted to labour, and then the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth (ZHO1) are said, by a play on the letters, to bid us enjoy life.
 form in use among the later writers) in Dem. c. Aristog. I. p. 794, 19.


The Ion. and Dor. formed this verb with the vowel $\omega$, and that not
 throughout the persons, thus $\zeta \omega \in \iota \varsigma, \zeta \omega \in \iota \nu, \zeta \omega \in \tau \varepsilon, \zeta \omega \omega v \sigma \iota \nu$, and also shortened to 弓óधıv, see Simonid. Gaisford. 231, 17. Herodot. 7, 46. Theodorid. Epig. 8, 7. Hence also a future tense, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tilde{\varepsilon} \zeta \omega \sigma \varepsilon$, which is now restored from the manuscripts to the text of Herodot. 1, 120.*
$Z^{\prime} \varepsilon \omega$, I seeth, boil, retains the $\varepsilon$ in the inflexion. From the examples given by Stephens it appears that $\zeta^{\prime} \epsilon$, generally speaking at least, has an intransitive, and $\zeta^{\xi} \nu \nu \cup \mu \iota$ a transitive sense ; the other tenses have both meanings in common. The pass. takes $\sigma$, e. g. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \approx \zeta \leqslant \sigma \mu \mu^{\prime} \nu \sigma, \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \zeta \leqslant \sigma \theta \leqslant i ́ g$.

 Midd. そ́́vขuцаs, \&c.

According to Suidas (v. $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \sigma \tau a)$ the older Attics had no $\sigma$ in the perfect. This he proves by the authority of Thucyd. 1, 6. $\delta \iota \zeta \zeta \omega \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \circ$, where however all the Codd. have $\delta \iota \varepsilon \zeta \omega \sigma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu o \iota$. Compare $\Sigma \tilde{\omega}^{\prime} \zeta \omega$.

Z Źw. See Záw.

## H.

'H6́ćc, I am in the bloom and vigour of manhood, pubeo;
 I have arrived at manhood, belongs to the second form.

See Moeris p. 180. with Pierson's note. In the compound however the form in á $\omega$ has the sense of to become, áv $\eta$ bãv to become young again.

When the $\omega$ is followed by a syllable naturally long it is lengthened by the Epics to $\omega 0$, and when it has the $\iota$ subscript it becomes $\omega o \iota$;



[^135] $\rho \in \theta \rho o y$, it seems to point out to me a radical identity in the verbs $\langle\hat{\eta} \nu$ and $\beta \iota \omega \hat{\nu} a \iota$, which accounts for their being so mixed up together in usage.
act. $\dot{\gamma} \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon$ is found only in its compounds, as $\pi \varepsilon \rho เ \eta \gamma^{\prime} \omega$, Schæf. Mel. p. 114., but it is better to derive these from the adj. $\pi \varepsilon \rho เ \gamma \gamma \eta^{\prime}$, \&c.; I doubt therefore whether $\dot{\gamma} \gamma \varepsilon \in \omega$ was ever really in use. - Passow.]

The Ion. and Dor. use, principally in the sense of to consider in a certain light, the perf. $\eta^{\prime} \gamma \eta \mu$ at instead of the pres.; it is common for
 Pythag. Gale p. 711 . (ä $\eta \eta \nu \tau a \iota)$; whence it came into the language of poetry, e. g. $\mu^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \eta^{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha \iota \tau o ́ d \varepsilon$, Eurip. Phœ. 553. In prose it does not appear frequent until the later writers.* In the sense of to precede ä $\gamma \eta \mu a t$ is found in Pind. Pyth. 4, 442. In a passive sense $\tau \dot{a} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \alpha$
 adv. Macart. p. 1072, 25. In two of the passages of Herodot. there is
 and it is very possible that this form had the Ion. short $\alpha$ for $\eta$ with a different breathing.
${ }^{\text {"H}} \mathrm{H} \omega$, I delight: but little used in the active. Pass. I am


Homer has once the midd. $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma a z o$ for $\ddot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta$, Od. $\iota, 353$.
 But Galen quotes from Hippocrates $\bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha s$ from $H \Theta \Omega$.
${ }^{\prime \prime} H \varkappa \omega$, I come, am arrived (see ${ }^{\text {' }} \mathbf{I} x \nu \varepsilon{ }^{\prime} о \mu \alpha$ ), has (in the older writers) only the present, the imperfect $\tilde{\eta} x o \nu$, and the future $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\xi} \omega$.

The form $\delta \iota \ddot{\eta} \xi a$ belongs to $\delta$ 䄸 $\tau \omega$; but later writers have also from
 pp. 743, 744.
${ }^{7} \mathrm{H} \mu \mathrm{a}$. See ${ }^{\text {E }} \mathrm{E} \Omega$, 2.

'H $\mu \dot{v} \omega$, I sink: fut. $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{v} \sigma \omega$, \&c. The regular perf. of this verb was $\eta \ddot{\eta v \kappa a}$; to this was prefixed the reduplic. with the shortened $\varepsilon$ in order to preserve the relation between the first and second syllable: but on account of the verse the first syllable was to be again made long, for

[^136]374. d. (ทク $\gamma \eta \sigma a u$ for $\hat{\eta} \gamma \in \hat{\imath}$, ), and in Clitophon 407. c. $\left(\eta \eta^{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon\right)$. Better examples perhaps may be found in Plat. Tim. p. 19. e. Legg. 8. p. 837. c.
which purpose $\mu \nu$ was taken instead of $\mu \mu$ ，as in the instances of $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\alpha}$－ $\lambda a \mu \nu$ os from $\pi a \lambda a \mu \dot{\eta}, \nu \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu \nu$ os for $\nu \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu$ os ；thus was formed an Epic perf．$\varepsilon$＇$\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \kappa \alpha$ ，and its comp．$\dot{v} \pi \varepsilon \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \kappa \alpha$ ，II．$\chi, 491$.
＇Н $\boldsymbol{\sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \iota , ~ \dot { ~ } \tau \tau \alpha ́ \alpha \mu \alpha \iota , ~ I ~ a m ~ i n f e r i o r , ~ a m ~ o v e r c o m e , ~ u s e d ~}$ in the pure language only in the passive form．Fut．$\dot{\gamma} \sigma \sigma \eta-$ Өŕ $\sigma \mu \alpha$ ，occasionally $\dot{\gamma} \tau \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha$, ，Lyc．c．Ergocl．9．，pro Polycr．32．Verbal adj．ทं $\tau \tau \eta \tau \in ⿱ ㇒ 日 勺 心$.
 Herodot．The later writers thought they might also form an active（to overcome），which Diodorus has occasionally（see Schæfer on Ari－ stoph．Plut．p．525．）．The only passage in which it occurs in any of the older writers（Isæus 11，31．p．86，3．）has been corrected by the
 $\nu \kappa \kappa \tilde{q} \nu$ ．＊

## $\Theta$ ．

$\Theta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, I$ germinate：fut．Taג亢̃，also Э $\alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\gamma} \sigma о \mu \alpha ь ;$ perf．2．$\tau \xi \in \eta \lambda \alpha$ ，Dor．$\tau \hat{\xi} \theta \bar{\alpha} \lambda \alpha$ ．
 formation therefore is，$\vartheta_{\eta \lambda \varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \omega,-\eta \sigma \omega$（II．$a, 236$ ．），\＆c．；perf．$\tau \hat{\varepsilon} \theta \eta \lambda a$ ，part． $\tau \varepsilon \theta a \lambda v i ̃ a ;$ with a rare aor．2．ๆád $\varepsilon$, Hymn．Pan．33．The form $\mathfrak{q} a \lambda \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$ ， wherever it occurs，is only a corruption of the Doric $\uparrow \bar{a} \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \epsilon^{\prime}$ ．The later Epics，as Quint．Sm．11，96．，have $\uparrow a ̆ \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ ．The pass．$\tau \varepsilon \theta \eta \lambda \eta \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ os in Hippocr．Insomn．5．is remarkable．

## 

$\Theta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$, I bury：fut．T＇́ $\psi \omega$ ；perf．$\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \alpha ̆ \phi \alpha$ ；aor．2．pass．
 $\tau \varepsilon \theta \alpha^{\prime} \mu \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \varepsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \phi \alpha$ ．The root of this verb was therefore

[^137]have been a most unnatural mode of speaking to bave brought in the verb $\dot{\eta} \tau \tau \hat{̣} \nu ;$ ；even if it had been in use．The neuter ideas＂to get the better，to win，＂ are here coutrasted with＂to be worsted， to lose，＂and it was therefore necessary
 exactly as had been said a little before
 $\theta \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \eta \eta$ ：where $\nu$ нкậ $\nu$ is taken in a judicial sense and stands absolutely，not having the opponent following it in the accusa－ tive case，as when it means to conquer any one in battle．
$\Theta А Ф$, as we see one or both of the aspirated letters in all the above forms. See below $\Theta А \Phi$.

Thus we have $\tau \varepsilon \theta$ á $\phi \omega$ in Lucian Dial. Mar. 9, 1. $\tau \varepsilon \theta$ áфatą in Herodot. 6, 103. Compare T $\rho$ ह́ $\phi \omega$, with note.
ӨАФ-. Perf. used as a pres. $\tau$ ย $\theta \eta \pi a$, I am astonished, where the second aspirated letter of the root is changed into the tenuis; on the contrary in the aor. ${ }^{\prime} \tau a \phi o \nu$ the first undergoes that change.* Compare $\Theta$ Á $\pi \tau \omega$.
$\theta A \Omega$, an Epic defective verb, of which the act. has the causative sense to give suck to, the midd. the immediate sense to suck. Of the former we know nothing more than the aor. Iñat, and that only from Hesychius. Of the latter Hom. has the infin. pres. $\mathrm{In}_{\mathrm{\eta} \sigma \theta a} \dagger$ with the collateral meaning of to milk (Od. $\delta, 89$.) , and the aor. 1. midd. éधभ́бazo,
 Hymn. Cer. 236. But in Hymn. Apoll. 123. Fifoazo has the causative sense she gave suck to.-Passow.]


## ఆzáopaı, I look at attentively, consider. Depon. Midd.

The following different formations from this stem or root have been preserved in the dialects :
 Apollon. de Pron. p. 359. a. Imperat. đáєo, Nossidis Epigr. 8., Anytes Epigr. 10. $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{a} \sigma \theta \varepsilon \text {, the Megarean in Aristoph. Ach. 770. Fut. }}$




3.) Эé́oнає Attic and common dialect.

Of these three formations the first and second have in Homer always the sense of being astonished and admiring. The simple Эá-opa九 appears to be the oldest, whence $\{a \tilde{v} \mu a$; and the second merely the com-
 arose the simple verbal subst., properly $\uparrow a ́ a$, but soon changed into $\uparrow \varepsilon ́ a$, like $\mu \nu a ́ a$ into $\mu \nu \varepsilon ́ a$; and hence first came the form $શ$ qáo $\mu a \iota$, which

[^138][^139]does not occur in Homer. In Herodotus we find indeed both forms,
 would seem to arise more from traditionary corruptions of the text. He has also constantly recurring as various readings $\frac{\varepsilon}{\theta} \eta$ हïro and $\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \eta \tilde{\eta} \tau 0$, of which the latter is perhaps according to the analogy of some verbs in á $\omega$ contracted by the Epics in $\eta$ instead of $a$, as $\dot{o} \eta \tilde{\eta} a \iota$ 2. sing. pres.



Ө $\varepsilon i v \omega$, I beat. This pres. is constantly used by the Epic poets and Tragedians in both the act. and pass. voice. Beside this the Attic
 for instance in Aristophanes, and consequently belonging to the common language of the time. But there is no instance of a pres. indic.; for in Acharn. 564. the manuscripts give, and the context requires, the fut. $\mathfrak{g e v e r i c s . ~}^{\text {. Hence our latest critics have shown that those forms }}$ are aorists, (excepting occasionally that the fut. $\overbrace{\varepsilon \nu \tilde{\omega}, ~}^{\vartheta \varepsilon \nu \tilde{\omega} \nu \text {, ought to }}$ be restored,) and therefore that the infin. and part. must undoubtedly
 momentary beating, Эeiveiv on the contrary (e. g. Эeiverat, Æschyl.
 Hom.) continued blows, or the proper imperfect. Of the indic. of this aor. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \theta \varepsilon v o \nu$ no instance has yet been found. The Epic language
 ย $\theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon$ as evidently an imperf. at II. $\pi, 339$., and as an aor. at $\phi, 491$. The perfects and the aor. pass. are wanting.


## ఆépouaь, I warm myself: used in prose in the present

 and imperfect only.Homer has, beside the above, a fut. It́foo
 without any good authority.
Quite as defective is the derivative form of which we find in Homer only $\xlongequal[\varepsilon]{\varepsilon} \rho \mu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ and $\exists \dot{\imath} \rho \mu \varepsilon \tau 0$. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 546. note.

Өと́ $\sigma \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a t$, to beseech; a defective aor. of which we find only 9'́ $\sigma \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o$ (Pind. N. 5, 18.), and part. $\imath_{\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s, ~ H e s . ~ F r . ~ 23 .: ~ s e e ~ S c h æ f . ~ S c h o l . ~}^{\text {. }}$ Par. Apollon. Rh. 1, 824. The verbal adj. would be $\approx \varepsilon \sigma \tau o ́ s$, from which come $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\partial} \theta \varepsilon \sigma \tau o g ~ a n d ~ \pi o \lambda \dot{v} \theta \varepsilon \sigma \tau o g, ~ H o m . ~$

[^140][^141] Dor．The other tenses are defective．Compare T $\rho^{\varepsilon} \chi^{\prime} \chi$ ．

For the imperf．${ }^{\nu} \theta \varepsilon \sigma \nu$ Hom．has 9 q̇єбкov．We find also an act．fut． શev́ow in Lycophr．119．There are some forms from Té $\omega$ ，the root of ri$i \eta \mu \mu$ ，which we must take care not to confound with those of ${ }^{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \omega, I$
 midd．शeĩтo，and $\pi о т i \theta \varepsilon \iota$ for $\pi o r i \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon$, Theocr．14， 45.

Өทє́оца．See Өєа́оцаи．
Ө $\eta \lambda$ и́ $\omega$ ．See Өá $^{\lambda} \lambda \omega$ ．
ӨНП－．See ӨАФ－．
Өйөөat．See ӨA $\Omega$ ．
 note under Ai $\sigma \theta$ ávouas．
 would be at the same time imperf．and aor．，and $\operatorname{si\gamma } \varepsilon$ iv would be dif－ ferent from $2 \lambda \gamma \varepsilon i \nu$（compare $\kappa \lambda \dot{\lambda} \omega)$ ．But there are not sufficient proofs of the indic． $\mathscr{S}^{i}$（ $\omega$ or of ${ }^{\prime} \theta_{1}$ yov as a decided imperfect．The accen－
 founded in the manuscripts；but when for instance we read in Hesychius，
 be placed on these accents．If we were to accent in every passage of our text $\vartheta_{\imath \gamma \varepsilon \nu}, \vartheta_{\imath \gamma \prime} \nu$, as aorists，we should not find the sense disturbed in any one instance．$\ddagger$

ఆ入ác，I contuse，bruise，crush：fut．श $\lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \omega$, \＆c．It has $\alpha$ short in the inflexion，and in the pass．takes the $\sigma$ ．

The part．perf．pass．is $\tau \varepsilon \theta \lambda a \gamma \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}$ os，Theocr．22，4．5．；as in the Doric dialect all verbs ending in $\zeta \omega$ and some in á $\omega$ ，which have $\alpha$ short in

[^142]look at the passages，we shall see a plain difference between these aorists and the sense of $\mu \in i \lambda\{\sigma \sigma \in \tau o$ in the former and enaф̂ิy in the latter，which express a du－ ration of the thought；nay in the passage of $\bar{E}$ schylus we shall find them contrasted，
 $\nu 0 \nu$ ．［There are a few other instances in the Tragedians，but none to be de－ pended on；e．g．in Soph．Phil．9．the Ald．ed．bas тpootryeâv．compare also Eschyl．Agam．1049．Soph．Aj． 1410. Elmsl．and Herm．（Ed．C．470．Schæf． Eurip．Or．p．12．Greg．Cor．p． 990. Monk Eurip．Alc．1136．Elmsl．Eurip． Bacch．304．Wunderl．Obs．Critt．p． 151. －Passow．］
the inflexion, change to the other formation with the $\xi$; as ко $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \zeta \omega$, Dor.

$\Theta \lambda i ́ \omega \omega, I$ press, squeeze : fut. $9 \lambda i \psi \omega$; aor. 2. pass.


In Homer we find the fut. midd. ${ }^{2 \lambda i \psi} \boldsymbol{q}_{\varepsilon \tau a t,}$ Od. $\rho, 221$. The pass. part. pres. |  |
| :--- |
| ¿Ó | evos is in Dioscor. Epig. 37., and the part. perf. pass. $\tau \varepsilon \theta \lambda \iota \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \eta$ in Leon. Tar. Epig. 70.

 $\theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$ : compare $\beta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \dot{\delta} \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ and note under $\mathrm{B} \alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$. Of this perf. the following syncopated forms are in common use:


 112. $\tau \varepsilon \theta_{\nu \varepsilon o ́ s, ~ w h i c h ~ i s ~ p e r h a p s ~ p r e f e r a b l e . ~ F r o m ~}^{\tau}$ 白 $\theta \eta \varkappa \alpha$
 or $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \dot{\xi} o \mu \alpha$ ), the latter of which is not to be considered in the light of a passive, but as a fut. midd. with an active sense. Verbal adj. 9 ข $\boldsymbol{\tau} \pi$ ós.

That the $\alpha$ in the infin. $\tau \varepsilon \theta y$ ávac was short in the common language is evident from Aristoph. Ran. 1012: but we find in Æschyl. Agam. 550. $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu$ ãvat which was perhaps a contraction of te日vaย́vat. The Epics have also $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu$, and Homer $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \dot{a} \mu \varepsilon v a l$. The Ion. and Hom.
 and $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \omega$ under "I $I \tau \eta \mu \tau$ ), for which Homer has sometimes $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta o ́ \tau o s$, and once $\tau \varepsilon \theta v \varepsilon \tilde{\omega} \tau \ell$, as a trisyllable, Od. $\tau, 331$. For $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta \tilde{\omega} \tau o c$ there is also a frequent various reading $\tau \in \theta \nu \varepsilon$ гшт $\tau o g$, and for $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta$ óros sometimes $\tau \varepsilon \theta v \varepsilon$ ótog. To preserve Homeric uniformity Heyne wrote all the above with $\varepsilon$, whilst Wolf for the same purpose preferred $\eta$ : of the two the latter seems to have made the better choice; but after maturely examining every part of the question, I think there are the strongest grounds both internal and external for the following as the Epic usage;


In usage this verb is so mixed up with its compound $\dot{a} \pi 0 \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$, that
 the contrary the perf. $\tau^{\prime} \theta \nu \nu \eta \kappa a$ with its derivative forms scarcely ever occurs compounded with $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta^{\prime}$. Moreover of the perfect we find hardly any but syncopated forms: the part. $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta<\omega \dot{\omega}$ s is indeed interchanged
with $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \varepsilon \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, yet so that of the latter the masculine only occurs in prose. The usage of prose is therefore the following:



The part. Эaváv, oi qavóveยg, is however common in prose as an adj. in the sense of dead.

The infin. perf. $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu$ dávat is used generally in its natural meaning: but not unfrequently it stands also for the aor. Эaveiv, e. g. in Plat.
 vat $\mu \varepsilon$; and such is its meaning in the familiar hyperbolical expres-
 passges we must not force it to mean to be dead, as Plat. Crito 14. $\varepsilon i$ סéo $\tau \varepsilon \theta v$ ávat $\sigma \varepsilon$. A wish to add force to the expression introduced the perfect, as a form of a more decided and more certain sound, in the place of the present.

The same was the case with the fut. $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \xi \omega$ or $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta^{\prime} \xi o \mu a t$, of which we may first observe that the active form appears to be the older Attic : see Dawes, p. 96., Buttm. notes on Plat. Gorg. p. 469. d., and Elmsl. ad Aristoph. Ach. 597. The fut. has evidently the meaning of the futurum exactum in the above passage of Plato, where $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \xi \varepsilon \tau a \iota$ ( $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \xi \varepsilon$ ) "he will be dead immediately" is a parallel case to such perfects as that mentioned above. But like the common fut. 3. of the passive (paulo-post fut.) this also passes over into a simple fut. with the idea of immediately or certainly. See Thom. Mag. in $\mathbf{v}$. and the passages in Brunck ad Aristoph. Ach. 590., Fisch. ad Well. 3. p. 106.*

The compound with kavá is likewise synonymous with the simple verb, but occurs only in the poets: and the forms of the aor. are never found but with the syncope, as $\kappa a \tau \theta a \nu \varepsilon i v, ~ \kappa a \tau \theta a \nu \dot{\omega} \nu, \& c$. ; hence in the Attic poets, who do not willingly omit the augment, the indic. (кárӨavє) seldom occurs (Æsch. Agam. 1553.), while the other moods are frequent in Euripides and others.

Өра́бәш. See Tара́бәш.
ఆpaúc, I break in pieces. The passive takes $\sigma$. The old perf. pass. $\tau \varepsilon$ ' $\theta \rho \alpha u \mu \alpha \iota$ has been restored by Bekker to Plat. Legg. 6. p. 75\%. e. (425, 7.).

[^143]$\tau \in \theta \nu \eta \xi \in \tau \alpha \iota$, where we always contrast to live with to die, whereas the true contrast is between to live and to be dead.
$\Theta \rho u ́ \pi \tau \omega$, I break in pieces: fut. Tpúұш; aor. 2. pass. غ̇трúфŋ» Compare $\Theta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$ and T T $\varepsilon^{\prime} ф \omega$ with note.
[This verb seems to have been scarcely used in its simple form and literal meaning by any good writers; but in a metaphorical sense it is very common, particularly in the passive, as $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha x_{i}^{\prime}$ I Púnt $\tau \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Xenoph. - Passow.]

 under B $\alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$.

The pres. Sopé $\omega$, which is in all the lexicons, is scarcely to be found even in the later writers; and where we do find it, ámoӨopoṽv $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \varepsilon_{\varsigma}$ is a false reading for $\dot{a} \pi \kappa \theta$ opóv $\quad \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\S}$ or something similar: see Stephan. Thesaurus.* That $\vartheta_{\rho \bar{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega}$ and $\vartheta_{\dot{\circ} \rho \varepsilon \iota \nu \text { are connected in usage was }}$ allowed by the old Grammarians : see Eustath.ad II. $\beta, 702$. p. 246, 47.


 ¿̀̀ (by leaping down) тòv $\mu \eta \rho o ̀ v ~ \sigma \pi a \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota$.

Among the forms of this verb we may with safety class the perf. $\tau \varepsilon \in \circ \rho a$, as it would not be easy to find an emendation more certain than this of Canter in a verse of Antimachus in Poll. 2, 4. 178. ' $\Omega_{\mathrm{s}}$
 dislocated...."' instead of Tovpíns.... ${ }^{\text {Ë }}$.

In the collateral sense of copulating (see $\Im \rho \omega \not \sigma \kappa \omega$ and $\approx o \rho \varepsilon i v i v ~ i n ~ H e-~$ sych.) the depon. $\mathfrak{F} \dot{\rho} \rho v v \mu a t$ is more common.

өу币-. See Tv́申w.
 Chœrobosc. p. 1286., Draco pp. 45, 26. and 87, 25.; aor. 1. pass. ह̇тū' $\theta \eta v$, part. $\tau u \theta$ síg. - Midd.
$\Theta_{v}^{\prime} \omega$, and a sister-form Sivvo, have also the sense of I rage; and with this meaning we find a syncop. part. aor. midd. $\uparrow \dot{v} \mu \varepsilon v o s$ in Pratinas ap. Athen. 14. p.617. d. according to the reading as now corrected.

## I.



[^144]iท＇бораи；aor．1．iaб́́uиข．Pass．I am healed，used only in pres．imperf．and aor．1．iá $\theta \eta \nu$, Ion．iń $\theta \eta \nu$ ，Hippocr．De Arte， 20．In the older writers from Homer＇s time the $\iota$ and $\alpha$ are long through all the moods and tenses：in the later authors， particularly in the Anthologia，\＆became common．
${ }^{\text {＇}} \mathrm{I} \delta \rho o ́ \omega, I$ sweat ；fut．$i \delta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．This verb，like its contrary $\rho \iota \gamma o ́ \omega$, is contracted irregularly in $\omega$ and $\omega$ ，instead of $o v$ and $o \iota$ ；thus $i \delta \rho \tilde{\omega} \sigma a$ ， Il．$\delta, 27$ ．，$i \delta \rho \varphi \dot{\varphi} \eta \nu$ ，$i \delta \rho \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota, ~ i \delta \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$ ，Hippocr．This however seems to hold good of the Ionic dialect only，as in Xen．Hell．4．5，7．the best editions now read $i \delta \rho \circ \tilde{v} \nu \tau \iota$ ，not $i \delta \rho \omega \tilde{\nu} \tau \iota$ ．
＇İ̀́v́w，I place，build：fut．iôpú $\omega \omega$ ，\＆c．－Midd．
The aor．1．pass．iop $\dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$ ，regular with $v$ long，is recommended as exclusively the Attic form；on the other hand iopju $\partial \eta \nu^{*}$（which sup－ poses a theme in－ive，which occurs in Homer，and came into use again in a later period）is rejected by the Atticists ：see Thom．M．in voc．It is found however，and sometimes even without a various reading，in the best writers．See Lobeck ad Phryn．in voc．p． 37. note．Oudend．ad Thom．M．Fisch．3．p． 108.
${ }^{\prime} I \zeta \omega$ ，more generally жа ${ }^{\prime} \zeta^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ ，has in the active voice both the causative meaning to seat，place，and the immediate or neuter to sit．The simple verb appears to occur only in the pres．and imperf．$\dagger$（Hom．and Herodot．8，52．71．）； but of $\varkappa a f_{i} \zeta_{\omega} \omega$ we find a fut．$\varkappa \alpha \theta_{i} \tilde{\omega}$ ，an aor．1．$\dot{\varepsilon} \varkappa \dot{\alpha} \theta_{\iota} \sigma \alpha$ ，and perf．$x \leq \varkappa \alpha ́ \theta$ เз $\alpha$ ．The Middle has the sense of to sit，and its future is generally $\kappa \alpha \theta \iota \zeta$ そ́ $о \mu \alpha$ ．

With regard to the accentuation of this verb，we know that the vowels $\iota$ and $v$ when short can be augmented only by being made long，
 the augment can be marked only by the difference of pronunciation and accent；thus in $\bar{i} \zeta \omega$ the imperat．pres．is $\bar{i} \zeta \varepsilon$ ，the imperf．is $\bar{i} \zeta \varepsilon$ ； though from errors of transcription this rule is very frequently broken in the manuscripts，and consequently in the text of all writers．The

[^145][^146]older Attics augmented каӨi弓ш in the middle also，$\kappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \varepsilon, \kappa \alpha \theta i \sigma \varepsilon v . *$ See Buttm．Lexil．p．122．Dindorf．ad Aristoph．Ran．921．Bekk． Thucyd．6，66．7，82，with the various readings．

The later writers，from the time of Aristotle，have also a pres． ¿弓ávш，каөц弓ávш．

With this verb is intimately connected the verb ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\text {f }} \zeta_{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha t$ ， жаӨє́そєनӨaı，which never occurs in the older writers except
 $x \alpha \theta \varepsilon \zeta{ }_{\rho} \mu \varepsilon \nu{ }^{\prime}$ ，\＆c．，and of which the fut．2．is $x \alpha \varepsilon \delta 0 \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha_{1} \dagger$ （like $\mu \alpha \chi о \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\pi$ เой $\mu \alpha s$ ）．The defective tenses are sup－ plied by $\varepsilon \tilde{i} \sigma \alpha$ ，iک $\omega$ ，and iopú $\omega$ ，with the comp．xaөєĩ $\alpha$ ，\＆c．

The general supposition is，that there are two synonymous verbal forms $i \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．In that case $\varepsilon \begin{gathered} \\ \text { б́ }\end{gathered} \mu \nu \nu$ must be an imperf．as well as $i \zeta o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ；whereas we can prove，not from the Homeric language，which is in this respect uncertain，but from Attic prose，that it is invariably

 perf．is not to be thought of，and the sense runs plainly thus，＂he sat himself down by us，＂\＆c．Again in Xen．Anab．5，8，14．（6．）кaì av̉－
 ＂while I was seating myself，＂nor＂while I was sitting，＂but＂after having sat a considerable time，＂\＆c．And in confirmation of this comes the strong inductive conclusion，which every one will draw for himself， that $\varepsilon$ है $\zeta \tau \sigma$ in the poets，and $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon ́ \zeta \varepsilon \tau о$ in all writers，are regularly used in the narrative of the momentary action of sitting down，as is also каӨ $\dot{\varepsilon}$－ $\zeta \omega \mu a \iota, \dot{\&} c .:$ those passages，therefore，where the context does not neces－ sarily show this，must be understood in the same sense．And thus the few instances where the pres．кaӨ́ $\zeta$ o $\mu a \iota$ is found become very suspicious．$\neq$

[^147]－we must undoubtedly read here also
 that the point in discussion is the differ－ ence between the midd．and act．voices， in the same way as кatajov入ov̂$\sigma \theta a l$ and кataסou入oûv are spoken of just afterwards． But in the direction given by Thom．M．

 tion，for among the preceding forms which are rejected there is no present ：and in Lucian Philopseud．27．the reading ra－ $\theta$ ө́sєтai is uncertain．In Eurip．Heracl． 33．＇Inévat ка日e§ó $\mu \in \sigma \theta a$ the augment is in the synalœpha，and the context requires either we are sitting（ $\kappa a \theta h \mu s \theta a$ ）or we

We can now then join together as the usage of common prose all the forms of this family of verbs which belong to the meanings to sit and to seat, together with eija and $\tilde{\eta} \mu a \iota$, whose immediate connexion with


 middle voice, $I$ seat or place (for myself), cause to be placed, are used
 кá $\theta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, properly I have seated myself, whence pres. I sit. Nor must we forget to mention with the above the usage of $\boldsymbol{\kappa a \theta i \zeta \omega , ~ I ~ s e a t ~ o r ~}$ place for myself; as well as the general remark that the meanings $I$ sit and I seat myself play into each other in many ways, and therefore the distinction between them is not to be observed too strictly : compare a similar case in $\kappa \rho \varepsilon \mu a ́ v v v \mu$.

The meaning of $I$ seat or place myself may also be understood passively ; and so arose ( $\left.{ }_{\varepsilon}{ }^{\imath} \sigma \theta \eta \nu\right) ~ \tilde{\varepsilon} \kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, ~ \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a l$, forms which are frequent in the later writers but banished from the pure language.*

${ }^{*} I \eta \mu, I$ send. See under 'E $\Omega 1$.
'I $\theta \dot{v} \omega$, I go straight on : fut. ìívo ; aor. 1. ' ' $\theta \bar{v} \sigma a$, \&c., to which be-
 Again in Phon. 73. and Helen. 1587.
 period a usage was formed from this, according to which ra0́'Souat, as a present, was the same as rdo $0 \eta \mu u t, I$ sit, I will not take upon myself to determine. We certainly find in Pausan. 10, 5. init., in speaking of the official sitting of a board or council, rat́Soytal; and again the same expression, which I own surprises me, in a work probably of antiquity, the dialogue of Axiochus, p.371. c., where the various reading ka0igoytat is of no assistance, the context requiring $\kappa \dot{d} \theta \eta \nu \tau \alpha t$. However the language of this dialogue,

 a., with many other unusual words and phrases, gives ample scope for critical examination.

I explain the point thus: The radical form of all these verbs was evidently ${ }^{\mathrm{E}} \Delta \Omega$, as proved by éôov̂uat, Ěōos, and sedeo. Now as $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \delta \mu \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \delta \mu \eta \nu$ come from \& $\pi \omega$ and 'EX $\Omega$, so $\& \sigma \delta \delta \beta \eta \nu$ comes from ' $E \Delta \Omega$ : and here even better than in $\mathfrak{\ell} \sigma \pi \hat{\ell}$ $\sigma \theta a$ we can see the augment which in the common language had become equally fixed throughout all the moods, ध$\sigma \tilde{0} \oplus \mu \alpha$,
 add the pres. $\% \delta \delta \omega, \% \delta \omega$, exactly like $\% \sigma \chi \omega$
 naturally enough ceased to be heard any longer, and then were formed éкdetra, $\kappa \alpha \theta i \omega \hat{c}$ : icaAéséco received a new augment at the beginning : and as to the aoristic accentuation of the infin., there is still less reason for insisting on it in the case of
 which we have seen mistaken in a similar manner. But it is now clear also that eiva and fiual, whose connexion with ¢ ¢ $\delta \sigma \theta 0 \mathrm{at}$ we acknowledged (see p. 117.), and yet separated them from it on practical grounds, do not come from ' $\mathrm{E} \Omega$, but from this same ' $E \Delta \Omega$; that is to say ${ }^{\eta} \mu a t$ was softened down from $\bar{\Pi} \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha$, , of which latter there are still remains in $\begin{aligned} \text { Jotat and in }\end{aligned}$ ei $\sigma \alpha$, $\epsilon i \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu$, both formed with that oldest of augments et, which being misunderstood in this case also was carried on to some forms to which it did not belong.

* See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 269. The
 Eschin. c. Ctes. p. 77, 33. has been now adopted by Bekker from evident traces in the Codd. The conj. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \hat{\omega}$ in Soph. EEd. C. 195. was indeed still more improbable: see Brunck and Reisig.
longs also in Homer and others $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \theta \dot{v} \omega$, with the $\imath$ long. But iOv́v is Ionic and Epic for $\varepsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v} v \omega, 1$ direct or guide straight forward: aor. 1. 'itvva : also in the midd. i日v́veтo in the act. sense, Od. $\chi, 8$.

 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \tilde{\chi} \chi^{\theta} \alpha$.

The Ion. 3. plur. perf. pass. ámiкатає in Herodotus is remarkable as the only known instance of the tenuis in the stem being retained. But ikto in Hes. 2 , 481. is a syncopated aorist : and to this belongs also íк $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ and ixó $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ in Soph. Phil. 494. : see note in Buttm. eait.

The Epic language has the pres. and imperf. of the active, ikw, i$\kappa o v$, with the aor. $\bar{i} \xi_{0 v}$; on which last, as a mixture of the aor. 1. and 2.,


In the pres. itw the $\iota$ is long throughout, while in the aor. iкó $\mu \eta \nu$ it is, according to the root, short, but becomes long by the augment;
 short: and accordingly in the Epic language the indicative iкó $\mu \eta$, from the augment being moveable, is both long and short. The form iкvoṽนaє (Eurip. Or. 670.679. \&c.) has the $\iota$ short. Another poetical present is iкáv $\omega$, with $t$ short and a long.

The pres. iкvoṽ $\mu \alpha \iota$ occurs in its simple form in particular senses only; in Hom. to go through, travel from one place to another, Od. 九, 128. $\omega$, 338. : in the Attics, to go to as a suppliant (iкध́т $\eta \mathrm{s}$ ), implore, and to be suitable to. The true pres. as to meaning is in the Epic language ikw and iкáv $\omega$, in the Tragic principally iкáv $\omega$, in prose $\dot{\alpha} \phi є к \nu \tilde{v} \mu \alpha \iota$. The aor. $\tilde{i} \xi_{o v}$ is solely Epic; but iкó $\mu \eta$ and $i \xi o \mu a \iota$ are common to all the poets.

To these we may add $\eta \kappa \kappa \omega$, which is to be found in its alphabetical place, and which we there see is used by good writers in the pres. imperf. and fut. only. This verb is connected with the above as one of its presents, but with this limitation, that it is used only in the sense of being already come to a place, but not long arrived there, with some other collateral meanings to be found in the lexicons. In a very early period however this form appears to have been confounded with ikw; whence, as Eustathius (ad II. a, p. 82, 33.) expressly informs us, the Grammarians agreed that íkw was the only form used in Homer, and $\ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ the only one in succeeding writers. But the more critical way of understanding it is that $i \kappa \omega$ and $\eta \pi \omega \omega$ are properly but one word in different dialects, like $\sigma \kappa i \pi \omega \nu$ and $\sigma \kappa \eta j \pi \omega \nu$.* The older poets (for this

[^148][^149]relates principally to them，including Pindar；see Boeckh ad Pind． Ol．4，11．）had the dialectic form i$k \omega$ ，which，like our come，was used of being already arrived at a place，e．g．in Il．$\sigma, 406$ ．；but the lan－ guage of the succeeding period，i．e．the Ionic and Attic prose with Attic poetry，in which $\eta \kappa \omega$ had become established，limited the usage of the latter verb to that particular meaning，while the lengthened forms iкর́ $\nu \omega$ ，áфıкขои̃ $\mu a \iota$ ，retained the more general sense of to come to，arrive at a place．In the future also the difference is pretty much
 ＇I shall set out from hence and come to you．＇



The Epics have also ìáouà（II．$\beta, 550$ ．）and î̀apà（Hom．Hymn． 20．Orph．Arg．942．）；while Ætschylus has ìéo $\mu a t$, Suppl．123． 134. The $t$ of the radical syllable is long，but it is also shortened by the Epics．

In the old language the active voice had the sense of to be gracious， kind，whence the Epics took an imperat．i＇$\lambda \eta \theta \iota$（Od．$\gamma, 380 . \pi, 184$. ${ }^{i} \lambda \lambda a ̆ \theta \iota$ ，Theocr．15，143．）from $i \lambda \lambda \eta \mu$ ，and a conj．and opt．from i入йк $\omega$ ．＊
＇I $\mu$ á $\sigma \sigma \omega \dagger, ~ I ~ w h i p: ~ f u t . ~ i \mu a ́ \sigma \omega ~(\check{\alpha}) ; ~ a 0 r . ~ 1 . ~ i ́ \mu a \sigma \alpha . ~ O n ~ t h e ~ f o r m-~$ ation of this fut．see＇Ар $А о ́ т \tau \omega$.
${ }^{'} \mathrm{I} \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \omega$, I draw up（a rope or water）：fut．iun＇$\sigma \omega$ ，\＆c．The Att．infin．pres．is $i \mu \tilde{\eta \nu}$ ：compare $\zeta_{\alpha} \alpha \omega$ ，${ }^{\prime} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ．－Midd．
 $i \mu \varepsilon i \rho a \iota \tau o$（Il．$\xi, 163$ ．），and the aor．1．pass．i $i \mu$ ép $\theta \eta$（Herodot．7，44．）． The $t$ is always long．
＂Iттада兀．See Пе́тодаи．
＂I $\sigma \eta \mu$ ，I know．［Of this verb we find only the Dor．pres．${ }^{\prime} \sigma \bar{a} \mu \iota$ in Pind．and Theocr．，the 2．sing．íans，3．sing．＇īā̃ı，and 1．plur． ${ }^{i} \quad i \breve{a} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，Pind．N．7，21．，and the part．＇i $\quad \sigma \varrho$, Pind．3，52．The forms which only appear to belong to this verb，such as ${ }^{i} \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，${ }^{i} \delta \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，$i \sigma \alpha \sigma \iota$ ，

＂I $\sigma \kappa \omega$ ．＂I $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon v$ ，he spoke，is a defective imperf．（Od．$\chi, 31$ ．），differing essentially from＇iok or $\hat{\varepsilon \ell t} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，I make or think like（which occurs only

[^150]be doubted，for i $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$（II．o，17．）may be the conj．aor．，as it is in Hesychius ；nor do I know other authority for the pres． than ija $\quad$ 的 $\mu \in \nu o t$ in Archix Epig． 22. which was perhaps first made from the passage of Homer．

## 134

in the pres．and imperf．，II．$\lambda, 798 . \varepsilon$, 181．Od．$\delta, 279 . \nu, 313$. ），and arising from the insertion of the $\sigma$ in IK－the root of $\varepsilon$ 覑 $\omega$ ，like 入á $\sigma \kappa \omega$



 2．indic． $\begin{aligned} & \text { En } \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ & \nu \nu \\ & \text { is seldom used before the time of Polybius：}\end{aligned}$ its other moods are found in Homer．Pass． $\boldsymbol{i} \sigma \tau \tilde{\alpha}^{\circ} \mu \alpha t$ ；im－ perf．i $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ：fut．$\sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma 0 \mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor．1． $\bar{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \nu(\breve{\alpha})$ ；perf．
 $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ；fut．3．（paulo－post）$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \gamma \dot{\xi} \omega \omega$ old Att．，and



The 2．and 3．sing．of the indic．pres．in $-\tilde{q} \bar{c}$ and $-\tilde{q}$ are found only in the later writers．The 3．plur．i $\sigma \tau \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \iota$ is the Attic form，io $\sigma$ 白 $a \sigma \iota$ the Ionic，iozávz the Doric．In the optat．is an abridged form of the dual and plural by dropping the $\eta$ ，and in the 3．plur．changing－$\eta \sigma a \nu$ into $-\varepsilon \nu$ ，thus returning to the regular optat．of the barytone verbs ；as dual，
 in the optat．of the aor．2．as $\sigma \tau a \tilde{\tau} \tau \varepsilon$ for $\sigma \tau a i \eta \tau \varepsilon$ ；but here the abridged form is not so usual as the other，while in the imperf．it is preferred by the Attics，who sometimes use it in the 3．plur．pres．In the imperf． we find an Epic 3．sing．í $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$（Od．$\tau, 574$ ．）with a sister－form in $-\omega \nu$ ， $-a \mathrm{~g},-a$ ，peculiar to the Ionic dialect and the later writers：Homer has also an aor．2．$\sigma \tau \dot{d} \sigma \kappa \sigma v$ ．In the aor．2．imperat．instead of $\sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \theta \iota$ we have in the compounds $\pi a \rho a ́ \sigma \tau a$, á $\pi \dot{\delta} \sigma \tau a^{*}$ ，as from a theme $\Sigma T A \Omega$ ．In
 the aor．2．the long vowel remains，as $\sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu a t, O d . \varepsilon, 414$ ．Il． $\rho, 167$ ．In the middle the fut．and aor．1．are Homeric ；the latter is also in common use ：but an aor．2． $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ is nowhere found in any of its moods or tenses．In the passive the Ion．3．plur．is iotéaraı for ïवтavтt．

In the conjunct．we find in the later writers the 2．and 3．sing．ior $\tilde{q} S$ ， $-\tilde{q}$ ，instead of $i \sigma \pi \tilde{\eta} s,-\tilde{\eta}$ ，in which case they belong to the inferior form ioráa．The Epics for the 3．sing．iorñ have iorñol．And as the conj． is a contracted form the Ionics resolve it，using for i $\sigma \tau \tilde{\omega}$ and $\sigma \tau \tilde{\omega},-\tilde{\eta} \varsigma, \& c$ ．，


[^151][^152] form inferior to the other．

Epics vary to suit the metre, using $\sigma \tau \varepsilon i \omega, ~ \sigma \tau h \eta \varsigma, ~ \sigma \tau i \eta \eta, ~ \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \eta \tau o v, ~ \& c .$, and $\sigma \tau \varepsilon i o \mu \varepsilon \nu$ for $\sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \varepsilon \tau \sigma \nu$ for $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \sigma \nu$ : but it is very difficult indeed to distinguish some of the above forms from those of the optative. In the conjunct. and optat. of the passive voice of all verbs in $\mu \iota$ a formation has been introduced into the common language, by which they assimilate, sometimes in sound but always in accent, to the regular conjugation (compare $\delta \dot{v} \nu \mu \mu \iota$ ): thus we find in all writers ïбтaıo,



The tenses of this verb, like those of $\delta \dot{v} \omega$, фú $\omega$, and many others, are divided between the causative meaning of to place, and the intermediate one of to stand. In the active voice we find, with the meaning of to place, the
 whence therefore the whole of the passive voice has the sense of to be placed; and a middle (iбтанаь, $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \alpha$, $\varepsilon$ ह̇ $\tau \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ), answering to the above tenses of the active, has the meaning of to place for oneself, cause to be placed or erected.

But the middle has also the pure reflective meaning of to place oneself, which however was felt more as an intransitive, or as the inchoative belonging to the sense of to stand, like the Latin consistere, to stop. Considered in this light the relation between $\bar{i} \sigma \tau \eta \mu$, and $\tilde{\sigma} \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha s$ is that of causative and immediate. Now as the aor. 2. act. and the perf. of many verbs take the immediate sense (see note under Tsú $\chi \omega$, p. 238.), we have the meaning of the
aor. 2. ย̋ $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$, constiti as aorist, I placed myself, stopped; perf. $\Xi \sigma \tau \eta x \alpha$, properly constiti as perfect, I have placed myself, stopped, and thence I stand;
so that this perf. in Greek supplies the place of the Latin stare, to stand, and the pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} x \iota \nu$ or $\varepsilon i \sigma \tau \eta^{\prime} x \varepsilon \iota y$ the imperf. of the same.*

To suit this present meaning of the perfect was formed

[^153] which，though a passive form，is not to be regarded as pro－ perly such（for in meaning it corresponds with the active）， but as a fut．midd．with an active sense，like Tavoũ $\mu \alpha$ ， $\lambda \eta^{\prime} \psi \not \mu \alpha<$ ，\＆c．

We see from the examples given by Elmsley，ad Acharn．590．，that the active form of this future is the older Attic．And in the com－ pound（e．g．$\dot{\alpha} \phi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \xi \varepsilon$, ，Xen．Anab．2，4，5．）we may observe the same change which occurs in $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta \xi \omega$ to the future meaning belonging to the pres．in－a a at．

Of all the syncopated forms of this perfect the infin． $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha{ }^{*}$ is most used，and $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \gamma x \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \alpha, ~ p e r h a p s ~ n o t ~ a t ~ a l l . ~$ Of the others are found principally $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu,-\alpha \tau \varepsilon \dagger,-\tilde{\kappa} \sigma \omega^{*}$气゙ $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu \cdot \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \omega ́ g,-\tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha$ ，gen．－$\tilde{\tau} \tau 0 s$ ．

In this abridged form the pluperf．has never its proper augment $\varepsilon$ ， but remains $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau a \sigma \alpha \nu$ ：hence the two first persons，as being similar to the perfect，seldom occur in prose．$\ddagger$ Beside these syncopated forms
 are perhaps exclusively poetical ：while of the conj．are found only those persons which have an $\omega$ ，e．g．$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，Plat．Gorg．52．p．468．b． $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota$, Eurip．Bacch． 319.

Instead of the regular perf．part．غ́ $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \dot{\omega} \varsigma$ ，－vĩa，－ós，gen．－óros，is used a syncopated form $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\omega} \varsigma, \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} \sigma a, \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\omega} \mathrm{~S}$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau$ óc（of the last we shall speak hereafter），gen．غ $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \tilde{\omega} \tau o c ̧$ ．There is also an Ionic form
 Homer has frequently a gen．غ́धrǎóros，an accus．غ́ $\sigma \tau a ̆ o ̆ \tau a, ~ a n d ~ a ~ n o m . ~$
 $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \omega ́ s$ by dropping the $\kappa$（like $\tau \varepsilon \tau \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \varsigma$ and others；see under Baì $\omega$ ）， is found in Hes． 9,519 ．，and a gen．غ̇ $\sigma \tau \eta \tilde{\eta} \tau o \varsigma$ ，with a fem．$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{u ̈ a} a$ in



[^154]formation：the regular part．was $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \omega$ ， whence by dropping the $\kappa$ came $\varepsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \cos$ ： the Ionics changed the $\eta$ into short $a$（see under Balv $\omega$ ），whence $\varepsilon \sigma \tau d \omega s$ ；while again in $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau h \omega s$ the length of the $\eta$ passed on into the following vowel，making éove－ ws，though the origin of this change was not visible in the nom．as it is in the gen．
 －Ed．］

II This reading，according to the correct criticism of the grammarian in the scho．
also for the syncopated 3. plur. $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \tilde{a} \sigma \iota$ the Ion. resolved form $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \varepsilon \in a \sigma \iota$
 हбтध́are, in Herodot. 5, 49., is genuine, notwithstanding the various reading $\pi \rho \rho$ 白 $\sigma \tau a \tau \varepsilon$ has crept in from the common language:

If we follow analogy the neut. part. of $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, contracted from $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \varsigma$, must be the same as the masc., and this is the reading of most of the manuscripts and editions wherever the word occurs. But the oldest and best manuscripts have generally the unanalogous $\mathfrak{e} \sigma \tau$ ós. Hence it is very probable that in this case the language of the Attics followed
 gen. and other cases are $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} \tau o g$, \&c.*

There is also a perf. for the transitive meaning $\begin{array}{r}\text { モ́quaka } \\ \text { I have placed, }\end{array}$ which belongs however to a later æra. $\dagger$ The older Attics used instead of the perfect, whether in a transitive or intransitive sense (for there is no proper form to express I have stood), either the aorists or a circumlocution, turning the perf. act. for instance into the perf. passive,
 not in common use.

In Homer we find eararav (for the accent and breathing must be determined by criticism) in both a transitive and intransitive sense: the plainest instance is in Il. $\mu, 55$. and 56 . where it has the two meanings in two succeeding verses. In the description there given of the ditch

 the first is beyond a doubt $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau a \sigma a \nu$ : for there is no other form to express the imperf. they stood or were standing. It seemed therefore most natural to write the same in the second instance also, and to suppose that the old language used the perfect in both senses: and the context is much in favour of this, "which the Greeks had placed." But there are other instances of $\varepsilon \sigma \tau a \sigma a \nu$ in a transitive sense, as $11 . \beta, 525$. Od. $\gamma$, 182. $\sigma, 306$., in all which it is evidently an aorist; whereas the pluperf. (which necessarily is and remains $\left.\begin{array}{c} \\ \sigma \\ \\ \sigma\end{array}\right)$ a transitive sense from the perfect have placed) cannot stand in these passages, particularly in Od. $\sigma, 306$., without the greatest violence. But
lium, has been admitted by Wolf into the text instead of $\mathrm{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \tau \epsilon$, which was directly contrary to the sense.

* See the unanimity of the best Codd., e. g. in Plat. Parmen. Pp. 63, 15. 16. 64, 2. 12. Bekk. Compare also Plat. Tim. pp. 30, 7. 41, 6., \&c. Thucyd. 3, 9. 4, 10. Hence Bekker always reads écoós, as does Hermann in Soph. EEd. T. 632. Compare Dind. Aristoph. Equ. 567. The
other reading is defended in Alb. Hesych. 1, p. 503.
+ In Polyb. 10, 20. stands दोєєбтдкєє according to which therefore, if we find in the same writer éфéơךпкe in a transitive sense, it must be altered. See Fisch. 2. p. 368. Schæf, ad Dionys. De Comp. 22. p. 331., and compare Reisk. ad Dem. Phil. 3. p. 117, 26. (Reisk. Appar. p. 251.).
if $\varepsilon \sigma \tau a \sigma a \nu$ be an aorist, it must be a shortened form of ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$ : and this opinion of Aristarchus, which Wolf has followed in his last edition, appears to me undoubted, particularly when I compare it with a similar case in Hesiod, ${ }^{\ell} \pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon$ for ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \pi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon *$ (see $\Pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu \imath$ ).
'Елíтганає see in its alphabetical place.

$1 \Omega$. See Eī $\mu$.


## K.



 є่ $\varkappa \theta \theta \bar{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ also), infin. $\varkappa \alpha \theta \tilde{\alpha} \rho \alpha$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 25. Midd. This verb is no compound ; see Buttm. Lexil. p. 119.


KáӨŋцаи. See "Нцаи.

Kaivvuau, I am distinguished, excel: defective depon. without fut. or aor., and occurring only in pres. and imperf. There is however a syn-
 these forms are correctly classed under one verb both sense and construction plainly show. For as in Od. $\gamma, 282$. we read 'ُkaivvto $\phi \tilde{v} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$


 without an accusative; therefore, as a necessary result of the above comparison, it stands absolutely in the sense of to excel or be distin-
 $\kappa \varepsilon \kappa a \sigma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon, \& c$. For these expressions a present кá ${ }^{\prime} \omega$ has been supposed with the meaning of to equip, adorn; but the above comparison shows that кaivveat might have been used in that absolute sense quite as well

[^155]point only from Buttmann : he reads with him the 3. plur. aor. 1. Є̄ซтăбuy for
 $\sigma, 306$. , but he also reads it in both lines 55. and 56. of II. $\mu$., whereas Buttmann reads in the former of the two the pluperf. EGテaбav with the force of an imperfect.]
as кéкабдац, and no doubt would have been if it had occurred more frequently. It is found however only three times, and in its simple form but once through the whole of Homer. We must therefore join каivyдaє
 same relation as $\dot{\rho} a i \nu \omega$ * does to $\dot{\rho} \dot{́} \sigma \sigma a \tau \varepsilon$ and $\hat{\varepsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{́} \dot{\delta} \partial a \tau a t$. But compared with each other as pres. and perf. they are like our expressions I distinguish myself and $I$ am distinguished: and the radical idea is undoubtedly that of shining, glittering $\dagger$, as in the Pindaric passage
 with ivory, but composed of it, of which therefore the poet could say, it shone with ivory, or in Latin candebat. To this verb, as to so many others in the middle voice, was joined the accusative of the person, or $\mu \varepsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тoĩs, $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \sigma \pi \overline{\mathrm{c}}$, together with the dative of the thing; and sometimes (as in Od. $\tau, 82.8,725$. Il. $\omega, 546 . \ddagger$ ) this dative stood alone.
 The perf. is wanting. In the passive the pres. and imperf. only are in use.

This verb is a sister-form of $\kappa \tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$, $\kappa \tau a \nu \varepsilon i \nu$, to which it bears the same relation as $\pi \tau$ ó̀ıs to $\pi \dot{\partial} \lambda \iota s$, or $\chi \theta a \mu a \lambda$ ós to $\chi a \mu a i$. [It is very common both in the Poets and Tragedians, and found also in the best Attic writers.-Passow.]

Kaíw, I burn (transit.), Att. xá w with a long and without contraction: imperf. छ้жаเоv, Att. Еैжc̄ov; fut.
 жаибто́g, жаибтє́os.

In the passive voice the aor. 1. is the only tense in use by the Attics; see Thom. M. v. кateкаú $\theta \eta$. Beside Homer and Herodotus none but the later writers have the aor. 2. pass. éќ́qy (ă).

The Epics have also an aor. 1. act. (without $\sigma$ in the termination) ย̌к $\quad a \S$; many forms of which fluctuate between $\eta$ and $\varepsilon \iota$, while a third

[^156][^157]with $\varepsilon$ has been retained by the Tragedians only，e．g．кéavres Æschyl． Agam．858．，éккє́avte§ Eurip．Rhes．97．；but this last can scarcely be considered in any other light than as derived like the others from the old
 $\kappa \eta \quad \alpha \varepsilon \nu$ have no various reading with the $\varepsilon \iota$ ，as all the others have：e．g． infin．aor．кєĩ and кท̃aє，Od．o，97：imperat．кєiov and ки̃оv，Od．$\phi$ ， 176：conj．кєio $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ and $\kappa \eta$ и́о $\varepsilon \nu$, II．$\eta$, 333．and 337．：indic．midd． 3. plur．квíavто and кท́avто，Il．$\iota, 88$ ．，and the same in the participles кєє́avтє¢，Od．є，231．v，26．，кєєá $\mu \varepsilon \nu o s, ~ I 1 . ~ \iota, ~ 234 . ~ O d . ~ \pi, ~ 2 . ~ \psi, ~ 51 . ~ I f ~ w e ~$ compare with this the exactly similar appearance in the Epic conjunc－ tives of the form in $\mu$ ，——those for instance from $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \tau \eta \nu,{ }^{\ell} 6 \eta \nu *$ ，一 it is evident that when the $\eta$ before the other vowel had been shortened in the old language into $\varepsilon$ ，it was again lengthened by the Epics into $\varepsilon \iota$ ，like $\beta \varepsilon i \omega, \sigma \tau \varepsilon i o \mu \varepsilon v, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．，in the two verbs above mentioned．Now as in some of these forms the various reading does not appear，while in others it is supported by the greatest authority of the manuscripts（see Heyne on the passages of the Iliad quoted above），I have no doubt of the reading кєíaขто，кєio $\mu \varepsilon \nu, \kappa \varepsilon і ̃ \iota, \& c$ ．，in all those passages being the genuine one，i．e．having the oldest tradition in its favour．$\dagger$ Compare a similar case of the text fluctuating between $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \varepsilon \iota \tilde{\omega} \tau o s$ and $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta \tilde{\omega} \tau \circ \varsigma$.

Some have also supposed a present $\kappa \varepsilon \in \omega$ and $\kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \omega$ ，on account of $\kappa \alpha$－ такєєє́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu$（var．reading катакทє́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ ），Il．$\eta, 408$ ．and $ย к к \eta о \nu, ~ O d . ~ \iota, 553$. To place this $\kappa \eta^{\prime} \omega$ as an Ionicism by the side of the Attic кá $\omega$ cannot be satisfactory，as $\kappa a^{\prime} \omega$ is the Ionicism like $\kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\prime} \omega$ ，ह̇入aía；nor is it easy to perceive what grounds there are for those forms，when we have $\kappa a \iota \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ， Il．$\xi, 397$ ．and ${ }^{\prime}$ ккаьov，Od．$\chi, 336$ ．As therefore in the one passage हैкךov has been already expelled from the text by the reading of the manuscripts $\varepsilon_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \alpha \iota \nu$ ，so in the other катакаєє́ $\mu \varepsilon v$ is undoubtedly the old reading，and the corruption was produced by confounding it with the forms of the aorist．

That the iota subscript with which кá $\omega$ and $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \imath \alpha \\ \text { are written in many }\end{gathered}$ editions，new as well as old，rests entirely on a false opinion，is evident without further investigation．See Piers．ad Moer．p． 231.

K $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega, I$ call：fut．$\varkappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \omega$ ，fut．midd，$\varkappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota ~(E p . ~$ and Poet．жа入є́ $\sigma \sigma \omega, \varkappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, ~ A t t i c ~ \varkappa \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega} \ddagger, \varkappa \alpha \lambda о u ̃ \mu \alpha \iota) ;$

[^158]See Aristoph．Fr．1133．and compare Piers．ad Moer．p． 321.
$\ddagger$ The fut．кa入є́ $\sigma \omega$ ，or，as the Attics spoke it，$\kappa a \lambda \omega$ ，is indisputably the fut．of the simple stem or root KA $\Omega$ ，and the common pres．кa入éw arose out of that fut． as the Ionic pres．$\mu a \chi$ ́́opal came from
 （Poet．x $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ）；perf．$x^{\prime} \kappa \lambda \eta x \alpha$ ；perf．pass．$x^{\varepsilon} \varkappa \lambda \eta \mu \alpha s$
 pass．＇̇x $x \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ ；fut．pass．$x \lambda \eta \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ；fut．3．（paulo－post） жєк $\lambda \dot{\prime} \sigma о \mu a$, I shall be called，named．Ion．and Hom． imperf．$\varkappa \alpha \lambda$ ย́ $\sigma \varkappa 0 \nu$ ．

From this verb came also by metathesis an Ionic sister－form $\kappa \kappa \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ， used by Homer in pres．and imperf．only ；see note under Кદ́̀ода兀．On


К $\alpha \mu \nu \omega, ~ I ~ a m ~ w e a r y: ~ f u t . ~ \varkappa \breve{\alpha} \mu о \tilde{\mu \alpha ь ; ~ a o r . ~ 2 . ~ छ ै ж \alpha ̆ \mu о \nu *, ~}$

 $\varkappa \lambda \eta x \alpha$ under $\mathrm{K} \alpha \lambda \varepsilon$ é $\omega$ ，with the note underneath．

Sophocles（Trach．，1215．）has the 2．sing．fut．канкі̃．In the Epic part．perf．the $\kappa$ is dropped as in кєкафضш́s，$\tau \varepsilon \tau \lambda \eta \omega^{\prime}$ and others；thus

 The Epics have also very frequently the aor．2．act．and midd．with the reduplication，which then remains in all the moods；thus $\lambda \tilde{\varepsilon} \lambda a \theta o v$ ， $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda a \theta \dot{\theta} \nu$ ；кध́к $\lambda \nu \theta 1, \pi \varepsilon \pi \dot{\prime} \theta$ outo，\＆cc．，and in the verb before us Homer has the conj．кєка́ $\mu \omega$ ，кєка́ $\mu \eta \sigma \iota$ ，кєка́ $\mu \omega \sigma$ ．

K $\alpha \mu \pi \tau \omega$ ，I bend：fut．$\kappa \dot{\alpha} \mu \psi \omega$ ，\＆c．In the perf．pass． when the 1 ．pers．has $\mu \mu$ ，one is naturally dropped，as $x^{\prime} \varkappa \propto \mu \mu \alpha \iota, x^{\prime} \varkappa \propto \mu \psi \alpha \iota, \& c$ ．
 $\sigma \theta a c$ Att．（A ristoph．frequently）；a defective verb found only in the fut．$\ddagger$ ，
 formed кéкл $\eta$ ккa by metathesis like $\tau \hat{\text { é }}$
 see also $\beta$ é $ө \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ ，under Bád $\lambda \omega$ ．In－ stances of this fut．may be seen in кa入є $\hat{i}$ ， Xen．Symp．1，15．ка入єîन Lept．5．тарака入ойутas，Xen．Hell．6， 3，2．See this formation also under $\Delta$ éreo． Of the fut．кал $\epsilon \sigma \omega$ the only instances which we find in the older writers are in Eschin，c．Timarch．p．10．and Lycurg．
 stoph．Plut．963．Brunck has mistaken the aorist for the future．
 under T $\mathrm{T} \notin \nu 凶$ ．
$\dagger$ I cannot think there are any grounds for $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \omega ิ \tau a s$ in Thucyd．3，59．however supported it may be by the manuseripts against the various reading кєкцךкóтаs， It can hardly have been introduced by the antiquated meaning（the dead）or by the solemn tone of the oration，as кєкц is used even by Euripides in the same sense．
 rodot．3，36．кazampoţerau，ib．3， 156. Archil．Fr．23．Aristoph．Nub． 1240. Vesp．1396．капро莫оутаи，Herodot．5， 105．Aristoph．Vesp．1366．Thesm． 566. Equ． 435.
and in such expressions as ov кататроíge, 'thou shalt not have done it for nothing' (i. e. not without being punished for it). A deviation to the aor. кatatpoi $\xi a \sigma \theta a t$ is very possible, but it occurs only in Themist. Or. 14. init.* In the Etym. M. we find also a verb $\pi \rho \circ$ ô $\sigma$ $\sigma о \mu a \iota, I b e g$, quoted from Archilochus, from which comes $\pi \rho o i ̂ k T \eta s$ in Homer: but the etymological connexion of the two is not clear. $\dagger$

Kavđáoцaı, I talk big. Dep. midd. Pindar uses it with infin. Herodotus 7, 39. has the aorist.

КАФ-; whence perf. part. кєкӑфŋ́́s, -óтos, breathing short and with difficulty, Il. $\varepsilon, 698$. Od. $\varepsilon, 468$. Of this root or stem we find no other trace except that Hesychius has $\kappa \varepsilon \in \kappa \eta \phi \varepsilon$, $\tau \in \in \nu \eta \eta \kappa \varepsilon$ : probably with the sense of expirare. [This perf. seems to be formed from an obsolete


Kєïat, I lie, belongs to the stem or root KEI $\Omega$ or KE $\Omega$, and has


 Fut. кєíбодаи. Comp. ката́кєцдаи, ката́кєєбая, \&e.: but the infin. retains the accent on the syllable of the stem or root, катакеїөat. So also $\dot{\varepsilon \pi i к \varepsilon} \varepsilon \mu \alpha, \& \varepsilon$.

The forms of the optative and conjunctive, as well as the accent of the compound infinitive, might possibly recommend $\mathrm{KE} \Omega$ as the radical form of $\kappa \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \mu a t$ : but the whole formation of the verb, together with the derivatives кoit $\eta$, коц $\tilde{q} \nu$, makes it far more probable that the $\varepsilon t$ is the radical syllable and the forms with the $\varepsilon$ shortened from it. К $\varepsilon \mu \mu a$ itself might certainly be considered as a syncopated form (like oì $\mu a$, $\tilde{\rho} \tilde{v} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ), by virtue of which it would agree with the formation in $\mu \iota$; but it is better to take it altogether as an old perfect (I have laid my-

[^159]Whereas to beg is, it is true, the correlative of to make a present of, but on that very account not fit to be joined in the same idea, because language rather strives to make the distinction between such words clearly perceptible. Otherwise it would be easy enough to trave recourse to the idea of stretching out the hand as belonging to both actions.
$\ddagger$ Homer always uses neírau, кeĩo, but we find in the Hymn. Merc. 254, as 2. sing. катd́кeial.
§. Whether кéwual was a genuine Attic form may be doubted. In an inscription in the Corp. Inseript. I. n. 102. p. 10. stands кєісита!.

## 143

self down，consequently I lie，）with the redupl．dropped，by which the accent in the compound като́кєєцає，катакєіг $\theta a \iota$ is accounted for in the
 to $\varepsilon$ arose naturally the change to the form in－$\varepsilon \omega$ ，whence in Homer кє́ovтац，in Herodot．1，178．кéєтац，and in Hippocr．de A．A．L．9， p．333．кย́є $\theta$ 0at．

Instead of the 3．sing．кєĩта兀 Herodotus has кє́єгац，and later writers кє́ата兀 ：instead of the 3．plur．кєгутаи Homer has кє́оутаи，and very frequently（according to Ionic analogy）кєíăтає and кє́ãa兀，the latter of which is found only in Homer and the later Ionics．In the 3．plur． imperf．Homer and the Ionics for eैкєєvтo have кєíăтo and кє́ăто，with an iterative кє́бкєто．Od．$\phi, 41$ ．In the infin．pres．we find in Hippocr．


In II．$\tau, 32$ ．Od．$\beta$, 102．Wolf has altered according to the Venet． manuscript the old reading of the text кєiтaє（which as an indicat． would be certainly incorrect）to a conjunct．кच̃тat．But this was un－ necessary，as by an old usage кєĩцat，кєĩтає served for both conjunct． and indicat．Thus in Plat．Phædo p．84．e．$\mu \grave{\eta} \delta \iota \alpha ́ \kappa \varepsilon \iota \mu \alpha \iota$ is conjunct．，
 Ed．Bas．2．бvүкєiтal，which ought however to be accented бט́үкєєтає：

 true reading to be $\delta \iota a \kappa \varepsilon ́ \eta \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ．Compare a similar case in $\delta \varepsilon ́ \eta, \delta \varepsilon \tau$ ，under $\Delta \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega . \dagger$

Homer has also an infin．кєเย́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，and part．кєí $\omega \nu$ ，кย́ $\omega \nu$（from KEI $\Omega$ ）， as future，Il．$\xi, 340$ ．Od．$\eta, 342$ ．；which undoubtedly come from the fut．кє́ $\varepsilon \omega$ contracted to кєi $\omega$ and again shortened to кย́ $\omega$ ．That this form should pass into a desiderative was very natural，Od． $2,315$. Compare a similar future in $\delta \hat{\eta} \varepsilon \iota \varsigma$ ，$\delta \grave{\eta} \not \mu \varepsilon \nu, \delta \dot{\eta} \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ ，from a fut．$\delta a \varepsilon ́ \omega$ and a root $\Delta \mathrm{A} \Omega$ ．
 pass．éxáprv．－Midd．

The Epic language forms the fut．кย́ $\rho \sigma \omega$ ，aor．1．${ }^{\ell} \kappa \varepsilon \rho \sigma a$ ．Pindar （Pyth．4，146．）has the aor．1．pass． $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \varepsilon\end{gathered} \theta \eta \nu$ ．


[^160]form кéєтau for кє́ŋтаи，like $\phi \theta i \epsilon \tau \alpha l$ ，i $\mu \in i-$ ретаи，\＆c．，is preferred for Homer：and it certainly appears to be an old reading；for at 11．$\tau, 32$ ．the small Schol．have the gloss Kéєтat durl тồ кєiтal，which should be ăขтl тоข̂ кย́ทтаи．
$\mathrm{K} \varepsilon \lambda a \lambda^{\prime} \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega$, I sound，roar，is regular；but the Epic language has the participle as from a barytone verb，$\kappa \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \dot{\delta} \omega \nu$ ，$\kappa \varepsilon \lambda \alpha^{\alpha} \delta \nu \nu \tau a$ ：although it is used only as an adjective．［Passow has also $\kappa \varepsilon \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \delta \omega$ ，which he calls the original form of $\kappa \varepsilon \lambda a \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \omega$ ，and from which he derives the above participle．］

Кє́ $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ，I run in，land：fut．кย́ $\lambda \sigma \omega$ ；aor．1．モैкє $\lambda \sigma a$ ．
Kє́ $\lambda o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ I ~ c o m m a n d, ~ e x a c t l y ~ s y n o n y m o u s ~ w i t h ~ к \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v ́ \omega ~: ~ f u t . ~ к \varepsilon \lambda \eta ́-~$
 $\mu \eta \nu$ ，$\varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon ́ \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \tau о$ ，кєк入ó $\mu \varepsilon \nu \frac{s}{}$ ，is most naturally considered as the aor．2．of this verb with syncope and reduplication（according to the analogy mentioned under Ká $\mu \nu \omega$ ），and with the augm．like $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \phi \rho a \delta o v$ ：it has also exactly the saıne meaning at 11．$\pi$ ，657．кє́клєто $\delta^{\circ}$ ä $\lambda \lambda о v \varsigma ~ ф \varepsilon v \gamma \varepsilon ́-~-~$ $\mu \varepsilon v a l$ ，he bade them fly．In most other passages however it means merely $I$ call to，although there is generally the collateral idea of $I$ exhort and command implied in it．＊
＂Eк入єo see under K $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$ ．
Kє $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \in$, I prick，is regular．But Homer（Il．$\psi, 337$.$) has the aor． 1$. infin．кévoac from the stem KENT－which shows itself in коvтós，a pole． The verbals кєбтós，pricked，and $\kappa \varepsilon ́ \nu \tau \omega \rho$ ，$\kappa \varepsilon ์ \nu \tau \rho \circ \nu$ ，are explained by the omission of $\nu$ before $\sigma$ in the one case，and of $\sigma$ between $\nu$ and $\tau$ in the others．$\dagger$

 The other forms are affected by syncope or rather by the metathesis（which we may see exemplified in $\beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \lambda \eta x \alpha$ under B $\alpha, \lambda \lambda \omega)$ ，joined with a contraction into $\bar{\alpha}$ ：thus perf．
 1．midd．ह̇xp $\bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ；but there is also an aor．1．pass．


In the perfect pass．is found also кєкє́раб $\mu a \iota$ ，but only in a later period， to which belongs also Anacr．29，13．On the other hand，Homer uses
＊It is generally acknowledged that кé $\lambda \omega$ ，of which калєiv is properly the inf，aor．and ràâ the fut．（compare $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \alpha \nu \hat{\omega})$ ，is the one original verbal stem，which afterwards branched off ac－ cording to difference of meaning into three

$\dagger$ If we examine this more closely we shall certainly find that the adopting a stem KENT－to unite the above－men－ tioned forms is the most suitable plan；
better for instance than REN $\Omega$ ，which does not explain $\kappa \in \sigma \tau \delta{ }^{\prime}$ satisfactorily，and than KE $\Omega$ through which we cannot im－ mediately get to $\kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \alpha \rho, \& c$ ．We must not however try to unite the ideas to prick， whence $\kappa \epsilon \tau \tau \epsilon \overline{i v},-$ to cleave，whence $\kappa \in d \delta \omega$ ， －and to beat，whence in all languages comes the idea of to kill，ктelvo，kaivo； nay we must rather endeavour to keep them separate．
$\ddagger$ Kєpadvyur and its sister－form кє－
the shortened form in the infin. aor. 1. act. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \kappa \kappa \bar{\eta} \sigma a l$, Od. $\eta, 164$. For the Ionians have the $\eta$ in кє́кр $\quad \mu \alpha \iota$, кр $\eta \theta \varepsilon i c, \&$ \& (КЕРА, КРЕА, КРН), but in the Attic and common language the $\eta$ is changed on account of the $\rho$ into $\bar{a}$ in this and other similar cases.

The simple form $\kappa \varepsilon \rho a ́ \omega$ is used by the poets: Homer has $\kappa \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau a \varrho$, $\kappa \varepsilon \rho \dot{a} a \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, кєро́шขто. Comicus ap. Athen. 2. p.48. a. кย́ра. Otherwise $\kappa \varepsilon \rho \bar{\omega}$ is the Att. future: see Hesych.
[In the fut. and aor. Homer doubles the $\sigma$ of the regular form,


The Homeric conj. кर́ $\rho \omega \nu \tau a l$, Il. $\delta, 260$. is not to be traced back to a theme KEPQ, but more analogically to кépauat, like $\delta \dot{v} \nu \omega \mu a \iota$ conj. of


Lastly at I. ı, 203. the text had until very lately the imperat. $\kappa \varepsilon ́ \rho a \iota \rho \varepsilon$, but now has from better sources кє́ $\rho a \iota \varepsilon$ : see under $\Delta a i ́ \omega$.

Kepoaiva, I gain, is regular in the Attic language, and in the aor. takes the $\alpha$ like жоь $\tilde{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota, \lambda$ диж $\tilde{\alpha} \nu \alpha$, and others: thus fut. $x \varepsilon \rho \delta \ddot{\alpha} \nu \tilde{\omega}$; aor. 1. infin. $\varkappa \varepsilon \rho \delta \tilde{\alpha} \nu \alpha$. But the Ionics and many of the later writers form $x \varepsilon \rho о \hat{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, ह̇х'́ $\rho o \gamma \sigma \alpha$.

This Ionic formation is undoubtedly the older, and -aive was originally nothing more than one mode of lengthening the present, as in $\dot{a} \lambda \iota \tau \alpha i \nu \omega$ and similar verbs, so that the simple KEP $\Delta \Omega$, $-\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ is the original stem, and tò képoos the verbal subst., as the analogy which it brings with it confirms. But in a very early period some imagined that кєрд̀aive sounded like a derivation from кє́poog, like $\lambda \varepsilon v \kappa \alpha i \nu \omega$ from $\lambda_{\text {evoús, }}$ \&e., and they accordingly inflected all the tenses in the termi-

 has in the Ion. dialect the aor. $\hat{\varepsilon} \kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \delta \dot{\rho} \nu a$, Hom. Epig. 14, 6.

In the Attic form the perf. has the unpleasant sound of кєкє́piayка; hence others formed кєкย́¢ঠaкa (see Chœrob. Bekk. p. 1285. and compare Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 34.), while others again deduced from the Ionic formation кeкє́ $\rho \delta \eta \kappa \alpha$, and Bekker has now restored from the manuscripts $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \rho \delta \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha \sigma \iota$ to Demosth. adv. Dionysod. (p. 1292. Reisk.).

Kєvi $\theta \omega$, I envelope, hide: fut. кєv́б ; perf. (synonymous with pres.)

pavvíw are formed like other verbs in $\mu_{\text {l }}$ (see ${ }^{*} A \gamma \omega, \not \approx \gamma \nu v \mu$ ) by changing the $\omega$ of the barytone form into $-\nu \nu \mu t$ or - $\nu v v^{\prime} \omega$, only that when $\omega$ is preceded by a vowel, the $\nu$ is doubled, thus кєра́ш, кєрауvíu.

[^161] with the Ep．redupl．кєкvi日，Od．$\zeta, 303$ ．Homer has also the aor． 1. conj．in the compound $\dot{\varepsilon \pi \pi \kappa \kappa \varepsilon} \dot{v} \check{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ ，Od．o，263．Of the passive we find only the pres．and imperf．Sophocles repeatedly［and Æschylus once］ use the active $\kappa \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \theta \omega$ ，and $\kappa \varepsilon \in \kappa \varepsilon \theta a$ ，as intrans．，I am hidden．＊

Krí̀oцaь，I feel care and anxiety，occurs in prose merely in pres．and imperf．

The Epic language had at first an active in a causative sense，$\kappa i \delta \delta \omega$ ，
 Tyrt．3，28．synonymous with the pres．к $\quad \dot{\eta} \circ \mu a<$.

The middle with a short vowel in the inflected syllable is found in Æschyl．Sept．138．in the imperat．к $\bar{\eta} \delta \sigma \sigma a t$ ：and the derivative verb $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ has the same inflexion in II．$\xi, 427$ ．$\dot{\alpha} \kappa \dot{\eta} \delta \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ as now corrected from ảк $\bar{\delta} \delta \eta \sigma^{\prime}$ ：see Heyne．
 looking only at its exterior，have classed with кéкадov，кєкад̀̀ $\bar{\sigma} \omega$（see Xáदoцаı）；but the sense when critically examined is opposed to that derivation $\dagger$ ，and in favour of the old one from кท́oo perf．кénnōa is synonymous with the last－mentioned present，it is quite as agreeable to analogy to have a future formed from the one as from the other；and equally analogous is the shortening of the radical vowel required by the riythm ；and which takes place in the $a$ ，because， as we see from the Doric к⿱㇒木口⿱亠乂oцat（Pind．），$a$ is properly the vowel of the root：in this case therefore it is the Ionic $\breve{a}$ ，as $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta$ for $\pi \eta^{\prime} \rho a$ ，


KIK－．See Kıđáv๗．
Kıкл $\dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ．See K $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$ ．
K เข $ย \omega$ ，I move，is regular．

[^162]gods ；or we must take it without the in－ terrogation（see Heyne），and understand oủkétı $\chi$ áfécoal tivos in the sense of not deserting，and this said by those who， after having long deserted their friends， at last assist them．
$\ddagger$ I adopt this mode that I may not take kécaóoy twice，once from $\chi a ́ s \omega_{\text {a }}$ and once from к $\eta \delta \omega$ ，but that I may ground my ar－ gument on two actually existing forms，



In the passive it has an Epic sister－form kivǔual，with e long like the active．This form must not be classed with ki（which will be found below），for that verb never gives the idea of continuous motion as кıvن́ $\mu \varepsilon v o v$ most plainly does at II．$\xi$, 173．，where it is used of oil moved about or shaken ：and in other places where кivvpat is used of a crowd of combatants pressing on to battle，it does not express their moving forward，but only the tumult and bustle of their motion； compare II．$\delta, 281.332 .427$ ．with Od．$\kappa, 556$ ．I consider it therefore more correct to give it a root for itself，KIN－，quatio．＊

 $\kappa i \chi \omega, \& c$ ．These are the only tenses found in the Attic poets；but the Epic language has（beside a new aor．midd．ह́кı $\chi \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu,-\sigma \alpha \tau o$ ）a very common preterite，which according to form is an imperf．of KIXE ， KIXHMI，without however this pres．ind．having been ever actually in

 －$\chi$ ह́r $\nu \nu$ ；to which we must add the moods of the present，as the opt，
 $\kappa \ell \chi \eta \quad \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$ ；in which formation in $\mu \iota$ therefore the $\eta$ is retained quite as far as it is in áचzva and $\delta i \zeta \eta \mu a \iota$ ．We find then（including the imperf． éкíavov）four historic forms，which，from the momentary meaning that the verb has in itself，can with difficulty in the Epic language be divided according to the sense into aorist and imperfect，and which therefore in the narrative are interchanged with each other principally for no other reason than the metre．With this corresponds the cir－ cumstance，that the Epics have not the other moods of either кıұávo or $\varepsilon$ हैcixov，but only those above quoted；consequently beyond the indicative they have no distinction between present and aorist．The earliest occurrence of the conj．кi$\chi \omega$ ，кiх⿻弓⿰丿㇄ s，\＆c．，is in the Tragedians （Soph．Aj．657．Eurip．Suppl．1069．）．

In all the above forms the Epics have the $\iota$ short：and $\varepsilon \kappa \iota \chi \circ \nu$ has this quantity in all the poets．$\dagger$ But in к九хáve both the principal syl－ lables are different in the Epic and Attic poets，the former having the $i$ short and the $a$ long，the latter the $\iota$ long and the $a$ short．Now as Hesychius and other Glossographers have the glosses $\kappa \iota \gamma \chi^{\boldsymbol{a} v \varepsilon \iota \nu, ~}$
> ＊Grammatical analogy also is in favour of it．For while кvvé $\omega$ ，from Kर－ёкขба， retains the $v$ short，кıvéw has the $\iota$ long： in the same way кivvual is remote from the analogy of $\zeta \dot{\omega} \nu \nu v \mu$ ，ऽ＇́vvvul，because it is written almost invarably with a single $\nu$ ，and therefore（with $\gamma^{\alpha} \nu \nu \mu a \iota, \lambda \alpha \oint \nu \mu a$,
\＆c．）comes under the analogy of those verbs which affix merely $v \mu$ ou to the stem or root．

+ It was impossible therefore that Si－ monides could say Eкi孔$\chi \in$ ，a reading which Brunck（in Gnomicis）in Sim．Fr．7．pre－

fei $\gamma \chi a \nu \varepsilon$ ，some moderns have explained that to be the true Attic way of writing this verb，and even introduced it already into the latest editions of the Tragedians．＊
 short），has been the cause of the general supposition that the stem of the verb is in ěčxov．Everything appears to me to lead to a form $\kappa i \chi \eta \mu \iota$（ $\kappa \iota$ being a reduplication），with $\kappa \iota \chi$ d́ $\nu \omega$ as a sister－form，which
 by a shortening of the syllable，just as $\xi_{i} v i o v$ did from $\xi_{v \nu i} \eta \nu$ ；and me－ trical causes confused the one with the other．According to this sup－ position the true stem or root is XE －or XA－（compare the note on $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota, \pi \lambda \varepsilon i \mu \eta \nu)$ ，from which came $\kappa \iota \chi \bar{\alpha} \nu \omega$ ，like $\phi \theta \bar{a} \nu \omega$ from $\Phi \theta A-$ ．

There is a Doric aor．1． $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \kappa \xi \xi a \text { ，moved away，pushed away，which }\end{gathered}$ Schneider in his Lexicon deduces from ki$\chi \omega$ ．There is certainly nothing to hinder this new aorist being formed from érıoov；but the grounds which I have laid down in Schol．Od．$\lambda, 579$ ．make me think it more eligible to give it a stem or root of its own KIK $\Omega$ ：and this last supposition is confirmed by a fragment of Simonides，although as it now stands unintelligible，ė̇п兀кíкo兀 $\delta \rho о \mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \iota$ ，Chœerobosc．ap．Bekk． p．1185．and Herodian in Bandini Bibl．Laur．Med．（Græea）p． 146. See Blomf．ad Callim．pag．ult．$\dagger$

$K i \omega, I g o$ ；used only in pres．and imperf．；indeed the indic．pres． seldom or never $\ddagger$ occurs（kíce，Æeschyl．Ch．676）；the other moods of the present however，as the optat．кiou $\mu$ ，part．кt $\omega^{\prime} \nu, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．，together with the imperf．，are in frequent use in Homer and the other poets．The part．pres．אt $\omega \nu$ has the accent on the last syllable，like $i \omega \nu$ ，but is not therefore an aorist；and the verb itself is to be considered as a sister－form of＇ $1 \Omega, \varepsilon \bar{\tau} \mu, I$ go．

To be satisfied that $\varepsilon$ ekov is an imperf．we have only to look at Il．

[^163]duction of it．The above supposition that $\kappa t$－is a syllable of reduplication，agrees both with the fluctuation of the quantity （as the Epics had both rípav́rnw and mi－ $\phi \propto v ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ ）and with the form $\kappa เ \gamma \chi \alpha \nu \omega$ ， which has its analogy in $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$ ．That $\pi\{\mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu<$ and кi久ávc were preferred to $\pi i \pi \lambda \eta \mu \varepsilon$ and кı $\boldsymbol{\pi} \chi d y \omega$（the two latter being also in use），corresponds with other euphonic observances．

+ ［Passow mentions（from кikw）a rare poet．aor．Є̌кікоу，infin．кике̂̀v，and a Dor． aor．1．گル
$\ddagger$［Passow says that the indic．pres．is not used at all．］
$\beta, 588$ ．$\zeta, 399$. ；and that $\kappa$ có $\nu$ is not an aor．we may be convinced by such passages as ä $\chi \chi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \chi \sigma \sigma \delta \delta \varepsilon \kappa \iota \omega \nu$, Il．$\gamma, 447$ ．，see also $\pi, 263 . \omega, 328$ ．： while in such as кл兀бi $\eta \nu \delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \kappa \iota \omega \nu \nu . . .9 \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \sigma, \kappa, 148$ ．，we must remember the usage of the participles i $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu$ ，$\phi \hat{\varepsilon} \rho \omega \nu$ ，stated in the construction of participles in the syntax ；according to which therefore that sentence is to be construed in the same way as $\varepsilon \quad \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \varepsilon \phi^{\prime} \hat{\rho} \rho \omega \nu$ ，Od．$a, 127$.
 $\Delta \iota \dot{\iota} \omega$ ．The verb кivvцає see above under Kıvє́ $\omega$ ．

 whence the fut．$\varkappa \varepsilon \kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \xi \omega$ and $\varkappa \varepsilon \kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\gamma} \xi \rho \mu \alpha$ ．

See кєк入aүүvĩaи，Xenoph．Ven．3，9．6，23．Conj．кєк入á $\gamma \gamma \omega$ and fut．кєк入ár $\xi^{\prime} \rho \mu a \ell$ ，A ristoph．Vesp．929．930．Both futures are quoted by Suidas．There are other presents formed from some tense of $\kappa \lambda$ á $\zeta \omega$ ； for instance $\kappa \lambda a \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \omega$ whence $\kappa \lambda a \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \bar{v} \nu \tau$, ，Theocr．Epigr．6．，and $\kappa \lambda a \gamma-$ rávo，which however is doubtful $\dagger$ ；see Schneid．ad Xen．Ven．4， 5.

In the Epic language this verb is also inflected with one $\gamma$ ．In the oldest poets however this is found only in the perf．кє́к $\kappa \eta \gamma a$ ，used as a present，of which the part．masc．$\kappa \varepsilon \kappa \lambda \eta \gamma$＇es changes in its oblique cases to $\kappa \varepsilon \kappa \lambda i$ íhovios，as though formed from a new present $\kappa \varepsilon \kappa \lambda i$ í $\gamma \omega$（Hom．）， like éppói Eria yov is found in Hymn．Pan．14．and Eurip．Iph．A．1062．in the anfura chorus．But the aor．1．$\varepsilon \kappa \wedge a \xi a \ddagger$ belongs merely to the Doric inflexion thes ase of $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$ ．［The regular aor． $1 . \epsilon_{k}^{\prime} k \lambda a \gamma \xi a$ is used in a transit．sense in $\sigma^{3}$ g the Pind．Pyth．4，40．Compare Æschyl．Sept．388．Agam．48．The～u九ricon presents $\kappa \lambda a ́ \gamma \omega$ or $\kappa \lambda a ́ \gamma \gamma \omega$ never occur．－Passow．］


K $\lambda \alpha i \omega$ ，I weep，Att．кл $\alpha, \omega$ with $\alpha$ long and without con－ traction：fut．$\kappa \lambda \alpha \tilde{v}^{\prime} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota \S(\kappa \lambda \alpha v \sigma \sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha \iota$ ，Aristoph．Pac． 1081．）；aor．1．${ }_{\xi}{ }^{y} \lambda \lambda \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha$ ．The fut．$x \lambda^{\prime} \alpha \eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega, x \lambda \alpha \gamma^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ is less frequent．Verbal adj．$\kappa \lambda \alpha u \sigma \tau o ́ s ~ a n d ~ \varkappa \lambda \alpha u \tau o ́ s, ~ « \lambda \alpha u-~$ $\sigma \tau$ óos．－Midd．［Passow remarks that the middle voice is used by Æschylus Sept．903．，but otherwise seldom found in the older writers．］

The fut．active is used by the Dorics，as Theocr．23，24．An aor．

[^164][^165]
## 150

${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \wedge \lambda a \varepsilon \nu$ standing in the text of Theocr. 14, 32., but occurring nowhere else, has been altered by Hermann to 'єккдa'; and no doubt correctly, for that imperf. exactly suits the passage, as it does also 23,17 . in both which the description is that of a continuous weeping.

K $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, I break: fut. $\kappa \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ (with $\alpha$ short); aor. 1. $\varepsilon \kappa \lambda \alpha-$ $\sigma \alpha$; aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon \in \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; perf. pass. $\varkappa^{\prime} \varkappa \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$. Thus the $\alpha$ is short in the inflexion; and the passive takes $\sigma$.

In Anacr. Fr. 16. we find a syncopated aor. 2. part. à $\pi o \kappa \lambda a ́ s ~ a s ~ f r o m ~$


K $\lambda \varepsilon i \omega$, I shut, is regular : thus fut. $\approx \lambda \varepsilon$ eíco, \&c. But the perf. pass. is both $\varkappa^{\prime} \kappa \lambda \varepsilon เ \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\chi^{\prime} \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon!\mu \alpha!$; while the aor. 1. pass. is $\hat{e} x \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ only.

The Ionians pronounced this verb $\kappa \lambda \eta_{i}^{i} \omega$, and formed it $\varepsilon \kappa \lambda \neq \ddot{\eta} \sigma \alpha$, $\kappa \lambda \ddot{\eta} \imath \sigma \alpha \iota$, кєк $\lambda \dot{\eta} \ddot{\mu} \mu \iota$ without the $\sigma$, but always $\varepsilon \in \wedge \eta \dot{\imath} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$. These forms had therefore, like the corresponding ones from $\boldsymbol{\tau} i \omega, \mu \eta v i \omega, \& c$., the $\iota$ according to the rules of formation long; consequently those editions
 forms, from being written thus, are erroneously given to $\kappa \lambda \eta \iota \zeta \omega$, which verb has, it is true, in the lexicons, the meaning of to shut, but improperly so: for the old writers know $\kappa \lambda \eta_{i \prime \zeta}^{\prime} \omega$ éк $\lambda$ j́ĭ́a in no other sense than that of celebro, and $\kappa \lambda \eta^{t} \omega \varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \kappa \lambda \eta \eta_{i} \sigma a$ in that of claudo. Hence arose again an Attic form $\kappa \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \omega$, '̛́ $\kappa \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \alpha$, which occurs frequently in the text, and still more frequently as a various reading in the manuscripts. Valckenaer's (ad Phœniss. 268.) opinion, that $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega$ must be older than $\kappa \lambda \eta$, because in the earlier times the $\eta$ was not yet come into use at Athens, is nothing to the point; for the question here is, not how it was written, but how it was spoken: now as $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon i \omega$ was the general form in use at a later period, $\kappa \lambda \eta_{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \omega$ certainly appears to me, wherever it is found, to have great authority as a critical form of the oldest grammarians, who knew that the earlier Attics spoke it so. This decision is however very difficult to be supported through all writers. And equally difficult is it in the case of кє́к $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \kappa \varepsilon ́ \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \iota \mu \alpha \iota, \kappa \varepsilon ́ \kappa \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \iota$. See Thom. Mag. in voc. Theodosii Canones, p. 1020, 25. Chœrob. in Ind. Bekk. v. кє́клєєца兀: and among the moderns Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 729. Matth. ad Hecub. 482. Androm. 495. Schneid. v. клєíw.*

[^166][^167] to this verb quite as much as it does to ка入є́ when put for кєк入jатає
 $\kappa а \lambda \varepsilon ́(\omega), 2,164$.
 Dor．for $\kappa \lambda \eta^{\ell} \zeta \omega$ ：compare $\Gamma \varepsilon \lambda a ́ \omega$ and $\Theta \lambda a ́ c \omega$ ．

There is one instance of a fut．2．$\kappa \lambda \iota \omega$ as used by the Comic poet Eu－ polis according to a remarkable observation of Chœroboscus（F．279．v．） in Bekker＇s Excerpta．＂Herodian，＂it is there said，＂tells us that there is no fut．2．act．in use．Apollonius quotes some，but they are either invented by him，like $\phi v \gamma \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ，$\delta \rho a \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ，or they are presents．＂And then is added，＂solitary exceptions there are in $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \chi^{\varepsilon} \tilde{\omega}$ and in катак $\lambda \iota \varepsilon \tilde{\imath}$


K $\lambda$ ย́ $\pi \tau \omega$, steal：fut．$\varkappa \lambda \varepsilon ́ \downarrow о \mu \alpha ь$ ；perf．$\varkappa \varepsilon ́ \kappa \lambda о ф \alpha^{*}$ ；perf．
 aor．2．pass．Е̇ $\varkappa \lambda \alpha ́ \pi \eta \nu$.

К $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega \dagger$ ，$\kappa \lambda \varepsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$, I celebrate；pass．$\kappa \lambda$ ह́o $\mu a t$, I am celebrated．In II．$\omega$ ，
 In Callim．Del．40． $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \text { ® } \\ \text { eo } \\ \Delta \tilde{\eta} \lambda o s \text { must at all events be accented like the }\end{gathered}$ above，$\varepsilon \in \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon_{0}$ ，in as much as either celebrabaris is poet．for vocabaris，or the poet thought himself at liberty to use the syncope thus，éка入є́єо，


 forms in Homer，but éx much less frequent is the aor．2．pass．and perhaps used only in the compounds as $x \alpha \tau \alpha x \lambda$ i้ที้ $\alpha \iota$ ，Plato and Aristoph．
 part．$x \varepsilon \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \check{\mu}{ }^{\prime}$ vos．－Midd．

[^168]placed here merely on account of $\kappa \lambda$ éo $\mu \alpha$, some have wished to bring back to the text of Eurip．Alc．449．（461．）and 1 ph ． A．1047．（1035．）．See Matthis on the former passage．
$\ddagger$ On the formation of the perf．and aor．1．pass．，see Teivw．
§ Examples however of $\kappa \lambda \iota \nu \theta \hat{\eta} y a a_{\text {may }}$ be found in Plutarch（see Stephan．The－ saur．）；and in Esop．Fab．143．Heusing．， but in this latter the reading is uncer－ tain．
 aorist，and also in the present sense of to be in the habit of hearing；see above in＂Evveтov．Imperat．$\kappa \lambda \dot{v} \varepsilon, \kappa \lambda \hat{v} \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ ，more commonly $\kappa \lambda \tilde{v} \theta \iota, \kappa \lambda \tilde{v} \tau \varepsilon$ ， like $\beta \tilde{\eta} \theta \iota, \gamma \nu \tilde{\omega} \theta \iota, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．，and with Homeric reduplication кย́к入ü $\theta \iota$, кє́к入й $\tau \varepsilon$ ； see Káava．To this syncopated aorist belongs the adjectival part． pass．$\kappa \lambda \dot{v} \mu \varepsilon v o$ os synonymous with the verbal adj．$\kappa \lambda v \tau o ́ s$, celebrated．

With regard to the aoristic usage of $\epsilon_{\varepsilon \kappa \lambda v o \nu}^{\prime 2}$ is to be observed that the pres．indic．$\kappa \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ never occurs in Homer：Hesiod has it once，$\varepsilon$ ， 724．，the Tragedians frequently．

## КМА－．See Ка́ $\mu \nu \omega$ ．

Kขд́ $\omega$, I scrape，scratch，infin．хข $\tilde{\nu}$ ，but in the more ac－ curate Att．writers жу $\tilde{\gamma}^{\nu}$, like $\sigma \mu \tilde{\eta}_{\nu}$ and $\psi_{\tilde{r}_{\nu} \nu}{ }^{*}$ ，Pollux， 7,196 ．；
 $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\eta} \mu$ ，is found only a 3．sing．$火 \nu \tilde{\eta}$ ，and that but once， $11 . \lambda, 639$ ． compare Herodot．7，139．－Midd．жу $\tilde{\kappa} \sigma \theta \alpha ь$ ，Att．$\varkappa \nu \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Plat．Gorg．p．494．c．Xen．Mem．1，2，30．（Schneid．3．）
$\mathrm{K} \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \omega$, I sleep：fut．$\kappa \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．See А Ар $\boldsymbol{\prime}$ о́тт ：but examples of this verb are so rare that we cannot settle its inflexion with any grammatical certainty．In Apollon．3，690．the aor．1．катаку＇баба is found in many of the manuscripts，but the old reading катакию $\sigma \sigma \sigma v \sigma \alpha$ is likewise in the best manuscripts（see Brunck），so that nothing can be decided in favour of either．

Kоьца́ш，Ion．жонцє́ $\omega$ ，Herodot．2．95．I cause to sleep，





Koда́ढゃ，Ipunish：fut．жода́бш（Xen．Athen．1，9．），and more frequently жола́бораь（Xen．Anab．2，5，13．）；the apparently Attic forms of the fut．жол $\tilde{\omega}$ ，midd．кол $\tilde{\omega} \mu \propto \iota \dagger$ ， are used by Aristophanes（Equ．459．），merely as a play on the word ；the participle of the fut．midd．ro $\lambda \omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \circ \mathrm{s}$（not жолои́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu 0 s$ ）is the true reading of Aristoph．Vesp．244．，as

[^169]logy can be laid down：for while in $\beta \iota-$ 6dsw the Attic fut．is very common，in aropdS $\omega$ and others it is a barbarism：see Lex．Seguer．p．331，and Maitt．pp． 47 48.
we gather from Hesych．in voc．and from the explanation of the Scholiast．［This form is the more usual one in prose， instead of the poetical roдov́w．In the present the Attics sometimes use the middle instead of the active；see Schneid．and Heind．Xen．Cyrop．1，2，7．Plat．Menex． p．240．d．Stallb．Protag．p．324．c．But in the fut．they never use the active $\kappa \boldsymbol{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ ，Xen．Anab．2，5，13．Hellen． 1，7，20．Porson post Hemsterh．Plut．p．575．—Passow．］

Koдov́ш，I mutilate：fut．жодоо́ $\omega$ ，\＆c．The pass．is formed both with and without $\sigma$ ；thus perf．pass．थєкó－



Schneider in Theophr．Caus．Plant．2，20．（15．）invariably reads ко－入ova日eiซa，ко入ovaӨच̈ on very slight authority：but the form without the $\sigma$ does occur in other writers（see Stephan．Thesaur．），and кєкодоv $\mu \dot{v} \nu$ оs in Philippi Epigr．25．is undisputed．



Kovíc，I cover with dust：fut．кovi＇$\sigma \omega$ ．This is the old and genuine form of the verb；whence the perf．pass．$x \varepsilon_{-}$ ко́viцдя！and bence in the poets the only way of writing
 and жоуй＇$\sigma$ ，perf．pass．хєхо́vıб $\mu \alpha \iota$ ，did not come into use until later．＊

Ко́ттє，I hew，cut down：fut．火ó $\omega \omega$ ；perf．xє́xоф ； aor．2．pass．вंхо́тทข．－Midd．

Homer has the perf．2．in the sense of the present，кєкот＇$\varsigma$ ，II．$\nu, 60$ ． Od．$\sigma, 334$ ．

[^170]Timon．45．），that кєкоขц＇́vos and кєко－ $\nu \iota \sigma \mu$ évos are both equally good，cannot，as applied there，be satisfactory：compare $\mu \eta \nu i \omega$. Whether，as some critics contend （see Valck．ad Theocr．1．c．），we ought in Thom．Mag．instead of Kal кєкорเauévos
 $\kappa$ ．K．，and whether there be sufficient grounds for the rejection of koviay in the sense of to cover with dust，require per－ haps a closer investigation．
 pass. takes $\sigma$; thus perf. $\varkappa \in \varkappa \dot{\rho} \rho \varepsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. ย̇хор́́ $\sigma \theta \eta \nu$. Midd.

The Att. fut. must have been кор $\tilde{\omega}$, for the Epic one is кор $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \omega$, II. $\vartheta$, $379, \boldsymbol{\nu}, 831$. The Ionic dialect takes the $\eta$ in the perf., as act. кєко́р $\kappa \kappa \alpha$, pass. кєко́р $\eta \mu \iota$; and the Epic language has also a perf. part. with act. form and pass. meaning, кєкoр $\begin{gathered}\text { ढ́s, Od. } \sigma, 372 \text {. See } \tau \varepsilon \tau \mu \eta \dot{\omega} \mathrm{c} \text {, in note }\end{gathered}$ under T $\mathrm{T}^{\prime} \mu \nu \omega$.

Kopívö, I arm (with a helmet): fut. кори́ $\xi \omega$; aor. 1. midd. ह́xopva-
 pass. кєко́рv $\theta \mu \alpha$, part. кєкорv $\theta \mu$ е́voç.

Kot $\varepsilon$ 由, and more frequently in midd. котє́одal, I feel enmity against:
 This verb retains $\varepsilon$ in the formation, except in the Ep. perf. part. кєко$\tau \eta \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, with the meaning of the pres. increased in force; thus кєкотŋо́ть
 Cer. 254. The word is entirely poetical.
 gov, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 337. But instead of this present the perf. $x \varepsilon$ ќр $\bar{\alpha} \gamma \alpha$ (with the force of a pres.) is generally used, whence by syncope 1. plur. $x^{\prime}<\rho \alpha \gamma \mu \leq \nu$ (pluperf.

 without syncope in Aristoph. Vesp. 415. is a very rare case ; for we find scarcely any instance of the imperative of a perf. unless where that perf. is used as a pres. like the one before us, and even then in most cases a syncopated form is preferred. Compare $\gamma^{\prime} \varepsilon \omega \omega \varepsilon$, and $\varkappa \varepsilon \chi^{\dot{\gamma} \nu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon}$ under X $\alpha \sigma \varkappa \omega$.
 кр $\eta \nu a l$, Od.; aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon$ éк $\rho \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta \nu$, Pind. The Epic infin. fut. midd. in a pass. sense is к $\rho a v \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, II. ヶ, 622. In Eurip. Hippol. 1255. kéкрavtat is 3. plur. perf.; nor do I find any instance of it as 3. sing. also. In the Epic language this verb is capable of being produced in all its


[^171]from креaiva : in which this striking peculiarity is to be observed; that it is not the resolution of a contracted syllable, but a production by repeating the vowel or syllable, as $\phi \hat{\omega} s$ is contracted from $\phi$ as

K $\rho \xi \mu \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \bar{u} \mu \mathrm{~s}$, I hang (any thing) ; pass. I am hanged; midd. I hang myself: in addition to which comes a particular form for the intransit., $x \rho^{\prime} \mu \mu \mu \alpha \iota, I$ am hanging. This last is conjugated like $\delta \dot{v} v \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ with conj. $\chi_{\rho} \dot{\xi} \mu \omega \mu \alpha \iota$, opt. $\varkappa \rho \xi \mu \alpha i \mu \gamma \nu^{*}, x^{\prime} \rho^{\prime} \mu \alpha \iota \tau$. In the inflexion $\alpha$ is short, as in the fut. $x \rho s \mu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ and aor. 1. ${ }^{\dot{\varepsilon}} x \rho \rho^{\prime} \mu \alpha \sigma \alpha$, and the pass. takes $\sigma$. The Att. fut. is $x \rho \xi \mu \tilde{\omega},-\tilde{\alpha} \mathcal{S},-\tilde{\alpha}$, \&c. The aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} x \rho \xi \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \gamma \nu$ is common to the passive (with a passive and middle sense) and to the intransitive; but the fut. x $\rho s \mu \alpha \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ belongs wholly to $x \rho s \mu \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \nu \mu$, , as the intransit. sense has its own future $\chi \rho \xi \mu \dot{\gamma} \sigma \sigma \mu \iota_{\iota}$, I shall hang, be in a state of suspension.

This distinction of forms and meanings is, generally speaking, observed by the Attic writers, although it must not be expected that they had analogy so constantly before their eyes, as never to deviate from it. Forms of the middle are found both in Homer and Hesiod. as $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \rho \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$, 2. sing. aor. 1. for $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \mu a \sigma o, 11 . ~ o, ~ 18.21 . ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ a o r . ~ 1 . ~ i n f i n . ~ к \rho \varepsilon \mu \alpha ́-~$ бarөat (with an accus.) to hang any thing on, Hes. $\varepsilon, 627$. The pres. $\kappa \rho \varepsilon \mu \alpha \alpha^{\omega}$ is used by the later writers. $\dagger$ In the pure Attic language the only future is $\kappa \rho \varepsilon \mu \tilde{\omega},-\tilde{q} \varsigma$, \&c., Epic крє $\kappa \dot{\sigma} \omega$.
In Aristoph. Vesp. 298. all the manuscripts have the eptat. кр $\varepsilon \mu o \iota \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ from кр'́ $\mu \alpha \mu \iota \iota$, except the Venetian, which has кр́є $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, naturally leading us to крє́ $\mu a \iota \theta \varepsilon$. The other reading however is not to be rejected too hastily: compare $\mu a \rho v o i \mu \eta \nu, \mu \varepsilon \mu \nu o i \mu \eta \nu$ with the accentuation of the optat. and conjunct. under $\Delta \dot{v} v a \mu a t$. There must however have been a uniformity in Aristophanes, and we find in Nub. 868. Acharn. 944., at least as the text now stands, крє́ $\mu a \iota$, крє́ $\mu \iota \tau о$.

An Attic sister-form of this verb in the pres. and imperf. is $\kappa \rho \bar{\eta} \mu \nu \eta \mu c$, крض́нгана兀 (the latter for крєє $\mu а \mu a \iota$ ), which deviates from analogy by the $\eta$ in the radical syllable. $\ddagger$ Hence this way of writing it may well appear doubtful, particularly as $\kappa \rho \varepsilon \mu \nu$ - and $\kappa \rho \mu \mu \nu$ - are found occasionally in the manuscripts. § On the whole however they are in favour of the $\eta$; and we find крпица́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$ (without any known various reading) in Æschyl. Sept. 231. катакр $\mu \nu$ ѓ́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu a \ell$, Aristoph. Nub. 377. кр $\eta \mu \nu \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu$, Pind.

[^172][^173]Pyth．4，43．the imperat．$\kappa \rho \eta \mu \nu \eta$ ，Etym．M．in voc．and in fragments of Euripides there quoted（see Piers．ad Moer．v．кipv ）．Eustathius also on II． $\mathcal{\vartheta}, 19$ ．（if any reliance is to be placed on it）expressly mentions the change of $\varepsilon$ to $\eta$ ．And lastly in the subst．кр $\eta \mu \nu$ óc（an overhanging precipice），which is of the same family，the $\eta$ is undoubted．

 1．pass．éxplonv（দ）．In Homer is also a poet．part．aor． pass．$x p เ \nu A \varepsilon l_{s}$ ，Il．ע，129．Od．9，48．This verb has a middle voice，but only in the Epic language（rрivaroas òsípous，to interpret，Il．$\varepsilon, 150$ ．）：it has however two compounds，depon．midd．

Hence in good writers the passive form $\dot{a} \pi о к \rho ө \neq \eta \quad \nu a c$ is nothing more than a real passive of ámoкрipu，I separate：but later writers used it for
 belongs to the later writers．



Кри́ттш，I conceal：fut．жри́廿ш．The characteristic is $\beta$ ． Pass．aor．1．̇̇xpúфAriv；aor．2．Ėxpúधทv（ŭ）－Midd．
 $\phi$ ，as ${ }^{\ell \prime}$ épupov，are found only in the later writers，Quintus，Nonnus，\＆ce． See also Lobeck ad Phryn．p．318．The Ep．imperf．кри́ттa⿱ко口（see


Kто́ораı，Ion．«тє́о $\alpha \downarrow$ ，Herodot．，I get possession of，


 ктлто，\＆c．There is also another form of the perf．opt． жєкт $\varphi^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \S$（like $\mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \varphi_{\varphi} \mu \eta \nu$ from $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \nu \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ ），of which we

[^174]logy of verbs beginning with two conso－ nants（not mutes before liquids），which take $\epsilon$ instead of the reduplication．This latter is properly Ionic，but used occasion． ally by the Attics，as Plat．Menop．97．e． et sæpe．See Heindorf．ad Plat．Protag． 75.
§ The $w$ in this form may be thus ac－
 Xen．Cyr．1，6， 3.

In a somewhat later period we find the passive $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ к $\kappa \eta \theta \hat{\varepsilon} \varphi \tau \tau$ ．［Indeed ктаó $\mu$ a as a passive is rare，and generally confined to the very late writers，Schæf．Schol．Par．Apollon．Rhod．1，695．Gnom．Græc． p．145．sqq．Still however the aor．1．pass．$\varepsilon$ ह́т $\quad \hat{\eta} \eta$ occurs in a passive sense in Thucyd．1，123．the fem．part．aor．кт $\eta \theta \varepsilon \pi \sigma a$ in Eurip．Hec． 453．，and the perf．part．кєктท $\mu$ évos in Thucyd．7，70．An active ктáw is never found．－Passow．］

 here that the aor．1．is more common in prose than the aor．2．，and that the only perf．in use by the older writers is Éxrova．The perf．pass．and aor．pass．were not used in the common language，but in their places the verb $\mathfrak{T} \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \varkappa \omega$


From the opinions of the Grammarians which have come down to us confused and corrupted（Thom．Mag．in á $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau о \nu a$, Mœr．in á $\pi \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\kappa_{\kappa 0 \nu \varepsilon \nu}$ ）we can extract nothing certain on the various forms of the perfect．The aor．2．occurs in Xenophon more frequently，where however we must not forget the possible exchange of this verb with
 always however accompanied with the various reading ย̇ктаүка，was likewise in the written language from the time of Menander：see Meineke ad Men．p．120．Schæf．ad Schol．Apollon．p．147．＊
counted for．As the perfects with the sense of a present borrow more or less from that tense，the termination of the opt． pres．oi $\mu \eta \nu$ was affixed to $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \eta \nu=$ ，which contained the stem of the verb，making $\kappa \epsilon \kappa т \eta o i \mu \eta \nu$ ．This was changed according to Ionic custom（like $\nu \eta{ }^{2}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ to $\nu \in \omega \dot{s}$ ）to $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon \varphi \mu \eta \nu$ ，and again contracted by the Attics to кєктч́ر $\mu \nu$ ．The form in－$\eta \mu \eta \nu$ appears to have been preferred by the older Attics，that of $-\varphi^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ to be peculiar to Euripides and Xenophon．
 was undoubtedly the more disagreeable to the ear，while the better－sounding ekкака was recommended by the analogy of $\tau \epsilon-$ така．I would therefore，contrary to the opinion of the above－mentioned philolo－ gists，acquit the language of Menander at
least of having used that form，and in a fragment of him preserved by Suidas de－ fend the old reading（which is also that of the Ed．Mediol．）ふ̀тєкт́ккаби．The di－ rection in Thom．Mag．＇Aлéктоуа кd́入－
 $\mu o v \pi \alpha^{2} \nu \tau \eta$ is nonsense arising from re－ peated mistakes．In that passage three perfects must have been mentioned，and nothing can be more suited to the point in question than，＇Aтéктova кd́d入iov \＃
 $\tau \eta$ ．That is to say，the strict Atticist pre－ ferred the old Attic perfect to all others， even to the well－formed one of the later Attics；but against the form which he saw and heard everywhere around him he cautioned his readers in the strongest lan－ guage．Mœris，whom we may with the
 $\chi$ онає or $\mu \varepsilon \mu о$ оضтає from $\mu \varepsilon і р о \mu a \iota . *$ Wherever this form occurs in the older Attics it is corrupted；as in Plat．A pol．p．38．c．the present reading taken from the best Codd．is $\dot{a} \pi \varepsilon \kappa \tau \dot{v} v a \tau \varepsilon$ ，and of Xen．Hier．3， 7．，the various reading $\dot{e} \pi \varepsilon \kappa \tau о \nu o ́ t a c ̧ ~ i s ~ i n ~ S t o b æ u s: ~ b u t ~ w e ~ m u s t ~ a l l o w ~$ that it is used by the later writers，for we find it in Plut．Timol．16．p．137． in Parthen．24．and in all three manuscripts of Aristot．Elench．33， 2.

The Epic language had the aor．1．pass．both with and without the $\nu$
 again used in the later prose，as $\kappa \tau a v \theta \tilde{\eta} r a c$ in Dio Cassius（see Lobeck ad Phryn．p．36．），and кта⿱ $\theta \varepsilon i \varsigma ̧$ ，Brunck Anal．ÆEnigm．34．＂Ектă $\theta \varepsilon \nu$ is Æol．3．plur．for $\varepsilon$ éктá ${ }^{2} \eta \sigma a \nu$, Il．$\lambda, 691$ ．Od．$\delta, 537$.

Homer has the syncopated aorist，corresponding with the aor．2．，


 （like i $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \in \omega$ for $i \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega}$ ；see＂I $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \tau$ ），whence $\kappa \tau \varepsilon \in \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，Od．$\chi, 216$ ．To this we must add a corresponding aor．midd．with passive meaning，
 кта́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ оs；all formed as from кт́́tш．Homer has also an Epic conj． pres．ктєiv $\omega \mu$ ，Od．$\tau, 490$.

The fut．in Homer is the common one $\kappa \tau \varepsilon \nu \omega \tilde{\omega}$ ，but always in a resolved
 instance：only the compound with кazá takes，as universally，the change
 sequently they are fut．midd．with a passive sense．To these we must add the simple form каí тє кта $\nu$ є́о $\tau \tau$ катє́кта，11．$\sigma, 309$ ．，where how－ ever as regards the sense a doubt still prevails．Both old and modern commentators agree indeed that it is a future，translating it＂and he who wishes to slay is himself slain＂（for the aor．катє́кта is here used in the sense of to be accustomed to slay）．But the context immediately preceding，$\xi_{v \nu o ̀ s ~ " A \rho \eta s, ~ r e q u i r e s ~ m u c h ~ r a t h e r ~ t h i s ~ s e n s e,, " t h e y ~ s l a y ~ a n d ~}^{\text {a }}$ are slain＂$\ddagger$ ；which leads us to conjecture that from ктaveiv arose $a$
greatest certainty restore from the manu－
 ктаүкєу＇E入入пуккิs，speaks more con－ cisely to the same point．And lastly， Sextus，who（Adv．Gramm．10．）says，$\kappa \tau \in\{-$
 tas，speaks not of the language of common life，but of that taught scientifically by the Grammarians．The only thing therefore which we learn from this passage also is，

－From ктclyw we suppose a form кто－ $\nu \epsilon ́ \omega$ ，like $\phi \epsilon ́ p \omega$ and $\phi о \rho \epsilon ́ \omega$（see $\Delta \epsilon ́ \mu \omega$ ），from which comes regularly éctóvŋкка．
$\dagger$ In all verbs which have in the perf． the augment instead of the reduplication， the indicative of this pass．aor．cannot be distinguished from the pluperf．Ep $\mu \eta \nu$ ，

$\ddagger$［Or still more literally，＂war is accus－ tomed to slay the slayer．＂－Ed．］
new present ктavé $\omega$ ，by which the continuation of the action appears


An Attic sister－form of this verb for the pres．and imperf．in prose is $\kappa \tau i \nu \nu v \mu \iota$ ；for so this form is generally written in the text；but the manuscripts fluctuate between $\iota$ and $\varepsilon \iota, \nu$ and $\nu \nu$ ．＊

Kti弓 $\omega$, I found，build：fut．iow，\＆c．The part．pass．ктi $\mu \varepsilon v o g$（like
 Kтeive），and the verb．adj．ктєtóg，which occur in the compounds é̈uri－


 lies the true primitive form or stem of the verb，and the subst．ктúros as well as $\kappa \tau v \pi \varepsilon \in \omega$ are derivatives from it．

Ku入ivi $\omega$ and жu入i $\omega$ ，Iroll（any thing）．＇The only forma－ tion which occurs from these two verbs is fut．$x u \lambda i i^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ；
 perf．pass．$\varkappa \in x u ́ \lambda เ \sigma \mu \alpha \iota .-M i d d . ~ T o ~ t h e s e ~ w e ~ m u s t ~ a d d ~ a ~$ lengthened present $x \cup \lambda เ \nu \delta \delta ́ \omega \dagger$ ，which，in its present tense only，is the prevailing form in Attic prose．

The two fuller forms of the present are used in preference to the other，when it is wished to express certain modifications of the sense implying a continuation of motion（see the lexicons）；yet no fixed distinction can be laid down，and all three occur in the simple sense of to roll，push．Homer has exclusively the form кvえivow（of which he uses only pres．and imperf．）with the aor．$\varepsilon^{\kappa} \kappa \nu \lambda i \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ．It is also probable that $\kappa v \lambda i \nu \delta \omega$ ，fut．$\kappa v \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ，was the original form of this verb，and that $\kappa v \lambda i \omega$ ，which is found in the later poets，arose merely from the fut．кv入io $\omega$ ．

With the midd．кv入ıขঠєiनӨat，to roll（neut．），correspond three other forms，

[^175]either drop one $\nu$ ，or shorten the et to $t$ ． The latter is the most current tradition ； but $\kappa \tau \in\{\nu \nu \mu \epsilon$ is found in the best manu－ scripts，as for instance almost invariably in the Cod．Clark，of Plato．Hence I con－ jecture that this is also the opinion of
 is now the reading there，is owing to the common corruption of $t$ for $\in l$ ．
$\dagger$ Of this force we find only the present， but it is probable that the formation in $-\eta \sigma \omega$ ，which we see just below in the verbs similarly formed，was borrowed from this．
all used in the intransitive sense of to roll, turn, or drive round; and these we find inflected according to the form in $\varepsilon \in \omega$; thus $\varepsilon i \lambda \iota \nu \delta \eta \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \nu$ or $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \nu \delta \eta \mu \varepsilon ์ \nu \omega$, Plut. Agis 3., and in a passage quoted by Stephens
 and of this alone we find an active voice with the meaning of to make (a horse) roll, lead him out to roll on the exercise-ground,

for these are the only forms which occur (see Piers. ad Mœr. p. 51.), and they are evidently from $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \nu \delta \omega, \dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \omega$. See all these forms detailed fully in Buttm. Lex. p. 396., \&c.

 gular; but in verse it has also the aor. infin. $\pi \rho о \sigma$ rúal, e. g. in Soph. Phil. 65\%. Aristoph. Equ. 156. See Kúw.

Ки́ттш, I bow, bend forward, is regular: fut. xú $ш \omega$; perf. $\varkappa \varepsilon ́ ห \bar{\jmath} ф \alpha$.

The length of the $v$ is not merely in the perfect (see for instance Epig. incert. 125.), but in the stem or root itself, as is plain from words of the same family, like кv́ $\phi o s$; it must therefore remain long in syllables long by position, and consequently be written $\kappa \tilde{v} \psi a \iota$, like $\pi \tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \bar{\gamma} a, \pi \rho \tilde{a} \xi a u$, and the like.

Kŭpé $\omega$, I meet with, an Ionic verb, used by the Attics for $\tau v \gamma \chi^{a}{ }^{\nu} \omega$ in poetry only $\ddagger$, is regular. But the poets made use also of the older barytone form with $v$ long, кípw, which however is not very frequent. Thus we find the imperf. ékípovy, and in Soph. CEd. C. 1159. éкīpov, whence 3. sing. к $\tilde{\nu} \rho \varepsilon$, II. $\psi, 821 . \S$ Fut. кŭ $\tilde{\eta} \sigma \omega$ and кúpow; aor.
 and (from кíp $\omega$ ) $\varepsilon$ ยкv $\sigma \sigma a$, infin. кí $\rho \sigma \alpha \iota$ or к $\tilde{\rho} \rho \sigma a \iota$, Hes. $\varepsilon$, 693., part. кípaas, Il. $\gamma, 23$. The formation from кíp is more usual in all the poets than that from кvрéc. The midd. ки́poдat is used as a deponent in II. $\omega, 530$.

[^176]which it would be so desirable to ascertain. § The pres. act. $\kappa \delta \rho \omega$ has been also restored to some passages by criticism on which we may depend: see Herm. ad Soph. Aj.307. Matth. ad Eurip. Hipp. 741. with which I may reckon the passage in Aj. (314. Br.), where Hermann has left $\kappa v p \in \hat{\imath}$, but the reading of the Scholiast, кupot, is more agreeable. Nor would I reject his historical information that the Attics used in the optat. кboot rather than кupoin (or кироî).

Kúw and $\varkappa v v^{\prime} \omega$, I am pregnant. The formation through all the moods and tenses is xu$\dot{\gamma} \sigma \omega$, \&c. To these we may add an inchoative form жиїбкш, and кийбконки, I conceive.

To fix the usage between ки́w and кvé $\omega$ is difficult, because the forms which occur most frequently vary only in the accent, as кข́є кขєĩ, ки́nvба киои̃ба, \&c. In Plato however (where in all other instances of this kind the accent fluctuates in the manuscripts, and in Theæt. p. 151. b, we find both кvovтa and кvoṽvтa,) all the manuscripts lave in the following passages, кvoṽ $\mu \varepsilon \nu$, Theæt. p. 210., кvoṽขтє, Symp. 206. e., éкúcı, 209, c.; which seems to me to settle the question as far as regards this writer.* In the authors of a later period the only decisive forms which I have found are in favour of кv́ † ; for instance, кv́ovтa, Aristot. H. A. 7, 5., т т кvó $\mu \varepsilon \nu a$ таıóía, id. Probl. (see Stephens) : тò $\delta \varepsilon$ к̀ кยєтає, is in the womb, Poll. 5. 12. p. 73., हैкขє, Æl. V. H. 5, 18.; while the accent in Aristotle and the later writers is pretty decisive in favour of this same form. Now as Homer has кvє́ovбаข, Il. $\psi, 266$. and éкúєє, $\tau, 117$. perhaps we may be safest in attributing кขะ亢兀 to the older, and кंvєє to the later writers. That is to say, the stem or root KY- with the meaning of to have in itself, is indisputably the old foundation of the verb, which in a very early period took the lengthened form of a present, кขє́ $\omega$, like $\sigma \tau v \gamma \varepsilon \epsilon$, $\kappa \tau v \pi \varepsilon ́ \omega$, \&c. To the simple stem belonged also, as in other verbs, an
 raĩav, Eschyl. Fr. Danaid. ap. Athen. 13. p. 600.: and with this is connected the Epic midd. кvба $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \nu \eta$, íтокvба $\mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta$, literally "suffering herself to be impregnated," conceiving, which form, on account of its apparent affinity with кv́ซal (see Kvy'́ $\omega$ ), is erroneously written with double $\sigma$. To express the same meaning was afterwards formed a present кvíซкорає (Aristot.); with which the active кvírкш as inchoative from кvé $\omega$ was synonymous. $\ddagger$

[^177]Lexicon [and Passow follows him] takes кvíжкш to be the causative of киtбкоцає, consequently in the sense of to impregnate; but all the passages in which the word occurs lead to the conclusion that the active voice is synonymous with the passive. See Poll. 4. extr. Schol. Theocr. 2,66. Stephan. Thesaur. Hippocr. De Steril.

## $\Lambda$.

$\Lambda \alpha \gamma \chi \propto \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ，I receive by lot or fate：fut．$\lambda \eta^{\prime} \xi$ ораь；aor．
 $\varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \eta \phi \alpha$ from $\left.\lambda \alpha \mu 6^{\circ} \alpha \nu \omega\right)$ ，or $\Lambda$ ś $\lambda \circ \gamma \chi \alpha^{*}$ ，which the Atticists rejected ：see Lucian Solœc． 7.

The fut．$\lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \xi \xi^{\prime} \mu a \iota$ appears to have been rare：I find it in Plat．Repub．
 with $a$ short according to the Ion．analogy of changing $\eta$ into short $a$ ．

In this verb the aor．with reduplication，$\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\chi} \omega \sigma \tau, \lambda \varepsilon \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \chi \eta \tau \varepsilon$ ，Hom．， is not the same as the common aor．2．but has the causative sense to make a person partaker of，as in II．$\eta, 80$ ．
\áלvцаı and 入á̧oцaı，I lay hold on，take，an Ionic（Hom．，Hippocr．） and poetic（Eurip．）defective deponent，used only in pres．and im－ perfect．

лАК－．See лá $\sigma \kappa \omega$ ．

 $\lambda \breve{\alpha} \epsilon^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \nu$ ；perf．$\varepsilon \backslash / \lambda \eta \phi \alpha$ with $\varepsilon \iota$ prefixed instead of reduplica－


The regular augment of the perf．occurs however sometimes in the dramatic writers ：in the perf．pass．for instance instead of $\varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \eta \mu \mu a$, ， we find $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \mu \mu \alpha$, ，Æschyl．Aganı．885．Eurip．Ion．1113．Aristoph． Eccl． 1090.

The Ionics have in the perf．act．$\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda$ á ${ }^{6} \eta \kappa \alpha$, Herodot．3，42．4， 79. 8,122 ．and（retaining the $\mu$ of the pres．）a fut．$\lambda$ á $\mu \psi о \mu a t$ ；perf．pass．
 Herodot．and a verbal adj．$\lambda a \mu \pi \tau$ éos．$\ddagger$ The Dories likewise have $\lambda_{\varepsilon \lambda a ́} \eta_{\eta} \alpha$ ，and in pass．$\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda^{\prime} \alpha \mu \mu a \iota$ ，$\lambda_{\varepsilon \lambda}$ ã $\phi \theta a \iota$ with a long for $\eta$ ．In the fut．they have also $\lambda a \psi o \tilde{\mu} \mu a \iota$ and $\lambda a \psi \varepsilon \tilde{\nu} \mu a$ ．The Epics and Ionics have the aor．2．$\lambda^{\prime} E_{\varepsilon \sigma \kappa o v, ~ H e s . ~ F r . ~ 61 . ~ a n d ~ H e r o d o t . ~}^{\text {．}}$

[^178][^179]$\Lambda \alpha \mu \pi \omega$ and $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi о \mu \alpha \iota, I$ shine: fut. $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \psi \omega$ and $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu$ $\psi о \mu \alpha \iota$, whence in comp. $\overline{\lambda \lambda \lambda \alpha} \mu \psi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Herodot. 1, 80. 8, 74, ; perf. $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha$, Eurip. Androm. 1025. Tro. 1295.
$\Lambda \alpha \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, less frequently $\lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \omega^{*}$ (Xenoph.), I lie hid, am concealed: fut. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; aor. 2. シ̈入̆̆ $\theta o \nu$, infin. $\lambda \alpha \theta \varepsilon \pi \nu$; perf. $\lambda \in \lambda_{\eta} \theta \alpha$, synonymous with the present. Midd. $\lambda \alpha \nu-$ $\theta$ व́vораь, less frequently $\lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta_{0} \mu \alpha$, , I forget ; fut. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 2. $\varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \theta_{o}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$; perf. $\lambda \in ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$.

Síroнає occurs in the sense of to be concealed, in Aristot. Analyt. Prior. 2, 21. Apollon. 3, 737. The passive $\lambda \eta \sigma$ ó $\mu \varepsilon \nu o s$ (obliviscendus) in Soph. El. 1248. is a lyric licence. The aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma a \dot{\mu} \mu \nu \nu$ is frequently used by the later poets; see Mosch. 3, 63. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 719. Theocritus has the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta v$ : he has also made a depon. pass. from the midd. in the infin. aor. $\lambda a \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ for $\lambda_{\eta \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} v a,}$ 2, 46. The Dorics have also $\lambda \bar{a} \sigma \tilde{\omega}$ for $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, and in the midd. $\lambda \bar{a} \sigma \varepsilon \tilde{v} \mu a \iota$ for $\lambda \hat{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu a \iota$.

For $\lambda \in ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \mu a \iota$ the Epics have $\lambda \hat{e} \lambda a \sigma \mu a \iota$ with short Ionic a. Pindar Ol. 10, 4. uses the perf. act. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \lambda \bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \bar{a} \theta a$ for the perf. pass. with the sense of I have forgotten.

The Epic $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda a \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is the same as $\lambda a \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ according to the ana$\operatorname{logy}$ of $\kappa \varepsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \mu \omega, \&$ c. (see Ká $\mu \nu \omega$ ), I1. $\mu$, 235. compared with $\tau, 136 . \dagger$ But the active form $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda a \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\tau} \nu$ is distinguished in usage from $\lambda a \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu$, in as much as it is the exact causative of $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda^{\prime} \theta_{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a c$, in the sense of to make to forget, Il. o, 60. $\beta, 600$. Hymn. Ven. 40. Theocritus, in order to express this meaning in the present tense, merely changed the accent, and retained the reduplication, using $\tau \grave{v} v \varepsilon \varepsilon \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \lambda a ́ \theta o \nu \tau a$ as a fixed epithet for Hades. $\ddagger$

This same sense of causing to forget is expressed by the aor. 1. (which does not occur elsewhere) in Od. $v, 85$. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu \nu \dot{a} \pi a ́ y \tau \omega \nu$ : and undoubtedly that meaning belonged also to the pres. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, of which we find in Od. $\delta, 221$. the neut. part. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \lambda \tilde{\eta} \theta o v$, if we follow

[^180]
#### Abstract

formed from perfects (such as $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \delta \mathbf{o i k} \omega$, 15,58 . \&c.), not only because there is no perf. $\lambda e ́ \lambda a ̆ \theta a$, but because $\lambda e ́ \lambda \eta \theta \alpha$ has not this meaning. We may be sure that Theocr. had merely the Homeric èm $\bar{\lambda} \epsilon-$ $\lambda a \theta o v$ (II. $\beta, 600$.) in his mind, and from it formed this part. pres., forsaking the proper analogy, as was frequently done by the later poets who imitated Homer.


## 164

some of the Grammarians in accenting it thus instead of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \lambda \eta \theta o v$ as an adjective．＊In another passage Homer has for this sense a par－ ticular present $\lambda \eta \theta a ́ v \omega$ ，żк $\lambda \eta \theta a ́ \nu \varepsilon \iota, O d . \eta, 221$ ．Of rare occurrence


 aor．2．midd．$\varepsilon \dot{\ell} \lambda \alpha \kappa o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ；perf．act．$\lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda \bar{\alpha} \kappa \alpha$ synonymous with the present．

That $\Lambda \mathrm{AK}$－is the stem of this verb is evident from the aor．2．：the $\sigma$ in the present is therefore inserted to strengthen it，as in＂$\sigma \times \omega$ from $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \ell \kappa \omega, \tau \iota \tau \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega$ from $\tau \varepsilon \dot{v} \chi \omega$ ．This however is only the Attic form；the
 which belong to the Attics，can according to analogy be formed only
 appears also from $\lambda a \kappa \eta \quad \eta \eta$ ，Aristoph．Pac．382．$\dagger$

The Epics have the Ionic $\eta$ in the perf．also，$\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\eta \kappa} \alpha$ ，but shorten it
 They have likewise the aor．2．midd．with redupl．，入є入áкоуто，Hymn． Merc． 145.

ムáw．See $\Lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ．
АЕГХ－．See $\Lambda a \gamma \chi^{a} v \omega$.
$\Lambda_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ ，in the sense of to say，has no perf．act．ł，and in the pass．the perf．$\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$ and aor． 1 ．$\dot{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \hat{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \chi \chi^{\theta \eta \nu . ~ B u t ~ i n ~}$ the compounds，which have the meaning of to collect，to choose，the perf．is $\left(\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime} \lambda 0 \chi^{\alpha}\right) \sigma v v \varepsilon_{i} \lambda_{0} \chi^{\alpha}$ ，$\varepsilon_{\xi} \xi_{i} i \lambda 0 \chi^{\alpha}$ ，\＆c．；and this augment remains also most commonly in the passive， $\varkappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon i \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha \iota \S$ ：with which is joined the aor．2．pass．«arধ－

[^181]Enin白 $\theta \omega 0$ ，together with the particular form $\lambda \eta \theta$ divo（see above），attached them－ selves to this particular meaning．
$\dagger$ We may well therefore be surprised at $\delta г \propto \lambda \bar{\alpha} \kappa 久 \hbar \sigma a \sigma \alpha$ in Nub．410．of the same writer：unless perhaps we suppose that in this longer word the syllable was lengthened by a licence approaching nearly to the Epic．－［Passow has ōta－ $\lambda \bar{\kappa} \kappa \epsilon \in \omega$ from лакє́ $\omega$ Dor．for $\lambda \eta \kappa \epsilon ́ \epsilon$ ，and quotes as his authority the above passage．］
$\ddagger$ The perf．act，was in less general use than the other tenses，and where really wanted its place was frequently supplied by the perf．pass．，as eठो $\lambda$ é $\lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau a l$ cot for

§ There is also the regular augment with
 $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu a l$; but in the aor. 1. $\delta \iota \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\theta} \chi_{\eta \nu}$, for which Aristotle
 see ${ }_{\alpha} \xi \approx \tau \varepsilon$ p. 7. and oैр $\sigma$ so p. 193.

In the old poetry the aorists of this family of verbs have another and
 $\mu \eta \nu$, I lay (myself) down to sleep; and in a similar sense to this aor. midd. is used also the syncopated aor. $\hat{\varepsilon} \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \mu \eta \eta,{ }^{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \sigma$, \& c ., with the imperat. $\lambda \tilde{\varepsilon} \xi \sigma$ or $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\xi} \xi \sigma$. The pres. and imperf. never occur with this


Beside the above, the syncop. aor. has also some of the meanings belonging to the ideas to reckon, to collect together, sometimes as a middle, in the sense of to choose oneself, offer oneself as a companion to others, $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \tau o \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ ह́ $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \mu \eta \nu$, Od. $\iota, 335$., sometimes quite as a depon. $\lambda$ е́кто ס̀ ápı $\theta \mu \dot{\rho}$, he counted the number, $\delta, 451$.
$\Lambda \varepsilon i \pi \pi, I$ leave, fut. $\lambda \varepsilon i ́ \psi \omega$, has in the active voice in general use the aor. 2. ${ }_{\xi}^{\prime 2} \lambda \check{\pi} 0 \nu$, infin. $\lambda \check{\pi} \pi \varepsilon i \nu$, and the perf. 2. $\lambda \in ́ \lambda o ı \pi \alpha$. Midd.

The aor. 2. midd. $\varepsilon^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \lambda \iota \pi \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu \text {, with a kind of passive meaning, I was }}$ left, I remained behind, is very common in the Epic poets, e. g. Od. $\delta$, 710. $\nu, 286$., and is found also in the later prose of Lucian ; see Schæf. ad Greg. p. 463.

In the pure times of the language the aor. 1 . ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \varepsilon \imath \psi a$ belonged solely to $\lambda \varepsilon i \epsilon_{\omega}$; it is occasionally however found as the aor, of $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \omega$ in the older writers, as in Aristoph. ap. Antiatt. Bekk. p. 106., Pythag. Aur. Carm. 70., but in the later writers it is more common; see Schæf. Gnom. Græc. p. 148. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 713. For the pluperf.éneırto see $\gamma^{\varepsilon} \dot{v} \mu \varepsilon \theta a$ under $\Gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega_{\text {. }}$ In the formation of the aor. 1. pass. the $\varepsilon v$ of the present was shortened to $v$, as $\tau \varepsilon \dot{\prime} \chi \omega \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\tau} \dot{v} \chi \theta \eta \nu$, and sometimes in the dialects a change took place of $\varepsilon \iota$ to $\iota$, as $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \phi \theta \varepsilon \nu$, Callim. Cer. 94. See Ernesti on this passage, and Brunck on Apollon. Rhod. 1, 1325.
$\Lambda \varepsilon i \chi \omega$ is regular. For $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon є \chi \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \varepsilon \xi$ see $\Lambda \iota \chi \mu \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$.
$\Lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$, I shell, peel, \&c. This verb, like $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega, \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$, $\pi \lambda \varepsilon ́ x \omega, \phi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$, $\psi \frac{1}{\gamma} \omega$, does not change the radical $\varepsilon$ in forming the aor. 2 pass., as, $\varepsilon \nsubseteq \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \eta \nu, ~ \beta \lambda \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}$, \&c.


Paneg. p.71. b. Bekker has adopted from the best manuscript èтeıлєүuévous.
 old forms，if indeed they are Greek，Reisig Comm．Critt．de Soph． CEd．C．120．We find indeed ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon$ veas in Æschyl．Pers．707．，but the acknowledged reading is now the imperf．${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \lambda \varepsilon v \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon$ ．Again in Soph． CEd．C．1197．入ev́rp̨s is a very probable emendation for $\lambda \dot{v} \sigma \eta ุ s$, but Tyrwhitt＇s reading $\lambda \varepsilon v v_{\sigma} \boldsymbol{q}_{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{s}$ is as good or better．

## $\Lambda$ «úv，I stone．The pass．takes $\sigma$ ．

АНВ－．See падbávш．
$\Lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ ．See $\Lambda a \nu \theta a ́ \nu \omega$.
$\Lambda \eta \kappa \varepsilon ́ \omega . ~ S e e ~ \Lambda a ́ \sigma \kappa ш . ~$
лНХ－．See $\Lambda a \gamma \chi^{\prime} \nu \omega$ ．
$\Lambda \iota a ́ \zeta \omega$, I bend（any thing）．Pass．Ibend myself，turn aside：see Buttm． Lexil．p．404．But the perf．$\lambda \varepsilon \lambda i \eta \mu a \iota$ see in $\Lambda \iota \lambda \alpha i o \mu a \iota$.
$\Lambda i \gamma \xi_{\varepsilon} \beta_{\iota}$ ǵs，the bow twanged，Il．$\delta, 125$ ．For this form a pres．$\lambda i \zeta \omega$ has been supposed，according to the analogy of $\pi \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega, \kappa \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega, \sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$ ； but it nowhere occurs．$\dagger$

ムı $\lambda \boldsymbol{i} \circ \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha$, I desire，long for；formed from $\lambda a ́ \omega$（see $\Lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ）by redupli－ cation．It is used only in pres．and imperfect．But from $\lambda e \lambda a ́ \omega$ or
 strive，hasten，for $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda i \lambda \eta \mu a t:$ see Buttm．Lexil．p． 406.
 $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ；aor．2．ह́入ıтó $\mu \eta \nu$ ．Homer has the Ep．imperf．$\lambda \iota \sigma \sigma \varepsilon ́ \sigma \kappa є \tau о$ ；of the aor．1．the Ep．1．pers．$\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\mu} \eta \nu$ and the Ep．imperat．$\lambda i \sigma \sigma a \iota$ ；and
 few verbs whose pure theme（from which comes the aor．2．）is used also as a present：e．g．入íто $\mu$ ає，Hom．Hymn．15．，入ıтó $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$ ，Aristoph． Thesm． 313.
$\Lambda \iota \chi$ а́о $\mu \iota$, I protrude the tongue．We mention this verb for the sake of observing that the Hesiodic participle $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon є \chi \mu$ ótєя bears the same relation to it as $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \nu \kappa \alpha$ does to $\mu v \kappa \tilde{c} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ；for the diphthong of the radical $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \chi \omega$ entering into the participle seems to be founded on the natural inclination of the perfect for a long vowel．This participial form and two others very similar．
$\pi \varepsilon ф и \zeta$ б́т $\varepsilon$ ，Hom．，
$\mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \zeta$ йтє，Antim．ap．Eust．ad Od．$\nu, 401$ ．p．523，46．Basil．， $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon є \chi$ но́тєє，Неs．Я，826．，

[^182]in the later authors，and in the sense of to give a superficial wonnd，graze，scratch， consequently akin to the Homeric $\lambda$＇$\gamma \delta \eta \nu$ ． He forms $\lambda i \gamma \xi \in$ from $\lambda i \gamma \gamma \omega$ ，and connects it with $\lambda^{\prime}$＇$\alpha$ a，$\lambda$ ı $\gamma$ us．］
appear to be remains of the earlier periods of the language，when analogies formed subsequently were not yet in existence．In virtue of their characteristic letters（ $\zeta$ and $\chi \mu$ ）they are not analogous to the perf．1．or perf．2．（perf．midd．）：and except in these participles the perfects themselves never occur：nor in the sentence does their con－ nexion with the context resemble that of a verb，but rather of an ad－ jective descriptive of the situation or continuous motion of an object． I am therefore inclined to consider them as old verbal adjectives formed something like participles perfect，instances of which we find in German and other languages．＊For a more particular account of this verb see Buttm．Lexil．p．546．and note．

Moúc，I wash：fut．入oú $\omega \omega$ ．The Attic and even the Ionic dialect shorten，in the imperf．of the active and in the pres．and imperf．of the passive voice，all the forms which have $\varepsilon$ and $o$ in the termination，as in the imperf．

 \＆c．See Lobeck ad Phryn．p． 189.

Homer has a 3．sing．aor．2．入óq，Od．к，361．；and in Hymn．Ap． 120. is a 3．plur．入óov†：from $\lambda \frac{\varepsilon \in \epsilon}{} \omega$ he has an imperf． $\begin{gathered}\text { éóevv，and an infin．}\end{gathered}$
 $\sigma \theta a t$ ，part．入оє $\sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o \varrho$, and a fut．midd．入oє́ $\sigma \sigma о \mu a \iota$ ，infin．入ó́ $\sigma \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ； in addition to which he uses all the common as well as the abridged forms．The most natural way therefore of treating this verb is to sup－ pose that from the simple stem $\lambda$ ów came the lengthened one $\lambda o \varepsilon ́ \omega$（com－
 ＇Eגov́єov，Hymn．Cer．290．，is a form of $\lambda$ ov́ $\omega$ again produced or resolved．

With regard to those abridged forms，the accentuation of $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda o \tilde{\nu} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，
 Cyr．4，5．4．，lead us to suppose that they are contracted from $\lambda^{\prime} \omega$ ， $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda o o_{o} \mu \varepsilon \nu, \& c$ ．，which is confirmed by the infin．$\lambda_{o v}^{v}$ as quoted from Hippocr．in Galeni Gloss．；although in the works of Hippocr．it is always written $\lambda$ ovév．Accordingly we do not with some of the older grammarians reckon $\lambda o \tilde{v} \mu a t$ among the examples of the syncope like

[^183]+ ［In Hes．є．751．Schneider is correct in having accented it $\lambda o \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a l$ as the infin． aor．midd．：and instead of $\lambda$ 人́et（Scol．21， 4．Br．）the true accentuation is $\lambda 0 \in \hat{\imath}_{.}$． Passow．］
of $\mu a \iota$ ，but suppose the verb in common use to be a mixture of the con－ tractions of the two old forms $\lambda o ́ \omega$ and $\lambda o \varepsilon \in \omega$ ．＊

This statement is fully confirmed by a further piece of information from Bekker＇s labours on Aristophanes．In Nub．838．the old reading
 midd．，＂thou squanderest my property in bathing ；＂see the Scholia． Brunck assisted the metre by the reading of a Paris manuscript，$\mu$ ov кata入ové，by which truth as well as error was glossed over．We know now that the former reading is in all the other manuscripts，particularly in the two best（Ravennas and Venetus）；and by this Bekker discovered a sure trace of the true reading，ката入óes．That is to say，in the indic． pass．the shorter form was the only current one in the old Attic dialect； hence in the 2 ．sing．they did not use 入ove，which is the same as the 3．sing．indic．act．，but preferred the shorter form；not however in the inharmonious contraction $\lambda o \tilde{c}$ ，but without the contraction $\lambda$ óe．$\cdot \dagger$

The 2．and 3．sing．of the pres．act．also might certainly have been $\lambda o ́ \varepsilon \iota \varsigma ̧, \lambda o ́ \varepsilon \iota$ ；but these persons were undoubtedly occupied by $\lambda o v ́ \omega$ ， which had already established itself in all the dialects in the 1 ．sing．，

[^184]bably because it was strange to the Gram－ marians，who rejected it wherever it oc－ curred in the way that it does in the be－ fore－mentioned passage of Aristophanes． On the other hand exovov is expressly objected to ；consequently the form re－ commended in its stead，which is the very one we are in search of，whether it be
 omitted by mistake．Now the gloss of Hesychius，$\Lambda o \hat{v}, \lambda o v ̂ \sigma \alpha \iota$ ，will assist us in discovering it．Here $\lambda$ ov̂ cannot be the imperat．act．，because it is impossible that in a verb whose active and middle voices are so essentially different，it could be explained by the imperat．of the aor． middle．It is therefore the imperative of the pres．midd．（coutracted from $\lambda$ dou）， which the Grammarians did not hesitate to explain by the imperat．aor．，because in the imperative the difference of these tenses is but trifling，and in other in－ stances very commonly overlooked by the Grammarians．This analogy shows us also with certainty the 2．sing．imperf． $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda o \hat{v}$ ，which by a very conceivable over－ sight was omitted in Phrynichus before єлоîтo．The abridged form in the pas－ sive voice is therefore，when completed，

 $\lambda 0 \hat{v}$ ．
as it did also in the optat. $\lambda$ ovoo $\mu$, - -oi $\mu \eta \nu$, in the conj. $\lambda o v(\omega,-\eta \varsigma, \& \mathrm{c}$., in the part. $\lambda_{o v i} \omega \nu$, and probably also in the imperat. act. $\lambda o \tilde{v} \varepsilon$. See note in the preceding page.

 $\theta \eta \nu(u)$.

This verb together with $\delta \dot{v} \omega$ and $\Re_{v} \omega$ shortens the $v$ in the perf. act. and in the perf. and aor. pass. : see Chœroboscus, p. 1286. Draco, pp. 45, 26. 87, 25. Compare also $\Delta \dot{v} \omega$ and $\Theta \dot{v} \omega$.

In Od. $\sigma$, 238. Homer has the 3. sing. optat. perf. pass. $\lambda \dot{e} \lambda \bar{u} \tau o$ for $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda^{\prime}$ outo ; where the $v$ is lengthened by its absorbing the $\iota$ of the optative; and the accent on the antepenult., though not according to the directions of the Granmarians, is yet agreeable to analogy, and corresponds with סaivvio in Hom. and $\pi$ 自 $\gamma v{ }^{2}$ o in Plato, as they are found accented in the great majority of the manuscripts. Again from an Epic syncop. aor. pass. $\hat{\varepsilon}^{\lambda} \hat{v} \mu \eta \nu$ (corresponding with the regular aor.2. midd.), Homer has a 1. and 3. sing. $\lambda v ́ \mu \eta \nu, \lambda v ́ \tau o$, and 3. plur. $\lambda \dot{v} \nu \tau 0$. An imperat. syncop. aor. act. $\lambda \tilde{v} \theta_{\iota}$ (for $\lambda \tilde{v} \sigma o \nu$ ) in Pind. ap. Etym. M. v. סt $\theta$ ípa $\mu$ bos may perhaps have been formed merely on account of the play on etymology there mentioned; for which it was quite sufficient that the form, though not in use, should be strictly analogical.
$\Lambda \tilde{\omega}, I$ wish, desire, a Doric defective verb, the only remains of an old theme $\Lambda A \Omega$, used only in the three persons of the sing. $\lambda \tilde{\omega}, \lambda \tilde{\eta} s$, $\lambda \tilde{\eta}, 3$. plur. $\lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$, optat. $\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega \mu$, , Hesych. infin. $\lambda \tilde{\eta} \nu$; compare Markl. Eurip. Suppl. 221.

## M.

Maivopul, I am mad, has a fut. midd. and an aor. 2. pass. є̇ $\mu \alpha ́ \nu \eta \nu$, infin. $\mu \check{\alpha} \nu \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, part. $\mu \check{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon i ́ g$. The perf. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \nu \alpha$ has the meaning of the present. But the aor. 1. act. ${ }_{\xi}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \alpha$, Aristoph. Thesm. 561., has the causative meaning to make mad, in which tense, and indeed in the present also, the compound $\varepsilon$ sxuaive is more usual.

The fut. 2. pass. $\mu$ ăvíбo $\mu a \iota$ is not Attic *; see Mœr. and Thom. Mag. the perf. pass. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \dot{\mu} \nu \eta \mu a t$ is used in Theocrit. 10, 31. in the same sense as the pres. $\mu$ aivoдat.

[^185]say "I shall go mad." He mentions also a fut. 2. $\mu$ ăvטขิ $\mu \alpha$..]

## Maiopa. See MA』.

## MAK-. See M $\eta$ ка́oда.

Ma $\kappa \kappa \stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \nu$ is an Attic infin. mentioned by Phrynichus (in Lex. Seg. p. 51.), Photius and Hesych. from $\mu \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda_{\kappa \iota} \alpha^{\omega}, I$ am frost-bitten. Perhaps the suspected form $\mu a \lambda \kappa \iota \varepsilon \tau \nu$ in Æl. N. A. 9, 4. should be $\mu a \lambda \kappa \check{\eta} \nu$. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 82.

 also 'Ажахiלш. The aor. pass. is wanting.

The Dor. fut. 2. $\mu a ̆ \theta \varepsilon \tilde{v} \mu a \iota$ for $\mu a \theta o \tilde{v} \mu a \iota$, Theocr. 2, 60. (like $\mu a \chi$ ои̃$\mu a \iota, \pi \iota o \tilde{\mu} \mu \iota, \& \mathrm{c}$.) supposes a root MHӨ $\Omega$.

Maлє́єı. See Mápatш.
Mápгă $\mu a l, I$ contend, fight ; used only in pres. and imperf. which
 but the optat. is $\mu a \rho \nu o i \mu \eta \nu$, Od. $\lambda, 512$., imperf. $\dot{\mu} \mu \rho \nu a ́ \mu \eta \nu$. [But ह̇ $\mu a \rho \nu$ á $\sigma \eta \nu$, II. $\eta, 301$., is an aor. - Passow.]
 Hes. $\varepsilon$, 206. To these must be added the Ep. aor. 2. with redupl. ( $\varepsilon \mu \alpha \rho \pi о \nu) ~ \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \alpha \rho \pi о \nu$, Hes. a, 245. or with $\rho$ dropped ( $\left.{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \mu \breve{a} \pi о \nu\right)$ ), infin. $\mu a ̆ \pi \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \imath v, ~ H e s . ~ a, ~ 231 . ~ 304 ., ~ o p t a t . ~ w i t h ~ r e d u p l . ~ \mu \varepsilon \mu a ́ т о є є \nu, ~ H e s . ~ a, ~ 252 . ~$

Mapтupé $\omega$ (u short), I bear witness (for or against a person or of a thing). Мaprúpouaı (u long) depon. midd. $I$ call as a witness.

In this case the active $\mu a \rho \tau \dot{v} \rho \omega$, which is not in use, must be considered as the causative to $\mu \alpha \rho \tau v p \hat{\epsilon} \omega$, I cause witness to be borne ; and $\mu$ арті́родає the midd. of it, I cause witness to be borne for myself, call to witness.

M $\alpha \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega$, I knead: fut. $\mu \dot{\alpha} \xi \omega$; perf. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \breve{\alpha} \chi^{\alpha}$, Aristoph. Equ. 55.; perf. pass. $\mu^{\prime} \mu_{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$, ib. 5\%. Also aor. 2. pass.

See also in note to Маioдá, p. 172., another $\mu$ á $\sigma \sigma \omega$ which has been erroneously supposed to exist.

 $\chi^{\varepsilon \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \gamma \nu}$; perf. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \alpha ́ \chi \eta \mu \alpha \iota$. Verbal adj. $\mu \alpha \chi^{\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon} \varepsilon^{\prime}$ g and $\mu \alpha \chi_{\eta} \tau$ ќos.

The perf. $\mu \varepsilon \mu a ́ \chi \eta \mu a t$ is in Isocr. Archid. p. 127. b. Another form of the perf. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \chi^{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, found in good manuscripts in Xenoph. Cyr. 7, 1,
14., would be recommended by analogy, but the context makes the common reading preferable, $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \delta \dot{\sigma} \theta \varepsilon \nu \xi \nu \mu \mu a \chi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \mu^{\prime} \nu \omega \nu$. The form $\mu a \chi$ бréov in Plato Sophist. p. 249. c. Rep. 2. p. 380. b. is supported by the authority of good manuscripts.

When in Homer the metre requires a long syllable the reading fluctuates between $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma$ and $\eta \sigma$, yet so that the text (at least as it is handed down to us) and a great majority of the manuscripts have in


 ambiguous, unless perhaps the Ionic prose used as a fut. $\mu$ ах́є́боцає only : see Fisch. 3. p. 131., Schweigh. Lex. Herodot., and compare II. $\beta, 366$. not. Heyn. Homer has, on account of so many short syllables following each other, lengthened each of the vowels in the pres.


MA-. To this stem or root belong three poetical verbs + :

1. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu a \alpha$, I strive after, am eager, desire ; a perf. with the force of a pres., of which however we find in use only the 3. plur. $\mu \varepsilon \mu$ áã $\sigma$, and the syncopated 1. plur. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \breve{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \nu$, 2. plur. $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \breve{a} \tau \varepsilon$, 2. dual $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \breve{a} \tau o \nu$, the 3. sing. imperat. $\mu \varepsilon \mu a ́ \tau \omega, ~ 3 . ~ p l u r . ~ p l u p e r f . ~ \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \check{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \nu$, and the part. $\mu \varepsilon \mu a ̆ \omega ́ s ~ o f ~ w h i c h ~ t h e ~ f e m . ~ i s ~ \mu \varepsilon \mu \check{v i ̃ a, ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ g e n . ~} \mu \varepsilon \mu \bar{a} \omega ̃ \tau o g$ or $\mu \varepsilon \mu \bar{a} o ́-$ тos, 11. $\beta, 818$. Theocr. 25, 105., compare $\beta \varepsilon$ ba'is and $\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \omega$ s. The form $\mu^{\prime} \mu \alpha \varepsilon \nu$ in Theocr. 25, 64. is a false reading. $\ddagger$ That all these forms are connected immediately with $\mu^{\prime} \mu o \nu a$, will be shown under Мย́vш.

[^186]separate them. The identity of the first verb with $\mu$ é $\mu o \nu a, \mu$ évos, will be shown under Mévo; but then it does not unite so immediately with $\mu \alpha i \epsilon \sigma \theta a t, ~ e \pi!\mu d \sigma \sigma \sigma \theta \alpha t$, $\mu \dot{d} \sigma \tau \iota \xi$ (which evidently come from the physical idea of feeling), as grammatical and exegetic etymology require. We therefore place together, in pursuance of our present object, three verbs only, leaving to the philosophical philologist to extend the inquiry.
$\ddagger$ If $\mu^{\prime} \mu a \in \nu$ be a true reading, it is one example among many of the later poets having misunderstood the older ones, and attributed to them forms which they never used. At all events it cannot be a perf., but must be an imperf. or aor., like $\delta \in \in \delta a \in$ which is an aor. with reduplication. Brunck has with some probability preferred $\mu$ ' $\mu o \nu \epsilon$, but the context requires the imperf. (pluperf.) consequently $\mu \in$.

2. $\mu \bar{\omega} \mu a \iota$, I desire, seek after: part. $\mu \dot{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s($ Soph. ©d. C. 836.) contracted from $\mu$ áo $\mu$ с ; but the $\omega$ generally prevails, as in the infin. $\mu \tilde{\omega} \sigma \theta a \iota$, Theogn. 769., the imperat. $\mu \dot{\omega} \varepsilon o$, Epicharm. ap. Xen. Mem. 2,


3. $\mu$ aioдat, I feel, touch; seek for, desire. To this belong the fut. $\mu$ áбоцаt, aor. $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \mu a \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, with a short; but occurring principally in the

 this aor. answer exactly to each other, we may see by such passages
 $\nu a i ́ w ~ \nu a ́ \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota . *$ - Verb. adj. $\mu a \sigma \tau o ́ s$.

MsAúw, I am drunken, used only in pres. and imperf., takes its other tenses from the pass., as $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu, \& c$. : for the other tenses of the active, as $\dot{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \neq \dot{v} \sigma \alpha$, \&c., belong to $\mu \varepsilon \theta_{u} \sigma \kappa \omega$, I make drunken. $\dagger$

Mєípouat, I share, partake, obtain. The older poets have (beside this present, Il., 616. Theogn. 1228.) a 3. sing. ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \mu \rho \varepsilon$. This is
 " never yet has a king received such honour." The later Epics use it in the same way, e.g. Apollon. 3, 4. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \mu \mu \circ \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon$. And we might perhaps consider it as an aor. in all the Epic passages, even when by the context it has evidently the force of a present, "he has obtained, he obtained, i. e. he has." In other cases, however, it will be more natural to take it as a perf. ( ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \mu \mu \rho \rho a$ for $\left.\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu о \rho a\right)$, e. g. in Od. $\varepsilon, 335$.
 of divine honours." And this is confirmed by the Doric 'E $\mu \mu$ о́pavtı' тєтєध́रaб兀, Hesych. $\ddagger$

This perf. 2. as well as the aor. 2. belong therefore, according to the analogy given in the note below §, to the immediate meaning, with which the midd. $\mu \varepsilon i \rho o \mu a \iota$ was used in the present. The act. $\mu \varepsilon i \rho \omega$ (properly to divide, whence $\mu$ 白pos) had therefore the causative sense to give out

* We find in the lexicons for $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a t$ a present $\mu \dot{d} \sigma \sigma \omega$, fut. $\mu \dot{d} \sigma \omega$; but there are no grounds for such a present, nor does any such exist. Má $\sigma \sigma \omega, \mu \dot{\alpha} \xi, I$ knead, although perhaps ukin to it, is a different verb.
$\dagger$ In the well-known Alcaic fragment, instead of Nv̂v $\chi$ рो̀ $\mu \in \theta \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \omega$ we must read $\mu \in \theta \dot{v} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, Eolic infin. for $\mu \in \theta y$ $\sigma$ ब̂̀̀vaı.

[^187]in shares, to allot, whence comes the perf. pass., which occurs only in the third person :
 of the reduplication like $\varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \eta \phi \alpha$, $\varepsilon^{l / \rho \gamma \varkappa \alpha}$, \&c.), it is allotted
 $\mu o i \rho \alpha)$, that which is allotted to any one, his fate, destiny. Pluperf. віцарто. Compare $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi т р \omega \mu \alpha ~ i n ~ П о р в і г . ~$

In Apollonius, 1, 646. 973., we find in a similar sense $\mu \varepsilon \mu \dot{\rho} \rho \eta \tau \alpha$, and in $3,1130 . \mu \varepsilon \mu о \rho \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} о$ : $:$ the latter with the change of vowel to o retained in the perf. pass. as in $\ddot{\eta} \rho \rho \tau 0,{ }^{a} \omega \rho \tau о$, the former according to the
 (see Kтєiv $)$.

Mé $\lambda \lambda \omega, I$ am about to do a thing, intend to do it.: fut. $\mu \in \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \omega$; aor. 1. $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$, I have delayed doing it. The Attics add the temporal augment to the syllabic one of the
 Вои́лорає.
$\mathrm{M}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \pi \omega$, midd. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \pi о \mu a \iota$, I sing, play. It has no perfect.
Mé入ı, I am an object of care or concern, I vex, go to the heart, is used in the active voice principally in the third person ; pres. $\mu^{\prime} \lambda s \iota, \mu_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda, 0 \cup \sigma \iota$; imperf. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon$; fut. $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \iota$; infin. pres. $\mu^{\prime} \lambda_{\epsilon \iota \nu}$, fut. $\mu \in \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon เ \nu$, \&c., it is an object of care, \&c. Pass. $\mu \in ́ \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ I ~ a m ~ c a r e f u l ~ o f, ~ a n x i o u s ~ a b o u t, ~ m o r e ~$ generally $\varepsilon$ ह̀ $\pi \iota \mu^{\prime} \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota,-\dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$, \&c.

The personal use of the active is in its nature rare, according to which it means, for instance, to be the object of care, e.g. iva veptépota $\mu^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \lambda \omega$, Eurip. Andr. 851. Now as this is most commonly said of impersonal objects, the third persons are naturally the most familiar; and thus arose the impersonal usage. The compound $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon$, it repents,

[^188]frequently recurring form in the Milesian Inscription in Chishull, p.67. ¿фе́бта入ка, which supposes the existence of $\sigma \tau \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha$. On the other hand the instances of eimap$\mu$ évos with the lenis, which Schæfer (Melet. p. 22. and ad Soph. CEd. T. 1082.) has quoted from the later writers, are to be considered as mere sophistry of the later grammarians.
admits indeed of no other. The passive $\mu^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \lambda$ о $\mu a t$ bears exactly the same relation to the imperf. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \epsilon$, as $\delta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} о \mu a \iota$ does to $\delta_{\varepsilon \tau}$.

The forms of the compound $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \mu \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu a t, \& c$., are generally placed with $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\sigma} \theta \theta a t$, which is an exactly synonymous sister-form of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi t-$ $\mu^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \lambda_{\varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota}$; but this latter is declared by the Atticists (see Mœr. and Thom. Mag.) to be less pure than the former. Both are, however, of such frequent occurrence in our editions, that no one can decide which was the original reading of any separate passage. Still there is no doubt of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ being the older form, to which the inflexion of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \mu \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ originally belonged.
The perf. $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \kappa \kappa^{\varepsilon} \mu_{0}$ has generally the meaning of, I have been considering about a thing, it has been an object of my care and thought, e. g. Xen. Mem. 3, 6, 10. But the Epic language has a perf. 2. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \lambda \varepsilon$, Dor. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu a \lambda \varepsilon$, which has the same meaning as the present, it lies at my heart, is a source of care and anxiety to me: to which we must add the pluperf. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \eta \lambda \varepsilon \iota$ for $\varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon \iota$ with the force of an imperf., II. $\beta, 614$. The same perf. has, however, sometimes the personal meaning of the pass. $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda o \mu a \iota$; in the first place as a real perfect, $\tau a \tilde{v} \tau \alpha \mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \eta \lambda a \varrho$, these things hast thou thought carefully about, invented, Hymn. Merc. 437., and next equally as much like a present, $\mu \varepsilon \mu \eta \lambda \omega ́ s \tau \iota v o ́ s$, thinking carefully, anxiously about any thing, intent upon it, II. $\varepsilon, 708 . \nu, 297$.

The pass. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \mu \mu a t$ is also used poetically for $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega$, as $\mu \varepsilon \lambda^{\prime} \sigma \theta \omega \sigma \sigma$, Od. $\kappa$, 505., $\dot{d} \dot{\tilde{L}} \mu \varepsilon \lambda$ ó $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$, cui cure sumus, Eurip. Hipp. 60 ., in which sense we find also the perf. as a pres. and consequently the pluperf. as imperf., бò $\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \tau 0$, tibi curce erat, Theocr. 17, 46 ., in which usage it has undergone also an Epic abridgement, as perf. $\mu^{\prime} \not \mu € \lambda \varepsilon \tau \alpha$, , pluperf.
 - [The aor. 1. pass. $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a t$ is sometimes used actively, to have taken care of, táфov, Soph. Aj. 1184., sometimes passively, to be taken care of, Epig. Ad. 112, 3.-Passow.]

Мя́ $\mu ф о \mu \alpha \iota$, I blame: fut. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \psi о \mu \alpha$. Depon. midd. without a perfect.
[This verb occurs first in Hes. $\varepsilon$, 188. and Theogn. 795. 871. ; but more frequently in Pindar and Herodotus: it is found also in the Attics, as Thucyd. 7, 77., Plato, and Isocrates.-Passow.] The Ionics and Tragedians use in a similar deponent sense the aor. 1. pass. ${ }_{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \phi \theta \eta \nu$ also.

[^189]formed. But it is far more correct to compare this with the similar perfects $\mu$ é$\mu \nu \epsilon o$ for $\mu \in ́ \mu \nu \eta \sigma o$, and d $\rho \eta \rho \in \mu a$.

Mév๗, I remain: Epic fut. $\mu \varepsilon \nu^{\prime} \in \omega$, Attic contracted $\mu \varepsilon \nu \omega ̃$; aor. 1. $\varepsilon_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \iota \nu \alpha$; perf. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta \nsim \alpha . *$ Verbal adj. $\mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon-$ $\tau$ テ́os, Plato Rep. 1. p. 328. b.

The Ionic and poet. perfect $\mu$ ќ $\mu$ оуа, I feel a strong desire, I am determined, I intend (Herodot. 6, 84. Il. $\varepsilon, 482 . \omega, 657 . \&$ e.), belongs to a stem or family differing in meaning from the above $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$, as we see from its derivative $\tau \grave{o} \mu \hat{\ell} v o g$, from which again is derived another Epic verb, $\mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon a i \nu \omega, \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \eta^{\prime} \eta a$ having in its most common acceptation the same sense as $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu o \nu a$, e. g. Il. $\nu, 628 . ~ o, ~ 565$. Od. $\delta, 282$. At the
 remark, that the relation between those two perfects is the same as between $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu о \nu a$ and $\mu \varepsilon \mu \alpha_{\alpha} \sigma \iota v, \&$ c., which latter correspond also in meaning. All this must prevent us from placing $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu o \nu a$, which could not be done without violence, among the forms of $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$, to remain ; although Euripides, who uses $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu o v \varepsilon$ quite in the old sense at Iph. T.
 1495.) for $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \iota$; this latter is however merely an instance of Lyric caprice, without proving any thing as to the language.

METI $\Omega$, or $\mu \varepsilon \tau i \eta \mu \mu$, Ion. for $\mu \varepsilon \theta^{i} \eta \mu$; of which we find among others the 3. pres. $\mu \varepsilon \tau i \varepsilon \varepsilon$, Herodot. 6, 37. 59.; the 3. sing. imperf. midd. $\mu \varepsilon \tau i \varepsilon \tau o$ (or $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \tau i \varepsilon \tau o$ ) for $\mu \varepsilon \theta i \varepsilon \tau о$, Herodot. 1, 12.; the infin. fut. midd. $\mu \varepsilon \tau \eta \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ for $\mu \varepsilon \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, Herodot.; and $\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \tau \iota \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\nu}$ os part. perf. pass. for $\mu \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \mu \epsilon \varepsilon$ vos, Herodot. According to the analogy of ti $i \theta \eta \mu i$ the 3. sing. pres. should be accented $\mu \varepsilon \tau \iota \varepsilon \pi$, and $\mu \varepsilon \tau i \varepsilon \iota$ should be the imperf. ; see Heyne on II. $\zeta$, 523. where Wolf now reads in his last edition $\mu \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \bar{s}$. Compare the simple "I $\eta \mu \varepsilon$.

Мخкх́оцаь, I bleat, cry out: probably a depon. midd. like $\mu$ ихи́орци.

This verb has some simpler Epic forms; e. g. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$ with the force of a pres., whence part. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \eta \kappa \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, II. $\kappa, 362$., and fem. with the short Ion. a, $\mu \varepsilon \mu$ ăкvia, Il. $\delta, 435$. And as this perf. had the sense of a present,
 коv, Hes. $a, 76 . ~,, ~ 673$. To this we must add the aor. ${ }^{\ell} \mu a \kappa o v$, of which however only the part. $\mu \boldsymbol{\alpha} \dot{\omega} \nu$ remains, Il. $\pi, 469$. Compare Od. $\kappa, 163$. Thus this verb is strictly analogous to the Epic forms of $\mu v \kappa \dot{\alpha} о \mu a \iota$.

[^190]defective, and sometimes form them as from a verb in otew, in which latter case $\mu \epsilon ́ v \omega$ may be joined with them, as $\mu \epsilon \mu$ é$\nu \eta \kappa \alpha, \nu \in \nu \neq \mu \eta \kappa \alpha, \delta є ́ \delta \mu \eta \kappa \alpha, \& c$.

Mıaivo, I stain, defile: fut. $\mu \iota \alpha \nu \omega ̃$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\text {è }} \boldsymbol{\mu i \eta \nu \alpha , ~ A t t . ~}$ also è $\mu$ íäva, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 24. ; aor. 1. pass. ępıáy$\theta \eta \nu$; perf. pass. $\mu \leqslant \mu i \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$.

At Il. $\delta$, 146. $\mu$ á $\nu \theta \eta \nu$ aíцатє $\mu \eta \rho o t$, the verb is either the 3. dual or plural. The old Grammarians explained it to be for $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \nu \boldsymbol{\theta} \dot{\eta} \tau \eta$, but of such an abbreviation no other instance is to be found; the moderns have considered it to be for '́ $\mu$ 'á $\partial \eta \eta \sigma a v$, but the $\eta$ is so unusual in the abridged 3. plur., that no example of it can be adduced even in the
 I consider therefore $\mu \mathfrak{l}^{\prime} \nu \theta \eta \nu$ to be the dual of a syncop. aor. pass.:
 both of which the $\sigma$ is dropped before the $\theta$.

 Plat. Legg. 12. p. 951. d.

In the old Attic inscriptions the derivatives of this verb are very often written with $\varepsilon \iota$, as $\xi v \mu \mu \varepsilon \iota \tau \pi$, which shows that the $\iota$ (except in the aor. 2. pass.) is long. We must therefore write $\mu \tilde{i} \xi a$.
$\mathrm{M} \imath \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \varkappa \omega$, I remind, has from MNA $\Omega$ a fut. $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ and aor. 1. ${ }_{\xi}^{\ell} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \alpha$, \&c., Il. $\alpha, 407$. Pass. $\mu \mu \nu \eta^{\prime} \sigma$ ко $\mu \iota, I$ remember, also I mention; aor. 1. द̇ $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; fut. $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \eta^{\prime}-$ $\sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$; verbal adj. $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau o ́ s$. The perf. pass. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ has the force of a present, I remember, whence imper. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \sigma$, optat. $\mu \leqslant \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$, Il. $\omega, 745$. Att. $\mu \leqslant \mu \nu \sigma_{i}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ and $\mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \varphi_{\varphi} \mu \eta \nu$, Herm. Soph. CEd. T. 49. (whence $\mu \leqslant \mu \nu$ ẹ̃тo, Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 3. contracted from the Ion. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\varphi}^{\prime} \mu \gamma \nu, \mu \equiv \mu \nu \varepsilon_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \varphi \tau 0$, II. $\psi, 361$.$) , conj. \mu_{\dot{\prime}}^{\prime} \mu \nu \omega \mu \alpha \iota,-\eta,-\eta \tau \alpha \iota, \& c . \ddagger$ To this perf. belong the pluperf. $\bar{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu \quad$ (whence Ion. 3. plur. ${ }^{j} \mu \varepsilon-$ $\mu \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \tau o$ for ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\xi} \mu \dot{\xi} \mu \nu \eta \nu \tau 0$, Herodot. 2, 104.), and the fut. 3. (paullo-post fut.) $\mu \xi \mu \nu \eta^{\prime} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, Herod. 8, 62.

[^191][^192]Ionic abbreviations are（ $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \nu \varepsilon a \iota$ ）$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \nu \eta$ 2．sing．indicat．for $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \nu \eta$－ $\sigma \alpha \iota$, Hom．，and $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \nu \varepsilon o$ imperat．for $\mu_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \mu \nu \eta \sigma o$ ，Herodot．5，105．：compare


The radical form $\mu \nu \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \mu \nu \tilde{\omega} \mu a \iota$ is in the above sense solely Ionic， in which dialect the $\alpha$ is changed into $\varepsilon$ ，consequently we have 3．sing．


 $\left.\tau \varepsilon \varsigma, \dot{\eta} b_{\circ} \mu \iota \dot{\eta} 6 \omega о \mu \iota\right)$ ，we find the 3．plur．imperf．$\mu \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \nu \tau 0$ ，Hom．，the imperat．$\mu \nu \omega \varepsilon$ ，Apollon．Rh．，and the part．$\mu \nu \omega o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s, ~ O d . ~ T h e ~ f u t . ~$ of $\mu \nu a ́ o \mu \alpha \iota$ is $\mu \nu \eta$ ибо $\alpha \iota$ ，but we have also $\mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \eta$ бо $\mu \iota$ ，Herodot．8，62．， and the aor．1．midd．$\varepsilon \in \mu \nu \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu$ ，infin．$\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$ with the sense of to remember，$\tau \iota v o s$, Hom．In the meaning of to woo，$\mu \nu \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a t$ is used not only in Homer but also in the common language．

## Модєіัข．See B入ш́бкш．

MY－．We will here place the following verbs by the side of each other，that it may be at once seen in what they correspond and in what they differ：
$\mathbf{M u s} \omega$ ，I initiate into the mysteries，is regular．
Mú $\omega$（whence also жат $\alpha \mu \dot{v} \omega$, жа $\mu и \dot{v} \omega$ ），I shut，close，e．g． the lips，eyes，\＆c．，and used both transit．and intransit． This verb is regular．Perf．$\mu^{\prime} \mu_{\bar{\nu}} \quad$ ，I am shut，I am silent．

Mú̧ $\omega$, I emit a sound by compressing the lips and breathing loud through the nose，I moan，grumble；aor．1．$\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \mu v \sigma a$ ，Hippocr．（of the rumbling of the intestines；see Foes．and Schneider）：but ${ }^{\prime}{ }_{\xi} \mu v \xi a,{ }_{\varepsilon} \pi \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon^{-}$ $\mu \nu \xi a \nu$ are used by Homer as sounds of anger and reproach．This latter formation，with $\gamma$ as its characteristic，is common to many verbs which express the uttering of some sound or exclamation，as крá $\omega \omega$ ，


Ми́ఢぃ，I suck ：fut．$\mu \cup \zeta$ そ̇ $\sigma \omega, \& c$ ．，from which inflexion first arose，it appears，in a later æra the pres．$\mu \nu \zeta_{\alpha} \dot{\omega} \omega$ and $\mu \nu \xi_{\xi}^{\prime}(\omega$. ．

For the part．$\mu є \mu \iota \zeta_{\circ}^{\prime} \tau \varepsilon$ see $\Lambda \iota \chi \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ．
Múб $\sigma \omega$ ，$\mu и ́ \tau \tau \omega$ ，but more generally $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \mu и ́ \tau \tau \omega$ ，emungo： fut．$\mu \dot{\prime} \xi=$ ，\＆c．－Midd．
［The simple verb occurs only in the writings of the Grammarians

[^193][^194]and as the root of $\dot{\mathfrak{a} \pi о \mu} \boldsymbol{v} \tau \tau \omega, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \mu \dot{v} \tau \tau \omega, \pi \rho о \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \tau \omega$, and of the Lat. mungo, emungo.-Passow.]

## Müхс́ораı, I bellow, roar: Dep. midd.

From the simple stem of this verb the Epics have formed a perf.
 Compare M $\eta$ ка́o $\mu$.

## N.

Natєтá $\omega, I$ dwell. This Epic verb is never contracted, nor, except in one instance, produced, but is almost invariably found in a purely resolved form, as vaıєтá $\omega$, Od. ı, 21., vaıєráєє, Hes, 9, 775., vaıєтáovat,
 the regular production is in the imperf. vaєєтáaбкоv, and of an irregular one in the fem. part. vaıeтá $\omega \sigma a$.*

Nai $\omega, I$ dwell, forms its tenses with simple $\breve{a}$. $\dagger$ In the active, how-
 to cause to inhabit, settle, or cause to be inhabited, colonize, fornd. The midd. and pass. fut. vá $\sigma \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$ (Apoll. Rh. 2, 747.), the aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu a \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu(\dot{a} \pi \varepsilon \nu \dot{\prime} \alpha \sigma \sigma a \tau o, \mathrm{Hom}$.), and the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu a ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ have the intransit. sense of to settle in a place. The post-Homeric poets, however, use the midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ in the sense of ${ }^{\prime} v \nu a \sigma \sigma a$ also: see Brunck. ad Apollon. 1, 1356. The perf. vévaruac is not found before the later poets. See Schneider's Lexicon.

The syncop. aor. кatévaбөє, you have settled yourselves, you dwell, (comp. Hesych. vá $\theta a \iota$ - oiкйбaı) in Aristoph. Vesp. 662. in the anapæsts would be remarkable, but both the best manuscripts have катย์ขa $\sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon$, and the third person suits the passage very well.

See also Náw, I flow.
$\mathrm{N} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, I stop up, I fill in and beat close together (as earth into a hole): fut. $\nu \alpha \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$, aor. 1. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\nu} \alpha \xi \alpha$ : but the perf. pass. is $\nu \leq ́ \nu \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, and the verbal adj. $\nu \alpha \sigma \tau o s . \ddagger$

[^195]The passive formation with the $\sigma$, as above given, is most indis-
 in Aristoph. Eccl. 840., on which and some other suspected passages see the note to N $\begin{gathered} \\ \epsilon \\ \omega \\ \text { 1. The only trace which I find of the regular form }\end{gathered}$ $\nu_{\varepsilon}^{\text {énaktat }}$ is in Suidas in voc., where it is quoted from Josephus.

Ná $\omega$, I flow, an old verb, found only in pres. and imperf.; written also vaíw. See Schol. Od. 九, 222. On $\nu \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu, \&$ c., see Ném 2.

N $\varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \in \varepsilon$, I rebuke, dispute, retains $\varepsilon$ in its inflexion, thus fut. $\nu \varepsilon є \kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega$, \&c.
[Hom. and Hes. have also, when the metre requires it, an Ion. sister-



Nєípo. See Né $\phi \omega$.
N $є \mu \mu \omega$, I distribute allot: fut. $\nu \varepsilon \mu \tilde{\omega}$ and $\nu є \mu \dot{\gamma} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1 .
 Өทข.* Verbal adj. $\nu \approx \mu \eta \tau$ ย́os. - Midd.

The fut. $\nu \varepsilon \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega$ is mentioned by Herodian (post Mœer. et Phryn.) and Thom. Mag.; but I find it quoted only from the later writers, Longus p. 55. Schæf. Eurip. Epist. 5. On the other hand $\nu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \tau \sigma \theta a \iota$ is in Demosth. Mid. p. 579. infra. [The later writers have also an aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \mu \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 742.—Passow.]

 clouds, Aristoph. Av. 1489. Perf. $\sigma u \nu \nu$ 'vo $\Phi$ sv.
 also written with the circumflex, as $\sigma v \nu \nu \varepsilon \phi \varepsilon \tilde{\text {, }}$-oṽ $\sigma a$ : see Schneid. Lexicon. The pres. $v \varepsilon i \phi \omega$ (with the explanation $\beta_{\rho} \varepsilon \chi^{\omega}$ ) which the Grammarians connect with the above verb (see the Etymologica, and Eust. ad Il. a, 420.) is only another way of writing vi申w, to snow, which the later writers used also of rain : see Stephens in Nípw. $\dagger$


 $4,62 . \ddagger$ Homer has a lengthened form which fluctuates between $\nu \eta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$

[^196]ing article: Né $\phi \omega$, fut. עé $\neq \omega$, perf. עévoфa, same as $\boldsymbol{\nu i} \phi \omega$; a rare, nay a suspected form.
$\ddagger$ See, however, the following note.
廿, 139., aor. 1. $\nu \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, Od. т, 64., infin. vท $\tilde{\eta} \sigma \iota, ~ o, 321$. Herodot. 2, 107., aor. 1. infin. midd. vך $\tilde{\sigma} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$, II. ı, 137.

The perf. pass. without $\sigma$ see in Lex. Seguer. 1. p. 13, 24. Thucyd. 7, 87. Xen. Anab. 5, 4, 27. The other form $\nu \varepsilon$ ' $\nu \eta \sigma \mu a \iota$ seems to me to stand on good grounds in Aristoph. Nub. 1203., where with á $\mu \phi о \rho \tilde{\eta} s$ $\nu \varepsilon \nu \eta \sigma \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \nu \circ$ is the various reading $\nu \varepsilon \nu a \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu 0$, , which being untenable on account of the sense, could have arisen only from the true verb being written with the $\sigma . \quad$ Nor is the reading less sure in Aristoph. Eccles.

 $\delta a \pi i \delta \omega \nu \nu \varepsilon \nu a \sigma \mu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \nu a \iota$. Now the reading of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi t \nu \varepsilon \nu a \sigma \mu \varepsilon \hat{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \nu a \iota$ is quite as untenable as that of $\nu \varepsilon \nu a \sigma \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \nu a \iota$ (looking at the sense) is certain; and Brunck's emendation $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \nu \in \nu \eta \sigma \mu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} v a t$ is now confirmed by the quotation
 writing with, the $\sigma$ is supported here again by the false reading $\varepsilon \pi \iota \nu \varepsilon$ $\nu a \sigma \mu$ - and by the similarity of this case to that quoted above from the Nubes. Lastly we must examine the passage of Theocr. 9, 9. where vévartat is used of a heap of skins, which, it is true, the derivation from vá $\sigma \sigma \omega$ appears to suit: but as the dialect of this poet requires vévaкrat, it would seem, according to the direction of the scholium бєб'өрєvтal, that in the passage in question it should be pronounced $\nu \varepsilon ́ v \overline{a ̄ \sigma \tau a \iota, ~ i . ~ e . ~ \nu ย ́ v \eta \eta \tau \tau a l . ~}$
2. I spin: fut. v $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega, \& c$; in addition to which was formed, but at an early period, another pres. עrं $\theta \omega$ (like $\pi \lambda r^{\prime} \theta \omega$, from $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu s, \Pi \Lambda \mathrm{E} \Omega$ ) ; and this became afterwards the common form.

It is difficult to decide any thing on the usage of $\nu \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} \nu$ and $\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ in good writers, as the verb occurs so seldom in those which have come down to us. We must therefore content ourselves with the observation of the Antiatticist, $\mathbb{N} \dot{\eta} \theta \varepsilon \iota \nu, o^{\circ} \mu \dot{\partial} v o v \nu \varepsilon \tau \nu$, and with what we gather from the glosses of the Grammarians, that the simpler form was peculiar to the older Ionics and Attics. And herein we find an irregularity of contraction; for while the regular form is $\nu \varepsilon \tau \nu, \nu \varepsilon \bar{\iota}$, Hes. $\varepsilon, 779$., ${ }^{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon$, Hesych., the other contractions are invariably quoted by all the Grammarians in $\omega$ instead of ov; as $\imath \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$, Pollux 7, 32. 10, 125., $\nu \bar{\omega} \nu \tau a$, Hesych., $\nu \dot{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, Phot.* The contraction to ov was

[^197][^198]therefore studiously avoided，and from $\nu \tilde{\omega}, \nu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ the $\omega$ was carried on through the tenses．

The passive forms I find quoted always with the $\sigma$ ；but it is pos－ sible that these came first into use with $\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ ，and that the old form for the meaning of to spin was vév $\quad$ 品at，to which we are also led by the verbals $\nu \eta \tau o ́ g, \nu \tilde{\eta} \mu a$, \＆c．

3．I swim．None of the forms of the pres．are con． tracted by the Attics in this short verb except those in $\varepsilon \iota$




An Epic sister－form is $\nu \eta \chi$ ，and the later prose writers use $\nu \dot{\eta} \chi \chi^{o-}$ $\mu a t$ ，a depon．midd．

4．The poetical verb $\nu^{\prime} \varepsilon \epsilon \theta \theta a \iota, \nu \varepsilon \pi \sigma \theta a l$ ，to go，more generally to go away，return，is used in present and imperfect only ：the pres．indic．
 like $\mu v \theta \varepsilon i a t, \nu \varepsilon i ̃ \tau a \iota ~ l i k e ~ \mu v \theta \varepsilon i ̃ a \iota . ~$

Niלん，I wash，takes its tenses from vín $\tau \omega$ ，an unusual verb in the older writers：fut．ví $\omega$ ；aor．1．हैvı $\downarrow \alpha, \& c$. ； perf．pass．עЕ́vıццаı．－Midd．

The pres．vi $\zeta \omega$ is found frequently in Homer，also in Herodot．2， 172．Aristoph．Vesp．608．Eurip．Iph．T．1338．Plat．Symp．p．175．a． All these writers form $\nu i \psi \omega, \& c$ ．：while the pres．$\nu i \pi \tau \omega$ occurs only in the later writers ${ }^{*}$ ，except in one single Homeric passage，Od．$\sigma$ ， 178．；and this is the more remarkable，as in ten others the reading is vi弓єı，See Damm．

Níб⿱宀㠯䒑at，I go，return to．Two questions have been started respect－ ing this verb，one as to its orthography and another as to its inflexion． With regard to the first，we find viбoцat，Il．$\psi, 76$ ．，$\nu \varepsilon i \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ，Eurip． Phœo．1240．，á $\pi о \nu \iota \sigma \dot{o} \mu \varepsilon \theta a$ ，A pollon．Rh．3，899．，and in each case the manuscripts fluctuate between $\varepsilon \iota \varsigma, \varepsilon \iota \sigma \sigma, \iota \sigma, \iota \sigma \sigma$ ．The form $\nu \varepsilon i \sigma \sigma o \mu a \iota$ is found in the best manuscripts（whence we infer that the vowel is
same．Nor is this at variance with the
eniveoovat of Herodot．quoted at the be－
ginning of No．1．；；for the Ionics con－
stantly use this form，like all those from
verbsin $\epsilon \omega$ ，without contraction．On the
other hand we are warranted in supposing
that the Attics from vêv to heap up，to
spin，formed $\nu \omega ิ \sigma t$, from עeiv，to swim， ขย์ข兀เข．
＊Thom．Mag．admits both forms ；kal
 of the manuscripts．The note of Hem－ sterhuys，which exactly reverses the usage， is incorrect．
long independently of the $\sigma \sigma$ ），and its authenticity is further supported by the cognate forms $\nu \varepsilon$ ко $\mu \iota, \nu \varepsilon i o \mu a \iota$ ，as well as by its being actually found in inscriptions of the purest times，Boeckh Pind．Ol．3，10．On the other hand usage was in favour of $\nu i \sigma \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$（see Etym．M．p．606， 12．）；and the Grammarians seem to have agreed in writing the pres． viббонat，the fut．viбoнal，Eustath．I1．$\psi, 76$ ．Heyne II．九，381．There are other passages with the same doubtful orthography，as vei⿱㇒⿻二丿⿴囗⿱一一儿丶ooval， Hes．Op．235．，$\nu \varepsilon \iota \sigma \sigma o \mu \varepsilon \nu^{\prime} \omega \nu$ ，Theog．71．Gaisf．，both with the various reading $\nu \iota \sigma \sigma_{0}$ ；and vícoovto，Scut．469．This uncertainty of the reading leaves the second question equally undecided：for in the three passages first mentioned the sense is that of a future；but then，in the verbs which signify to go，the present has frequently the force of the
 we read vícouac we have the future，if vifoopat we have the present with the meaning of a future：compare also the scholium in the pas－ sage of Euripides．On the gloss of Hesychius veioavto，until we know to what it refers，nothing can be said．

No $\operatorname{c} \omega$ ，I think，has in the Ionic writers the same contraction and accentuation as $\beta$ oá $\omega$ ；e．g．perf．$\nu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \mu a t$ ；pluperf．$\varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \omega \mu \eta \nu$ ，whence 3．sing．$\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \nu \omega \tau o$ for $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \nu$ ónto，Herodot．1，77．and the compound aor．

 and $\nu \cup \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega^{*}$ ：but all the derivatives are formed with the palatic letter，as $\nu u \sigma \tau \alpha \varkappa \tau r_{s}, \& c$ ．

## 色．

Éco，I shave，scrape，retains $\varepsilon$ in the inflexion，and takes $\sigma$ in the passive：thus fut．$\xi \xi \sigma \omega$ ，Epic $\xi \neq \sigma \sigma \omega$ ．

Eupś $\omega$ ，I shave，shear，has more commonly in the midd．

 $\xi v \rho o v{ }^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon v o v$, Alexis ap．Athen．13．p．565．b．In the later writers the pres．$\xi v p a ́ \omega$ was common，but the inflexion in－$\dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$ is never found． See Lobeck ad Phryn．p．205．Passow has also another later form $\xi_{v \rho i \zeta}, \xi_{\nu \rho i \zeta о \mu \alpha \iota}$

[^199]ミ́v, I shave smooth, polish: fut. そ̌v́vo, \&c. It takes $\sigma$ in the passive: $\xi u \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha l$, aor. 1. midd. to polish for one's self, for one's own use, Xen. Cyr. 6, 2, 11.

## O.

'Oó́poraı, I lament, bewail; depon. midd. with both trans. and intrans. sense. The act. appears to have never been in use.
 $\dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \zeta \omega$, or $\dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \zeta$ کouat appears to have been ever in use; but we find in Hom. an aor. 1. midd. ( $\dot{\omega} \delta \check{v} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ) -ao, -ão and 3. plur. without the augm. $\dot{\delta} \delta \dot{v} \sigma a \nu \tau o$, part. $\dot{\delta} \delta v \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s ;$ also 3. sing. perf. pass. with the

${ }^{3} \mathrm{O} \zeta \omega, I$ send forth $a$ (good or bad) smell: fut. ${ }^{\circ} \zeta \gamma \dot{\gamma} \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{3} \zeta_{\eta}{ }^{2} \sigma$, Aristoph. Vesp. 1059.; perf. with the force of the pres. o $\delta \omega \delta \delta$. Generally with gen. of the thing or part from which the smell proceeds.
 Steril. 10. De Superfet. 10.) and the later writers.
 the Epics generally separate the diphthong in the augmented forms,
 prose the following compound is in use :
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \sigma^{\prime} \gamma \omega, \dot{\alpha} \nu о \dot{\gamma} \gamma \nu \mu \mu$. In the augmented tenses the syllabic augment is added to the temporal as in the imperf.

 $\dot{\alpha} \nu^{\prime}\left(\omega \chi \alpha\right.$; perf. '2. $\dot{\alpha} \nu E ́\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \gamma \alpha\right.$. 'This last tense had from a very early period (Hippocr. \&c.) an intransitive meaning, $I$ stand open; which however was unknown to the Attics, who in this sense used the perf. pass. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon \in \gamma \mu \alpha$. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 157, 158.

In the dialects, as in Herodot., Theocr., \&c., we find the aor. 1. with the regular augment $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tilde{\varphi} \xi a$; and in the later writers the act. $\ddot{\eta}_{1}$ oo $\dot{\xi} a$, pass. 'ทroi $\gamma \eta \nu$, \&c., Fisch. III. pp. 36, 37.

Oiośc $\omega, I$ swell. For this verb with the forms oiòóce, oiò́̀ucc, oioolive, we cannot lay down any fixed usage. We can only observe that the formation in - $\dot{\gamma} \sigma \omega$ is the only one for all four forms; and that the two last are used also in a causative sense. See Stephens' Thesaur.
 ${ }_{\omega}^{\mu} \mu \omega \xi \alpha$.
 $\omega^{\dot{\eta}} \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$, infin. oi $\eta \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha$, , part. oin $\theta$ és. The 1. pers. sing. of both pres. and imperf. was also pronounced in a syncopated
 (like Boúzsı and ${ }^{\prime} \psi \psi \varepsilon \iota$ ) was not only the Attic form, but almost the only one in use in the common language.

The old Grammarians (see Thom. Mag. in voc.) laid it down as a rule, that the form oi $\mu$ ac was used only of things fixed and certain, consequently merely a milder expression for "I am convinced, I know well." That is to say, oi $\mu a \ell, \stackrel{\varphi}{\varphi} \mu \eta \nu$ was a kind of interjectional phrase introduced into a sentence without much stress laid upon it, like our expression "I believe," which in different languages is used in courtesy to soften the harshness of a positive assertion ; and which frequently arises from a slight irony incorporated, as it were, into the tone of polished conversation. We can readily imagine that this must have been particularly natural to the Attic language: and the necessary result therefore was, that as soon as it was wished to give the word its proper force, it was generally pronounced at full length. If now we read this olopat, for example, in the two passages of Isæus (pp. 50, 22. $58,14$.$) which are adduced in a note on Thom. Mag. as supposed$ instances of a contrary nature, we shall feel that the tone of the sentence loses by it. And the further we extend our observation the more we shall find the above rule verified. One thing however may fairly be presumed, that, in order to follow it up in all cases, we ought to have the reading more certain than it can possibly be made where the difference in the forms is so slight.

The Epics make use also of the active oo $\omega$, but only in the present; more frequently they separate the diphthong, of $\omega$, and in the middle always, ótouat, in which the $\iota$ is long: and in this form, which has the

[^200]midd. as well as the pass. aorist, we find only the regular inflexion; e.g

 part. öi $\sigma \theta \varepsilon i \varsigma$; aor. 1. midd. $\begin{gathered}\text { ö̈ } \\ \text { á } \mu \eta \nu \text {, whence in Hom. 3. sing. without }\end{gathered}$ the augment òitَaтo, and part. òïбá $\mu \varepsilon \nu o c$. This Epic form of the verb has the collateral meaning of to conjecture, to foresee; in which sense we find it in the Ionic prose of Arrian, oiaध光片 (Ind. 13, 5.), which
 writers formed again an infin. aor. oi $\sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a l$ with the part. oi $\sigma \theta \varepsilon i!$ : and Aratus has with the common formation an aor. 1. infin. midd. oiń $\sigma a-$ $\sigma \theta a t$, used by still later writers in prose: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 719.
 fut. oiхйбоцаи.

Although the radical meaning of this verb is, as we shall see in the next paragraph, simply to go, yet an established usage has existed in the common language from Homer's time, by which oilxouat never means I am going, but always I am gone. We will first prove this by



 $\mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ o i l \chi o v \tau a l ~ \pi \nu o a i ; ~ h o w ~ l o n g ~ h a s ~ t h y ~ m o t h e r ' s ~ b r e a t h ~ b e e n ~ g o n e ? ~ ? ~$ Eurip. Or. 440.; compare also 844. In Xenophon we find many instances; e. g. (addressing a dead body) ól $\chi \eta \eta^{\eta} \dot{\eta}$ à $\pi o \lambda \iota \pi \grave{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{a} \varsigma$, Cyrop. $7,3,8$. ; see also $5,4,11.6,1,45$. and Anab. 3, 1, 32. This usage is continued in the imperf. $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{\prime} \mathrm{X} \dot{\mu} \eta \nu$, I was gone; as Penelope says to her
 heard that thou wert gone to Pylos, Od. т, 24. See also Pind. P. 4, 145. and Xen. Cyr. 3, 2, 27. It may also be understood in the same sense when at the end of a spirited narrative a phrase is added with $\psi \chi$ हro;
 man was now gone, when the Medes came . . . . ., Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 5. In the majority of passages however this imperfect cannot without force be made to signify more than simply he went away, e. g. X $\omega$ ó $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ os $\delta{ }^{\circ}$



That the original meaning of oí ${ }^{\varepsilon \sigma \theta \theta \iota}$ was simply to $g o$, without the addition of away, is clear not only from the sister-form oix $\chi \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \omega$, but from the compound $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi o i \chi o \mu c \iota, I$ go to or towards, as well as from some passages of Homer, in which the simple verb, but never in the pres. conj. (quare, is this accidental?), is used in that original sense: e.g. кат̀



Now that particular use of the present mentioned in the last paragraph may be explained, like many others, from the oral language: for whoever goes, is gone: whence "he is going thither" is much the same as "he is gone hence." But all such original ideas lose by custom their exact meaning; and so oix $\begin{gathered}\text { rat } \\ \text { was } \\ \text { used } \\ \text { of one who had been }\end{gathered}$ gone a long time, who had been long arrived at some other place, or who had quite disappeared from the world. But as soon as the thing is no longer actually present, the difference between the person being then just going away, or being supposed to be on the road to his place of destination, is in most cases unimportant. Although therefore ${ }^{\omega} \mathrm{X} \mathrm{Z}$ то, as imperf. of the common oíz $\varepsilon \tau \alpha$, , meant, wherever it was necessary, and the context showed it, he was gone; yet it generally signified, agreeably to its origin, he went, went away. And the future had the
 عiṣ̉ $\mu a \kappa a ́ p \omega \nu$ ón тıvaç eviounuoviaç, Plat. Phæd. 115. d.

From what has been said, a perf. of this verb is superfluous for general use; it does however sometimes occur (e. g. 解 $\mathrm{X} \eta \mu a \iota$, Ion. oí $\chi \eta \mu a \iota$, Herodot. 4, 136.), but in the common language in the compounds only,
 nymous; see Stephan. Thesaur. and Sturz. Lex. Xen. : and so is the other compound in Herodot. 4, 136. ai $\grave{\eta} \mu$ épaı סıoíx $\bar{\nu} \tau a \ell$, compared with Soph. Aj. 973. Aías dooi $\chi^{\text {erat. In }}$ In the older language the perf. is found in an active form also ( $\psi \chi \eta \kappa \alpha$ ), which will therefore connect it with oi ${ }^{\text {vé }} \omega$ : it is however rare, and in Homer occurs but once, viz. in $\pi a \rho \psi^{\prime} \chi \eta \kappa \varepsilon \nu$, is past, Il. $\kappa, 252$. ; of more frequent occurrence is the form оіхшка*, which has exactly the common meaning of oixoнat; e.g.
 98. In this last writer oi $\chi \dot{\omega} \kappa \varepsilon \varepsilon, 8,126$. and $\pi a \rho o \iota \chi \dot{\omega} \kappa \varepsilon, 8,72$. are evidently pluperfects with the force of an imperfect ; but at $1,189.4$, 127. 165. oi $\chi \dot{\omega} \kappa \varepsilon \varepsilon$ is exactly the same as $\ddot{\varphi} \chi \varepsilon \tau \sigma$ in the common language, that is to say, used as an aorist, probably because the expression, "he was gone," marked the momentary act of going away. + [An Ion. 3. plur. pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varkappa_{\dot{\prime}} \times$ aro also occurs, but seldom. A regular fut. oilgouat is found in some manuscripts in Herodot. 2, 29.-The pres.
 Leon. Tar.; for the act. oix ${ }^{\omega}$ there is no authority.-Passow.]

[^201]sition of the two palatic letters, olyшка.
$\dagger$ It is certain that the common meaning of $\psi \chi$ ето may be explained in this same way, that is to say, as a pluperf., olxetal having the force of a perf.: but the view which I have taken of it appears to me simpler.

## Oit S．See Oiopat and Ф́́p $\omega$ ．

＇O $\boldsymbol{x}^{\prime} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，I land，has（beside the pres．and imperf．）only
 they stranded，\＆c．，Herodot．8， 84.



The form ódıofaive is not Attic：see Porson ad Phœniss． 1398. Bast．Ep．Cr．p．248．Isolated instances of its occurrence in the older writers（as in Plat．Lys．p．216．c．compared with Cratyl．p．427．b．） are but little to be depended on：in the later writers，as Lucian，\＆c．， it is found very frequently．＊－An aor．1．$\dot{\omega} \lambda \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a$ is also used by the later writers；see Lobeck ad Phryn．p．742．Passow has also a perf． ஸ்入і $\sigma \theta \eta к а$.
${ }^{3} \mathrm{O} \lambda \lambda \mu_{\iota} \dagger$ ，I destroy，annihilate：fut．$\dot{\lambda} \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ；aor． 1. ఱ้ $\lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha$ ；perf．${ }^{\circ} \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \alpha$ ．Midd．I perish，am undone；fut． o่入ои̃цаи；aor．2．шंगо́цги ；to which belongs the perf． 2. （perf．midd．）${ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega \lambda \alpha$ ．

The intransitive forms $\dot{\omega}^{\lambda} \alpha^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ and ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega \lambda a$ serve at the same time for
 per forms of the pass．are not used；none but writers of a very late


Of the same æra is also the fut．$\dot{o} \hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \ddagger$ ，e．g．Long．3，17．$\dot{\text { a }} \pi 0 \lambda \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\sigma \omega \nu$ ，Lucian．Asin．33．The examples quoted from Attic writers in Lobeck，p．746．，are not critically examined．

From the perf．act．was formed an Epic sister－form of the present， $\dot{\lambda} \lambda$ éccu§，of which（both in the act．and midd．）Homer has only the pres．and imperf．；the latter without the augment，ö̀єкоу，òле́коขто．


In II．$\tau$ ，135．stands the iterative imperf． $\begin{gathered}\text { 的 } \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \nu \text { ，which supposes }\end{gathered}$ an imperf．$\omega \lambda_{\varepsilon \sigma \nu}$ not quite agreeable to analogy．Heyne has adopted the reading $\ddot{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \nu$ ，which would be the iterative aorist；but the

[^202]$\ddagger$［What can Buttmann mean by stating $\dot{\Delta} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \omega$ to be the usage of the later writers only ？We find it in Od．$\nu, 399$ ．Hes．$є$ ， 178．and ỏ $\grave{́ \sigma} \sigma \sigma, 11 . \mu, 250 .-\mathrm{Ed}$.
§［Beside this Epic pres，we find $\delta \lambda \lambda \omega$ ， ò $\lambda \in ́ \omega$ ，ò $\lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，which are not Greek，$\delta \lambda$－ $\lambda \nu \nu \epsilon \in \omega$ ，which is suspected，and $\dot{b} \lambda \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ in Hesych．－Passow．］
iterative imperfect is the only tense to suit the passage, therefore the various reading $\dot{\delta} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \nu$ ought to have been adopted long ago.

 active sense of destructive, òдoبévav 'Eøıvviv, Phœen. 1036. In the Epic poets, who on account of the metre can have only oì $\lambda \dot{\rho} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ оc, the adjectival usage is the only one, and generally in the active sense with $\mu \tilde{\eta} \nu \varsigma$, , 'A $\tau \eta, \& c_{0}$ : but it has also the strictly passive meaning wretched,

 the Ep. aor. infin. in Hom. and Hes.-Passow.]
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O} \mu \nu \bar{\mu} \mu \ell, I$ swear: fut. ${ }^{\circ} \mu о \tilde{u} \mu \alpha l,-\varepsilon \tilde{h},-\varepsilon і ̃ \tau \alpha l, ~ \& c .$, infin. o $\mu \varepsilon i \sigma \theta \alpha \iota^{*}$; the other tenses take an o in the inflexion, as
 part. ${ }_{0} \mu \omega \mu \rho \sigma \mu \dot{\prime} \nu 0 s$; but in the remaining forms and in the aorist the Attics generally drop the $\sigma$, as in 3. sing. perf. pass. ${ }^{\circ} \mu \dot{\omega} \mu о \tau \alpha$, and aor. 1. pass. $\omega^{\prime} \mu{ }_{\prime}^{\prime} \hat{\theta}_{\eta \nu}$. - The middle occurs in the compounds, e.g. छ̇ $\pi \omega \mu \sigma \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \gamma \nu$.

From the $\sigma$ having been properly admitted into those forms only in which the three $\mu$ followed each other, we see that it was done for the sake of euphony ; and consequently they never appear without it. But it was afterwards transferred to some of the other forms, perhaps however not in the pure Attic writers. Thus in Demosth. c. Olymp. p.1174, 8. the reading has always been $\dot{v} \pi о \mu о \theta^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \sigma$ s, and in Demosth. c. Leptin.

[Homer generally uses the aor. 1. without the augment, and frequently with double $\sigma, \dot{\text { ó }} \boldsymbol{\prime} \sigma \sigma a \iota, \& c$. In the simple verb he has the imperf. $\ddot{\omega} \mu \nu \breve{v} \varepsilon$ as from $\dot{o} \mu \nu \dot{v} \omega$, but in the compound $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\omega} \mu \nu \bar{v}, \operatorname{Od} . \beta$, 377. In Herodot. 1, 153. is the Ionic part. pres. ó oои̃ves as from о̀ $\boldsymbol{o}^{\prime}$. - Passow.]

 is inflected according to the analogy of ${ }^{\circ} \gamma \nu \cup \mu$, , $\delta \varepsilon i \notin \nu \cup \mu$, \&c. - Midd.

[^203]perides ap. Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 725. ข่ло $\mu \sigma \theta$ eí $\sigma \eta s$; and in Eurip. Rhes. 816., without any necessity from the metre, о $\mu \omega \mu о \sigma \tau \alpha$,
'Ovinnu, I am of use to, I help: (no imperf. act.*) fut.

 part. óvńusvas (Od. $\beta, 33 . \omega, 30$.) ; but the other moods of this aorist have the $\alpha$, as optat. óvaí $\mu \eta \nu$, infin. oै $\nu \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha!$; and the indicative also borrowed this formation, but not until a later period, $\omega^{\prime} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$.

On this peculiarity of the aorist see Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 12, 13. Hence $\nleftarrow v a \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ in Eurip. Herc. 1368., and occurring in that passage only, well deserves our consideration. For a further account of this aor. む̀ $\nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ and the similar one from óvouat, see the latter verb. The aor. pass. $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ is also found (instead of $\dot{\omega} \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ ) in Xen. Anab. 5, 5, 2. Theocr. 15, 55.

This is one of those verbs formed by the reduplication of the first
 the reduplication is a (as in $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega, \delta i \delta \omega \mu \mu$, \&cc.), and it is substituted for the vowel of the root, as the temp. augment $\eta$ is in áкикоа, \&c.; thus ỏvá $\omega$ (whence $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ) $\dot{\delta} \nu i \nu \eta \mu$, like ả áá $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ả $\tau \iota \tau a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, and $\dot{o} \pi \tau \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ $\dot{\delta} \pi \iota \pi \tau \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega$. There is however no instance of $\dot{o} \nu \alpha ́ \omega$, $\partial \nu \varepsilon \in \omega$, or ơ ö $\nu \mu c$ being used by any writer.

The 3. sing. pres. act. $\dot{o v i v \eta \sigma \iota}$ and the midd. ovivapat are found in Homer, Plato, and others : but those forms in which there was anything displeasing to the ear were not used, and their places were supplied by the synonymous $\omega \phi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon}$. This was the case for instance with the imperf. act. $\dagger$; and for the same reason it might also seem very likely that the infin. act. odvivávat would have been avoided. This however cannot be asserted positively ; and there is even great probability in Matthiæ's suspicion that ovivat in Plat. Rep. 10. p. 600. d. may be a corruption of this word. $\ddagger$
"Ovoual, I think lightly of, reject with disdain, 2. sing. ö̀vooat,

 Hom. the infin. with double $\sigma$, $\dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta a t$; aor. 1. pass. $\omega_{\nu} \delta \sigma \theta \eta \nu$;

[^204]cannot prefer that aor. 2. act. (unknown in any other instance, and used here for the common ob $\nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha$, , to Matthiæ's correction; particularly as the imperf. is the only tense naturally suited to that passage.
$\oint$ T $\hat{\nu} \nu \mu \eta \delta \in ้ \nu$ катঠेоббо, Arat. 1142. according to the Paris manuscript.
 and infin. with double $\sigma$, óvó $\sigma \sigma a \sigma \theta a u$.

From a comparison of the forms we see that this is exclusively an Ionic and Epic verb, a formation in $\mu \iota$ from the root or stem ONO We must not therefore consider, as others frequently have done, övo $\mu$, oैvоутац, óvotто, \&c., as forms of the common barytone conjugation.

The inflexion of this verb however is certainly nothing more than a lengthening of the simple root $\mathrm{ON}-$ by the insertion of the vowel $o$, to which we are led by two Homeric forms, viz.

1. Aor. 戶vato, Il. $\rho, 25$. This Homeric form is separated from the ©vato of the later language belonging to ovivinu, not merely by its meaning, but, if accurately examined, by its form also ; only that this latter difference happens to be not marked by a difference of letters. That is to say, oviv$\eta \mu t$, ovivapat is a formation in $\mu \iota$ with the radical vowel $a$, ONA-: $\dot{\omega} v a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ therefore bears the same relation to it as $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \alpha_{-}$ $\mu \eta \nu$, if it were in use, would to ívтa $\mu a \ell$, or as $\varepsilon$ ह́ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ actually does to $i \pi \tau a \mu a \ell$, and it is the aor. 2. midd. Whereas the formation of övouau from ONO- is not to be unnecessarily confounded with the formation from ONA-, but is to be traced back, as in other similar cases, to the simple stem or root ON-.* According to this ळvá $\mu \eta \nu$ is the aor. 1. midd. of ON $\Omega$; or (which is the same thing) the aor. 2. 由̀ó $\mu \eta \nu, \not \omega \varepsilon \varepsilon-$ то, \&c., took the Ionic $\alpha$, making ढ̈varo, like єúparo, \&c.
2. Pres. ovv $\nu \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon$, 11. $\omega, 241$. Here the o of the radical syllable is
 again for obo $\nu 0 \sigma \varepsilon$, which is singular ; as there was no metrical reason for forming this particular present from the simple stem. $\dagger$

OП-. See 'Opáw.
> 'Onuíc, I marry, cohabit with, loses in the inflexion the เ; thus fut. $\dot{o} \pi \dot{v} \sigma \omega, \& c$., Aristoph. Acharn. 255.

[^205]such an arrangement, for the pres. ठve$\sigma \theta \epsilon$ is as strange in connexion with the root ONA- as with ONO-. Yet Hesychius has the glosses Oüncâote (corrupted
 all three with that false explanation; for all evidently refer to the Homeric passage. From this and from Aristarchus writing $\partial \nu \delta \dot{\sigma} \alpha \sigma \theta \in$ we see clearly how uncertain the reading was from the earliest times; and I have no doubt therefore that the old and genuine one was ofrvoate; nay, this becomes a certainty by the occurrence of the same phrase in the 2 . sing. \#) ууобаи...; Od. $\rho, 378$. therefore in

[According to Piers. ad Moer. p. 278. and Porson on Od. $\delta, 798$. the old and genuine form was $\dot{o} \pi \dot{v} \omega$; compare Schæf. Schol. Par. Apoll. Rh. 1, 45.-Passow.]
'Oṕćc, I see: imperf. with double augment écópovy (see
 verb siồ (which see) were borrowed the aor. 2. घiิov, im-

 (as an interjection iboú, ecce), infin. ióé $\sigma \theta \alpha \downarrow$; and from an
 shall see). The perf. pass. is either éépoquct (
 pass. the Attics use only ${ }^{\omega} \phi \theta \eta \nu$, while the later writers formed this tense from $\dot{\delta} \rho \dot{\rho} \alpha \omega$, as infin. $\dot{\delta} \rho \bar{\alpha} \dot{O} \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha$, . Verbal
 $\delta_{\rho} \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota,{ }_{\delta} \hat{\delta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ is in the simple verbs solely poetical.

The regular imperf. of ópci $\omega$ is $\tilde{\omega} \rho \omega \nu$, Ion. $\tilde{\omega}^{\rho} \rho \varepsilon \nu$ from the Ion. pres.
 रןє́धтає under $М \iota \mu \nu \grave{\eta} \sigma \omega$. We find also an Epic 2. sing. pres. midd.
 adopt the latter accentuation we must suppose it formed as from a verb in $\mu \tau$; if the former (which is expressly mentioned by Eustath. p. 548,40. Basil.), we form ópáєaı ípãaı like $\mu v \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon a \iota \mu v \theta \varepsilon \tau a \iota$, and we can

[^206]quire ${ }^{8} \delta р а к \alpha$. Now as all the passages where Dawes wrote むjpaka (except two totally corrupted in Athen, 2. p. 49.) become quite regular by adopting Tyrwhitt's emendation, eopaka has been considered an undoubted Attic form, and adopted in all the above-mentioned passages: see Porson ad Eurip. Phcen. 1367. Reisig ad Aristoph. p. 73. Meineke ad Menand. p. 119. And in support of this reading the $o$ is actually found in the Cod. Ravenn. of Aristoph. Plut. 1046. Thesm. 32, 33. At the same time it must be remembered that in other passages there is very strong traditional authority in favour of the old reading époaca, which must then be pronounced occasionally as a trisyllable.

+ This same $\delta \pi \tau$ ós is also furmed from ủncdos, I roast, consequently for $\dot{\delta} \pi \tau \eta r o b s$, as in Lat. assus for assatus.
easily see why the $\eta$ was preferred to the $a$, a change not uncommon in the Epic language, as in $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma a v \delta \eta \tau \eta \nu$ and the infinitives in- $-\eta \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$ and
 to us only as a various reading of Zenodotus for ó $\rho \tilde{a} \tau o$, cannot certainly with any propriety be admitted into Homer's text, as long as $\dot{\rho} \tilde{\rho} \tau \boldsymbol{r} \boldsymbol{c}$ and $\dot{\delta} \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ stand in other passages without a similar various reading. The other grammarians call this not an Ionic but a Doric form; which no doubt Zenodotus knew as well as they, otherwise he would have written $\dot{\delta} \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$, $\dot{o} \rho \tilde{\eta}$, коч $\mu \tilde{\eta} \tau о$, \&c. Whatever it is, we may be sure that it was a reading founded on old copies, which Zenodotus was unwilling to erase. To account for it we have no occasion to have recourse to the formation in $\mu$. We should rather say that the infin. in - $\varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$ being a sister-form of that in - $\varepsilon \nu \nu$ may be supposed to exist in the contracted shape also, and as there is no other Epic sister-form for $-\tilde{\alpha} \nu$ and $-\varepsilon \tilde{\nu} \nu$ than that in $-\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon-$ $v a t$, the natural supposition is that this belongs to the same contraction. There are instances enough in the Epic language of $\eta$ used for $\varepsilon \varepsilon$, which is still further supported by a remark of Heraclides in Eustath.ad Od. v, 287. p. 735, 15. Basil., that "the Dorians, whose dialect is used
 we must remember that a great portion of the Doric dialect is at the same time archaisms, and therefore not surprising in the Epic language.
 in Tim. Locr. - The imperfect generally used by Homer is (always without the augment) the 3. sing. act. ${ }^{\circ} \rho \bar{\alpha}$, midd. $\dot{\rho} \rho \tilde{a} \tau 0$, and plur. о́ $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu \tau$ т.
[Homer has used this verb both in a contracted and resolved shape,
 3. sing. opt. ס́ $\rho \tilde{q} \tau 0$, 3. plur. ópóviaro, Hom. Epig. 14, 20.; again ópó $\omega$,
 ípáa

From the root OI- comes the Ion. perf. (2.) $\dot{\boldsymbol{o} \pi \omega \pi a, \text { never used by }}$ the Attic prose writers; and thence in the Od. we find the 3. sing. pluperf. $\dot{o} \pi \dot{\omega} \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon$, in Herodot. $\dot{\boldsymbol{\pi} \pi} \boldsymbol{\omega} \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon, 1,68.5,92,6.7,208$. , but at 3, $37.0 \pi \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon$ is a pure perfect : compare ${ }^{\varepsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \omega \theta \varepsilon$ under " $E \theta \omega$.

In the compounds $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\prime} \nless \neq \mu a \iota$ must be distinguished from $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota o ́ \psi о \mu a \iota$. The former is the common fut. of $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi o \rho \tilde{q} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ occurring in II. $\xi, 145$. Od. $\eta$, 324. ; the latter has the particular sense of to select, choose, II. 九, 167. Od. $\beta, 294$., which $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi o \rho \tilde{a} \nu$ never has. And it is a singular fact that of both forms we find an aor. 1. midd. (the simple being never used*), as

[^207] '́ $\psi$ ato, he chose, in an old Attic expression, for which see Piers. ad Mœr. v. épón $\phi$ ópoo.*

'Oр $\varepsilon$ ' $\omega$, I stretch out, reach out: fut. |  |
| :---: |
| $\rho$ |
| $\xi$ |$\omega$, \&c. with accusative. Pass. and midd. I desire, with genitive; e. g. aor. 1. infin. midd.



In the poets the midd. occurs also in its proper meaning, $I$ stretch myself out, or with $\pi$ oãiv, $\chi$ £ $\rho \sigma i$, \&c., I stretch out my feet, hands; in


 part. ö $\rho \sigma a \varsigma$, and frequently in Hom. the Ionic aor. ö $\rho \sigma a \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ for ${ }_{\omega}^{\bar{\omega}} \rho \sigma \varepsilon$.
 $\mu \eta \nu$, or more frequently by syncope ( $\ddot{\rho} \rho \mu \eta \nu$ ), 3. sing. ${ }_{\omega} \rho \tau \sigma$, imper.

 for an account of these syncopated forms see ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \varepsilon \nu \tau o$ under $\Gamma_{\varepsilon}$ ivouat.

I know of no authority for the fut. midd. óproцu兀, instead of which Homer has (from a fut. 2. орой $\mu u$ ) the 3. sing. ө̀реїтає (Il. v, 140.); but the various reading öpprat as aor. 2. conj. may very well be preferred to the future.

With the above are joined two reduplicated forms:

1. ópw $\rho a$, a perf. belonging to the immediate meaning of the middle, I an risen up. Of this form Homer has only the 3. sing. ö $\rho \omega \rho \varepsilon$, conj. ö $\rho \dot{\omega} \rho \eta$; pluperf. ò $\rho \dot{\rho} \rho \varepsilon \iota$ and $\dot{\omega} \rho \omega \dot{\rho} \rho \varepsilon$, Il. $\sigma, 498$.

 it has generally a causative meaning and is therefore the same as the aor. 1. $\varpi_{\rho} \rho \sigma$ : but like that perfect it has sometimes the immediate meaning; and this was the foundation of an earlier opinion, according

[^208] and olve under $\Phi \leqslant \rho \omega$.
§ This perfectly regular form was for a long time ejected from II. 刃, 474. by $\bar{\omega} \rho$ $\theta a ı$, because ó $\rho \theta$ at was considered to be the perfect (see Heyne), the cause of the abbreviation being unknown. But Homer never uses the perf. పןpua, while he has the aor. Фрто, брго, бриєעos frequently. The true reading spoai is now restored to the text from the most undoubted sources.
 posed, which idea seemed also supported by II. v, 78. Оṽtc $\nu \tilde{v} v$ кaì

 firmly established by analogy and usage, ↔юpope must be understood here as well as elsewhere to indicate the moment of his courage being first roused, and indeed in this passage $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \rho \theta \eta$ might have been joined with the pres. and perf. quite as well as épope.

Beside the above Homer has from a perf. pass. oj $\rho \dot{\rho} \rho \varepsilon \mu a \iota$ the 3. sing.
 the Epic language are three similar perfects $\dot{\alpha} к \dot{\eta} \chi \varepsilon \mu a \iota, \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \dot{\rho} \varepsilon \mu a t$,

 were smoothed off into their present shape according to the analogy of the formation in $\dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ : thus the conj. $\dot{\rho} \omega \omega^{\prime} \rho \eta \tau a t$ is quite as agreeable to analogy as кє́ктшнає, \&c., is from кéктпцаь.

Another Homeric form is $\dot{o} \rho \bar{\varepsilon} o \nu \tau o$ (II. $\beta, 398 . \psi, 212$. ), which is not quite according to analogy, particularly if supposed to be the same as $\epsilon^{\circ} \rho o v \tau 0$. But according to form it can be only an imperfect; and if we examine the passages more closely we shall see that it belongs to a peculiar meaning. It is said of the Greeks, that 'Avarávzes ópéovтo кє-
 must mean they hastened, rushed; and the same of the winds, roi $\delta$
 is never the meaning of $\not \partial \rho \nu v \nu \tau 0, \& c$. We must therefore suppose a separate verb $\bar{\rho} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} о \mu a \iota^{*}$ derived from OP $\Omega$ : and we find the pres. of such a verb in the epitaph on Hesiod given by Pausanias (9,38.) 'Hroó-
 still less will arise, but rushes in every direction, is spread far and wide.
 $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \lambda o i ̀$ ópovzat, the herdsmen . . . . over the herds. Here the old Grammarians, as the meaning of the verb is not clear, supposed a separate verb öpouaє with the meaning I take care of; of which öpovтo, at Od. $\gamma, 471$. (where the same phrase recurs) would be imperfect. $\dagger$ But at II. $\psi, 112$. we find in the same sense of an overlooker or superintending servant, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \grave{\delta} \delta^{\circ} \dot{a} \nu \grave{\eta} \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \lambda \grave{o}$ s $\dot{\delta} \rho \omega \dot{\rho} \rho \varepsilon$. I know of no other way to reconcile these passages, but to suppose a separate verb öpo $\mu a \iota$ synony-

[^209]keep watch, Od. $\xi, 104$. Others place the verb in this passage under OP $\Omega$, оै $\rho \nu v \mu$; but neither ö $\rho \omega$ nor oै $\rho o \mu \alpha$ is ever found in actual usage, and the sense of the passage is contrary to it.]
mous with $\dot{\text { oféo }} \boldsymbol{\mu a \iota}$; then $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\delta} \rho \rho \mu a \iota$ will mean, I bestir or busy myself about anything: while in the third passage, where the metre would not admit of the same form, the pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \ldots \ldots$....ó $\rho \dot{\rho} \rho \varepsilon$ was substituted for it with the sense of, he had bestirred himself, had risen up (to accompany them). Thus in both passages the preposition $\varepsilon$ ét gives of itself the idea of guard or protection.
'О reduplication) ópópüұх; pluperf. ópwpú $\chi \varepsilon เ \nu$; perf. pass. о́р́́рияцаи, Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 7. Midd. e. g. aor. 1. infin. ópúz $\alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Herodot. 1, 186.

In the later writers the reduplication of the perfect was dropped and the temporal augment substituted for it, particularly in the pass. $\begin{aligned} & \text { épv- }\end{aligned}$ $\gamma \mu a l$, of which we may see instances from the time of Polybius in Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 33. Whether we ought to suffer ©̈pvктo, 1, 186. and $\begin{gathered}\rho \\ \text { и }\end{gathered}$ тat, 2, 158. to remain in the text of Herodotus, when we find ¿рє́риктo only a few lines afterwards in the former passage, I will not venture to decide.
 aor. $\omega \sigma ф \rho o ́ \mu \eta \nu: ~ s e e ~ n o t e ~ u n d e r ~ A i \sigma \theta \alpha ́ \nu о \mu \alpha ь . ~[I t ~ i s ~ j o i n e d ~$ with. accus. in Herodot. 1, 80.'; in the later writers as Elian, Lucian, \&c., with genitive. - Passow.]
The pres. $\dot{\sigma} \phi \rho \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota$ was also an Attic form, Antiphanes ap. Athen. p. 299. e., öaфpã̃ $\alpha \iota$, Lucian. Piscat. 48.

Instead of $\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ we find, but less frequently, $\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, whence
 from Eipiaкш. The aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ came also into use among the later writers (Arat. Dios. 223. see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 741.), as did also from the regular inflexion other forms, e. g. aor. 1. pass.

[This verb was also used as a passive with the meaning of to be smelt, but only by the later medical writers, who have likewise the active óaфpaìw тıvá $\tau \iota v$, I give a person something to smell at, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 468. But the presents, which have been erroneously derived from aorists, as ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \phi \rho \rho \omega$, ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \phi \rho о \mu a \zeta$, $\partial \sigma \phi \rho a ́ \omega$, $\partial \sigma \phi \rho \varepsilon \in$, , and the like, are not Greek. - Passow.]

Oи̇入ópıvos. See "Oגлv $\mu$.
Оथ̈vєбөє. See "Оуоцаи.
Oúpé $\omega$, mingo : imperf. (with syllabic augment) ṡoú-

pour* ; fut. midd. oúpriбopat; perf. act. ह̇oúprxa. Beside the regular infin. oupsiv, Hes. $\varepsilon, 760$., the common language used oupñ้v, like そั̃ข. $\dagger$
 The following Epic forms belong to a syncopated aorist with $\alpha$ short

 Homer has the pres. où $\begin{gathered}\text { á } \zeta \omega \text {, with its aor. 1. ov̈rắ } \sigma, \text {, and perf. pass. }\end{gathered}$

' $\mathrm{O} \phi s / \lambda \omega$, I owe, I ought, I must: fut. ’’фsı $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, \&c. The aor. 2. $\omega^{\prime} \phi \varepsilon \lambda_{0 \nu}$ is used only as a wish, as ${ }^{\prime} \phi \varepsilon \lambda_{0}$

 that he had . . . ., \&c.

There are some Ionic forms of the present which come immediately
 p. 309.

Homer uses $\dot{\delta} \phi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ sometimes as a separate verb with the sense of $I$ increase, enlarge, sometimes as synonymous with $\dot{\delta} \phi \varepsilon i \lambda \omega . ~ \ddagger$

The form $\ddot{\omega} \phi \varepsilon \lambda o \nu,-\varepsilon \varsigma,-\varepsilon$. (the 1. and 2. pers. plur. were not in use) had no augment either in the Ion. dialect, in the whole range of Greek poetry (except what was strictly Attic), or in the later prose, e.g. ö $\phi \varepsilon-$ $\lambda_{o v},-\varepsilon \varsigma,-\varepsilon$; and in this form as well as in the other the Epics doubled the $\lambda$ whenever the metre required it, as $\ddot{\omega} \phi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda o v, \not{\omega} \phi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$, ${ }^{\circ} \phi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu, \& \mathrm{c}$.

 Melamp. ap. Tzetz. ad Lycophr. 682. And there is no doubt that the imperfect, however it may have been written, was the true old form of this wish, "it was my duty to have been there, I ought to have been there." The common $\begin{gathered} \\ \phi \\ \lambda \\ \text { ov } \\ \text { arose therefore entirely from a quick pro- }\end{gathered}$ nunciation of the above formula, and has the appearance only of an aor. 2.

[^210]$\ddagger$ That this verb is sometimes written in Homer $\dot{\delta} \phi \epsilon \in \mathfrak{\lambda} \omega$ (11. ג, 686. 688.698.), and sometimes ob申é $\lambda \lambda \omega$ (Il. т. 200. Od. $\gamma$, 367. N, 332. 462.), is an old mistake naturally arising from tradition. Without wishing to prove the affinity of the two meanings, I have still no doubt of the Homeric form for both being $\delta \phi$ é $\lambda \lambda c o$; consequently the three verses in II. $\lambda$. ought properly to be written the same as the others.

Of ó $\phi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，I increase，there is in Homer an anomalous 3．sing．opt． ó $\phi \hat{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \epsilon \varepsilon \nu$, Il．$\pi, 651$ ．Od．$\beta, 334$ ．If we call this word a present，its irregularity will be quite unexampled．But by a closer examination of the verse in the former of the two passages we shall see that the sub－ ject of it is not Hector but Jupiter，who was then in the act of making his decision．In this case then the aor．is the proper form，and it is the more natural one in the other passage．But the aor．of ${ }^{\prime} \phi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ can be no other than $\ddot{u} \phi \varepsilon \epsilon \lambda a$ ，opt． $\begin{gathered}\phi \\ \epsilon \\ \lambda \\ \lambda \epsilon \varepsilon \nu\end{gathered}$ ；and it is not at all im－ probable that the Rhapsodists，who had but an obscure feeling of analogy，being reminded by this form of the meaning of ò $\phi \varepsilon i \lambda \omega$ ，might have altered it to the clearer but less analogous $\dot{\circ} \phi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu . *$
＇Oф入ıбжо́vш，I am guilty（of a crime），incur（as a punishment）：fut．$\dot{\delta} \phi \lambda \eta \dot{\sigma} \omega \omega$ ；perf．$\omega^{\omega} \phi \lambda \eta \varkappa \alpha$ ；aor．$\omega^{\circ} \phi \lambda 0 \nu$ ， infin．$\dot{\langle } \phi \lambda \epsilon i \nu, ~ p a r t . ~ \dot{~} \phi \lambda \omega ́ \nu$ ，Elmsl．Aristoph．Ach．689．and Eurip．Heracl． 985.

A pres．${ }^{\circ} \phi \lambda \omega$ is nowhere found，and wherever ${ }^{\omega} \phi \lambda o \nu$ occurs，it pre－ supposes a juridical decision or something equivalent to have already
 tion as still continuing，and in a metaphor borrowed from common life describes the situation of one who is constantly exposing himself to something unpleasant，as ò $\phi \lambda \iota \sigma \kappa a ́ v \varepsilon \iota ~ \gamma^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \lambda \omega \tau a$ ，he incurs laughter， makes himself ridiculous，and the like．Bekker was therefore quite right in accenting $\dot{\delta} \phi \lambda \varepsilon \tau \nu$ for $\begin{aligned} & \phi \\ & \lambda \varepsilon \iota \nu \\ & \text { according to the reading of the }\end{aligned}$ best manuscripts in Plat．Alcib．I．35．（p．121．b．）：but with regard
 The aor．1．$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \circ \phi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma a \iota$（Alciphr．3，26．）belongs therefore to the later forms enumerated in Lobeck＇s Parerg．c． 5.

Among the Ionic resolutions in Herodotus，one of the most re－ markable is that of the 3．pers．of the imperf．$\varepsilon \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon$ in three verbs，
 under ${ }^{\text {＂}} \mathrm{E} \theta \omega$ ．

It is clear that $\stackrel{\oplus}{\tilde{\omega}} \phi \lambda o \nu$ is properly the aor．of $\dot{\partial} \phi \varepsilon i \lambda \omega$ according to the analogy of $\eta$ グ $\gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau$ and $\tilde{\eta}^{\lambda} \lambda \theta o \nu$ ；and that the other forms for this parti－ cular meaning were framed after it．

[^211][^212]
## п.

Паiלш, I sport, joke: fut. $\pi \alpha \not \xi \neq \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\pi \alpha \iota \xi \xi_{0} \mu \alpha \iota$; whence the later writers formed an aor. 1. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \alpha \iota \xi \alpha$, perf. pass. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \pi \alpha r \gamma \mu \alpha$, , \&c.; but in the Ionic and pure Attic dialect the aor. 1 . is always $\because \pi \alpha \omega \sigma \alpha$ and the perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \iota \sigma \mu \alpha_{l}{ }^{*}$, notwithstanding their similarity to the same tenses in $\pi \alpha i \omega$.
[This verb does not occur at all in the Iliad; but in the Odyssey we find (beside the pres. and imperf.) the imperat. aor. $\pi$ aifare, Od. I, 251. On the other hand the later writers, as Plutarch, \&c., have the regular Dor. aor. infin. $\pi a \tilde{\xi} \xi a \iota$; the aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon$ ह̇ai $\chi \theta \eta \nu$; perf. act. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi a \iota \chi a$, perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi a \iota \gamma \mu a \iota$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 240.—Passow.]
$\Pi \alpha i \omega, I$ strike, is regular. The pass. takes $\sigma$.-Midd. as aor. 1. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha$ í $\sigma \alpha \tau$, Xen.

The Attics have another fut. $\pi a \imath \eta \sigma \omega$, which is more in use than the regular one, Aristoph. Nub. 1125. Lys. 459.
$\Pi \alpha \lambda \alpha i \omega$, I wrestle, struggle: fut. $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha l \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ह̇ $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$, whence 3. sing. opt. $\pi \alpha \lambda \eta \dot{\sigma \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon, ~ H e r o d o t . ~ 8, ~} 21$. where however one manuscript has $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha i \sigma \varepsilon เ \varepsilon \nu$. The pass. takes $\sigma$.
 Pass. aor. 2.

Homer has also the aor. 2. act. with the reduplication in the compound part. $\dot{a} \mu \pi \varepsilon \pi a \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \nu$ : and the syncop. aor. 2. midd. $\pi$ á $\lambda \tau o$, II. o, 645. In Callimachus 1. 64, we find the aor. 1. midd. infin. $\pi \boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda a \sigma \theta a$.

Пáo $\mu a t, I$ acquire, occurs only in its aor. 1. ह̇ $\pi \bar{\alpha} \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \alpha ́-$ $\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$; and perf. $\pi \bar{\varepsilon} \pi \bar{\alpha} \mu a \iota \dagger$, 3. sing. pluperf. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \bar{\alpha} \tau 0$. This verb was used exactly like ктáoцa!, кє́ктŋцаи. The aorist is found only in the poets; the perfect and pluperfect in prose also, e. g. in Xenophon.

The aorist of this verb is sufficiently distinguished from the aorist of $\pi a r \varepsilon \varepsilon_{0} \mu u, I$ eat, (although they are written the same, ) by the $a$ of the former being long while that of the latter is short. The perfect of the latter differs by having the $\sigma$. $\ddagger$

[^213][^214]П́́бб⿱, Att. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega, I$ strew, sprinkle, besprinkle: fut. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ ( - ) ; perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\xi} \pi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$. - Midd. See $\Pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ and 'Арио́тгш.

Some of the forms of this verb are written the same as those of $\pi a \tau$ '́o $\mu$ u.
$\Pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega^{\omega}$ *, I suffer: fut. $\pi$ sí opaı as the fut. midd. of $\pi \varepsilon i \theta \omega$; perf. 2. $\pi \in \pi \pi o \nu \theta \alpha$ (from the stem ПEN $\Theta$ - as seen


Beside the above, we find the following old sister-forms ; in Od. $\rho$, 555. a fem. perf. part. $\pi \varepsilon \pi a ̆ \theta v i ̃ a, ~ w h i c h ~ s u p p o s e s ~ a ~ p e r f . ~ \pi ध ́ ~ \pi \eta \theta a ~ a c-~$ cording to the analogy of $\dot{\alpha} \rho a \rho v i ̃ a$ and others under 'A $\rho a \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega$ : and in Æschyl. Agam. 1635. in the Iambics the aor. 1. part. $\pi$ 向бas (from an aor. $\check{\varepsilon} \pi \eta \sigma a)$. The fut. $\pi \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a t$ is uncertain. $\ddagger$

We find also in Homer a syncopated perf. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi v \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ for $\pi \varepsilon \pi \dot{v} \nu \theta a \tau \varepsilon$, like $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \dot{\eta} \gamma o \rho \theta \varepsilon$ for ${ }^{\varepsilon} \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \dot{\prime} \rho a \tau \varepsilon$, by an imitation of the passive termination : that is to say, as soon as in $\pi \varepsilon \pi \sigma \nu \theta \theta a \tau \varepsilon$ the $\theta$ preceded the $\tau$, it was changed to $\sigma$ (as ${ }^{\prime} \delta \mu \varepsilon \nu,{ }_{\imath}^{\prime} \sigma \tau \varepsilon$ ) and the $\nu$ was dropped, making $\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon^{-}$ $\pi o \sigma \tau \varepsilon$; a transition was then made to a passive form $\pi \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \pi o \sigma \theta \varepsilon$.

Пaг $\alpha \sigma \sigma \omega, I$ strike, is regular: it was used by the Attics in the active voice only. See П $\lambda \dot{\gamma} \sigma \sigma \omega$.
$\Pi a \tau \varepsilon \in$, I tread, is regular. The pres. pass. accidentally coincides with the following verb.

Пatéoцat, I taste, eat, an Ion. depon. midd. : àor. 1. غ̇ $\pi a ̆ \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \dot{\text { áa }} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta a \iota$; perf. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi a \sigma \mu a \iota$. That these forms belong to each other is proved by the identity of usage (e.g. Herodot. 1, 73. and 2, 47.
 of $\delta a \tau \varepsilon \pi \tau \theta a \iota, \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma a \sigma \theta a$.

Пav́w, I cause to cease, stop: fut. $\pi \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. है $\pi \alpha u \sigma \alpha$, \&c.: there are no traces of a perfect. Midd. $\pi \alpha \dot{\prime} \rho \mu \alpha \iota, I$ cease: fut. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma о \mu \alpha \_$§; perf. pass. $\pi \in ́ \pi \alpha u \mu \alpha$, I have ceased, i. e. I no longer continue to do so ; aor. 1. midd. '่ $\pi \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$; aor. 1. pass. غ̇ $\pi \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \dot{u} \sigma \theta \eta \nu \|$;

[^215]$\ddagger$ It occurs here and there as a various reading, e. g. in Herodot. 9, 37. Xen. Cyr. 7,3.10. See also Schweig. Ind, to Polyb.
§ [The regular fut midd. is $\pi \alpha$ v́couas, but the purer Attic writers prefer merav́. бomal, Soph. Ant. 91. Piers. ad Mœr. p. 293:- Passow.]
|| [There is said to have been also an
the former, Ionic and perhaps old Attic, is found in Hes. 9, 533. Herodot. 1, 130. ; while the latter is preferred by Thucydides and the Attics who followed him.*

The imperat. act. $\pi a \tilde{v} \varepsilon$ is very commonly used in the immediate sense for auvov: and there is one instance mentioned of the aor.
 $\iota \sigma \alpha \nu \kappa \alpha i ̀ \pi a v ̃ \sigma a \nu$ á $\theta \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, but the excellent Cod. Vindob. 56. has $\mathrm{M} \nu \eta-$ $\sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \rho a \varsigma$, according to which the subject of the verb is the two chief suitors mentioned in the verse before. By this emendation the connexion of the whole sentence becomes so much more natural, that it helps to prove the truth of the reading. Compare also the Ambrosian Scholium.

 fut. midd. $\pi \varepsilon i \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$; perf. pass. $\pi \varepsilon$ я $\pi \varepsilon เ \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, I have been convinced, therefore $I$ believe firmly: aor. 1. є̇sí $\sigma \eta \eta \nu$ : to
 intransitive sense, I trust.

In Il. $\beta, 341 . \delta, 159$ we find a syncop. 1. plur. pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \theta \mu \varepsilon \nu$
 $\theta_{\mu \varepsilon \nu}$ from $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \theta a$ under " ${ }^{\prime} \rho \chi \circ \mu a t$, and several others, every thing between the root and the termination is dropped : and as some of these perfects (кє́краүa, $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi o t \theta a, \& c$.) have the force of a pres., they have also an imperative ending in $\theta \iota$, кє́крах $\begin{aligned} & \ell \iota, \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \theta \iota \text {, Æschyl. Eum. }\end{aligned}$ 602 ., in which latter the diphthong of the root is retained.

Poetry has also (see the Indexes of Aristoph. and Eurip.) the
 $\pi i \theta o v, \pi t \theta \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta a u$, for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon i \sigma \theta \eta \nu, \&{ }^{2}$. The Fpic language never uses the act. aor. without the redupl. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \check{\imath} \theta o v, \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \theta \varepsilon, \pi \varepsilon \pi i \theta o \mu \mu, \& c$.; but in the midd. it has the usual $\pi t \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a a$. The reduplicated form of the midd. (at least in the only passage where it occurs) belongs as to
 the act. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \ell \theta \omega \nu$, Pind. Isth. $4,122 . \ddagger$

From this aor. 2. arose again other active forms, as fut. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \because \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, and $\pi \grave{\imath} \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, aor. 1. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \theta \eta \sigma a$, and part. $\pi \grave{\theta} \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$; but with this difference,
aor. $̇$ End́ $\eta \nu$, Chœeroboscus A B. 3. p. 1324. - Passow.]

* It must be observed, however, that even in Thucydides $(2,77.5,91,100$.) the reading $\pi \alpha v \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ has been restored from the best manuecripts.
+ [Of this tense Homer has only the

$\ddagger$ Bockh says the same of the simple aor. part. $\pi \iota \theta$ ©́v, Pyth. 3, 28. (50.), but I cannot subscribe to his opinion.
that $\pi \varepsilon \pi \epsilon \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ has the meaning of to persuade, but $\pi \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \pi \iota \theta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$, the intransitive sense of $\pi \varepsilon^{\prime} \theta \circ \mu \mathrm{\alpha}$ and $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi o \iota \theta a$, to obey or follow; to trust to.

Such is the distinction which must be observed if we follow our present Homeric text. But here our attention is at once arrested by the circumstance, that according to this rule $\pi \varepsilon \pi o t \theta \omega_{s}$ and $\pi i \theta$ ضroas would be used in many passages indifferently, without distinction of sense or metre. Now it should be observed, that $\pi \varepsilon \pi o \iota \theta$ 's , of which the established meaning has always been, trusting to, relying on, fretus, never
 $\pi \varepsilon \pi o \iota \theta$ ' $\varsigma, \& c$. : while we cannot but feel, that in opposition to these

 obeying or yielding to; which sense the future of the same verb has also in the only passage where any part of it occurs beside the participle;
 $\delta, 398$. Tydeus, having slain all the Thebans (who lay in wait for him),
 clear that he does it "in obedience to the signs of the gods." When, however, at $\zeta, 183$., Bellerophon attacks and kills the terrible Chimæra, and the same expression is used, $\neg \varepsilon \tilde{\omega} \nu$ т тра́ $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota \pi \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a \varsigma$, the word can mean nothing more than trusting to, confiding in. But we find in the same sense at II. $\mu$, 256. speaking of the Trojans attacking the Grecian walls, Toũ $\pi \varepsilon \rho \delta \grave{\eta}$ (i. e. of Jupiter,) т $\tau \rho$ ŕ $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota ~ \pi \varepsilon \pi \circ \iota \theta$ óт $\varepsilon \varsigma$ : which passage alone makes it very probable that $\pi \varepsilon \pi \sigma \theta \dot{\omega} s$ was also the original reading in the other, viz. $\zeta, 183$. And this supposition is strengthened by II. $\nu, 369$. Od. $\phi, 315$. where our text reads $\pi \iota \theta \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma$ in the same sense of trusting to, but the manuscripts actually have the various reading $\pi \varepsilon \pi o \iota \theta$ 's.s. It is therefore very probable that through the affinity of the two readings, and the similarity of the expressions, both verbs were very early confounded together; and that $\pi \varepsilon \pi o \iota \theta$ ís was also the original reading in II. $\lambda, 235 . \rho, 48 . \chi, 107$. , and Hes. $\varepsilon, 669$.

Пєíк $\boldsymbol{I}$ shear, comb : fut. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$, \&c. Compare the Ion. $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$ from ঠєíкvขци. - Midd. In the Attic language the pres. $\pi \varepsilon \kappa \tau \varepsilon ́ \omega$ was in use.*

[^216]Theocr. 5, 98. Etym. M. vv. $\pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa o s$ and теіккш (p. 667, 40.), Etym. Gud. v. теікс (p. 456.). Aristophanes has тектеi้ and тєктойеуоу: but whether тє́ктеเข or тектеiy is doubtful. In Pollux 7. e. 33, 1. we find $\pi \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \in เ \nu$ as a pres. of $\pi \epsilon \in \xi a \tau 0$, but through a misunderstanding the text of our editions has тéket. See Jungermann's note. Thus we see that the simple stem $\pi$ ккш was strengthened by the Atties to $\pi$ ќктш, which again was changed to $\pi \in \kappa \tau \hat{\omega}$, like $\hat{\rho}\{\pi \tau \omega$ to $\dot{\rho} เ \pi \tau \hat{\omega}$.
$\Pi \varepsilon \iota \nu \alpha ́ \omega$, I hunger: fut. $\pi \varepsilon เ \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, \&c. This verb, like

 $\pi \varepsilon \iota \nu \tilde{\eta} s, \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha \iota, \delta i \psi \eta \eta \varepsilon$, so that in these forms the indic. and conj. are the same.

Пsip $\alpha$, , I try, is regular, with $\alpha$ long, Ion. $\eta$, in the inflexion. The passive as a deponent, with fut. middle, has the same sense; but it means also to experience.

The Epics use the aor. of the midd. as well as of the pass. in the sense of a deponent. The same poets have a form $\pi \varepsilon$ ¢á $\zeta_{\omega}$ with a frequentative meaning, to try, to prove, which again became common in the language of the later writers, while the Attics always used iтє $\varphi \rho \tilde{q} \tilde{\nu}$ only. The passive with the $\sigma$ belongs entirely to this later $\pi \varepsilon \varphi \rho^{\prime}-$ $\zeta \omega$. The form $\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon i \rho a \nu \tau a \iota$ may come also from $\pi \varepsilon \rho a i \nu \omega$. See Пєрá $\omega$.

## $\Pi \varepsilon ́ \kappa \kappa, \pi \varepsilon \kappa т \varepsilon ́ \omega$. See Пєі́кш.

## $\Pi \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\zeta} \omega$, $I$ approach, is regular. The Attic fut. $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\alpha} \tilde{\nu}$ occurs sometimes in the poets.

In the older language this verb has the causative meaning to bring near, carry or place near; whence the pass. $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta о \mu a u, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \nu$ takes the immediate sense, which the active has in the common language. Homer has $\pi \varepsilon \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$ in the older meaning only, succeeding poets in both.

The sister-form $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \omega^{*}$ occurs as a present in Hymn. Bacch. 44. $\pi \varepsilon \lambda a ́ q \nu$. The poetical aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \nu$ used by the Attics, and the verbal adj. $\ddot{a} \pi \lambda \bar{a}$ ãos which comes from it, and is found both in the Attics and the Epic poets, are supposed to be formed by syncope: but the $a$ is always long; whence it is clear that this is rather a transposition of sounds together with a contraction, like кє́кра̄ка from кєрá $\omega$, $\pi \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\pi \rho a ̈ \kappa a$ from $\pi \varepsilon \rho a ́ \omega, \& c$. And in the same way we must explain in the Epics, 1. the perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu \iota \iota, \pi \varepsilon \pi \lambda \eta \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu o g$, Od. $\mu, 108$., and 2. the aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu, \pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \tau o \dagger$; that is to say, as syncopated forms from
 contraction takes place, as it does in the similar case of кéкра̄ка (under Kєрá $\nu \nu \nu \mu$ ), Ion. into $\eta$, Att. in $\bar{a}$. $\ddagger$ We find also frequently $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \eta \nu$, but this is indisputably through the common fault of corrupting the $\theta$

[^217][^218]of the aor. 1. pass. into $\sigma \theta$; for it cannot be supposed that beside $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{c}^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ a third form not required by any metre could have been also in use. See Brunck on Eurip. Hec. 880.

The Tragedians have also a sister-form $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$, by adding - $\theta \omega$ to the vowel of the stem or root, and this they again contract in the present (as in the last paragraph) into $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$ with long $\alpha$.

A pres. $\pi \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$ (for $\pi \varepsilon \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega)$ is also supposed, on account of $\pi \rho o \sigma \varepsilon ́-$ $\pi \lambda a \zeta \varepsilon$, Od. $\lambda, 583$. , and the particip. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \pi \lambda a ́ \zeta o \nu$, Il. $\mu, 285$. And the Epic language furnishes sufficient grounds arising from metrical difficulty, to account for the syncope in these forms. But there are other points to be considered : particularly that these two would then be the only Homeric passages among a very large number, in which the active voice would have the later immediate meaning of to approach. Besides in these two passages the water and the waves are the subject, and the case is the same in a third passage, II. $\phi, 269$., where the wave that is
 mentators understand this last also to be for $\pi \bar{\varepsilon} \lambda a \zeta \varepsilon$, although here the context makes it far less probable. In addition to this we must observe that the common $\pi \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$, $-\mathbf{a} \gamma \xi \omega$ occurs very frequently in Homer, and is used also of waves, in as much as they beat and drive ships from their course. It is therefore pretty certain that $\pi \lambda \alpha{ }_{c} \zeta \omega$ is the proper expression for the beating of the waves, and was used intransitively as well as transitively, in as much as an object is met and moved by them, consequently moved from its place, or beaten and driven away; whence therefore the common metaphorical sense of $\pi \lambda a ́ \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a c$, to wander about.

Another Epic sister-form is made by changing -a $\omega$ into - $\nu$ á $\omega,-\nu \eta \mu$, and the $\varepsilon$ of the root into $\iota$, as $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega, \pi i \lambda \nu \eta \mu \iota$, $\pi i \lambda \nu a \mu \alpha \iota$ : see $\kappa i \rho \nu \eta \mu \iota$ from $\kappa \varepsilon \rho a ́ \omega$ in note under Kєрáv$\nu v \mu$.
$\Pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda$ and more frequently $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda o \mu a t, I a m$, an old verb which remained in use among the Dorics ( $\pi \varepsilon^{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon \iota, \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta$, Fragm. Pythag. Gale, p. 749. 750.) and the poets. It has only pres, and imperf., which latter, when it retains the augment, suffers syncope; e. g. 3. sing. imperf. act. $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \varepsilon$; 2. sing. imperf. midd. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \varepsilon \sigma$, contr. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon ;$ 3. sing. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \lambda \varepsilon \tau o . *$ And here we find this peculiarity, that the imperfect passive has very commonly the meaning of the present, as II. $a, 418 . \zeta, 434$.
 $\mu \varepsilon v_{0} \dagger$, in what appears to be the original meaning, I am employed about, prevail amongst, versor, and with the same syncope: as in Od.


[^219]vail among men, frequentant, versantur ; in which sense Homer elsewhere uses $\pi \omega \lambda \lambda_{\dot{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{\prime} \mu \iota, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \pi \omega \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \circ \mu a \iota$, which is therefore the only instance of the termination $-\varepsilon$ $\omega$ having the change of vowel to $\omega$.
$\Pi \varepsilon ́ \mu \pi \omega, I$ send: fut. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \mu \psi \omega$; aor. 1. $\xi^{\prime} \pi \varepsilon \mu \psi \alpha$; perf. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \sigma \mu \phi \alpha$.* In the passive Pindar and Herodotus have the aor. 1. part. $\pi \varepsilon \mu \phi \theta s i g$, and Photius the part. perf. $\pi \varepsilon-$ $\pi \varepsilon \mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu o s$. The other tenses are generally supplied by $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \sigma \tau \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \omega$.

חENӨ-. See Пáбхш.
Пе́voцаи, I am poor: in Hom. I labour, and transit. I prepare by labour, $\delta \alpha \tilde{\tau} \tau \alpha, \& c$. It is used only in pres. and imperf.

Пє́погӨモ. See Пáбхш.
Пє́тршرац, \&c. See Порєіข.
$\Pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega$. See Пє́ $\sigma \sigma \omega$.
Пspá $\omega$, I go over, pass over or through : fut. $\pi \varepsilon р \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$, Ion. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \gamma^{\prime} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$, Ion. $\varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\rho} \eta \sigma \alpha$. This verb is regular, with $\alpha$ long, Ion. $\eta$.
Different from the above is an inflexion with a short, $\pi \varepsilon \rho a \dot{\sigma} \sigma$, , $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\rho \tilde{\sigma} \sigma a$, and in the sense of to sell; but found only in the Epic poets, and without any trace of a present with the same meaning having been in use; for $\pi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$, infin. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{q} \nu$ is in this sense a future. Hence comes the verb in common use $\pi \iota \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ with the subst. $\pi \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \iota$. For further particulars we refer to that verb, only remarking here that the original identity of the two is undoubted. That is to say, the common meaning of $\pi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{q} \nu$ is to go over, and it governs as a transitive the accusative of
 taken causatively, to carry over $\dagger$; whence arose the meaning of to sell, i. e. to carry over the sea or into another country for sale. And usage separated the formation, so that $\pi \varepsilon \rho a ̆ \sigma \omega$ and its derivatives meant only to sell, while $\pi \varepsilon \rho \bar{a} \sigma \omega, \pi \varepsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ retained only the sense of to pass over, with the single exception of $\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \rho \eta \mu \varepsilon v^{\prime}$ os in Homer, for which see Пıтра́бкш.

[^220]proper sense ; for in the Hymn. Merc. 133. (see Hermann) the reading is not sure; and $\pi \epsilon \rho \not ̨ \nu \pi \delta \delta$, Eurip. Hec. 53. is like $\beta a i v \in เ \nu \pi \delta \delta \alpha$, for which see Baivw.

With these verbs we must compare a third, $\pi \varepsilon \rho a i \nu \omega$, from $\pi \varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \rho a s$, an end, (consequently with the meaning of to complete, which is regular and takes a long in the aor., é $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \bar{q} v a$, Ion. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tilde{\varepsilon} \varphi \eta \nu a$. Perf. pass.
 $\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon i \rho a \nu \tau \alpha$, Od. $\mu$, 37. Soph. Trach. 581.*
 fut. $\pi \alpha \rho \delta \hat{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$; perf. $\pi \in ́ \pi о р \delta \alpha$.

In Aristoph. Vesp. 394. $\dot{a} \pi о \pi \alpha \rho \delta \bar{\omega}$ is accented falsely. It must be
 $\mu^{\prime}$, has the force of a future, even when it is joined in a sentence with real futures.
 infin. $\pi \rho a ̆ \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu, ~ p o e t . ~ \pi \rho a ̆ ̈ \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon є v . ~ H o m e r ~ h a s ~ a l s o ~ a ~ f u t . ~ p a s s . ~ \pi є ́ \rho \sigma о \mu а и, ~$ II. $\omega, 729$., and a syncopated aor. (but only in the infin.) $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \theta a \iota$, which is to be explained by $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \theta \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \theta-\theta q \ell$, and dropping the $\theta$ $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \theta a t$, like $\delta_{\varepsilon} \hat{\ell} \theta a t$. The perf. act. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \pi o \rho \theta a$ is post-Homeric.

## Пєбєi้. See Пiттш.

Пє́ $\sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \in ́ \tau \tau \omega, I$ cook: fut. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \psi \omega$, \&c. ; perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \mu \mu \alpha \ell$, infin. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \phi \theta \alpha \iota$. The pres. $\pi \varepsilon \in \pi \tau \omega$ which corresponds with this formation, is found in the later writers.

That MEII- is the simple stem or root is clear from some of the derivatives, as $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega \nu$, áproтóтos: and the change from $\pi$ to $\sigma \sigma$ or $\tau \tau$ is found also in ${ }^{\varepsilon} \nu i \sigma \sigma \omega$ for ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \nu i \pi \tau \omega$ : compare ф́́ $\sigma \sigma a$ the fem. of $\phi \dot{\alpha} \psi$, $\& \mathrm{c}$, as well as Kœn. ad Greg. 厄ol. 42., and Buttm. Lexilog. p. 126.

Пєтג́ $\nu \nu u \mu$, or $\pi \varepsilon \tau \alpha \nu \nu v ́ \omega$, I spread wide, open: fut. $\pi \varepsilon-$ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega(\breve{\alpha})$; aor. 1. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon^{\prime} \tau \tau \check{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$, Ep. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha$, \&c. Perf. pass. by syncope $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \tau \check{\alpha} \mu \alpha \iota$; but aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

The Att. fut. $\pi \varepsilon \tau \tilde{\omega}, \& c$., was generally preferred to $\pi \varepsilon \tau \dot{c} \sigma \omega$ : see Thom. Mag. p. 61. and Meineke Menand. Incert. 190. The later writers took the liberty of using this form or the simple theme as a

 oracle of Herodot. 1, 62., and in ávanєтध́тa⿱тal, Lucian. Somn. 29. Out of the Attic dialect this verb was very naturally confounded with the following one, which is so nearly akin to it : see, for instance, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau$ áa $\theta \eta \nu$ under that verb; Parmenides (Fragm. v. 18.) had a part.

[^221] the natural length of the middle syllable is removed by transposing the letters.
aor. ả $\nu a \pi \tau a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$ in an active sense, having opened; and Zenodotus read at II. a, 351. रeĩpaçá $\downarrow \nu a \pi \tau$ ás.

For the form $\pi i ́ \tau \nu \eta \mu \iota, \pi \iota \tau \nu a ́ \omega$, see кєра́ш in note under Kєрáv$\nu \nu \mu$, , and the end of the article on $\Pi \varepsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$. Schneider in his Lexicon quotes the following authorities for it; viz. $\pi i \tau v a$ for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \tau \nu a$, imperf.
 plur. for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \neq \nu \eta \sigma a \nu$, Pind. Nem. 5, 20. In Hes. Scut. 291. the reading of ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \tau \tau v o \nu$ from $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ is doubtful, and Gaisford reads ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \pi \iota \pi \lambda o \nu$. Schneider improperly confounds this verb with $\pi \iota \tau \nu \varepsilon ́ \omega$, $\pi \iota \tau \nu \varepsilon i v$, a sister-form of $\pi i \pi \tau \omega$ : see the latter.

Пéтоццц, I fy, depon. midd. : fut. $\pi \varepsilon \tau \mathfrak{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, Hom. and Aristoph. Pac. 77. 1126., but in Attic prose generally $\pi \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha \iota$; syncop. aor. 2. $\grave{\text { è }} \pi \tau \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \tau \boldsymbol{\xi} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. *

In addition to the above, which according to the Atticists are the only legitimate forms in Attic prose, we find also frequently a pres. ì $\pi \tau \alpha \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ with the aor. 1. $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$; and in an active form the aor. |  |
| :--- |
| $\pi$ |
| $\tau \nu \nu$, infin. | $\pi \tau \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha l$, part. $\pi \tau \alpha{ }^{\prime} s$.

See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 325. Lucian. Lexiph. extr. By these and other testimonies the pres. $i \pi \tau a \mu a \iota$, which is the common one in use among the later writers, becomes very suspicious as a form of the older language, although still found in some passages without any various reading: see Porson ad Medeam. 1. Lobeck ad Phryn. 1. c. $\dagger$ The aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ in the Ionic writers and old poets is unobjectionable and of frequent occurrence: see Porson on the passages quoted, and Hermann on Soph. Aj. $275 . \ddagger$ : but in the prose of the older time it is very doubtful, as in many passages where it is the common reading, the manuscripts have $\pi \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a u, \pi \tau \dot{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu \nu_{\rho}, \&$ c. The form $\ddot{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \pi \tau \eta \nu$ is old and genuine in the poets, although not so frequent; but in the later language it is very common.
Beside the above we find $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau a \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\pi \varepsilon \tau \dot{\sigma} o \mu a \iota$ used in the later prose; in which they are free from all suspicion, as even the pass. aor.

[^222][^223]$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \tau a ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ (for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ ), notwithstanding its identity with the aor. pass. of $\pi \varepsilon \tau a ́ v \nu v \mu$, occurs in it, e. g. Aristot. H. A. 9, 40. (9, $27,5$. Schneid.) and in Lucian. Rhet. Præcept. 6. For the form $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau а \mu a \iota ~ t h e r e ~$ is older authority in the poets; for $\pi \varepsilon$ ध́atat is found not only in Pindar, but also in the chorus and the anapæsts of the dramatic poets*;


Lastly come the forms with the change of vowel to o or $\omega$ according
 $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \phi \alpha \omega$, $\tau \rho \bar{\varepsilon} \chi \omega$ and $\tau \rho \omega \chi \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \omega$, and others mentioned under $\Delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$; in which however it must be observed that this is the only verb with the formation in -á $\omega$ which changes the vowel to $o$ : for the principal form, used also by the Attic poets, is $\pi о \tau$ áo $\mu a \iota$ ( $\pi о \tau \tilde{a} \tau a \iota, \pi о \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha)$ ), which in the Epics takes the formation in - $\varepsilon$, $\omega$, but only in a resolved shape, as жotéovat ; and when the metre requires, it has an $\omega$ in the stem or root, as $\pi \omega \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau$. Of the further formation of this verb we find the Doric
 1338. A ristophanes has however the perfect $\pi \varepsilon \pi \delta \dot{r} \eta \mu a t$, not only in the Anapæsts (Nub. 319.), but also in the Iambics (Av. 1445.); whence Bekker's opinion is very probable that this was the usual perfect of $\pi \varepsilon^{-}-$ тонає in the Attic dialect: for I know of no authority for the active $\pi \varepsilon \pi \pi \tau \eta \kappa a \ddagger$ beyond grammatical tradition. If this supposition be correct, the Attic prose usage of the above verb will be as follows:

$$
\text { Пє́тоцає, ттйбоцає, є́пто́ } \mu \eta \nu, \pi \varepsilon \pi о ́ т \eta \mu \alpha \text {. }
$$

## ПЕТ- See Пĩтн.

## Пєv่Өоцає. See Пvข日ávодає.

 copated aorist of $\Phi E N \Omega$ (whence фóvos), like éкєкло́ $\mu \eta \nu$ from кé $\lambda о \mu a$. The participle is accented contrary to analogy $\pi \varepsilon \phi \nu \omega \nu$ (Il. $\pi, 827 . \rho$, 539.), and this is expressly mentioned by the Grammarians as a pecu-


[^224]тацаи, \&c. These perfects, like кéктワ$\mu \mu u$ and $\mu \epsilon \in \mu \nu \eta \mu u$, are exceptions to the general rule of verbs, beginning with two consonants, and forming their perfect with $\epsilon$ instead of the reduplication. See note

§ I see clearly however that we cannot build much on this grammatical tradition. It is possible that the aoristic force of this participle, which is not evident at first sight even in the passages where it occurs, was not observed until its accentuation as a present had become firmly established.:

meaning in all the Homeric forms belonging to | $\varepsilon \pi$ |
| :---: |
| $\varepsilon$ |
| $\phi \nu o v$ |
| there can be | no doubt; and the supposition of a pres. $\pi \varepsilon \phi \nu \omega$, as shown also by the analogy of $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \wedge \lambda \varepsilon \tau o$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\phi} \rho a \delta o v$, is perfectly untenable.*

With this we must join the perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \varphi \dot{\varphi} \mu a t$, of which Homer hās

 This $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \phi a \mu a c$ bears exactly the same relation to the root SEN- as $\tau \hat{\varepsilon}-$ тадає does to TEN- in $\tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$; while $\pi \varepsilon \phi \eta \sigma о \mu a \iota$ is formed from $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi a \mu \alpha \iota$
 form comes also from the root ФA- in фaivo; and Lycophron has allowed himself to use, in the sense of killed, the perf. part. $\pi \varepsilon \phi a \sigma \mu \varepsilon^{\prime}-$ voc, which belongs also to $\phi a i v \omega$ and $\phi \eta \mu i$.
$\Pi \gamma \dot{\gamma} \nu \bar{u} \mu$ and $\pi \eta \gamma \nu u ́ \omega$, I fix: and in the later writers $\pi \eta^{\prime} \sigma-$ $\sigma \omega$, Att. $\pi \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$; fut. $\pi \eta^{\prime} \xi \omega \dagger$; aor. 1. ${ }_{\xi} \pi \eta \xi \alpha$; aor. 1. pass.
 midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \eta \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ : the perf. 2. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \pi \gamma \gamma \alpha$ has the sense of the pass. $\pi \dot{\gamma} \gamma \nu \cup \mu \alpha \iota, I$ am fixed, I stick firm $\ddagger$; pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \pi \eta^{\prime}-$ $\gamma \varepsilon \iota \nu$ : an aor. 2. midd. غ̇ $\pi \eta \gamma^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ occurs in Esop. Fab. 146. Ern.-Midd.

 63. ; aor. 1. pass. ह่ $\pi เ \varepsilon \varepsilon \theta \theta \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi เ \varepsilon \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, but in Hippocr. $\pi เ \varepsilon \chi \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$; perf. pass. $\pi \varepsilon \pi i \varepsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, but in Hippocr. $\pi=\pi i \leqslant \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$, infin. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \iota \varepsilon ́ \chi \not \chi^{\ominus \alpha}$. This verb therefore, like $\dot{\alpha} p \pi \alpha \dot{\zeta} \omega \omega, \pi \alpha i \zeta \omega$, and others, partakes of two formations, the one with a lingual as its characteristic letter, the other with a palatic.

There are some traces of a sister-form $\pi \iota \ell \zeta \zeta_{\xi} \omega$, as we find in Homer $\pi \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \zeta \varepsilon \nu \nu$ 3. plur. imperf. for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \varepsilon \zeta \circ \nu$, in Herodotus $\pi \iota \varepsilon \zeta \varepsilon v \mu \varepsilon \nu O \varrho$, and in Plut. Thes. 6. $\pi เ \varepsilon \xi$ о̃̃ขто૬.
 pres. and imperf., imitating it even in the admission or rejection of the forms in $\alpha \omega$ : fut. $\pi \lambda \eta_{\eta} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }_{\xi} \pi \lambda \eta \eta \sigma \alpha$;

[^225]aor. 1. midd. $\grave{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$; perf. pass. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon$ ह่ $\pi \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

In the compounds of this and the following verb $\pi i \mu-$ $\pi \rho \eta \mu$, , whenever a $\mu$ precedes the first $\pi$, it is dropped before the second, as $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi i \pi \lambda \eta \theta \imath$, Il. $\phi, 311$.; but resumed when the augment intervenes, as $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \pi \xi^{\prime} \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$.

The poets observe or disregard the above rule according to the metre ; but the deviations from it which occur in prose, at least in the older writers, may be ascribed to the negligence of transcribers. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 95.

The syncopated pass. aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$, imper. $\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma o$, opt. $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta \nu$ (like $\beta \lambda \varepsilon i \mu \eta \nu)$, \&c., is one of the few aorists of this kind which are found also in Attic prose; e.g. in Aristoph. $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s, \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta \nu$.* In this last the diphthong of the optative $\varepsilon \iota$ is remarkable, as the formation $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \nu a l, \pi i \mu \pi \lambda a \mu \alpha \iota, \& c$. , supposes a stem or root $\Pi \Lambda A-$. But in the same way $\chi \rho \eta$, which comes from х $\quad a ́ \omega$, has in the opt. x $\rho \varepsilon i \eta . \dagger$ The supposition most agreeable to analogy is, that $\Pi \Lambda A \Omega$ was changed after the Iono-Doric manner to $\Pi \Lambda E \Omega$, whence therefore the Lat. pleo. To this we must add the Hesiodic ( $\mathcal{F}, 880.) \pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{v} \sigma \alpha \iota$ for $-\tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha \iota$; for as in the Epic Ionicism, unlike to the later, aov in those verbal forms is changed to $\varepsilon v$, the above participle supposes a present $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \varepsilon$ é $\omega$.

The immediate sense to be full belongs to $\pi \lambda \eta \theta \omega$. This verb, beside the pres. and imperf., has no other tense than the perf. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \theta a$ synonymous with the present, Pherecr. in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 330, 23. Antim. Theb. Fr. 12. Arat. 774. $\ddagger$

[^226]decision of the old Grammarians, and declaring myself in favour of the former, I would leave the old reading untouched in the passage of Ach. 236., but in Lys. 235. I would complete the emendation by read-

$\ddagger$ This $\pi \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \omega$ is very commonly supposed to be the radical form, principally on account of $\langle\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; but the supposition is erroneous, as we may learn from comparing it with exp $\boldsymbol{e}^{2} \sigma \eta \nu$ and others. We should much rather say that $\pi \lambda \eta_{-}$ $\theta \omega$ and $\pi \rho \eta \theta \omega$ may be quite as well deduced immediately from a radical form in - $\alpha \omega$, as $\sigma \hbar \theta \omega$ and $\nu \hbar \theta \omega$ are from similar forms in -diw and - $6 \omega$. For the actual usage of the pres. $\pi \lambda \hbar \theta \omega$ in the causative sense of $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$ we have but a bad authority in Pseudo-Phocyl. 154. On the other hand we find a striking instance of

Пí $\pi \rho \eta \mu я, ~ I ~ b u r n ~(t r a n s i t),. ~ i n f i n . ~ \pi \iota \mu \pi р \alpha ́ v \alpha я, ~ f o l l o w s ~$ in the common language the analogy of $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ in every part of its formation，even to the dropping or retaining of the $\mu$ before the $\pi$ ．

Photius in Lex．v．$\sigma$ 交的ral quotes as one of the older Atticisms $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \eta \mu$ е́vos．

The shortening of ${ }^{\ell \prime} \pi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ to $\ddot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon$ in Hes．$\neg, 856$ ．is remarkable． Compare the forms under $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \tau$ which lead to a formation in－$\varepsilon$ 它。＊

In this verb the form $\pi \rho \eta^{\prime} \theta \omega$ is synonymous with $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu$ ，but found only in II．$\iota, 589$ ．$\varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \in \rho \eta \eta o v$ ．
 infin．$\pi เ \varepsilon \tau \imath, ~ \& c .$, imper．$\pi i ́$（Od．$\iota, 34 \%$ ．Eurip．Cycl．560．） solely poetical，the common term being $\pi \tilde{\imath} \theta_{l}$（like $x \lambda \tilde{u} \theta_{l}$ ， $\left.\beta \tilde{\eta} \theta_{l}, \gamma \nu \tilde{\omega} \theta_{b}, \& c.\right)$ ，Athen．10．p．446．B．The other tenses come from the root $\Pi \mathrm{O}-$ ，with variable quantity，as perf．
 adj．тотós，тотध́os，whence the Lat．poto．
 found in Hippocr．de A．A．L． 22.

A future in the shape of the fut．2．$\pi t o \tilde{v} \mu a t$ is of frequent occurrence from the time of Aristotle．We find indeed $\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ in Xen．Symp． 4，7．but probably the old reading $\pi i \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ought to be restored ：see also Schweigh．Athen．5．p．497．Lobeck ad Phryn．p．31．－The $\iota$ in $\pi i o-$ $\mu a t$ is long in Aristophanes，e．g．Equ．1289．1401．but in the other comedians it is short ：see Athen．10．p．446．e．11．783．e．（p． 221. Schweigh．）p．471．a．13．p．570．d．－A solitary instance of $\pi i o \mu a \iota$ （with $c$ long）as a present for $\pi i \nu \omega$ is found in Pind．Ol．6， 147.

The syncop．infin．$\pi \tilde{\imath} v$ or $\pi \varepsilon \tau v$ ，accented also $\pi i v, \pi \varepsilon i \nu$ ，occurs in Lucill．Epig．28，3．Meineke Euphor．Fr．105．See Mus．Antiqu． Stud．p．247．sqq．Herodian．Hermanni，§47．
the aor．$\alpha \pi о \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a l$ in a neuter sense in Herodot．8，96．$\approx \sigma \tau \epsilon ~ \grave{\pi т о \pi \lambda \eta ิ \sigma \alpha \iota ~ \tau ो \nu}$ $\chi р \eta \sigma \mu \delta \nu$ ：for nothing but a very impro－ bable degree of violence can supply a subject to the verb，so as to give it the sense of to fulfil．So decisive however is the usage of the same aorist in its com－ mon sense in all the other passages of He － rodotus（see Schweigh．Lex．Herod．for the simple verb and all its compounds）， that this reading cannot but be looked on
with the greatest suspicion．And may not the syncop．aor．$\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$ ，which we have seen abovel in the Attic usage，have belonged to Ionic prose also ？
＊The various reading ${ }^{2} \mu \pi t \pi \rho \epsilon i s$ Herodot．8，159．deserves also in this respect our attention．It may be an an－ cient form and grounded perhaps on some old uncertainty in the actual usage．Com－ pare Г $\eta \rho \alpha a^{\omega}$.

+ Compare $\beta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \in$ under Bıóo．

 Меөй́xш.
$\Pi \imath \pi \rho \dot{́} \sigma \kappa \omega$, I sell, Ion. $\pi \iota \pi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \varkappa \omega$, Herodot. It has in the common language neither fut. nor aor. active : the other forms are, perf. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} x \alpha$; perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \mu \alpha \iota$, infin.
 In all these forms the Ionics changed the long $\alpha$ to $\eta$.

In the common language the defective tenses were made up by àmo$\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu a \iota, \dot{a} \pi \varepsilon \delta \dot{o} \mu \eta \nu$. The forms properly belonging to this verb are, in the old and Epic language, fut. $\pi \varepsilon \rho a \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ (with a short), Att. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$, infin. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{q} \nu, \pi \varepsilon \rho a ́ q \chi \nu$; aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho a \sigma a$; of which the pres. $\pi \varepsilon \rho a ́ \omega$, as we have seen above, is nowhere found with this meaning, but occurs only in the cognate sense of to go over, in which however it is inflected with - $\tilde{\sigma} \sigma$, Ion. $-\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$. The above $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \bar{\epsilon} \bar{\alpha} \kappa a$ with the other forms came from the formation $\pi \varepsilon \rho a ̆ \sigma \omega ~(\pi \varepsilon \pi \epsilon ́ \rho$ ăка) by the same metathesis which we have frequently seen, for instance in кєрá $\nu \nu v \mu$, $\kappa \varepsilon \rho a ̆ \sigma \omega$, (кєкє́рӑка) кє́кра̄ка, Ion. ке́крךка.

The Homeric $\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \rho \eta \mu \bar{\varepsilon} v_{0}$, II. $\phi, 58$., formed from $\pi \varepsilon \rho a ́ \omega$, $-\eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega$, and referring to $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho a \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ at $v .40$., would therefore be a particular deviation from the above; according to which it would stand for $\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon$ рă $\mu$ évos with the a lengthened on account of the metre: but this metrical necessity was much more likely to have suggested, according to the above analogy, and with the Ionic $\eta$, the form $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \eta \mu \mu^{\prime} \nu$ os ; which without doubt is the true reading of the passage.*

The pres. $\pi \iota \pi \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$ does not occur in the Epic language, but in its stead is found $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \nu \eta \mu$ ( éompare $\delta a \mu \nu \alpha ́ \omega, \delta \alpha ́ \mu \nu \eta \mu \mu$, under $\Delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$ ). In the old language, therefore, the following is the established usage:


The Atticists lay it down as a rule that $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \dot{a} \sigma o \mu a \ell$, not $\pi \rho a$ $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \alpha$, is used as the common future: and in reading the Attic writers we shall find that this rule holds good, in as much as the text has $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \varepsilon \tau a \iota$ where there is not the slightest expression of certainty or quickness. And what is particularly confirmed by the rule is this, that although $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \rho^{\alpha} \theta \eta \nu$ is good Attic, yet $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a t$ is very frequently found, without any of the force of a perfect, instead of the mere aorist, e. g. $\varepsilon \in \kappa \dot{\rho} \rho v \xi \xi_{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota$,"he proclaimed that . . . . should be sold,"

[^227]
 Myst. p. 10, 18. These forms therefore bear the same relation to each other as $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu$ ávaı does to $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta^{\prime} \xi \varepsilon \sigma \theta a l$. See $\Theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \omega$.
$\Pi i \pi \tau \omega$, I fall, with $~$ naturally long*, consequently the imperat. is accented $\pi \tilde{\pi} \pi \tau \in$ : the formation is from ПET $\Omega$; e. g. fut. $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \tilde{u} \mu \alpha l$, Ion. $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \circ \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 2. ${ }^{\xi} \pi \pi \varepsilon \sigma 0 \nu \dagger$, infin. $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \tilde{\nu}$; perf. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega \varkappa \alpha$, Attic part. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \omega ́ s, \tilde{\omega} \tau \sigma g$.

The part. perf. is shortened by the Epic poets to $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \varepsilon \omega \mathrm{c}$, by the Attic to $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau$ 白ç. The latter carries us back to the regular $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \omega \kappa \dot{\omega} \mathrm{c}$,
 points to $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$ (compare $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \varepsilon \dot{\epsilon} \varsigma$ ). And this is without doubt the original form (HET $\Omega \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$, like $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$, $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \mu \eta \kappa a$ ), from which, by the change of vowel, came $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \boldsymbol{\pi} \alpha a$ : see Buttm. Lexil. p. 137.

We find also both aorists regularly formed from the simple stem or root ПET $\Omega$ : viz.

 a verb of the common popular dialect, the two aorists ${ }^{\prime \prime} £ \varepsilon \sigma \alpha$ and ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \in \sigma o \nu$ have been confounded together in daily usage; so in the verb before us the aor. 1. was not found, indeed, in the current language of the day, yet it appears to have remained always in the dialects; hence it occurs among others in the Alexandrine and occasionally in the later ones ; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 724. Orph. Arg. 519. Among the older writers Euripides has it twice in the Chorus, $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma$ ह́ $\pi \varepsilon \sigma a$, Tro. 291., $\pi$ ย́ $\sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon$, Alc. 471., in both which passages these forms have been rejected in the latest editions by a precipitate criticism. $\ddagger$

[^228]of $o \nu$, as $\in T \bar{\sigma} \alpha, \in \bar{\lambda} \lambda \alpha$, $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha 6 a y$, and acknowledged to be barbarous. But they who classed it thus, did not at the same time consider, that while these latter forms have very little in the pure language harmonising with them, like elma, jve $\boldsymbol{j} \kappa \alpha$, the form $E \pi \in \sigma \alpha$ on the other hand is the regular aor. 1., and with its future $\pi \in \sigma o \hat{v}-$ $\mu \alpha \iota$ answers to $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \alpha, \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma o v ิ \mu \alpha$, and many others, in short to half the language. In this case therefore, where the anomalous $\left.\begin{array}{l}\ell \\ \pi \\ \epsilon \\ 0\end{array}\right)$ was in current use, the
 $\sigma \in!\tau \delta$ z̈ $\pi \in \sigma a$, Schol. Aristoph. Av. 840.) might very well remain as a not-discordant dialect in the Lyric poetry of the Iono-Attics, with quite as much reason
 appears to be the established formation of this verb by a comparison of some of the passages where it occurs ; and thus it comes under the analogy of $\sigma \tau v \gamma^{\varepsilon} \omega$, ${ }^{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau v \gamma o \nu$ and similar verbs, from the aorist of which arises a pres. in - $\varepsilon \omega$ : see K $\bar{\tau} \pi \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$. The accentuation however of $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ for $\pi \iota \tau \nu \tilde{\omega}$, of $\pi i \tau \nu o \nu \tau \varepsilon$, , \&c., not only occurs very frequently in the manuscripts and in the Grammarians, but sense and metre are by no means generally decisive between them. See Hermann on Eurip. Med. 53. (Ed. Elmsl. Lips. p. 340. sqq.) and Reisig on Soph. Ed. Col. 1754. (Enarr. p. ccxi.) The only cases where the aorist appears to me evident, are those where we find $\ell_{\varepsilon \pi \tau \tau \nu o \nu, ~}^{\ell} \pi \tau \tau \nu \varepsilon$. Since however this aorist does not contain the simple root, which is much more conspicuous in the Pindaric $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \pi \\ \\ \text { roov (see } \Pi i \pi \tau \omega \text { ); the formation of the }\end{gathered}$ aor. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \varepsilon \tau \circ \nu$, pres. $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$, has in its favour the analogy of the aor. $\varepsilon$ ह́ $\delta a \times o \nu$, pres. $\delta$ ák $\nu \omega$. I do not therefore by any means reject the supposition that $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ and $\pi \iota \tau \nu \epsilon \in \omega$ might have existed together (like $\beta v \nu \varepsilon \in \omega$ and $\beta \dot{v} \nu \omega, \delta \nu \nu \varepsilon ์ \omega$ and $\delta \dot{\delta} \nu \omega)$, without $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \tau \nu o \nu$ being therefore necessarily an imperfect; for ${ }_{\epsilon \kappa} \in \lambda v o \nu$ from $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \omega$ is used by the same Tragedians as an aorist. And here in particular, where from $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ arose a lengthened
as the similarly analogous and equally unusual ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu$ remained in the EoloDoric dialect. Now it is at least worthy of remark, that this is the only one of all those Alexandrine aorists which tradition attributes to Euripides; and with regard to the correctness of the readings, if we had nothing else in support of them, we have this consideration, that while it was very conceivable and indeed almost una-
 truded themselves as various readings, it was quite inconceivable that transcribers or correctors of the metre should have interpolated $\notin \pi \in \sigma a$ and $\pi \in \sigma \in เ \epsilon$. For who has ever seen an instance of Christian transcribers having introduced into the tragedians or any of the Attic writers those
 common in the LXX.? And this leads me back to the examination of another passage, which grammatical criticism has long lost sight of. In the wellknown passage of Herodotus 6, 21., the text formerly had ess ódrcpua ${ }^{\ell} \pi \in \sigma a \nu \tau \delta$ సิย์ทrpov. I much fear, that when ërєбє was adopted from some. of the manuscripts, the historian was deprived of an intended grammatical figure as well as of his dialect. Longinus $(24,1$.$) quotes this$
passage as an instance of a collective singular used instead of a plural to elevate the diction. And certainly the expression, as it now stands in Herodotus, fully answers that purpose, as does also a passage quoted just before from Demosthenes, in $\Pi \epsilon \lambda о \pi \delta \nu$ -
 sage of Herodotus is so corrupted in Longinus that it contradicts the reason for its being quoted: the manuscripts have ${ }^{\prime} \pi \epsilon-$
 haps be said that the whole sentence hes been corrupted, by the attempts made to
 now adopted as the text in Longinus also : this would be possible, if the reading had been only $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma o \nu$; but how came the commentator or his corrupter by $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \pi \\ & \\ & \text { c } \sigma \alpha \nu \text { ? }\end{aligned}$ Let us now suppose that the old reading both in Herodotus and Longinus was Eneval rd Néntpoy, and we then discover the corruption in each writer; in the
 If aught were wanting to complete the proof of would be found, I think, in the comparison with the aorists ${ }^{\ell} \chi \in \sigma \alpha$ and $€ \chi \in \sigma o \nu$, the confusion between which was not remarked until very lately.
present $\pi \iota \tau y \tilde{\omega}$, it appears very natural that a distinction should have been made between the aor. $\ell^{\ell} \pi \iota \tau \nu o v$, and the imperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \tau v o v \nu . *$

Пム-. See Пе́̀ $\omega$.

П入á̧ $\omega$, I cause to wander, turn from its course: fut. $\pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \xi \omega$; aor. 1. $\not{\varepsilon} \pi \pi \lambda a \gamma \xi \alpha$. Pass. $\pi \lambda a ́ \zeta o \mu a \iota, I$ am driven from my course, I wander


These tenses are formed as from a pres. ПЛАГХ $\Omega$; or, which comes to the same, $\pi \lambda a \dot{\zeta} \omega$ has $\gamma \gamma$ for its characteristic letter, like $\kappa \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$ and

$\Pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, I form: fut. $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, \&c. This verb, like $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \tau i \sigma \sigma \omega$, ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\rho} \rho_{s} \sigma \sigma \omega, \beta p \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, and $\beta \lambda i \tau \tau \omega$, has for its characteristic letter a lingual instead of a palatic, which is generally seen by a $\sigma$ in the inflexion instead of $\xi, \gamma, \kappa$, or
 $\pi \lambda \alpha \theta_{0}$ the characteristic letter would seem to be 9 .
 $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \varepsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$; perf. pass. $\pi \varepsilon \in \pi \lambda s \gamma \mu \alpha$. The aor. 2. pass. is generally $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \varkappa \eta \nu$, but Bekker has always found in the best manuscripts of Plato ह̀ $\pi \lambda$ ย́кəข : see $\mathrm{B} \lambda$ é $\pi \omega$.
$\Pi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega, ~ I ~ s a i l: ~ f u t . ~ \pi \lambda \varepsilon u ́ \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$, or more generally $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \cup \sigma \sigma \tilde{u}-$ $\mu \alpha s$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \varepsilon \cup \sigma \alpha$; perf. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \cup \alpha \alpha$. The pass. takes $\sigma$; thus, perf. pass. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \varepsilon v \sigma \mu \alpha l$; aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon$ ह̇ $\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

This verb was still found in the older Attic writers in a resolved form : at least the instance of ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime 2} \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu$ (not ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon$ ), in Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 27. has great weight; and in Thucyd. 4, 28. Bekker has followed the majority of the Codd. in retaining $\pi \lambda^{\prime} \varepsilon \varepsilon$. . See note to $\Delta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \omega$, I want.

There is an Ionic form of this verb $\pi \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \omega \dagger$, infin. $\pi \lambda \omega \epsilon \epsilon \nu$; fut.


[^229]Hermann can read only $\pi$ rivoúvтcov, of which he avails himself also in ( $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \pi i \tau-$ novtes), Eschyl. Pers. 461. If my view of the subject be adopted, no change is necessary.

+ [Homer seems to have used $\pi \lambda$ dow with its derivatives more in the sense of to swim, and $\pi \lambda \epsilon \omega$ with the meaning of to sail.- Passow.]
perfect on the Attic stage (Hel. 539.), appears to have been ridiculed by Aristophanes (Thesm. 878.) for so doing. To this verb belongs
 and its compounds $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \omega \nu, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \omega \nu, \pi a \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \omega \nu$ with their participles

$\Pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$. See $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$.
$\Pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, Att. $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$, I strike: fut. $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \xi \omega$; perf. 2. (sometimes in a pass. sense) $\pi \varepsilon^{\prime} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha$; perf. pass. $\pi \varepsilon^{\prime} \pi \lambda \eta-$ $\gamma \mu \alpha l$; aor. 2. pass. $\varepsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma_{\eta \eta \nu .}$

Beside the active and passive of this verb we find in Homer the middle also ( $\mu$ npò $\pi \lambda \eta \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 s$ ) ; so that it is used in all its voices by the Epics and by them only. In the Attic dialect the place of the active was supplied by $\pi \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, which again was not used by the older Attics in the passive.

All this holds good of the simple verb only and of its proper meaning, in which however there is no compound in regular use. On the other hand $\varepsilon \in \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\tau} \tau \omega$ and $ж \alpha \tau \alpha-$ $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$, which mean in the active to strike with fear, in the passive to be struck with fear, are used in both those voices and have in the aor. 2. pass. the $\check{\alpha}$; as, $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \in \pi \lambda \alpha \alpha_{\gamma} \gamma \nu$, $\varkappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha$.

On the relative usage of $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\pi a \tau \alpha \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \omega$ as laid down above, see Valcken. ad Act. Apost. 12, 7. and the passage of Lysias there


The perfect however appears to have been an exception, which, as it could not be formed from $\pi \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ so as to please the ear, was taken probably from the old Ionic dialect, and continued in constant use among the Attic writers with an active meaning in the form $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma a$ :
 the later language the perf. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma$ as used in a passive sense: see

[^230]natural to understand the accusative as the subject of the passive, a construction in which we cannot well use $\pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \boldsymbol{y}^{\prime} v a u$ in Xenophon. I conjecture therefore that under $\pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \chi$ évou is concealed the true reading $\pi е \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \chi \theta \alpha$.
¿á入шка under＇A入iбконає；Stephan．Thes．in $v_{0}$ ；and Oudend．ad Thom．Mag．v．$\pi \varepsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \omega \omega^{\prime}$ ，p． 703.

On $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \gamma \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{c} \hat{c}^{\gamma} \eta \nu$ compare what has been said on＂A $\gamma \nu v \mu$ ， fé $\boldsymbol{y}^{\prime} \eta$ ．We have only further to observe that Homer uses on account of the metre кaテєп入h $\gamma \eta \nu$ ，II．$\gamma, 31$ ．

The Epics have also an aor．2．act．and midd．but only with the reduplication，as $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \circ \nu$ ，infin．$\pi \varepsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，and $\pi \varepsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \tau 0$ ，in the


From a rare sister－form $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \gamma \nu v \mu$ ，Thucydides 4，25．has $\varepsilon \in \pi \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma^{\nu} v-$ $\sigma \theta a c$.
 perf．$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \check{v} \kappa a$ ；perf．pass．$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \check{v} \mu a \iota$ ；aor．1．pass．$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \hat{v} \theta_{\eta \nu}(\breve{v})$ ．＊This verb is generally poetical．
$\Pi \nu \varepsilon ́ \omega$ ，poet．$\pi \nu \in i ́ \omega, I$ blow：fut．$\pi \nu \varepsilon \cup ́ \sigma \omega$ ，later $\pi \nu \varepsilon u ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, more generally $\pi \nu \varepsilon \cup \sigma \sigma \tilde{u} \mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor．1．${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \nu \nu \varepsilon u \sigma \alpha$ ，\＆c．；aor． 1 ．


There is no instance of a perf．pass．formed according to the above formation；the only one in use is the poetical $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \mu a u$ ，with the force of a present and the particular meaning of to be inspired with wisdom， be wise，intelligent ：hence perf．infin．$\pi \varepsilon \pi v \tilde{v} \sigma \theta a t$ ，and 2 ．sing．pluperf． （with the force of an imperf．）$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \nu v \sigma o$, Od．$\psi, 210$ ．By the same formation come the Epic syncopated aor．2．ä $\mu \pi \nu \bar{v} \tau o$ for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon ̇ \pi \nu v \tau o$ ；the aor．1．pass．$\dot{a} \mu \pi \nu \dot{v} \nu \theta \eta$ for $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \nu \bar{v} \theta \eta$（like i $\delta \rho \dot{\rho} \nu \theta \eta \nu$ ）；and the imper． aor．2．act．à $\mu \pi \nu v \varepsilon$ for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\partial} \pi \nu \nu \varepsilon$ ，consequently from an aorist ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \pi \nu v o \nu$ used by the later Epics，as Quintus，\＆c．$\dagger$ On the aor．1．pass．


Пvi $\gamma \omega, I$ choke：fut．midd．（with transit．meaning） $\pi \nu i \xi o \mu \alpha \iota \ddagger$ or $\pi \nu \iota \xi \circ \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ ，and in Lucian $\pi \nu i \xi \omega$ ；aor． 1. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \pi \nu \downarrow \xi \alpha$ ，infin．$\pi v \tilde{\xi} \xi \alpha$ ．Passive，I am being choked：fut．

[^231]$\sigma \theta \epsilon$, Epicharm．ap．Athen．p．60．With－ out attempting to restore the whole of this tetrameter，I shall content myself with amending what the language and sense
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa \lambda_{\text {．}}$ ．）：and I therefore understand it as Stephens does，＂you will poison （people）like dried mushrooms＂：which passage is at least an authority for the fut． middle；the probability of the Doric fu－ ture $\pi \nu \iota \xi$ ov̂ $\mu \boldsymbol{a}$ having been used in the Attic dialect is strengithened by $\phi \in \cup \xi \xi_{0} \hat{v}$－ $\mu a t$ ，тaıķv̂uar．Lucian however（Con－ templ．23．）has $\alpha \pi о \pi v i \xi \in ⿺$ ．
$\pi \nu เ \gamma^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$; aor. 2. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \nu v^{\prime} \gamma \eta$. The s is long except in the aor. 2. pass., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. $10 \%$.

ПО-. See Пìvш.
$\Pi_{0}$ Aś $^{\prime} \omega$, I long for, regret: Ionic and old Attic fut. $\pi 0-$
 $\pi \circ$ ब'́ $\sigma о \mu<\iota$ not only Ionic in Herodotus, but in Plato, e.g. Heind. Phædo, p. 98. a. ; aor. 1. act. $\varepsilon$ ह̇ $\dot{o}^{\prime} \theta \varepsilon \sigma \alpha$, whence 3. plur. $\pi \delta^{\prime} \theta \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$, infin. $\pi \circ \theta^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \alpha$, Hom., and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \delta^{\prime} \theta_{\eta} \sigma \alpha$, Xen. and Isocr. ; both forms of the aor. 1. are found in Herodot. 3, 36. 9, 22. ; perf. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \delta_{0} \eta_{\eta \kappa \alpha}$; perf. pass. $\pi \in \pi \delta^{\prime} \theta_{\eta \mu \alpha ь}$; aor.


חovź $\omega$, I labour, suffer, is inflected regularly; thus,
 suffering, it makes $\pi 0 y$ ธ́ $\sigma \omega$.

Such is the statement of the Grammarians ; see Chœrob. in Bekk. Anecd. in Ind.; where we find also quoted as an exception, $\pi \varepsilon \pi o ́ \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$ $\tau \grave{\omega} \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta$, Aristoph. Pac. 820.: but the probability is that the perfect is always formed with the $\eta$ (whatever be its meaning) as in $\pi 0 \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$. The formation of $\pi o \nu \varepsilon \in \sigma \omega$, \&c., is found in Hippocr. de Morb. 1, 15. 16. and three times in Lucian. Asin. 9.
[In the oldest language we find only the depon. midd. $\pi о$ у́ó $\mu a$, -乡ббоца兀 in an absolute sense : see Homer passim. - Passow.]
 [The indicative without the augment is found frequently in Homer; ] the part. $\pi о \rho \dot{\omega} \nu$ in Æschyl. Prom. 954. ; the infin. $\pi о \rho \varepsilon \bar{\nu}$ in Hesychius.
In Pind. Pyth. 2, 105. is an infin. $\pi \varepsilon \pi о \rho \varepsilon \tau$, , but the majority of the manuscripts have $\pi \varepsilon \pi a \rho \varepsilon \tilde{\nu} \nu$. According to the former reading the word is an infinitive of the above verb with reduplication: but there is in Hesychius an old explanation of $\pi \varepsilon \pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu-\hat{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \delta \varepsilon \tilde{\xi} \alpha \iota$, $\sigma \eta \mu \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha$, , which appears to me to suit the sense of Pindar better; ostentare. See Boeckh. In this latter case it is therefore a solitary forn of some lost verb.*

By the principle of the metathesis, as shown under Bád $\lambda \omega$ and
 to impart, allot,) belongs the perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \omega \mu a \iota, I$ am allotted

[^232]by fate, fated; part. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \omega \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ os; whence 3. sing. pluperf. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \rho \omega \tau 0$, Hes. Th. 464. Compare Mєípoцаи.

## ПО-. See Пivш.

Пє́тобөє. See Пá $\boldsymbol{\chi}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}}{ }^{\omega}$.
ПРА-. See Пıтра́бкш and $\Pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu$.
$\Pi \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, Ep. and Ion. $\pi \rho \dot{\gamma} \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \tau \tau \omega$ *, transit. I do, intransit. I am doing (well or ill), find myself in a certain state or situation: fut. $\pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \xi \omega$, Ion. $\pi \rho^{\prime} \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$; perf. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \chi^{\alpha}$; perf. 2. $\pi \varepsilon^{\prime} \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \gamma \alpha$; perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha l$, \&c. In the older writers $\pi \varepsilon^{\prime} \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \alpha$ was the only perfect; afterwards arose the custom of using $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \alpha$ in an intransitive sense only, $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \rho \rho \alpha \chi^{\alpha}$ in a transitive. The $\alpha$ is naturally long.

The above usage may be gathered from the direction of the Atticists, who merely tell us that $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho a \gamma$ is Attic, $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho a \chi \chi^{\alpha}$ common Greek: see Piers. ad Mœer. p. 293. Phryn. App. Soph. p. 60. But the latter is found only in a transitive sense: e. g. in Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 42. Hell. 5, 2, 32. Anab. 5, 7, 29. Menand. Incert. 75. (see Meineke, p. 221.), and as a rejected various reading in Aristoph. Equ. 683. Against this usage, therefore, the assertion of the Atticists is directed: and it is now uncertain in this as in many similar cases, with what writers the objectionable usage began, and when it is to be attributed to transcribers. $\dagger$
$\Pi \rho \eta \theta \omega$. See $\Pi\langle\mu \pi \rho \eta \mu$.
Прía ${ }^{\prime} \alpha \alpha$, to buy, infin. of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \stackrel{\alpha}{\mu} \mu \nu$, a defective aorist (according to the analogy of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ), used by the Attics instead of the obsolete aorist of $\omega^{\prime} v$ '́ $\mu \alpha \iota \ddagger$; imperat. $\pi \rho i \alpha \sigma_{0}$

[^233]ticists sufficient to warrant our positively asserting that this form was not used by Xenophon.

$\ddagger$ This is the meaning of the direction of Phrynichus, which is quite free from corruptions, though Lobeck ( p .137. ) has misunderstood it. The grammarian directs that nothing of む̀veîo $\theta a t$ should be used, as a form of rpiactat may stand in its place. At the time this was said, no one could misunderstand it, as a pres. $\pi p l a \mu a t$ was unheard of in the whole range of Greek literature, and ${ }^{2 \pi} \boldsymbol{\pi p t} \alpha-$ $\mu \eta \nu$ was equally unknown as an imperfeet. The only thing intended was to guard against some forms of $\begin{gathered}\text { veioio } \\ \text { aut. }\end{gathered}$ The grammarian excludes therefore from
（Aristoph．Ach．870．），or $\pi$ рíw（id．Nub．614．）；opt．
 See Lobeck ad Phryn．pp．137． 360.

Прíw，Isaw，gnash（the teeth）：imperat．трĩ，Aristoph． Ran．92\％．The passive takes $\sigma$ ；as，aor．1．$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho i \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ；perf． $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \rho เ \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$.

The $\iota$ is undoubtedly long throughout all the inflexions of $\pi \rho i \omega$ ：and with this the $\sigma$ in the passive agrees，according to the rule mentioned under ápóow；so that it is not necessary on that account to have re－ course to a present $\pi \rho i \zeta \omega$ ，which，it appears，became very common at a later period．$\dagger$ See also Buttm．Lexil．p． 485.

## Поӧ̈бонаь．See Kататр．

$\Pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i v, ~ \Pi \rho o v \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i ้$ ．See under Eìh $\omega$ 。
$\Pi \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma t$, an infin．aor．of rare occurrence and of a rather uncertain character，supposed to be a contraction from $\pi \rho o \omega \sigma \sigma a t$ ，and explained as an expression of the palæstra in Lucian．Asin．10．where（ib．9．） we find also the imperat．$\varepsilon \pi i \pi \rho \omega \sigma o \nu$ as an emendation of $\tau \rho \omega \sigma a \varsigma$, and again of Straton．Epigr．48．，where the text has the part．$\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \sigma^{2}$ as． Both Schneider and Passow derive it from $\pi \rho o \omega 9 \varepsilon$＇$\omega$ ；fut．$\pi \rho o \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ or －$\dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$ ；aor．1．$\pi \rho \rho \hat{\varepsilon} \omega \sigma \alpha$ or $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \omega \sigma a$ ，contracted $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \omega \sigma a$ ，infin．$\pi \rho \tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha \iota$ ， $\& \mathrm{c}$ ．

חтaí，I stumble：fut．$\pi \tau a i \sigma \omega$ ，\＆cc．It takes $\sigma$ in the passive，as perf．$\ell_{i} \tau \tau a \iota \sigma \mu \iota$, \＆c．See＇Арów and Прíw．

$\Pi \tau \dot{\gamma} \sigma \sigma \omega, I$ duck or drop the head from fear ：fut．$\pi \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \xi=$ ， \＆c．，is regular ：perf．$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \gamma \chi^{\alpha}$ ．
In Æschyl．Eum．247．all the manuscripts have кataттакív，which some have changed to кatentakís，on account of the Hesychian gloss $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau a \kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \nu a l$, кєкриф́́val．But the verse requires a short $a$ ；and an aor． 2.
 $\pi \tau \tilde{\omega} \kappa \varepsilon \varsigma, \& \mathrm{sc}$ ．，show $\kappa$ to be the characteristic letter of $\pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ ．If，there－ fore，the gloss of Hesychius be genuine，this is the Doric perf．2．with
the Attic style the whole aorist＇ewrnod－ $\mu \eta \nu$ ，and even the perfect térmuas in
 supply its place．Compare Herodian Ed． Piers．p． 453.
＊To the verbs mentioned under àpbow， as taking the $\sigma$ in the passive，may be
 $\pi \alpha \lambda a l \omega, \pi \tau a i \omega, \pi \rho l \omega, \chi \rho i \omega, \beta v \omega, \xi v ́ \omega$, ジわ．
$\dagger$ See Pollux 7．c．26．The instance in Plat．Theag．p．124．a．is of sufficient an－ tiquity，notwithstanding the spuriousness of the dialogue．
$a$ long for $\varepsilon \pi \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$. Consequently the inflexion will run thus, $\pi \tau \eta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \omega$;


We find in the poets other forms from a more simple stem or root
 ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \gamma \nu \omega \nu$ under $\Gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ ), and a part. perf. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \eta \dot{\omega} \varsigma$ (see Baiv $)$, which is not to be confounded with $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \varepsilon \omega$ s under $\Pi i \pi \tau \omega$. All the above, and in particular this reduplication ( $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau-$ ) comes from the root ПЕТ-, as we have observed in a note at the end of Пє́тоцас.
$\Pi \tau i \sigma \sigma \omega$, I stamp (grain): fut. $\pi \tau i \sigma \omega$; perf. pass. ${ }^{\ell} \pi \tau \downarrow$ $\sigma \mu \alpha$. See 'Aриóттш and Пло́ббш.

ПТО-. Sее Пі́лтш.
Пти́рш, I make fearful: fut. $\pi \tau \cup р \tilde{\sim}$. Pass. $\pi \tau \dot{\rho} \rho \boldsymbol{\mu \alpha и , ~}$ with aor. 2. غ̇ாтúpŋv, I become fearful, said particularly of


Пли́ $\sigma \omega$, I fold up : fut. $\pi \tau \cup \dot{\xi} \omega$, \&c., is regular.-Midd. [Ifold or wrap (anything) round me, with accus. Aristoph. Nub. 26\%.-Passow.]

Птú $\omega$, I spit: fut. $\pi \tau \cup \tilde{\sigma} \omega$. The pass. takes $\sigma$, as perf. ${ }^{\prime} \notin \tau \tau \sigma \mu \alpha$.
[It is written also $\psi \dot{v} \omega$, whence the Latin spuo. The $v$ is long in pres. and imperf., but short in fut., \&c.: see Graefe Mel. 124, 7., yet in Theocr. 24, 19. and Apollon. Rhod. 2, 570. 4, 925. the $v$ is short in the imperf., when the syllable following is short also ; this is frequently the case in Nonnus. - Passow.]
$\Pi \dot{\theta} \theta \omega$, I cause to rot: fut. $\pi \dot{v} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1 . $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi v \sigma a, \& \mathrm{c}$. Pass. I rot. The $v$ is long throughout; yet Callimachus (Fr. 313.) has allowed himself to use $\pi \dot{v} \sigma \varepsilon$ for $\pi \tilde{v} \sigma \varepsilon$ with $v$ short. Compare ${ }^{\prime} \pi \tau \rho \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon$ and $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \quad \varepsilon \tau a ̆ \sigma a v . ~\end{gathered}$

חuvӨส́vouaı, I inquire, learn by inquiry, depon. midd., forms its tenses from $\pi \varepsilon \dot{v} \theta o \mu \alpha b^{*}$, which is still used by the Epic and Tragic poets; thus, fut. $\pi \varepsilon \cup ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota \dagger$; aor. غ̇ $\pi \cup-$ $\theta_{0} \mu \mu \nu$, [imper. $\pi u \theta_{0} \tilde{v}$, but Ion. with change of accent $\pi \dot{v} \theta \varepsilon u$, Herodot. 3, 68., Epic opt. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \dot{v} \theta_{o \iota \tau}$, infin. $\left.\pi \cup 匕 \theta s \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ;\right]$ perf. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \sigma \mu \alpha \iota \neq$, 2. sing. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \cup \check{\sigma} \alpha l$, Plat. Protag. p. 310.

[^234]b., Epic $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi v \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota$, Od. $\lambda, 494 . ;$ pluperf. $̇ \pi \varepsilon \pi v ́ \sigma \mu \eta \nu$. Verbal adj. $\pi \varepsilon \cup \sigma \tau o ́ s, \pi \varepsilon \cup \sigma \tau$ ย́os.

Пирє́ $\sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. - $\tau \tau \omega$, I am in a fever: fut. $\pi v \rho \bar{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$; aor. 1. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{v} \rho \varepsilon \xi \alpha$, \&c., although it is derived from $\pi v \rho \varepsilon \tau o ́ s . ~ C o m p a r e ~ e ́ \rho ย ́ \sigma \sigma \sigma . ~$

## P.

'Paive, I besprinkle, forms the following tenses regu-


In the Epic language we observe two irregular forms; 1.) the aor. 1.
 Od. $v, 354$. pluperf. éppódaco, Il. $\mu, 431$. That is to say, from the simple stem or root PA- were formed one derivative with its full complement of tenses $\dot{\rho} \alpha i \nu \omega$, and another very defective PAZ $\Omega$. $\dagger$
 s’’’óqıข.
[Nonnus has an irregular aor. $\varepsilon$ ép $\rho \rho a ̆ \phi \varepsilon$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318. Passow.]
 same as ${ }_{\varepsilon} \rho \rho \delta \omega$, from which it is formed by transposing the two first
 Of the passive we find only $\dot{\rho} \varepsilon \chi \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$, as ${ }_{\xi}{ }^{\circ} \rho \chi \theta \eta \nu$ and ${ }_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \rho \gamma \mu a \iota$ are formed


In order to form a correct judgment on the connexion of these forms, we must first keep in view the mutual change, founded on general rules, of the middle $\ddagger$ consonants $\gamma$ and $\delta$, with which is connected that of $\gamma$ to $\zeta$ occurring in other verbs, e. g. крá $\zeta \omega$, кра $\bar{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \tilde{\nu}$. The next thing to be observed is, that the forms ${ }^{\ell} \rho \delta \omega$, ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \rho \xi a$, with the subst. ${ }^{\text {Epprav}}$, have the digamma in the old language, and that the aspirate which is joined with the $\rho$ was frequently in the dialects changed into the digamma, for instance in the Æolic $\beta \rho \rho_{0} \delta{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{v}$, i. e.


[^235]$\dagger$ According to Apollon. de Adv. p. 600,28 . the fut. $\beta \alpha \nu \hat{\omega}$ was used by the Attics with a long: on which see Фaive.
$\ddagger$ [Consonants are divided into aspirated, as $\mathcal{N}, \phi, \chi$; smooth, as $\kappa, \pi, \tau$; and middle, as $\beta, \gamma, \delta$.
 same appearance as we find in $\delta_{\varepsilon ́ \rho \kappa \omega}$, $\delta \rho a \kappa \varepsilon \tau v, ~ \delta \varepsilon ́ \delta о \rho к а$. *
'PE-. See Eiteiv.
 $\dot{\rho} s v \sigma \alpha$; but these two forms are seldom found in the Attics (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 739.), who generally use the fut.
 the aorist. $\dagger$

We may easily conceive that a neuter idea like that of to flow may be understood in an active as well as passive sense, and it is therefore unnecessary to have recourse to a theme PYHMI in order to form ${ }_{\varepsilon}{ }^{\rho} \rho \bar{\rho} \dot{p} \eta \eta$.
 $\mu \varepsilon v_{0}$, , dropping with sweat, is merely a lengthening of the o in $\dot{\rho} \varepsilon \sigma^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \mathrm{~s}$,
 introduced into the passage without the slightest authority, is therefore to be rejected.

 All the above have a transitive meaning, in which, however, there occurs no perfect ; but we find in an intransitive sense a perf. 2. $\begin{gathered}\text { "’ } \rho \dot{\rho} \omega \gamma \alpha, ~ I ~ a m ~ b r o k e n, ~ w i t h ~ t h e ~ c h a n g e ~\end{gathered}$ of vowel from $\eta$ to $\omega$ : on which see note on $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \circ \chi \alpha$ under

 and in Arat. Dios. 85. an Ion. 3. plur. pass. $\dot{\rho} \eta \gamma v$ vazo. There is a sister-form of $\dot{\rho} \eta \gamma \nu v \mu \mathrm{in}$ II. $\sigma, 571$. $\rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\dot{\rho} a \sigma \sigma \omega$ : this last, however, is particularly used as an expression of the palæstra, to throw to the ground, Jac. Ach. Tat. p. 821.-Passow.]

 кєк入ウ่ word is solely poetical.-Passow.]

[^236]nounced ; therefore wright is $\beta$ ékтŋ̧s. Compare Buttm. Lexil. p. 376.

+ [A pres. $\delta$ éouas occurs also in the poets. - Passow.]
$\ddagger$ See ${ }^{2}$ A $\gamma \nu \nu \mu$.
＇Pir＇$\dot{\omega}$ ，I freeze：fut．$\dot{\rho} \quad \gamma \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma$ ，\＆c．This word，like iôpó $\omega$ ，is contracted into $\omega$ and $\omega$ instead of the regular ou and or；e．g．infin．$\rho_{\iota} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu} v$, Aristoph．Vesp．446．Av． 935.
 1145．；part．fem．$\dot{\rho} \nmid \gamma \tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha$ ，Simonid．De Mul．29．；opt． р́rө́⿱亠䒑䶹，Brunck．Aristoph．Ach．1146．Av．935．Lucian De Luct．11．Plut．Apoph．Lac．p．233．a．Hippocr．De Sal．Diæt．1．；conj．$\dot{\rho}$＇rọ̣，Plat．Gorg．p．50\％．d．（p．52\％． Heind．）with Buttm．notes．See also Piers．ad Mœr． pp．336．339．All these are Attic forms．
 There are also two sister－forms $\rho^{\circ} \iota \pi \tau^{\prime} \omega{ }^{*}$ ，$\dot{\rho} \iota \pi \tau \tilde{\omega}$ ，from the former of which comes the imperf．èppin $\tau \tau \varepsilon \nu$, Herod．8，53．； but the formation follows $\dot{\rho} / \pi \tau \omega$ ．The $t$ is long by nature

 the only two instances in Homer of $a$ instead of $\varepsilon$ ，except perhaps the

 perf．pass．$\rho \varepsilon \rho \bar{\ell} \phi \theta a \iota$ is found in Pind．Fr．281．－Passow．］
＇Poi $\zeta a \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ ，Epic imperf．，with the force of an aorist，from $\dot{\rho} \circ \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\xi} \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ ：see the preceding paragraph．


 the force of a pres．），I am strong in health，［whence the



[^237][^238]е́pp $\omega \mu$ ย́vog．The aor．1．pass．is the only tense which takes the $\sigma$ ，as $\varepsilon e^{\rho} \rho \dot{\rho} \omega \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu$ ．
＇P＇ө́oнає［an old Epic depon．midd．］，I move with rapidity，rush，

 ［Some，however，connect it with $\dot{\rho} \omega \nu v \nu \mu \iota, \dot{\rho} \omega \mu \eta, \dot{\rho} \dot{v} o \mu a t, \dot{\rho} \hat{v} \mu \eta$ and the Lat．ruo．－Passow．］

## $\Sigma$.

 part．$\sigma$ ŕpas，Soph．Ant．409．No other tenses are in use．

A nother form $\sigma a \rho o{ }^{\prime} \omega$ ，$-\hat{\omega} \sigma \omega$ ，was used in the active and passive，but not by the Attics：see Lobeck ad Phryn．p．83．Whether perhaps the passive of it was used by the Attics to supply the defectiveness of $\sigma a i \rho \omega$ ，I know not．Lycophron（389．）has $\sigma$ арои́ $\mu \varepsilon v o s$.

From the same stem or root，but with a different radical meaning，comes a perfect，with the force of a present，$\sigma$＇ $\sigma \eta p \alpha$, I grin；part．$\sigma \varepsilon \sigma \eta p \dot{\omega}$ ，－uі̃ $\alpha$, －ós，Theocr．7， 19. Epic fem．$\sigma \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \check{\alpha}_{\rho} u \tilde{u} \alpha$, Hes．Sc． 268.
$\Sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$, I blow the trumpet：fut．$\sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i \gamma \xi \omega$ ；aor． 1. ह̇ $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \pi เ \gamma \xi \alpha$, Il．$\phi, 388$ ．，but the later writers use $\sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i \sigma \omega$ ， $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \pi \iota \sigma \alpha$ ，Lobeck ad Phryn．p．191．So also the old subst．was $\sigma \alpha \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \tau \eta_{s}$ ，the later one $\sigma \alpha \lambda \pi t \sigma \tau \gamma_{s}$ ．Compare Пла́ढш and इuрiگょ．

इaów．See $\Sigma \omega^{\omega} \zeta \omega$ ．
「á $\omega$ ，an old form for $\sigma \dot{\eta} \theta \omega, I$ sift，whence 3．plur．$\sigma \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota$ ，Herodot． 1． 200.
$\Sigma G^{\varepsilon} \nu \nu \bar{u} \mu$, or $\sigma \varepsilon_{\varepsilon \nu \nu v ́ \omega}$（Pind．），I extinguish：fut．$\sigma^{6} \varepsilon \sigma \omega$, less frequently $\sigma 6 \hat{\gamma} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, Plat．Legg．7．p．805．c．；aor． 1.




[^239]guished, I die away, dry up; perf. $\stackrel{\sharp}{\xi} \sigma €=\sigma \mu a s$; aor. 1. $\hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \epsilon_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \sigma \theta \theta_{\eta \nu}$. The passive therefore takes $\sigma$. On the formation of $\stackrel{\stackrel{ }{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \vartheta \eta \nu}{ }$ see $\stackrel{\jmath}{\xi} \gamma \nu \omega \nu$ under $\Gamma_{\iota \gamma \nu}{ }^{\prime} \sigma x \omega$ : and on the intrans.

 sense, to be extinguished; but as in verbs of this kind the immediate sense comes so near to the passive, not only does $\sigma G_{\varepsilon} \nu v v \mu a \iota$ serve for
 this latter, or rather its compound $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \ell_{\eta \nu}$, is by far the more common of the two.

 and in the aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \phi \eta \nu, I$ was filled with reverence, Soph. ap. Hesych. whence part. fem. $\sigma \varepsilon \not \subset \theta \in \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \alpha$, Plat. Phædr. p. 254. b.
[The act. $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} 6 \omega$, fut. $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \psi \omega$, is post-Homeric. - Passow.]

 under 'Pint
$\Sigma \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega$, I drive : pass. and midd. I hasten. This verb, like those beginning with $\rho$, doubles the first consonant in the augmented tenses, and retains it even in the perfect instead of the reduplication; e. g.
 $\sigma \nu \mu a \epsilon^{*}$; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \dot{v} \theta \eta \nu$, Soph. Aj. 294. And having the $\sigma$ thus doubled, it has none in the termination of the aor. 1. act. or midd., as

 $\sigma \dot{\theta} \theta \eta$, Hom. In this as in other cases, the Epic dialect rejects the augment entirely; as $\sigma \varepsilon \tilde{v} a, ~ \sigma \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon$, бєváao.

The perf. pass. ध́ $\sigma \sigma v \mu a t$, I am put in motion, has the meaning of, $I$ am restless, eager for, as in Il. $v, 79$. Od. $\kappa$, 484. in which sense the
 tion of a present, $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \dot{v} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ оs $\pi о \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \mu о v$, I1. $\omega, 404$. According to this the pluperf. $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \nu \mu \eta \nu$ would have the force of the imperfect; but it coincides in form with the syncop. aor. (see $\varepsilon \in \kappa \tau \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ in note under $\mathrm{K} \tau \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$ )
 $\sigma \dot{\sigma} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s ;$ and the sense is therefore always that of an aorist. In the

[^240]second person of this pluperf. or aorist $\begin{gathered}\text { E } \\ \text { ovo ( } \\ \text { Il. } \pi, 585 .) \text {, the } \sigma \text { in the }\end{gathered}$ last syllable is rejected for the same euphonic reason as in $\varepsilon$ हैббєva.

We find also syncopated forms of the present; as 3. sing. $\sigma \varepsilon \tilde{v} \tau a$, Soph. Trach. 645. but most commonly with a change of vowel, $\sigma o \tilde{\mu} \mu a$, , бои̃тal, Æschyl. Ch. 636., бoũvтal, Pers. 25., whence the imperatives used in common life, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ и̃, run, quick, Aristoph. Vesp. 209., or $\boldsymbol{\text { бoṽбo, }}$ бov́ $\sigma \theta \omega$, $\sigma о \tilde{v} \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, and infin. $\sigma \bar{v} \sigma \theta a c .{ }^{*}$ [These forms are used only by the Attic poets. - Passow.]

And lastly to this place belongs the well-known Laconian $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma o v a$, he is gone, from Xen. Hellen. 1, 1, 23. explained to be an aor. 2. pass. for $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \dot{\eta} \eta$.
$\sum_{\eta \prime}^{\prime} \pi \omega$, I make rotten or putrid. Pass, $\sigma \dot{\eta} \pi о \mu \alpha$, I rot, putrefy, mortify; aor. 2. ̇̇ $\sigma \alpha ́ \pi \eta \nu$; perf. act. (with the intrans. meaning of the pass.) $\sigma \in \varepsilon \sigma \pi \alpha$.

E'ivoцаи, Ion. бเขє́o $\mu \alpha$, I harm, injure; a defective depon., used only in pres. and imperfect. The rare perf. $\sigma \varepsilon \in \sigma \mu \mu \alpha \iota$ is found in an inscription in a passive sense.
[We find, however, in Herodot. 8, 31. the aor. 1. midd. ह́aivavio. The act. $\sigma i \nu \omega$ never occurs; and, except in the above-mentioned perfect and in Orph. Arg. 212., aivouat has never a passive sense.-Passow.]
 2. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} ф \eta \nu$. The characteristic letter is therefore $\phi$. $\Sigma_{x \in \delta} \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \mu$, , or -עvúco, I disperse, scatter: fut. $\sigma x \in ́ \delta \alpha \sigma \omega$, Att. $\sigma x \in \delta \tilde{\omega},-\tilde{q} s,-\tilde{\alpha}$, Aristoph. Vesp. 229. but found also in Herodot. 8,68 . The passive takes $\sigma$, as perf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma x^{\prime} \delta \dot{\delta} \alpha-$ $\sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma x \varepsilon \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

Sister-forms of the above are $\sigma \kappa i \delta \nu \nu \eta \mu$ (compare кí $\nu \eta \mu \iota$ from кєрá $\nu$ $\nu \nu \mu$ ), бкiòvaцat; and in the Epic poets, dropping the $\sigma, \kappa \varepsilon \delta \partial{ }^{\prime} \nu v v \mu$, кіঠঠə $\mu \mu$, like $\sigma \mu \kappa \rho o ́ s, ~ \mu \kappa к \rho o ́ s, ~ \& c . ~ A p o l l o n i u s ~ a n d ~ o t h e r s ~ h a v e ~ a l s o ~$ $\kappa \varepsilon \delta a i \omega$ : see $\delta a i \omega$. [Such a form as $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \delta \alpha \dot{a} \zeta \omega$ appears to have never occurred.—Passow.]

[^241]§єúgyvua. In case we adopt the syncope, $\sigma 0 \hat{v} \sigma o$ will be quite regular, nad $\sigma o v$, which occurs only as a kind of interjection (Aristoph. Vesp. 209.), will be a very natural abbreviation for such a usage. Compare a similar argument under $\Lambda$ иóv.
$\sum_{x \leq \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega}$, or $\sigma x \in \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \omega, I d r y$ any thing. But more frequently used in the pass. $\sigma x^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ ло $\mu<$ or $\sigma x \varepsilon \lambda \wedge$ oũ $\mu \iota$, I become dry: fut. $\sigma \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \rho \mu \alpha s$; to which we must add (with the same intransitive sense of the passive) the active forms, aor. 2. $\ell^{\ell} \sigma x \lambda \eta \nu$, opt. $\sigma \kappa \lambda \alpha i \eta \nu$, infin. $\sigma \kappa \lambda \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$; and perf. ย̈ $\sigma \lambda \lambda \eta \pi \alpha$. See note under Tév́ $\chi \omega$.

The active of this verb scarcely ever occurs in a causative sense; nor do we find in the common language the aorist, which, according to analogy, would be $\varepsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \iota \lambda a$. But in the Epic writers we find forms
 Th. 694. These lead us to a theme $\sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega$, which also exists, but which in the common language is a completely different verb from the above, signifying to scratch, scrape. So common, however, is the mutual change of the vowels $a$ and $\varepsilon$, that we may with full confidence suppose a theme $\sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega$ to have existed in the oid Ionic dialect with the former meaning, as we find the $\alpha$ in the optative $\sigma \kappa \lambda \alpha i \eta \nu$ (although known to us only from ároбкגain in Hesychius), and we have therefore here the metathesis $\Sigma K A \Lambda-, \Sigma K \Lambda A$-, according to the analogy of

$\sum x^{\prime} \pi \tau \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, Ilook around me, consider, ( a depon. midd.) is inflected regularly. The Attics scarcely ever used the pres. and imperf., but generally $\sigma \varkappa о \pi \tilde{\omega}$ or $\sigma$ котои̃ $\mu \alpha s$; on the contrary in the future always $\sigma x \varepsilon ́ \psi o \mu \alpha \iota$, never $\sigma \varkappa o \pi \dot{\gamma} \sigma \omega$ or $\sigma \varkappa о \pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, as also in the aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \varkappa \varepsilon \psi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, and in the
 In this last-quoted passage it has its usual active signification, but in Demosth. Mid. p. 576, 27. and Erot. p. 1403, 21. it is used passively, although even in this writer its regular usage is active. Verbal adj. $\sigma x \varepsilon \pi \tau \varepsilon \circ \delta$.

The pres. and imperf. belong principally to the Epic language; e. g. $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \pi \pi \varepsilon \tau \%$, Il. $\pi, 361$., imperat. $\sigma \kappa \in ́ \pi \tau \varepsilon 0$, II. $\rho$, 652. Theogn. 1091., $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon-$ $\pi \tau \delta \dot{\mu \varepsilon v o s,}$ Apoll. Rhod. In the older Attics I have found $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \pi \tau \dot{\sigma} \mu \varepsilon \theta a$ in Plat. Lach. p. 185. and $\pi \rho o v \sigma \kappa \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \varepsilon \tau o$ in Thucyd. 8, 66. (see however the note below). In the later writers these tenses are found more frequently, as in Lucian, \&c..*

[^242]An aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \eta \nu$ is found in the LXX, as in Numb. 1, 19. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \in ́ \pi \eta \sigma a v$, they were numbered.
$\Sigma_{\varkappa о \pi \varepsilon} \omega$, or $\sigma \varkappa о \pi о \tilde{u} \mu \alpha \iota$, idem. It is used only in the pres. and imperf. : all the other tenses are supplied by $\sigma$ ќ $^{\prime} \pi \tau о \mu \propto \iota$; which see.
 Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 278. 844. [aor. 1. है $\sigma \varkappa \omega \downarrow \alpha$; and in Aristoph. Nub. 296. Reisig has restored to the text the act. fut. $\sigma \varkappa \omega ́ \psi \omega$. Compare Comm. Crit. de Soph. CEd. C. 398. - Passow.]
$\Sigma \mu \alpha ́ \omega$, Ion. $\sigma \mu^{\prime} \omega$, I smear, anoint: fut. $\sigma \mu \dot{\gamma} \sigma \omega$, Dor. $\sigma \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\gamma} \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu ;$ aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \eta \chi^{\ominus}{ }^{\ominus} \eta \nu$; verbal adj. бииктós. These two last are formed from a sister-form $\sigma \mu \dot{\eta}^{\prime} \nsim \omega$ (fut. $\sigma \mu \dot{\eta} \xi \omega$, aor. 1. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \mu \xi \propto, \& c$.), used by the Epics and in the later language; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 253. The present is contracted to $\sigma \mu \tilde{\omega}$ and inflected in $\eta$, as $\sigma \mu \tilde{\gamma} s, \sigma \mu \tilde{\gamma}, \& c$. , infin. $\sigma \mu \tilde{\eta} \nu$; (see $\left.\Pi_{\varepsilon เ \nu \alpha ́ \omega}\right)$ nor do $\sigma \mu \tilde{q} g, \sigma \mu \tilde{\alpha} \nu, \& c$., ever occur before the time of Lucian; Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 61.

इoṽนat. See $\Sigma$ モย́v.
$\Sigma \pi \alpha ́ \omega, I$ draw: [fut. $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\ell} \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \alpha$; perf. ยै $\sigma \pi \alpha ̆ \varkappa \alpha$; perf. pass. ${ }^{\xi} \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. midd. $\grave{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta v$.] The $\alpha$ is short in all the tenses.
$\Sigma \pi \varepsilon \tau \nu, \& c$. See "E $\pi \omega$.
$\Sigma \pi s i \rho \omega, I$ sow : [fut. $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\wedge} \sigma \pi \varepsilon เ \rho \alpha$; perf. 2.
 $\alpha$ short. - Midd.
 бкотоvินat (compounds as well as simple), coupled with the decided defectiveness of the forms of $\sigma \kappa o \pi \epsilon i \nu$ in $-\eta \sigma \omega$, and - $\eta \sigma a$, , of which I nowhere find any mention. Instances where бrє́лтодą formerly stood in the text may be seen in Sturz. Lex. Xenoph. in voce; these require the particular examination of the critic. In the passage of Thucydides, all the manuscripts have тd $\rho \eta 0 \eta \sigma \delta \mu \in \nu a \pi \rho o ́-$

тepò aùroîs троибнénteтo. There is no objection here to the imperfect as a tense, but, as the imperf. of a depon. in a pass. sense, it excites suspicion. If now we read $\pi \rho o b \sigma \sigma \kappa \pi \tau o$, the connexion is as correct, and perhaps more suited to the context thus, " and they considered beforehand all that was to be brought forward:" and this sense Heilmannen gave it, although he did not contemplate any alteration in the reading.
$\sum_{\pi \varepsilon} \varepsilon \delta \delta \omega$, I pour out：fut．$\sigma \pi \varepsilon i \sigma \omega$ ；aor．1．$ٌ$ 解 $\pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \alpha$ ；perf． ぞ $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \iota \varkappa \alpha$ ，Plut．Sertor．14．；perf．pass．${ }^{\prime} \sigma \pi \pi \varepsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ．
［Homer has the Ionic imperf．$\sigma \pi \varepsilon \frac{1}{\partial} \hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ and the aor．$\sigma \pi \varepsilon i \sigma a \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ ，as also the Ep．2．sing．conj．pres．$\sigma \pi \varepsilon \quad \nu \delta \eta \sigma \theta a$ ，Od．$\delta, 591$ ．－Passow．］


$\Sigma \tau \varepsilon i \ell \omega$ ，I tread，tread upon：［fut．$\sigma \tau$ si $\psi \omega$ ；aor．2．

 ［The word is solely Poet．and Ion．］
$\Sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, I$ send：［fut．$\sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega}$, Ep．$\sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \in \omega$ ；aor． 1.

 and in the poets aor．1．$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha^{\prime} \lambda A \eta \nu$ ，

In Herodot．7，89．we find a 3．plur．pluperf．É $\sigma \tau a \lambda a ́ o ̂ a \tau o$, which however is perhaps nothing more than an old error for éacádato， occurring in Hes．Scut． 288.
$\Sigma \tau \varepsilon \nu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$, g groan：fut．$\sigma \tau \varepsilon \nu \alpha \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$ ，\＆c．Compare $\Sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\zeta} \omega \omega$, B $\alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega, \Delta / \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ ．
$\Sigma_{\tau \varepsilon} \varepsilon \omega, I$ sigh，is used only in pres．and imperf．＊
The poets（Æschyl．and Eurip．）use also a pass．aтévoual，Epic бтеivoцat，in the sense of I am narrow，full．
$\Sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \gamma \omega$, I love，am contented with：fut．$\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \xi \xi \omega, \& c . ;$

$\Sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \rho^{\prime} \omega, I$ deprive，bereave：fut．$\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \gamma_{j} \sigma \omega$ ，but also $\sigma \tau \varepsilon-$ $\rho^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ，Schæf．Schol．Par．Apollon．Rh．1，850．Jacob． Anthol．Poet．pp．680．711．whence the infin．aor．$\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon_{-}$ $\sigma \alpha \iota$ ，Od．$\nu, 262$ ．This verb is complete and regular in all its tenses in its compound $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho^{\prime} \epsilon$ ，which，beside the more general idea of to deprive，has oftener the more im－ mediate sense of to take away；e．g．fut．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \sigma \tau \varepsilon p \eta_{\sigma} \omega$ ； aor．1．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \leq \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \rho \eta \sigma \alpha$ ，\＆c．：pass．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \circ \tilde{u} \mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor．1．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon-$

[^243]$\sigma \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \eta$ A $\eta \nu$; with the fut. midd. $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \gamma^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha$. In the simple verb the pres. in general use is $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho i \sigma \pi \omega, \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta ; \sigma \omega$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau^{\prime} \rho \eta \sigma \alpha, \& c$. ; and in the passive $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho о u ̃ \mu \alpha \iota$ or $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho i \sigma \varkappa о \mu \alpha \iota$,
 غ̇ $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$.

A particular form is $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \rho \rho \alpha_{\iota}$ with the meaning of $I$ am in the state of a person deprived of any thing, I am without it. [In prose this form is used only in pres. and imperf. - Passow.]

We must not confound, as is too commonly done, this $\sigma$ т $\rho \rho \mu a \iota$ with $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \rho \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota$ or $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho i \sigma к о \mu a \iota$. The meaning of $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$ is always deprived, that of $\sigma \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ to be deprived; so that these forms would be considered as an aorist of the principal verb, if the indic. pres. did not occur in the same full meaning in Xen. Symp. 4, 31. vũv $\delta^{\circ} \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \in \mathcal{O} \eta \dot{\eta}$
 картой $\boldsymbol{\iota}$ : see also Anab. 3, 2, 2.

The poets have also from oré $\rho о \mu a \iota$ the part. aor. 2. pass. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon$ ís, synonymous with $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$ and $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon$ s.

Whether the simple verb $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \bar{\omega}, \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho o \tilde{v} \mu a \iota$ occurs as a pres. in the old Attic writers I cannot venture to assert positively in the present imperfect state of our catalogues of Greek verbs. In Lucian and others it is, at least in the passive, not uncommon. But in Xen. Anab. 1, 9, 13.



Homer seems to have inflected $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \epsilon$ with the $\varepsilon$, for he has the
 $\sigma_{\varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon}$, which occurs in the old Atticism (Andocid. Myster. extr.) is to be explained by the same inflexion.
 deponent. The above forms occur frequently in Homer in the sense of he gives to understand, promises, threatens: and we find the 3. plur. бтєiv̌at once in Eschyl. Pers. 49. in the same sense. At Od. $\lambda, 584$. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \tilde{v} \tau o \delta \grave{\varepsilon} \delta \iota \psi a ́ \omega \nu$, in a description of Tantalus, Passow derives it from i $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$, , and translates it in its literal sense, he stood, but Voss renders it, he strove, endeavoured.
$\Sigma_{\tau \eta р i \zeta \omega, ~ I ~ f i x: ~ f u t . ~}^{\sigma \tau \eta р i \sigma \omega ; ~ a o r . ~ 1 . ~ ̇ ̇ \sigma \tau \eta ́ p ı \xi \alpha, ~ a o r . ~} 1$.
 рі $\gamma \mu \gamma \nu . \quad$ Compare $\mathrm{B} \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega, \Delta \sigma \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$.
$\Sigma \tau i \xi \omega$, I prick：fut．$\sigma \tau i \xi \omega$ ；aor．1．${ }_{\xi} \sigma \tau \downarrow \xi \alpha$ ；perf．pass． हैб $\sigma \iota \gamma \mu \alpha$ ．See the preceding．
$\Sigma_{\text {торе́vуици，I }}$ spread，strew，abbrev．$\sigma \tau$ о́рvиць，and by metathesis $\sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\tau}^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \nu u \mu$ ；so also in the formation＊，fut． $\sigma \tau о \rho \in ́ \sigma \omega$ or $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$（Att．$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \tau о \rho \tilde{\omega}$ ，Aristoph．Equ． 484．）；aor．1．$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau o ́ p s \sigma \alpha$ or $\stackrel{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \rho \omega \sigma \alpha$ ；in the other tenses the usual forms are perf．pass．${ }_{\xi} \sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor．1．pass． ย̇ $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \nu$ ；verbal adj．$\sigma \tau \rho \omega \tau$ о́s．

Hippocrates uses катабторєбөच̈дat；see Foes．EEc．Hippocr．：and

 Theognet．Conv．Athen．3．p．104．c．Lobeck ad Phryn． p．578．perf．pass．光 $\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \mu \mu \iota$（like $\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\tau \varepsilon ́ \theta \rho \alpha \mu-$ $\mu \alpha \iota$ ，with $\alpha$ instead of $\varepsilon \ddagger$ ）；aor．1．pass．є่ $\sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon \oint \theta \eta \nu$（compare


The aor．1．pass．白 $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\phi} \phi \theta \eta \nu$ occurs in the Doric dialect of Theocr．7， 132．I know of no authority for a pres．$\sigma \tau \rho$ áф $\boldsymbol{\text { ；}}$ compare $\tau \rho a ́ \pi \omega$ ，

$\Sigma \tau u \gamma s \in$, I fear，hate，is regular．The perf．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \tau u ́ \gamma \eta x \alpha$ has the force of a present，Herodot．2， 47.

From an obsolete stem $\Sigma T Y \Gamma \Omega$ or $\Sigma T Y Z \Omega$ Homer has the aor． 2. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau v \gamma o \nu$ ；and an aor．1．${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \sigma \tau v \xi \alpha$ ，opt．$\sigma \tau \dot{v} \xi a \mu \mu$, Od．$\lambda, 502$ ．，with the causative meaning of to make terrible；which latter form is however again used by the later poets，e．g．by Apoll．Rh．4，512．，in its original sense．
 quently and purer Attic $\sigma u p i \xi \neq \mu \alpha t$ ，Non－Attic $\sigma u i^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ， Dor．$\sigma u$ í $\sigma \omega$ ；see Hemsterh．Aristoph．Plut．p． 229. The aor．1．infin．$\sigma$ upi $\sigma \alpha$ is found in Lucian．Harmon． 2. Compare $\mathrm{B} \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\zeta} \omega$ and $\Delta \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \zeta_{\omega} \omega$ ．

ミ＇úpw，I draw，drag along．Pass．бúpoual；aor． 2. ย̇бúpŋข．

[^244]$\Sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \zeta_{\omega}$, Att. $\sigma \phi \dot{\sigma} \tau \tau \omega$, [I cut the throat, slaughter, offer up in sacrifice : fut. $\sigma \phi \alpha^{\prime} \xi \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }_{\xi} \xi \sigma \phi \alpha \xi \alpha$; perf.
 and Pind.] but in the Attic writers generally aor. 2.

$\Sigma \phi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, I deceive : [fut. $\sigma \phi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \tilde{\omega}$; aor. 1. ${ }_{\varepsilon} \sigma \phi \eta \lambda \alpha$, infin.
 aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \phi \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \nu$.
$\Sigma \phi_{i}^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \omega$, I tie together, fasten together: fut. $\sigma \phi_{i} \gamma \boldsymbol{\xi} \omega$;
 $\xi \alpha!, \& c$.
$\Sigma \phi u ́ \zeta \omega, I$ beat (as the pulse does), palpito: fut. $\sigma \phi u ́ \xi \omega$, \&c. Compare $\Sigma \tau \alpha \xi_{j}, \Sigma \tau i \zeta \omega$, \&c.
$\Sigma \chi a ́ \zeta \omega, I$ drop, open: fut. $\sigma \chi a ́ \sigma \omega, \& c$. This verb has in the older language a pres. in -á $\omega$, as $\sigma \chi{ }^{d} \omega$, infin. $\sigma \chi \tilde{q} v$ : imperf. ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \sigma \chi \overline{ }{ }^{\omega}$; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 219.; but in the formation the $a$ is always short.
[Both the act. and midd. voices of this verb have a transit. and intransit. meaning; in the former it seems connected with ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega, \sigma \chi^{\ell} \theta \omega$,
 Lycophr. 21. - Passow.]

$\Sigma \omega^{\prime} \zeta \omega, I$ save: fut. $\sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$, old Attic $\sigma \omega^{\prime} \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\ell} \sigma \omega \sigma a$; perf. pass. Att. $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \mu a \ell$, otherwise generally $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \sigma \mu a \iota$; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu .-$ Midd.

The radical form is $\sigma a o ́ \omega, \sigma a \omega \prime \sigma \omega$, coming regularly from $\sigma \alpha \dot{\sigma}$, salvus; and as from oáos came $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$, so by contraction from $\sigma a \dot{o}^{\omega} \omega$ was formed $\sigma \dot{\omega} \omega, \sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega, \sigma \varepsilon \in \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \iota, \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \sigma \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu$. The pres. $\sigma \omega^{\prime} \omega$ * $\sigma \dot{\omega} \varepsilon$, \&c., remained in the usage of the Epic poets; but $\sigma \omega^{\prime} \zeta \omega$, which sprung from it, was introduced into the common language, and gave rise afterwards to $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \sigma \mu a$. The rarity of the older form $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \mu a \iota$ (on which see Suid, v. $\sigma \varepsilon \in \omega \sigma \sigma a \iota$ ) arose from transcribers using the one then in common use. $\dagger$

There is perhaps no instance whatever in the Epic writers of the pres. $\sigma \omega ' \zeta \omega . \ddagger$ In the other tenses they use the resolved form only, as fut.

[^245]$\ddagger$ The single occurrence of $\sigma \omega \oint\langle\omega$ in O J. є, 490. is most likely a false reading for $\sigma \omega ́ \omega \nu$, as we find at $\iota, 430, \sigma \omega$ ontes : and in Hes, $€$, 374. $\sigma \dot{\omega}$ Sot is a rejecter reading. Among the Alexandrine Epics Apollon, Rhod, has invariably $\sigma \omega^{\prime} \omega, \&$ e.
 and in the present beside $\sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \omega$ ，\＆c．，a shortened form of it；as，conj． aóns，бón，$\sigma$ ówotv，II．九，393．424．681．But the resolved form is seldom found in the present in the Epic writers；qaõ̃，Theogn． 868. Bekk．and Callim．Del．22．，$\sigma a o \tilde{v} \sigma \iota^{*}$, Tyrt．2，13．The imperative would therefore be $\sigma a ́ o v$ ，and the imperf．（éqáovv）3．sing．é éáov，$\sigma a ́ o v$, and so the imperative is written in the manuscripts and in the text of the common editions in the following passages；Hom．Hymn．12．（13．） Callim．Epigr．35．Theodorid．Epigr．4．Epigr．Adesp．179．But Homer has $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma a ́ \omega$ ，$\sigma$ á $\omega$, Il．$\phi, 238 . \pi, 363$ ．as the 3．sing．imperf．，and $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega$ ， Od．$\nu, 230 . \rho, 595$. as the imperat．；and so has Callimachus in his hymns：whence also the text of the first－quoted passages has been sometimes altered to $\sigma$ á $\omega$ ．Besides it has been already mentioned under vaıєrá $\omega$ ，that this form is lengthened in the same anomalous manner as vaıeтáwaa；that is to say from éqáov，aáov came $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \tilde{\omega}, \sigma \tilde{\omega}$ ； which contraction，instead of being resolved into－ow according to general analogy，was changed to－$\alpha \omega$ ．

In an Attic inscription in Corp．Inser．Gr．T．1．p．107．no．71． stands legibly $\mathbf{\Sigma O O}$ ，while the context requires the fut．$\sigma \omega \sigma \omega$ ：that form must therefore be read $\sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \omega$ ，which is the same old future as the Epic $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \rho \dot{v}$ ovat，tavíovat，and which had therefore left its traces in the
 article on＇Epúw．

## T．

TA－．We must suppose this stem or root on account of the old im－ perative $\tau \tilde{\eta}$ ，take！here！（in French tiens ！）to which belonged also a plural $\tau \tilde{\eta} \tau \varepsilon$（Sophron．ap．Schol．Aristoph．Ach．204．），formed ac－ cording to the analogy of $\zeta \tilde{\eta} \nu, \& c$ ．

Akin to the above is another stem or root TAF－†，from which Homer has a redupl．part．aor．2．тeтayúv，seizing．

That the supposition of a stem or root TA－for the formation of $\tau \varepsilon$－ $\tau a k a, \& c$. ，from $\tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$ is grammatically unnecessary，although there may be etymological grounds for it，is shown under Tqive．See also an account of all the above－mentioned forms in Buttm．Lexil．Art． Tєтаү⿳亠丷厂彡，p．503．et sqq．

TAF－See TA－（TA $)$ ．
Ta入áw．See T入áw．

[^246]gave rise to the adoption of a form $\sigma \alpha^{\prime} \omega$ ．

+ Compare ér $\mu \alpha ́ \gamma \eta \nu$ under Tє́ $\mu \nu \omega$（тс́－ $\tau \mu \eta \kappa \alpha)$ ．

Tavíw, I stretch out, strain: fut. тavv́бw; perf. pass. тerávvouat;
 $\phi, 174$. In Il. $\rho$, 393. we find a 3. sing. pres. távvtat, as formed from rávopat. The $v$ is short in all the tenses, so that Homer, in order to lengthen it, doubles the $\sigma$.

Tapá $\sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\tau \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega$, I disturb: fut. $\tau \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \xi \omega \dagger$, \&c. Its inflexion is regular.

This verb has a sister-form of less frequent occurrence, 1.) in the
 pres. was used in prose, the aor. 1. $\varepsilon \in \rho a \xi \alpha$, infin. $\uparrow \rho a \tilde{\xi} a \iota$ by the poets: 2.) in the Epic writers the perf., with an intransit. sense, $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \chi$ $a$, , $I$ am agitated, stormy.
 with the $\rho$, and then contracting the two alphas into one long syllable: consequently the $\tau$ before the $\rho$ became aspirated, like $\tau \hat{\theta} \theta \rho \pi \pi \pi \nu$, $\mathfrak{F}$ оцд́a$\tau \iota o v, \phi \rho o v \delta o s$, \&c. In $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \rho \eta \eta^{a}$ a the $\tau$ was necessarily restored, and the $\eta$ for $\bar{\alpha}$ is a common Ionicism. From this perfect the later writers formed a pres. $\tau \rho \eta \eta_{\chi \omega}$. See the Art. on $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \rho \eta \chi^{a}$ in Buttm. Lexil. p. 506.
$\mathrm{T} \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\tau \alpha \prime \tau \tau \omega$, I set in order, arrange : fut. $\tau \alpha \mathfrak{\xi} \omega \omega$;



Tєiv, I stretch out, extend (any thing): fut. $\tau \varepsilon \nu \tilde{\sim}$; aor. 1. $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon เ \nu \alpha$; perf. $\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \not ั \varkappa \alpha$; perf. pass. $\tau \in ́ \tau \alpha \mu \alpha!$; aor. 1. pass. غ̇т $\alpha^{\prime} \eta \nu . ~ S e e ~ T A-$, and Tavúш.

This verb, with $\kappa \lambda i \nu \omega, \kappa \rho i \nu \omega, k \tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$, and $\pi \lambda \hat{v} \nu \omega$, drops the $\nu$ in the perf. act., perf. pass., and aor. 1. pass., and takes the short vowel of the future; the two verbs in $-\varepsilon i \nu \omega$ changing also the $\varepsilon$ to $a$. When we observe that ${ }_{\xi} \phi \theta \iota \mu a \iota$ and $\delta \nu \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a c$ belong, both in form and meaning, to $\phi \theta i \omega$ and $\delta \dot{v} \omega$ ( $n o t ~ \phi \theta i v \omega, \delta \dot{v} \nu \omega$ ), that $i \delta \rho \dot{\rho} \nu \theta \eta \nu, \dot{\varepsilon}_{\pi} \pi \nu \dot{v} \nu \theta \eta \nu$ must come from i $\delta \rho v^{\prime} \omega, \pi \nu \nu^{\prime} \omega$, there being no trace of a pres. in $-\nu \omega$ for either, and that $\beta a i \nu \omega$ comes from BA $\Omega$, $\phi \theta$ áv $\omega$ from $\Phi \ominus A \Omega, \& c$. \&c., we may conclude that the above five verbs also ( $\tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega, \& c$.) came originally from roots which according to the more general analogy would be pure, and that another present was afterwards formed by the very common insertion of the $\nu$. But as in these five verbs the $\nu$ is carried on to the future,

[^247]which is not the case with the other anomalous verbs in $-\nu \omega$, and there exists also a plain analogy between these and other verbs which have for their characteristic letter $\lambda, \mu, \nu$, or $\rho$, particularly in the change of the vowel $\varepsilon$ to $a$; it seems to me a more grammatical and more practical arrangement to join them thus with each other and with the verbs in $-\nu \omega$, than to refer certain tenses to such themes as $\mathrm{KPI} \Omega, \mathrm{TA} \Omega$, \&c., by which the number of verbal anomalies would be unnecessarily increased.

Tєipw, I rub out (attero), wear out, torment, is used only in pres. and imperf. Topẽ̀ and Tépropą must be considered as distinct stems or roots, which, although akin to each other, have been separated by usage. See both in their places.

TEK-. See Tiктш.
T $\varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$, I.finish, complete, fulfil: fut. $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\sigma} \omega^{*}$, $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$ (Il. .9, 415.), and Att. $\tau \approx \lambda \tilde{\omega}$, Plat. Protag. p. 311. b. ; in the passive also $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha$ (Herodot. 3, 134.) is a future. See $\Delta \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \mu \omega$ and K $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$. Pass. $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \mu \alpha l$; fut. $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha s$; perf. $\tau \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \downarrow$; aor. 1. pass. غ̇ $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.
[Homer has also the aor. 1. act. $\varepsilon_{\tau} \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \sigma a, \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \in \dot{\epsilon} \hat{\lambda} \varepsilon \sigma \sigma a$, of which Herodotus uses the infin. $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { 覑 } \sigma a l \text {. We find also in Homer the Epic pres. }\end{gathered}$ tedeím both in the act. and pass. voice.-Passow.]

Té $\lambda \lambda \omega$, an old verb $\dagger$, occurring only in its compounds, which may be found in the Lexicons; e. g. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau \in ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, \&c. It is reflected regularly according to the ana$\operatorname{logy}$ of verbs having as their characteristic letter, $\lambda, \mu, \nu$, or $\rho$; and in the passive has only the aor. 1.-Midd.
[Passow gives the following inflexion: $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$; fut. $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega}$, Æol. $\tau \in \lambda$ -


 pref. $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \mu \eta \varkappa \alpha \not \ddagger$, perf. pass. $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \mu \eta \mu \alpha s$; aor. 1. pass. $\grave{\varepsilon} \tau \mu \gamma^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ : 3. fut. $\tau \varepsilon \tau \mu \gamma \dot{\sigma} \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, whence ย̇ $x \tau \varepsilon \tau \mu \gamma \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \theta_{0 \nu}$, Plat. De Rep. 8. p. 564. c. §-Midd.

In II. $\nu, 707$. $\tau \underline{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \epsilon$ is a solitary instance of a pres. $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$; and so it is

[^248][^249]considered by Heyne: but Wolf and Passow read $\tau \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \tau$ as a future. The common form however in both Epic and Ionic writers is $\tau \dot{a} \mu \nu \omega$ : yet the aor. ${ }^{\prime} \tau \alpha \mu o y$ is found in the Attics, and was probably one of the older Atticisms, e. g. Thucyd. 1, 81. Eurip. Hel. 1240.

An Epic sister-form is $\tau \mu \eta \eta^{\prime}$; aor. 1. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \tau \mu \eta \xi \alpha$; aor. 2. $\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \tau \mu a \gamma o v$; aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \mu a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$. See also Tér $\mu o v$.
 This verb is regular.

The pass. т $\varepsilon$ ¢́тонаи, I am delighted, satiated, has in the Epic lan-

 (whence the conj. $\tau a \rho \pi \dot{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \theta a$, Il. $\omega, 636$.) or with redupl. тєтap $\tau \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$,
 likewise in many passages of Homer with a change of vowel, e. g. $\tau$ áp $\phi \theta \eta$, Od. $\tau, 213 ., \tau \dot{\alpha} \rho \phi \theta \varepsilon v, \zeta, 99$. : for this however there are not sufficient analogical grounds; and as there is still less foundation for imagining that these two forms were used indifferently for each other in the same poem, it is possible that the one with the change of vowel might have been an impure dialect foisted into Homer's text at some very early period.*

Three times (Il. $\gamma, 441 . \xi, 314$. Od. 9,292 .) Homer has $\tau \rho a \pi \varepsilon i o \mu \varepsilon \nu$, which is aor. 2. conj. pass. for $\tau \rho a \pi \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, $\tau \rho a \pi \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$, and formed according to the analogy of verbs in $\mu$, that is like 9 siopau for $9 \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \mu$ a from $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \mu$, or $\sigma \tau \varepsilon i o \mu \varepsilon \nu$ for $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \in \omega \mu \nu$ from í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$. But in the above passages the verb comes from $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \pi \omega$, not from $\tau \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$, by the same metathesis as in $\tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \rho a \theta o v$ : see $\Pi$ 白 $\rho \theta \omega . \dagger$

Tद́роолu, I become dry, depon. pass.; aor. 2. pass. ( $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \in \rho \sigma \eta \nu)$ infin. $\tau \varepsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu a \ell, \tau \varepsilon \rho \sigma \dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha$, Il. $\pi, 519$. Od. $\zeta, 98$. The active voice does not occur in any ancient writer, but in its stead we find, in a causative sense, Tepनaì $\omega$, I make dry, dry up, (regularly inflected) whence aor. 1. étépaŋva Il. $\pi$, 529.

At II. $\pi$, 519. we find $\tau \varepsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu a t$, to become dry, and at v. 529. Tध́ $\rho \sigma \eta \nu \varepsilon$,

[^250]from $\tau \rho \epsilon \in \pi \omega$, grounded on grammatical construction, is correct. To which we may add that Homer in sucb a sense (to turn oneself toward), never uses $\tau \rho a \pi$ गेvas but $\tau \rho a \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a s$; while on the other hand we meet with the same expression $\tau \epsilon \in \rho \pi \in \sigma \theta \alpha$ $\phi i \lambda \delta \tau \eta \tau i$ at $\mathrm{Od}, \epsilon, 227$. In the passage of Od. N. 292. we must join eunntevte
 like.
he made dry; hence the two forms, thus standing in evident relation to each other, have been generally considered as infinitive and indicative of the same verb, with no other difference than that of sense. Now as $\tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \sigma \eta \nu \varepsilon$ can be nothing but an aor. 1. act., $\tau \in \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu a \varepsilon$ would then be the infinitive of the same tense, with an immediate or neuter meaning. But $\tau \varepsilon \rho \sigma \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$ (Od. $\zeta, 98$.), which exactly corresponds with it, is clearly an aor. passive.*

Nicander (Ther. 96. 693. 709.) has some forms of an aor. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \tau \varepsilon \rho \sigma a$ for éréponva; and again in Theocr. 22, 63. I would, rather on account of the context, consider $\tau \hat{\varepsilon} \rho \sigma \varepsilon \iota$ to be a future than a present. If this be so, and these forms of Nicander, like others of the same poet, were not made by himself, they come probably from $\tau \in \in \rho \rho \rho \omega, I d r y u p$ (see


Tєтă $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega}$. See TA-.
Terev $\bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$, to be armed, Od. $\chi, 104$., a perfect derived from the subst. $\tau \in \mathfrak{\chi} \chi \varepsilon \alpha$. Compare 'E $\sigma \theta \eta \mu$ évos.

Tєтіпиа兀. See TIE-.

'T'́т ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \nu$, ${ }^{\prime} \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \mu \circ v$, I found, hit upon, attained: a defective aorist, of which we find no other tense than the conj. т $\tau$ ' $\tau \mu \eta \mathrm{s}, \eta, \mathrm{Od} . \boldsymbol{o}, 15$. The analogy of | $\varepsilon$ |
| :---: |
| $\varepsilon$ | however being totally different in meaning from TEM $\Omega$ the stem or root of $\tau \varepsilon \mu \nu \omega$, must be kept distinct from it, at least by the grammarian.

 well as ${ }_{\varepsilon ̇ \tau \varepsilon \tau \mu}$, Passow forms from an obsolete pres. $\tau \varepsilon \in \tau \mu \omega$.]

Tвтраірш. See Tıтра́ш.

## Tsú $\chi$. The two following cognate verbs must be kept distinct from each other.

1. Tєú ${ }^{\omega}, I$ prepare : a poetical word, regularly inflected, as fut.

[^251]$\tau \in \rho \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ with $\tau \epsilon f \in \iota y$ by means of a future and an aorist of this verb, according to the analogy of кєipш ${ }^{3} A \lambda \epsilon(\xi \omega)$, must be pronounced incorrect, because the $\sigma$ in $\tau \in \rho \sigma \sigma \sigma \theta \alpha \sigma$ is in the root through the Ionicism of $\rho \sigma$ for $\beta \beta$, as shown by the derivative subst. $\tau a p \phi o$ s and rapoós, and the Lat. torreo. Nor is there so immediate an agreement between the meanings of ( $\tau \in ́ \rho \rho \rho \omega$ ) тépow, I dry up, and reipos, I rub off, which latter may indeed have been pronounced in the Aolic dialect тéppow also (see Greg. Cor. in Æol. ii.), as to justify the grammarian in joining both verbs under the same inflexion.


2. Tv $\chi^{\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega, ~ I ~ h a p p e n, ~ c h a n c e ~ t o ~ b e, ~ h i t ~ u p o n: ~ f u t . ~}$
 formation of these tenses from $\tau \varepsilon u ́ \chi \omega$, see notes under
 $\tau \varepsilon \tau \cup \dot{\chi \eta r \alpha}$ from ${ }^{\text {En }} \tau \cup \chi^{\circ}$ (without having recourse to a new theme $\tau \cup \chi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega$ ), see 'A $\lambda \alpha \chi^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ and note.

The meaning of $\tau v \gamma \chi^{\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega,}{ }^{\ell} \tau v \chi^{\nu \nu}$ is that of the passive of $\tau \varepsilon \delta^{\prime} \chi^{\omega}$ with an intransitive immediate force. That is to say, $\tau \varepsilon \tau$ í $\chi^{\theta a t}$ very frequently means in the Epic poets to be fated, destined, brought on by circumstances, whence тerv́ктat is much the same as $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau i$, , for which was




 was prepared for them, was their lot $:$ and sometimes in this as in other cases the relation is reversed, érvұov toúrov, I obtained that as my lot, whence comes the meaning of to obtain, light upon, find. In a similar way it is easy to distinguish in the two aorists of the same theme, ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon \xi a$ and ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \tau v \chi^{\varepsilon} \nu$, the causative and the immediate meaning becoming active and passive, ("I caused, prepared," and "it was prepared, was my lot") a distinction which we see plainly in $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \iota \psi a$ and $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \pi \sigma o v$, in



With this aor. 2. is connected also, according to the analogy given in the last note, the perf. act. from the same simple form, $\tau \varepsilon \in \tau \varepsilon v \chi a$. This was the true Ionic perfect of $\tau v \gamma \chi^{\dot{a} \nu \omega, ~ e . ~ g . ~ i n ~ H e r o d o t . ~ 3, ~ 14 . ~ e x t r ., ~}$ which in a later period became frequent in the non-Attic writers, as in Aristot. Eth. 3, 14. Polyb. 1, 81 : see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 395. Nay, the part. of this perfect occurs in Homer in a completely passive sense

[^252]пє́фика, I am produced, I grow.
The same may be observed of $\approx \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ and $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta к а$, of $\epsilon \delta v \nu$ and $\delta \in ́ \delta v к а$, of $\varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \eta \nu$


 but to $\tau v \gamma \chi^{d} \nu \omega$; and the Epics join $\tau \ell$ т $\rho \circ ф$ with हैтрафоу.
 similar instances may be seen in a note under A $\lambda i \sigma \kappa \sigma \mu \alpha$ ．For the perf． of $\tau \varepsilon \dot{v} \chi^{\omega}$ in an active sense，there is no genuine undisputed authority．＊

 and perfect，precisely synonymous with those above－mentioned，viz． ${ }_{\varepsilon} \quad \dot{\prime} \dot{\chi} \eta \sigma a$ and $\tau \varepsilon \tau \dot{\chi} \chi \eta \kappa \alpha$ ，of which the aor．1．remained in Epic usage， while the perfect became the Attic and common form．

In the Ionic 3．plur．of tétvरみac Homer has restored，on account of the metre，the diphthong of the present，making тeтєúazal，$\tau \varepsilon-$ тє́́ ${ }^{\text {ato }}$ ；but we find also，at least in the later prose，тєтєúy $\mu a \iota$（see Lobeck ad Phryn．p．728．）；whence áтотєтєvү $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime}$ о̧，of a thing which has not answered the expectation，Lucian．Alex．28．$\dagger$ And lastly in Homer，the fut．3．is not formed with $v$ ，but written $\tau \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \dot{v} \xi o \mu a \iota$ ； which future is used at Il．$\mu, 345 . \phi, 585$ ．in the neuter sense only of тétuy $\mu a l$ ，and therefore cannot be mistaken at $\phi, 322$ ．

The same uncertainty which is found in the vowel of тvктós，тєvктós， appears to have existed also in the aor．1．pass．；at least in Anacr． 10. rò $\tau \varepsilon v \chi^{\theta \varepsilon} \nu$ is the better accredited reading．Perhaps it was wished to distinguish $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \varepsilon \dot{v} \chi \theta \eta \nu$ with the proper sense of $\tau \varepsilon \dot{v} \chi \omega$ ，from $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \dot{\prime} \chi \theta \eta \nu$ ， which has in all other instances a neuter meaning．

The Epic language has another aorist，always found in a redupli－ cated shape，the aor．2．тєтvкє亢̈v，Midd．тєтvкє́धat，and corresponding in meaning with $\tau \varepsilon \tilde{v} \xi a \iota, \tau \varepsilon \dot{\xi} \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，to prepare：see Od．o，94．II．$a, 467$. The $\kappa$ comes from the Ionic dialect（see $\Delta$ éко垎），and is retained in this old form，which may be compared with кєкceঠєiv under Xáל $\omega$ ．

[^253]rallel cases（II．$\kappa, 364, \sigma, 583$ ．）in the old Epic poetry，was yet contrary to the common rules of grammar established at a later period；the word was first altered to a supposed present тетеи́ұетоу，and then to a perfect，which，as far as regarded formation，was a correct one．The pre－ sent Scholium of this verse is most cor－ rupt；that at Il．$\kappa, 364$ ．，attributed to the Alexandrines，and containing the Scho－ liast＇s opinion of this dual in all three pas－ sages，reads indeed in the one before us $\tau \in \tau \epsilon \dot{U} \chi \in \tau o \nu$ ，but it can only be rendered consistent with itself by our reading there
 $\chi^{0 \nu}$ ．

+ See also Stephan．Thesaur．in ama－ $\tau v \gamma \chi^{d} v \omega$ ，and Lex．Seguer．（Antiatt．）， p．79．，where the still more astonishing form aжотєтíxทral is explained by ão－ тヒ́т єขктаи．

With this $\tau \varepsilon \tau v \kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \theta 0 a t$ is joined in the same Epic language a new pre-
 342. this form has plainly and without force the meaning of $\tau \varepsilon \chi^{\chi} \varepsilon \iota \nu$, to prepare (fire); and so it was understood by the ancients, as the usage of Apollonius proves, who uses it $(4,248$.) in the sense of "to prepare the sacrifice." The active voice is found in the Alexandrine poets, as in Arat. 418. Antim. Fr. 26. Lycophr. 1403. Opp. Hal. 2, 99. Compare Ruhnk. Epist. Crit. p. 38. At the same time this form belongs also to the other meaning, that of $\tau v \gamma \chi^{\alpha} \nu \omega$; for $\tau \tau \tau v \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \sigma \theta a i \quad \tau \iota \nu o s$ (II. $\nu, 159$.) to aim at any one, bears the same relation to $\tau v \chi^{\text {Eiv }}$ тuzos, to hit any one, as à àoдıঠ́pá $\begin{gathered}\text { кe, he runs away (spoken of one who may still }\end{gathered}$ be caught), does to $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta} \rho a$, he escaped, or as captare does to capere, and the like.*

Tóv $\sigma a \iota$ for $\tau v \chi \varepsilon \tau \nu$, see in its alphabetical place.
T $\grave{\prime} \varkappa \omega, I$ melt, soften (trans.) : fut. $\tau \dot{\eta} \xi \omega$, \&c. Pass.
 (intrans.): see ${ }_{\varepsilon}{ }^{\prime} \alpha \gamma \alpha$, \&c., under ${ }^{"} A \gamma \nu \nu \mu$, and note under Teú $\chi$.

TIE-, whence $\tau \varepsilon \tau i \eta \mu a \iota, I$ am vexed, of which we find only the 2. dual $\tau \varepsilon \tau i \eta \sigma \theta o v$, Il. 9,447 ., and the part. $\tau \varepsilon \tau \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\nu} \circ \underline{\rho}$, II. $\lambda, 555$. In the same sense Homer uses also the active form $\tau \varepsilon \tau \imath \eta \omega$ 's - óros, Il. «, 30. $\lambda$,
 under Baivw.

T/x $\tau \omega$, I bring forth, pario $\dagger$ : fut. $\tau \in \xi \omega \ddagger$, more generally
 -óg, Hes. $\varepsilon, 593$.


#### Abstract

* Modern crities have attempted to connect this verb with $\tau$ traiva, by deducing the idea of taking aim from that of drawing tight the string of the bow, and be-  is used of attaching the horses to the chariot, i. e. straining or drawing tight the traces. But independently of the two  milar only in appearance, the similarity vanishes entirely between reiv $\omega$ and $\tau i-$  plained by means of this deduction without very unusual force; and as for the idea of the horses straining or stretching. the traces, it does not correspond with any Greek or Latin expression whatever,


for Homer uses tivalveiv \%puce in the sense of the horses drawing along the
 sage is therefore only a slight deviation
 order, make ready, and hence the Greek commentators unanimously explain it by

$\dagger$ [Sometimes also, I beget, Eurip. Suppl. 1092., in which sense Homer very frequently uses the middle voice, II. $\beta$, 742.-Ed.]
$\ddagger$ Decisive authorities for this active form in the Iambic trimeter of the Atties, will be found in Aristoph. Thesm. 509, Eurip. Tro. 742. Aschyl. Prom. 868.
 non-Attic writers, e. g. in Hippocr. De Superfet. 8. and Pausan. 3, 7.
 Epist. 141. The middle voice, with the same meaning as the active, is poetical only; $\tau i \kappa \tau \varepsilon \tau a t$, Æschyl. ap. Athen. p. 600. b., aor. 2. $\varepsilon$ є́єкó $\mu \eta$, тย́кєто, тєкє́ $\sigma \theta a l$, Hom. [The aor. 1. т $\bar{\varepsilon} \xi a \sigma \theta a t$ is found in some editions of Hes. $\mathcal{O}, 889$., but perhaps the better reading is $\tau \in \xi \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. The aor. 1. act $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon \\ \\ \varepsilon \\ \xi \\ \xi\end{gathered} \alpha$ is very rare, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 743. - Passow.]
 127., but I think $\tau \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\varepsilon \in \sigma \theta a c}$ would suit the syntax of the passage quite as well, in which case $\tau \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \pi \sigma \theta a \iota$ might be an old correction. The form $\tau \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \varepsilon \in \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, Arat. 124., which must be explained by supposing a fut.

 pass. тéтi入 $\mu \alpha$. - Midd. This verb is inflected like xpliv.

Tiv,$\tau i \nu \nu v \mu$. See Tíw.
Títрош, I perforate: fut. трท́ $\sigma \omega$; aor. 1. है $\tau \rho \eta \sigma \alpha$. We
 $\tau \rho \eta \nu \alpha$, Aristoph. Thesm. 18., but in Theophr. è $\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu \alpha . \dagger$ This latter verb, which is properly nothing more than a strengthened form of the other, became the general one in Attic usage. The perfects are however always taken from the radical form, thus perf. act. $\tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \eta \varkappa \alpha$, perf. pass. $\tau \varepsilon \in-$ трпиая, Herodot. 4, 158. - Midd.

The aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \rho \eta \nu a$, formed contrary to the general rule of verbs in -aivw (see $K \varepsilon \rho \delta \alpha i \nu \omega$ ), is an Ionicism which remained in the Attic language. Authorities from Theophrastus for étérpava may be seen in Stephan. Thesaur. The form $\tau \iota \tau \rho a i v \omega$, wherever found, is a corruption.

Tıтр́шбжш, I wound: fut. трஸ́бш, \&c. Perf. part. pass. $\tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \omega \mu$ ย́vat עย์ย, injured, Herodot. 8, 18.

The stem or root of $\tau \tau \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$ is in the verb ropeiv (as ӨOP- is the root of ${ }^{2} \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega, \mathrm{BOP}-$ of $\beta_{\iota} \ell \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ), by the well-known metathesis detailed more at length under Bá $\lambda \lambda \omega$, , $\ominus \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \omega$, and $\mathrm{K} \alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$. But as the

[^254][^255]sense of the derivative verb has become more precise and limited than that of its original theme, they must be treated as two separate verbs.
 once, and then in the general sense of to hurt or injure, Od. $\phi, 293$.

Tıти́əкш. See TєúX $\omega$.
Tíw. As usage has separated the two following verbs, it will be better to do the same.

Ti $\omega$, I honour, is solely poetical, and quite regular ; e.g. fut. riow,


Tivc, I pay or suffer (the penalty of an offence), forms, like the preceding, a fut. $\tau i \sigma \omega$; aor. $1 .{ }^{\ell} \approx \tau \sigma \alpha$, \&c. ; perf. $\tau \varepsilon \in \tau \iota \alpha$; but the Attics make the $\imath$ short in all the tenses, and the pass. takes $\sigma$, as perf. $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. घ̇ $\tau i \sigma \theta \eta \nu$. Midd. тivoual, I punish (a person), avenge (a thing) : fut.


According to the general analogy of verbs in -iv $\omega$, the Epics have the $\iota$ long in tive and all its tenses. The Attics, on the contrary, generally use it short : see, as instances of $\tau i \nu \omega$, たtschyl. Prom. 112., Soph. ©d. Col. 1203., Eurip. Or. 7.; and of tigal, Aristoph. Eccl. 45. Vesp. 1424. The $\boldsymbol{c}$ of the present is also short in the Doric dialect of Pindar (Pyth. 2, 44.) ; in the early time of Solon (5, 31.), as well as in that of the later Epigrammatists, Jac. Anthol. Poet. p. 823. On the other hand, the fut. and its derivative tenses have the $\iota$ long in Pind. Ol. 2, 106., in the Anapæsts of Aristoph. Eccl. 656. 663., in the Iambic Trimeter of Soph. Trach. 1113. Phil. 1041., and a lyric passage of Aj. 182. ; see Reisig. Comm. Crit. de Soph. CEd. Col. p. 220.

We find an Ionic sister-form of the pres. $\tau i \nu \omega$ in $\tau i \nu \nu v \mu \iota$, tivvv $\mu a$, , written-in the Attic poetry $\tau i \nu v \mu a \iota$ with $\iota$ short, Eurip. Or. 313.*

T入चัva, to bear or suffer, bear up manfully, venture, dare. Of this verb there is neither present nor imperfect: fut. $\tau \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha l$; perf. $\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$; aor. 2. ${ }^{\prime} \tau \lambda \eta \nu$, imper. $\tau \lambda \tilde{\eta} \theta_{t}$, opt. $\tau \lambda \alpha i ́ \eta \nu \dagger$, infin. $\tau \lambda \eta \tilde{\eta} \nu \iota$, part. $\tau \lambda \alpha ́ s, \tau \lambda \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha, \tau \lambda \alpha ́ \nu$.


These forms are used both in poetry and prose, while the defective tenses are supplied from the verbs of similar meaning $\dot{v} \pi о \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$ and

[^256]ávéxoual．Tét $\lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ is a regular perfect，and used as such in A ristoph． Plut．280．，but the poets have formed from it（with the force of a pre－ sent）the following syncopated forms ；perf．plur．$\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \lambda a \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，$\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \lambda a \tau \varepsilon$ ，
 infin．т $\tau \tau \lambda a ́ v a \iota ~(a ̆), ~ \tau \varepsilon \tau \lambda a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu ~ a n d ~ \tau \varepsilon \tau \lambda a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota ; ~ p a r t . ~ \tau \varepsilon \tau \lambda \eta \omega ́ g, ~-o ́ \tau o s ; ~ p l u-~$

 The Epic language has also an unusual aor．1．étáda $\begin{gathered}\text { a } \\ \text { érá } \lambda a \sigma \sigma a\end{gathered}$ ，Il． $\rho, 166$ ．，whence conj．$\tau \alpha \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega,-\eta s,-\eta$ ，II．$\nu, 829 . o, 164$ ．，and in a later period wé find a fut．$\tau a \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, Lycophr． 746.

TM－．See Tér $\mu \nu$ and Tét $\mu \omega$ ．
T $\mu \bar{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ ．See T ${ }^{\prime} \mu \nu \omega$ ．
Topeĩ（Hesych．），to pierce，stab：aor．2．ह̈topov，a defective aorist， Il．$\lambda, 236$ ．，and（of less frequent occurrence）aor．1．Éróp $\sigma \sigma$ ，part．
 are also traces in Hesych．of a reduplicated aor．任Topov explained by $\tau \rho \tilde{\omega} \sigma a t$ ．—Passow．］

The same idea of piercing lies in тєтop $\sigma \omega$ ，a future with the mean－ ing of to pierce（the ears），utter with a loud or shrill voice in Aristo－ phanes（Pac．381．），who has also in the same sense a present topev́w （Thesm．986．）．$\ddagger$
 Pyth．3，48．；compare Bœekh．var．lect．p．456．Beside the above we find only the compound $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \sigma \sigma \sigma \varepsilon$, part．$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \tau \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma a \iota$, Pind．Pyth．4， 43. 10， 52.

## Tралєíш．See T $\bar{\rho} \rho \pi \omega$ ． <br> Tра́тн．See Tр́́тн．

T $\rho{ }^{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$, I tremble，is used only in the pres．and imperf． T $\rho \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$ ，Iturn：fut．$\tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \psi \omega$ ；aor．1．${ }^{\prime} \tau \rho \equiv \psi \alpha$ ；aor．1．midd．


＊The conjunctive is not in use．
＋There is no doubt of the verb Té $\lambda \lambda \infty$ having had in the older language the meaning of to bear，traces of which we see in the Lat．tollo and tuli．Now $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta}-$ vai $\tau \lambda \alpha i \eta \nu$ have the same relation to $\tau \in ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，as $\sigma \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu a c$ $\sigma \kappa \lambda a i \eta \nu$ have to бкé入入c．In the course of time forms disappeared，and the meaning became modified，but was still quite perceptible in $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} v a t$ and tollo．The simple meaning of to bear remained only in tuli．The present té $\lambda \lambda \omega$ disappeared entirely as a simple verb ；in its compounds，in which
it has the aor．1．ETci入a，the original

$\ddagger$ As $\epsilon_{\mu} \mu \rho \rho o \nu$ comes from $\mu \mathrm{E} \rho \rho \omega$ ，so is ěropov indisputably the aorist of a stem or root TEP－，which may be compared etymologically with reifas，although this latter cannot in its precise meaning be joined grammatically with тopḕ．Hesy－ chius has preserved forms of the redupli－ cated aorist tétopoy（тéropev，тetópy）， but which are explained by $\tau \rho \bar{\epsilon} \sigma a t$ ．See тєтри́ккс．
§ See note under Kле́лтш．This $\tau \in$ тpopa is found in Aristoph．Nub．858．a
and $\tau$ ย́ $\tau \rho \alpha ф \alpha$; perf. pass. $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota$. - Midd. Verbal adj. $\tau \rho s \pi \tau$ '́s, and with the sense of the middle voice $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \eta \tau \varepsilon \circ \sigma$. With regard to the aorist, $\tau \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$ is the only verb which prefers the aor. 2. to the aor. 1. in all three voices : still, however, the latter is used in each voice to express certain deviations of meaning ; but this is a subject for the Lexicons.

A very singular instance of the aor. 2 . midd. in a Passive sense is


In this verb, as in $\sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon \rho^{\prime} \phi \omega$ and $\tau \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \phi \omega$, the $a$ of the perf. pass. is not carried on to the aor. 1., excepting in the Ionic and Doric dialects $\dagger:$ thus the Attics use $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \rho \varepsilon \dot{\phi} \phi \theta \eta \eta^{\prime}, \tau \rho \varepsilon \phi \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a t, \tau \rho \varepsilon \phi \theta \varepsilon i(\mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{Xen}. \mathrm{Ven}. \mathrm{12}, \mathrm{5.} \mathrm{but}$,
 it is difficult to form a decided judgment on this point, as Herodotus
 202.) $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \rho a \psi \varepsilon$; though in all these instances the reading is uncertain. $\ddagger$ Compare $\boldsymbol{\sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \phi \omega . ~}$

We find, in a multiplicity of verbs, as in $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{ } \nu \omega$, $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma$ vo $\alpha a t, \delta a \rho-$
 and note under ${ }^{\prime}$ Аках $\left.{ }^{〔} \zeta \omega\right)$ : but in the verb before us, as well as in $\kappa \tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$, we have instances of a present so formed, e.g. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \tau \rho a \pi \varepsilon \in o v \sigma \iota$, 11. $\kappa, 421$. We must here bear in mind that $\tau \rho a \pi \varepsilon \in$, I tread (the grapes), is a very different verb. See $\tau \rho a \pi \varepsilon i o \mu \varepsilon \nu$ under T $\epsilon$ ' $\rho \pi \omega$. [We find also in Homer an imperat. perf. pass. $\tau \varepsilon \tau \rho a ́ \phi \theta \omega$, II. $\mu$, 273., an Epic 3. sing. of the pluperf. pass. тє́т $a \pi t o$, and the Epic and Ionic 3. plur. of the perf. and pluperf. pass. тєтрáфatal, тєтрáфaтo. - Passow.]


#### Abstract

Andocid. Myster. p. 17, 13. Ald. and in Soph. Trach, 1009.; but it is probable that at a very early period, in order to avoid confusion with $\tau$ ét $\rho \circ \phi$ a from $\tau \rho$ é $\phi \omega$, it was changed to $\tau$ ét $\rho a \phi a$, although from the uncertainty of the readings it is diffcult to ascertain with any degree of accuracy when this change took place. We find, for instance, in Demosth, pro Cor. 324. 27., in the same passage quoted by Longin. 32., and in Eschin. c. Timarch. p. 179. Ctesiph. p. 545. àvarétpaqa always accompanied by the various reading àvatépoфa, which latter Reiske has adopted in his text. Again in Dinareh. c. Demosth. pp. 23. 73., and c. Philocl. p. 93. we find тé $\tau \rho \alpha \emptyset a$, but without any various reading hitherto discovered. - This $a$ is peculiar to the three per-


fects passive of $\tau \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \omega \omega, \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \omega$, and $\sigma \tau \rho^{\prime} \phi \omega$ : in $\kappa \lambda \epsilon$ éntw also usage fluctuates between
 M. voc. èmıтeтpdфaтal, and Not. Crit. ad Aristoph. Vesp. 57. et ad Athen. 9. p. 409. c.

+ [Passow adds the Epic language of Homer, and quotes $\begin{aligned} & \text { é } \tau \alpha \phi \theta \eta \nu \text { from Od. }\end{aligned}$ $o, 80$., but the reading seems to be uncertain. - Ed.]
$\ddagger$ However singular it may appear that in the Ionic dialect the verb should be inflected $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \omega$, $\tau \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \psi \omega$, yet this is by far the most common mode of inflexion in our copies of Herodotus: see Sehweigh. in $e \pi \tau \tau \rho$.: nay, in the two passages quoted
 т $\rho e \downarrow \epsilon$ in very excellent manuscripts.
 $\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho \circ \phi \alpha$（see $\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho \circ \phi \alpha$ and note under $\mathrm{T}_{\rho} \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$ ）；perf．pass．



The stem or root of this verb had both the immediate sense to become fat，large，strong，and the causative one to make fat，\＆c．From this latter comes the common meaning；the former occurs in the Epic lan－ guage，but only in the aor．2．غ́tpaфov and the perf．тétpoфa，according to the rule laid down in the note under T $\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \chi \omega$ ：and undoubtedly these two forms had in that Epic lauguage this intransitive meaning only， but in a later period the perfect took the causative sense also，as we see it in Soph．©Ed．Col．186．，Alcæ．Messen．Epigr．18．（Anal． 1. p．490．），and Polyb．5，74．，while the aor．2．（ $\varepsilon \tau \rho a \phi \varepsilon$ ，II．$\phi$ ，279． $\begin{gathered}\text { z } \tau \rho \alpha-~\end{gathered}$ $\phi \varepsilon ́ \tau \eta \nu, \varepsilon, 555 ., \tau \rho a \phi \varepsilon ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu$ for $-\varepsilon \tau \nu, \eta, 199$ ．）became obsolete．$\ddagger$ That is to say，when in this，as in other similar verbs，that neuter meaning to become large，grow up，began to be expressed in the present by the passive voice（see Il．九，143．），it soon spread to the aor．and perf． p s ve ：and thus we find，even as early as Homer，the forms érpáq $\eta$ ，


[^257]ing in any of the Grammarians．There was evidently，therefore，in the text of Homer，as handed down to us，a discre－ pancy between this passage and two others $\left(\gamma, 201 .{ }^{\text {a }}\right.$ Os тр $\alpha \nmid \eta \eta$ èv $\delta \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \varphi$ ，and $\lambda$ ，122．＂Os $\tau \rho d \phi \eta \leqslant \nu$ Өрйкך），which those Grammarians did not attempt to reconcile，and in which we ought to have followed their example．Nay，this dis－ crepancy should rather have led us to conjeeture that the passive forms had crept into Homer＇s text from the usage of a later period；that the 3．plur．$\tau \rho d \phi \in \nu$ ， for instance，had taken the place of rpa－ $\phi o y$ ，and that the original reading of the two passages quoted above was＂Os $\tau \rho d$－
 This conjecture is much strengthened by the circumstance，that the remaining pas－ sage，of which the emendation is not so easy（＇A入入＇$\delta \mu o \hat{v}$ ©ेs ह $\tau \rho \alpha \phi \eta \mu \in \nu \quad$ हो
 in variety of readings．One，in particular， of great weight in criticising Homer＇s text as being a full quotation of the whole passage in AEschines（c．Timarch．p．21．）， has this striking difference，＇$\Omega s$ s $\delta \mu o v$ ＜$\tau \rho \alpha \phi \in \mu \in \nu \quad \pi \in \rho$ \＆vv．$\delta$ ．Surprising as this latter form is，we see at once

The present with the radical vowel $a$, $\tau \rho \dot{\prime} \phi \omega$, is exclusively Doric, as in Pind. Pyth. 2, 82. 4, 205. Isthm. 8, 88. (7, 40. Boeckh.)*

## T $\rho \varepsilon ́ \chi \neq$, I run, forms its future like $\tau \rho^{\prime} ф \omega$ (see note under

 the more common future comes from a very different stem or root, fut. $\delta \rho \alpha \mu о \tilde{\mu} \mu \iota^{\dagger} \dagger$; aor. 2. $\begin{gathered} \\ \delta\end{gathered} \rho \alpha \mu о \nu$; perf. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \rho \alpha \mu \eta x \alpha$.

The forms ${ }^{\varepsilon} \theta \rho \varepsilon \xi a$, , $\uparrow \rho \varepsilon ́ \xi \rho \mu a \iota$, were almost obsolete: Homer has the aorist (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 719.); and the future is still found as an old Atticism in Aristophanes, $\mu$ ета日рє́єоцаи (see Fischer ad Well. 3. p. 182., Herm. ad Nub. 1005.) and $\pi \varepsilon \rho \ell \theta \rho \varepsilon \in \xi a$, , Thesm. 657., at which passage the Scholiast thinks it necessary (so little was the word in use) to explain it.

The present of this verb is found in the Doric writers with the $a$, $\tau \rho a ́ \chi \omega$ : see Boeckh on Pind. Pyth. 8, 34.

The perf. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \rho \alpha \alpha_{\mu} \eta \kappa a \ddagger$ is formed from the aor. 2. $\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} \rho \rho a \mu \nu$ according

that with the mere additional insertion of $\delta \delta$ after ' $2 s$ required to connect it with the context, this was the old and genuine reading of the verse: instead of which some grammatical Diaskeuastes removed the is from its natural place, where it answered
 sacrificed the $\pi \hat{\epsilon} \rho$ which served to exalt the comparison, merely to introduce into the verse the regular ${ }^{2} \tau \rho \alpha \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$, grating as this ěrp ... . must have been to an Ionic ear by the harshness which it gave the metre. Now as far as regards this e $\tau \rho d$ d$\phi \epsilon \mu \in \nu$, Boeckh (on Pind. Pyth. 4, 115.), is of opinion that the ancients saw in all
 \&c.), nothing more than a shortening of the $\eta$. I agree with him in this opinion : but a correct idea of the true relation of this verb in Homer's language can only be formed by our recollecting the mutual coincidence of meaning in $ұ \tau \rho \alpha ф є$ and $\tau \in \tau \rho \circ \phi \epsilon$, and the great leading analogy mentioned in a note under Meipopal, and again more fully illustrated in a note under Teíxa. The form erpad $\eta \nu$ is not Homeric, but zrpoqoy had the intransitive sense expressed afterwards by èpod$\phi \eta \nu$ only. Now, where the difference of form was so slight, it was very natural that any one, who did not carry in his mind the whole of Homer's usage, should suppose the forms $\tau \rho d \phi \varepsilon$, $\tau \rho a \phi \ell-\tau \eta \nu$, \&c., to be merely a metrical shortening
of the vowel, as in the conjunctives $\{\mu \mu$ iретаи, vavtiגлетal, \&c.: and thus Eтрd$\phi \in \mu e y$ was introduced where the old Rhapsodist had used é $\tau \rho d \phi$ o $\mu \in \nu$, as also from
 I have no doubt, therefore, that the old reading of the above verse was, ' $\Omega s{ }^{5}$ '
 Moistw.

* In all three passages the forms in question are by some accented as aorists, трафєiv, трафф̆́: but we dare not so easily suppose efraфoy to be used for E日peya. In all three passages the present is correct, in the last it is indispensable.
$\dagger$ This future in an active form is found in the comic writer Philetrrus ap.
 the syntax of that whole passage that the Attic language does not allow it to be transferred altogether to the conjunctive ( $\beta d \lambda \omega, \delta \rho \alpha \mu \omega$ ) by a change of accent.
$\ddagger$ Sufficient authority for this perfect is collected in Fischer vol. 3. p. 183., to which may be added èriô $\bar{\rho} \rho \alpha \mu \eta \tau \alpha \varepsilon$, Xen. Ec. 15, 1. That the old Grammarians cite their proofs of $\overline{\delta \epsilon} \delta \rho \alpha \mu \eta, a$ from Menander or Philemon (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 619.), arose from the circumstance that this perfect active, like that of so many other verbs, is of very rare occurrence.
$\delta \rho a \mu$ ṽцає cannot be formed from it in the same way; for then it would
 therefore from the theme itself, which, on account of the old perf. $\delta \varepsilon ́ \delta \rho \rho \rho a$ (Od. $\varepsilon, 412 . \zeta, 45$.), is supposed to be $\triangle$ PEM $\Omega$; from which, it is true, that future cannot be formed in the usual Attic manner of verbs having $\lambda, \mu, \nu$, or $\rho$ as their characteristic letter ; but a fixed analogy in the change of the vowel is not to be expected in these primitive verbs, the present of which was probably never in actual existence. Compare what has been said on Bá $\lambda \lambda \omega$ and $\Lambda a \gamma \chi^{a} \nu \omega$.

The 3. sing. of a fut. àva $\delta \rho \dot{a} \mu \varepsilon \tau a \iota$ is found in Philipp. Thess. Epigr. 24, 4., for which it is probable the writer had some old Epic authority.
$\mathrm{T}_{\rho}{ }^{\prime} \omega$, I tremble, retains $\varepsilon$ in the inflexion : thus infin. $\tau \rho \varepsilon \mathbb{L} \nu$; fut. $\tau \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \tau \rho \varepsilon \sigma \alpha$. This verb keeps all its forms resolved, except where they can be contracted in $\varepsilon \iota$ : see $\Delta^{\prime} \omega$, I bind.
[The Epic poets double the $\sigma$, making (with the omission of the augment) the aor. трє́ $\sigma \sigma \varepsilon, \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma a \nu$, \&c. A poetical present is $\tau \rho \varepsilon i \omega$. -Passow.]

T $\rho i \in \omega$, I rub: fut. $\tau \rho i \not \psi \omega$; aor. 1. pass. èrрíфөทv, Thuc. 2, 77., but more frequently is used the aor. 2. $\varepsilon \tau \rho i \delta_{\eta \nu}$ (on which see $\Gamma_{\rho} \dot{\prime} \phi \omega$ ) ; perf. pass. $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho!\mu \mu \alpha$.
[Homer has the aor. 1. act. of this verb in its compound $\delta$ oarpi $\psi a c$, 11. $\lambda, 846$. The fut. midd. трi$\psi о \mu a \iota$ is used in a passive sense in Thucyd. 6, 18. - Passow.]

Tpí弓w, I twitter, chirp: fut. $\tau \rho i \sigma \omega$ and (Hemsterh. Aristoph. Plut. 1100.) трi $\xi \omega$; perf. with force of a pres.
 characteristic letter of this verb is $\gamma$.

The Epics allowed themselves the liberty of pronouncing long the accented $o$ in the oblique cases of the part. perf., as $\tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \subset \gamma_{\tilde{\omega} \tau a s}$ for


ТРҮФ-. See Өри́лтш.
Tрú $\chi \omega$, I rub in pieces, wear out, consume, forms from три $\chi^{\prime} \omega$ (a present of rare occurrence) an aor. 1. ̇̇трú $\chi \omega \sigma \alpha$; aor. 1. pass. غ̇три $\chi \omega \dot{\theta} \eta \nu$; part. perf. pass. $\tau \in \tau \rho \cup \chi \omega \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s$,

 aor．2．pass．غ̇тр $\dot{x} \gamma \eta$ ข．

The $a$ in this aorist would seem to lead us to a theme TPHГ』，a sister－form of $\tau \rho \dot{\omega} \gamma \omega$ ，like $\pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\pi \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ ．An aor．1．in the com－ pound кататр $\boldsymbol{j}^{\prime} \xi a \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$ is found in Timon Phlias．Fr． 7.

 Midd．－Instead of the regular inflexions the Attics used a fut．$\tau v \pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ，a perf．pass．$\tau \varepsilon \tau u ́ \pi \tau \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ ，and a verbal adj． $\tau \cup \pi \tau \eta \tau$ ย́og．

On the above deviation from the regular inflexion，see Thom．Mag． in voc．and Stephan．Thesaur．The fut．midd．тvттйоодає in Ari－ stoph．Nub．1382．with a passive sense，may possibly be a mistake for тvォ $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu a \iota$ ；as the old reading $\dot{\omega} \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon$ in Eurip．Med．336．is now proved by the Codd．to have been a corruption from $\omega \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \varepsilon$ ．The aor．1．Étvұa，tú $\neq v$, \＆c．，appears to have been in constant use from Homer＇s time：the aor．2．${ }^{\text {étrutov }}$ is seldom found，but it does occur in Eurip．Ion． 766.

Túф $\omega$, I smoke，burn：fut．Яú $\psi \omega^{*}$ ；aor．1．${ }^{*} \theta u \downarrow \alpha$ ；perf．


## $\Upsilon$ ．


＇$\Upsilon ф$ aive，I weave：fut．ن́ $\phi$ ăvल̃ ；aor．1．Ü $\phi \eta \nu \alpha$ ，Att．


A very suspicious reduplicated perf．pass． $\boldsymbol{i} \phi \dagger \phi a \sigma \mu a \iota$ is quoted by Suidas in voc．，Phrynich．Seguer．p．20，3．，Herodian $\pi . \mu o \nu_{.} \lambda$ 白．44， 25．The Grammarian in Suidas is puzzled how to account for the $\eta$ in the second syllable，whence I conjecture it to be a corruption of $\dot{v} \phi \dot{v} \phi a \sigma \tau a l$ ，which is quoted in the Etym．M．in voc．as an old and rare form from Zenodotus．In all our Attic writers we find invari－ ably $\tilde{v} \phi a \sigma \mu a \iota$ ．Homer has from the radical form $\mathfrak{v} \phi \dot{c}^{\omega} \omega$ a sister－form v́фó $\omega$ ，whence the 3．plur．í $\neq \dot{\omega} \omega \sigma \iota$ ，Od．$\eta, 105$.
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{X} \omega, \boldsymbol{I}$ rain，make wet with rain：fut．च̈ $\sigma \omega$ ；aor．1．$\tilde{v} \sigma a$ ．Pass．

[^258]vopat, I am rained upon, made wet with rain; fut. midd. (in the same sense) $\mathbf{v} \sigma o \mu \alpha t$, Herodot. 2, 14., aor. 1. pass. v́ $\sigma \theta \eta \nu$, Herodot. 3, 10.

## Ф.

## $\Phi \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{See} \Phi \eta \mu \hat{i}:$ also $\Phi a i v \omega$ and Пє́фvov. <br> ФАГ-. See 'E $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta$ íw.

$\Phi \alpha l y \omega, I$ bring to light, show: intrans. I shine. Pass. I am brought to light, I appear. Act. фaivш; fut. фવ̆ע̃̃; aor. 1. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \eta \nu \alpha$, infin $\phi \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$; perf. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \alpha \gamma \varkappa \alpha^{*}$; perf. 2. $\pi \varepsilon$ 白-


 The active voice has in the transitive sense the aor. 1.; in the intransitive the pres. the imperf. and the perf. 2. The passive has (beside the meaning attributed to it above) the strict passive sense of $\phi$ aive as a transitive verb, and in this sense it employs the aor. 1, ; e. g. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \alpha \nu \theta^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$, the things announced or declared, Demosth. c. Theocr. p. 1325., фроúpa ÉфáעӨn, was announced, Xen. Hell. 6, 4, 11., $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon ф \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta$, Lys. de Aristoph. Bon. p.155, 28.; but in the sense of to appear the aor. 2. pass. is used. In this last sense we find a double future, viz. the fut. midd. which is the more common, and the fut. pass. which is of rarer occurrence : the latter is found more frequently in verse,

 11. The perf. 2. of the active serves as a perf. to фaivo$\mu_{l}$ in this intransitive sense ; while the perf. pass. (beside its proper passive meaning, I have been announced) has also the neuter sense of I have appeared. And lastly we find a form of the middle voice (the aor. 1.infin. $\phi \eta^{\prime} \nu \alpha \sigma \theta a t$, Soph. Phil. 944.) in the transitive sense of the active, which is particularly common in the compound $\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \not \propto \alpha i v \omega$.

[^259]This verb is contracted from the old $\phi a \varepsilon \iota \nu \omega$ (Hom.), as aip ${ }^{\text {( }}$ is from $\dot{\text { a }} \varepsilon \rho \rho \omega$. Hence in the Epic writers the radical syllable admits of being lengthened, as $\varepsilon \notin a \alpha ́ \nu \theta \eta \nu^{*}$ and the comparative $\phi a a ́ v \tau \varepsilon \rho \rho \varsigma, \& c$. This aor. 1. is used by Homer in the same sense as é $\phi$ áv $\eta \nu$.

By deriving the verb from this same radical form the Attics pronounced the future $\phi a \nu \tilde{\omega}$ with the $a$ long, that is to say they contracted it from $\phi$ aยvஸ.. Apollonius (De Adv. p. 600, 28.) expressly mentions this quantity, and Bekker notices the same in Aristoph. Equ. 300. where the words кai $\sigma \varepsilon \phi a \nu \bar{\omega}\left({ }^{-\cdots-}\right)$ have been arranged differently in opposition to all the Codd. The coincidence of this verb with the same appearance in ail $\rho \omega$ makes the thing certain: still however in both verbs the usual quantity is not altered in the Attic writers: e. g. фăע⿳̃, Soph. Aj. 1362., and фăvoṽ $\mu a \iota$ wherever it occurs. $\dagger$

An aor. 2. act. and midd. of this verb is also quoted, but there is no certain authority for either. At II. $\pi$, 299. the old editions certainly did read the 3. plur. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi a \nu o \nu \ddagger$; but as many of the most undoubted
 $\nu \varepsilon \nu$, which is found in the best manuscripts. It is true that фáveซкev (II. $\lambda, 64$.) appears to point to such an act. aorist; but this iterative

 (Philem. Fr. inc. 52. b.) are more than suspicious from their transitive meaning : see Buttmann's notes on Soph. Phil. And lastly in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 34. instead of фavof $\mu \eta \nu$ the various reading фaıvoi $\mu \eta \nu$ ought to have been long ago adopted. In Soph. Aj. 313. фavoinv is the Attic optat. fut. of the active voice.

At Od. $\xi, 502$. we find the stem of this verb in its most simple form, the 3. sing. $\phi$ á $\varepsilon$ in the sense of the aorist, "the morning broke," which may be considered as the aor. 2. ( $\left.\ell^{\nu} \phi a 0 \nu, \phi a \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} v\right)$ from which came the pres. $\phi a \varepsilon i \nu \omega$. But Aratus has taken the liberty of using this simple form as a present, $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \grave{\alpha}$ фáovacu, v. 607., where the sense of the aorist does not suit. And if we form from the same simple stem an analogous perf. act. and pass. we come to the Homeric fut. 3. $\pi \varepsilon \phi \eta_{-}$ боцац, II. $\rho$, 155. (will have appeared, will have burst over), written precisely the same as the fut. of $\Phi \mathrm{EN} \Omega$.

[^260]$\alpha l \rho \omega:$ or is $\rho a \nu \omega$ correct, and did the $\rho$ produce the same effect here as in кє $\rho \overline{0}-$ tos?
\# [Passow unhesitatingly condemns this aorist as entirely obsolete; see Pors. Eurip. Or. 1266., Buttm. Soph. Phil. 1191., Meineke Menand. p. 416. - Ed.]

## Фа́бкш See Ф $\eta \mu$ i.

 as the morning does ; a verb occurring only in its compounds with $\delta t a$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i$, and $\dot{v} \pi o$ (see the examples in Schneider's Lexicon*), of which the inflexion (fut. фav́vw, aor. ${ }^{\prime} \phi a v \sigma a$ ) is known only from the Septuagint and New Testament, e. g. Sam. ii. 2, 32. Ephes. 5, 14., but it is supported by the subst. ìmó $\propto a v \sigma \iota$, Herodot. 7, 36.

The Epic verb $\pi \iota \phi a v ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\pi \iota ф a \tilde{\sigma} \kappa \kappa \mu \iota, I$ show, give to understand, of which we find only the pres. and imperf., is distinct from фavoк.
$\Phi_{\varepsilon} i ́ \partial 力 \mu \alpha$, I spare, Depon. midd. : fut. $\$ \varepsilon i \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. '่ $\phi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta y$, infin. $\phi \varepsilon i \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 17.

The Epic poets have the aor. 2. with reduplication, e. g. infin. $\pi \varepsilon \phi \tau \delta \varepsilon$ $\sigma \theta a \iota$, opt. $\pi \varepsilon ф \iota \delta o i \mu \eta \nu$, whence a fut. $\pi \varepsilon \phi \iota \delta \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ : compare $\pi \varepsilon \pi \iota \theta \eta \sigma \omega$
 In Euseb. 10. p. 130. Valckenaër (ad Herodot. 8, 10.) has correctly



ФEN-. See Пє́qvov.
$\Phi \varepsilon ́ p b \omega, I$ feed, nourish: perf. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi o p b a$; pluperf. é $\pi \varepsilon \phi o ́ \rho \in \varepsilon \iota \nu$, Hymn. Merc. 105. Pass. I am nourished, тıvós, Hom. Hymn. 30, 4. The fut. and aor. are defective both in the act. and pass.
$\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ Ép $\omega$, I bring or carry, forms its tenses from very different stems or roots; thus, fut. ol $\sigma \omega$, to which we must add from the common language an imperative (used also by the Epic and Attic writers) with the force of a pres. or
 Aristoph. Bat. 482. Ach. 1099. 1101. 1122., Antim. Fr. 10.: see $\varepsilon \delta \dot{\delta} \sigma \varepsilon \tau 0$, p. 73. From the stem EГK $\Omega$ or
 the first person of these two aorists and in the optative
 tuating, as the Grammarians have observed. $\ddagger$ Of the remaining forms we find a preference given (the Attic usage

[^261]an aorist in Od. $\gamma$. 429. Il. $\gamma, 120$., but as a fut, in I1. $\sigma, 191$. ), and olvew, which has the force of a present in Pind. Pyth. 4, 181 .
$\ddagger$ See Greg. Cor. in Att. 78. with the quotations there made by Koen.; and Phryn. Appar. p. 35, 24.
is sometimes exclusive), in the active voice to the infin.
 imper. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \varepsilon \gamma x \in$, all from the aor. 2.; while the others together with the whole of the middle are taken from the aor.




 Midd.

 ple theme which can be adopted for these forms is ETK $\Omega$, whence by
 1. to $\eta_{\nu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \gamma \mathrm{K} \circ \nu$ is the same as that of $\varepsilon \boldsymbol{i} \pi a$ to $\varepsilon \boldsymbol{i} \pi o \nu$ as described at p.9. under $\varepsilon i \lambda \lambda a$. Let us now suppose EГK $\Omega$ lengthened to ENEK $\Omega$
 $\kappa \lambda о \phi a$ under $К \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \omega)$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon \gamma \mu a \iota$ and $\dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon ́ \chi \theta \eta \nu$ are quite regular. The
 change of pronunciation, and the same formation was then extended by a false usage to other forms, e.g. to $\dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon i ́ x \theta \eta \nu, \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon c \gamma \mu a u$, and to the pres. $\sigma v \nu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon i \kappa \varepsilon \tau a t ~ i n ~ H e s . ~ S c u t . ~ 440 . ; ~ s t i l l ~ h o w e v e r ~ w e ~ f i n d ~ t h e ~ p e r f . ~$
 Inser. Att. no. 71. p. 116.

The old aorist, of which the imper. oi $\sigma \varepsilon$ and infin. oi $\sigma \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu$ are the only remaining tenses, was mentioned at the beginning of this article and in the note there subjoined. If this oi $\sigma \varepsilon$ and the other imperatives quoted below be considered as isolated instances of an imperative future, such a supposition is at variance with all usage, for strictly speaking either all imperatives are futures, or none are so. Hence it is more agreeable to analogy to suppose a new theme arising out of the future from which these aorists may be formed; compare $\dot{\alpha} \varepsilon i \sigma \varepsilon o, \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \xi \varepsilon,{ }^{\circ} \rho-$
 the common termination of the aor. 1.; of which the surest instance is found in Herodotus, but with an unusual lengthening of the radical syllable, in the compound $\dot{a} \nu \tilde{\omega} \sigma a t(1,157$.$) ; and this lengthening is$ again found in another form, in which it is quite as extraordinary, áv $\dot{\boldsymbol{i}}$ -

[^262]$\sigma$ ros $(6,66$ ．），both words having the same sense of sending（referre） to consult an oracle．＊Suspicious examples of the aorist oícue from succeeding writers，and genuine ones of a very late period may be seen in Lobeck Parerg．p．733．We find in Lucian Parasit．2．a solitary instance of the perf．pass．$\pi \rho \frac{0}{}$ ī $\sigma \alpha$, ，in which for the sake of perspicuity the oc is left unchanged，and the augment therefore can only be recognised by means of the accent．

The few forms coming immediately from $\phi \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega$ ，which are in general
 the syncopated Epic imper．фє́ртє for фє́ $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ ，I1．九，171．；the 3．sing． $\phi \varepsilon ́ \rho \eta \sigma \iota$ as from $\phi \varepsilon ́ \rho \eta \mu \iota$ ，Od．т，111．；the Ion．3．sing．imperf．фย́ $\varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ ， and 3．plur．ф́́рєбкоv，Od．九，429．к，108．；and the poetical verbal adj．
 from $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$ ；see last note，p．61．：but this latter has the more precise sense of being in the habit of carrying，of wearing generally．Of this verb we find an Epic infin．pres．форйиєvą and форйvaє for форгїv： compare $\gamma о \grave{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota, \kappa \alpha \lambda \eta \not \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota, \pi о \theta \eta ̆ \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota, \& c$ ．See $\Phi \rho \varepsilon ́ \omega$ below．
 $\phi$ ви $\alpha$ ；aor．2．हैфurov．＇There is no passive voice．Verbal adj．фsuxтós，фsurtśos．

The perf．pass．лє́фvyमa＜is a passive in form only，as the Epics use the part．$\pi \varepsilon ф v \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v o \varsigma$ in the active sense of having escaped，Od．a，18．§ On the $v$ of this perf．see note under Xéw．

The Epic language uses the verbal adj．фиктós：whence äфuктоs came into the common dialect．


[^263]not the gloss of Suidas，duvoícal，although explained only by the general expression кор／бat，refer to the above，passage of Herodotus？Still，however，greater cer－ tainty is requisite before we alter the text of Herodotus．
＋Of this verb we find an instance（ $\phi$ o－ ptoau）as early as Isæus；in the later authors it is more frequent．
 is found in Aristoph．Ach．203．，and else－ where in that writer．Very late authors have a fut．2．фиү⿳⺈⿴囗十．－Passow．］
§ We may compare this participle with סิєôakpvuévos；in both verbs the perf． pass．expresses the completion of an ac－ tion belonging rather to the middle voice， having shed a flood of tears，having con－ veyed himself to a place of safety．See

 conj．ф $\tilde{\omega}$（3．sing．фrin，Hom．），infin．фávar，part．фás； imperf．${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \eta \nu$ ；fut．$\phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ；aor．1． $\bar{\varepsilon} \phi \eta \sigma \alpha$ ．Of the midd． were used the following forms，viz．the infin．and part． pres．$\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \phi \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 s$ ；both used by Homer，the latter by the Attics also；and the imperf．$\dot{\varepsilon} \phi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ．Of the passive we find some perfect forms，as the part．$\pi \varepsilon \phi \alpha \sigma \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \circ \varsigma$, Il．$\xi$ ， 127．，and the imperat．$\pi \varepsilon \phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \omega$ ．Verbal adj．$\phi \alpha \tau o ́ s, ~ \phi \alpha-$ $\tau$ тog，and the Hesiodic фatєtog．

This verb is the only genuine instance of a dissyllable in $-\mu \iota$（begin－ ning with a consonant）without the reduplication．The radical form is $\Phi A \Omega$ ．The indicative present，with the exception of the 2 ．sing．is enclitic，i．e．throws back the accent on the word preceding．In the formation of this 2 ．sing．$\phi$ gis there is no ground for the $\iota$ subscriptum， and the acute accent instead of the circumflex is unusual，but both are supported by very strong tradition．$\dagger$

This verb has a twofold meaning，viz．1．the general idea of $I$ say， and 2．the more precise one of I assert，maintain，assent，allow；with its converse ovv $\phi \eta \mu$ ，I dissent，deny．The present $\phi \eta \mu i$ has both senses； but the first is limited by the general usage of the pure Attic writers to the pres．and imperf．active through all their moods，the remaining tenses being supplied from the anomalous $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon \tilde{\nu} \nu$ ．On the other hand the fut．and the aor．1．are generally found in the second sense；in which also the imperfect with the infin．and part．present，in order to avoid ambiguity，are generally expressed by фá⿱кєє兀（which does not otherwise occur in prose），and by the midd．фá $\sigma \theta a t$ ，фá $\mu \varepsilon \nu o s$ ；e．g．${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \eta$
 that he ．．．；фáбкшv，asserting，maintaining；ov̉ фá $\mu \varepsilon v o s$, denying．

In the 2．sing．of the imperfect we generally find in the Attic writers
 quent in the later authors；see Lobeck ad Phryn．p．236．This 关 $\eta \nu$ is commonly used as a complete aorist，synonymous with elimov；and

[^264]out the $\frac{1}{}$ subscriptum，like $\% \sigma \tau \eta s$ ，but the conjunctive with it．Passow however in his Lexicon says expressly $\phi$ ñ＇s（not $\phi$ hs or $\phi \hat{\eta} s$ ）：the latter he restricts to the 2. sing．imperf．Ion．for $\begin{aligned} & \text { èp } \\ & \text { s，Hom．See }\end{aligned}$ the Etym．M．voc．фy＇s and Chœerobosc． MS．ap．Bekk．p．345．v．－Ed．］
to this imperfect we may add the infin．фávat，which is confined so entirely to express past time only（ $\phi$ ávaı tò̀ Пहр七к $\lambda \varepsilon ́ a$ ，that Pericles
 is used．＊The same holds good of the imperf．with the infin．and part． pres．of the middle voice．With regard to the statement of the Gram－ marians that there was also a particular aor．2．है $\phi \eta \nu$ ，which retained the $\eta$ in the plural，and had $\phi \tilde{\eta} v a c$ or $\phi \tilde{a} v a c$ in the infinitive，it is en－ tirely unfounded．If we find $\phi \tilde{a} \nu a \iota$ occasionally in the text of some authors，it is either an error of transcription，or if correct（as it is in Eubul．ap．Athen．p．8．c．）it is a poetical licence like $\tau \varepsilon \theta \tau \tilde{a} \nu a u$ ．

By aphæresis the following forms have arisen from $\phi \eta \mu i$ in the lan－ guage of common conversation ；$\eta \mu \ell$ ，say I（inquam），in a quick repe－ tition in Aristoph．Nub．1145．Ran．37．；and again in the imperf．$\eta_{\eta} v$
 narrative of Aristoph．Equ．640．and Plato；to which belongs also the Epic $\bar{\eta}$ ，he spake，II．a， 219.
［In the Homeric usage we find the 1．plur．opt．pres．$\phi$ aĩ $\mu \nu$ for $\phi$ ai－ $\eta \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ；the 3．conj．$\phi \dot{\eta} \eta$ for $\phi \tilde{\eta}$ ；the imperf．$\phi \tilde{\eta} \nu, \phi \tilde{\eta} s, \phi \tilde{\eta}$ ，for ${ }^{\prime \prime} \varphi \eta \nu$ ，${ }^{\ell} \phi \eta \zeta$ ， ${ }^{\prime} \phi \eta$ ，and the 3．plur．${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi a \nu$ ，$\phi \dot{a} v$ ，for ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi a \sigma a v$ ；also the imperat．midd． фáo for фá⿱o，Od．$\pi, 168 . \sigma, 170$ ．－Passow．］
$\Phi \forall \alpha ́ \nu \omega \dagger$ †，I get before，anticipate：fut．$\phi$ Өท⿱宀о $\mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor． 2．$\xi \neq \theta \eta \nu$, opt．$\phi \theta$ aínv，conj．$\phi \theta \tilde{\omega}$ ，infin．$\phi \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ ，part．$\phi \theta \alpha ́ s$ ；
 the aor．1．${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \phi \theta \ddot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$ ；but this latter is used by the best Attic writers，e g．by Thucyd．3，49．，and from the time of Xe－ nophon is the more usual form of the two．

The fut．$\phi \theta$ á $\sigma \omega$ is found only in the later writers，e．g．in Dio Chrys．
 6．A part．aor．midd．$\phi \theta$ á $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ уcs is used by the Epic poets synony－ mous with $\phi \theta$ ás，like $\phi$ ás，$\phi$ á $\mu \varepsilon \nu o g$ ，from $\phi \eta \mu i$ ．We find also a Doric
 aor．opt．not conj．；as the at would be an unheard of diphthong in the conjunctive of ${ }^{\xi} \phi \theta \eta \nu$ ，and the $-\sigma t$ is admissible in lengthening the optative，though less usual than in the conjunctive．
 1． $\begin{gathered} \\ \phi \\ \\ \\ \gamma \\ \xi \\ \xi\end{gathered} \alpha_{\mu} \mu \nu$ ．The active $\phi \theta^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \omega$ never occurs．

[^265]$\Phi$ बsípw, I corrupt, is regular : thus, fut. $\phi \theta$ spẽ (Epic $\phi \theta^{\prime} \rho \sigma \omega$, Il. $\left.\nu, 625.\right)$; perf. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \phi \theta \alpha \rho ж \alpha$; perf. 2. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \theta \circ \rho \alpha$; perf. pass. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \theta \alpha \rho \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. pass. छ̇ $\phi \theta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \eta \nu$; verbal adj.
 intransitive sense, I am become corrupt, am destroyed, undone; this is its meaning at Il. o, 128., and it was so used by the Ionics and by all the later writers from Theophrastus. The pure Attics on the contrary gave it a transitive sense, and used intransitively the pass. है $\phi \theta \alpha \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, ${ }^{\prime} \phi \theta \alpha^{\prime} \rho \eta \nu$. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 160. Still however we find the perf. 1. گøӨapжа in the early Attic writers: see the old instances collected in Piers. ad. Mœr. p. 127.

The fut. of the neuter meaning is generally $\phi \theta a \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \mu a$, for which the Ionics have the fut. 2. midd. (with the change of vowel to $a$ ), $\delta(a-$ $\phi \theta а р є ́ \rho \mu ц$, Herodot. 8, 108. 9, 42.*
$\Phi \theta^{i v} \omega$ and $\phi \theta i \omega$, I pass away, come to an end, perish. This verb is generally poetical, and the pres. $\phi \theta i \omega$ with its imperf. ${ }^{\ell} \phi \theta \iota o \nu$ are exclusively Epic. The intransitive meaning (I pass away) is by much the prevailing one in the present tense, indeed there occurs no instance of $\phi \theta i \omega$ with the causative sense of I bring to an end, consume: for the imperfect in II. $\sigma, 446$. $\phi \rho^{\varepsilon} \nu$ 的 ${ }^{\circ} \varepsilon \phi \theta \iota \varepsilon \nu$ is to be understood intransitively, as is also $\phi \theta i \omega$ at $\mathrm{Od} . \beta, 368$. ̈̈s $\kappa \varepsilon \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\iota} \varphi \phi \dot{i} \eta \underline{q}$. The transitive meaning of $\phi \theta i \nu \omega$ is found in Soph. El. 1414. and Theocr. 25, 122. In general this form has the neuter sense, in which it is used in prose also, still however only in certain expressions which do not proceed from the present. The remaining forms, which the poets use in an intransitive sense, are taken from the midd. of $\phi \theta i \omega$, as the fut. $\phi \theta i \sigma o \mu a t$, the perf. ${ }^{\prime} \phi \theta \mu \mu a t$, and the pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi \theta i \mu \eta \nu$, which last form is at the same time (see $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ in note under Kтєiv $)$ a syncopated aorist, e. g. in Eurip. Hipp. 839., Soph. OEd. T. 962. 970., and in this respect it has its own moods, as opt. $\phi \theta i \mu \eta \nu,(\phi \theta i ̈ o), \phi \theta i ̈ \tau o, O d . \kappa, 51 . \lambda, 330+$; conj. $\phi \theta i \omega-$


On the other hand the transitive meaning is established in the fut. act. and aor. 1. $\phi \theta i \sigma \omega,{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \phi \theta \iota \sigma a$ : see note under M $\varepsilon i \rho \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, and com-


[^266][^267]The quantity of the $c$ (both in the present in $-\nu \omega$ and in the tenses formed from $\phi \theta i \omega)$ is the same as that of $\tau i \nu \omega$, long in the Epic poets, but short in the Attic writers: e.g. compare $\phi \theta i \nu \omega$, Od. $\lambda, 182 . \xi, 161$, with Soph. Ant. 695., Eurip. Alc. 201.; and $\phi \theta i \sigma \omega, \& c .$, Il. $\pi, 461$. x, 61., with Soph. Trach. 709., Aj. 1027. On the contrary the perf. pass., and consequently the syncop. aor. also, together with the derivatives $\phi \theta$ ioıs, $\phi \theta \iota \tau$ óg, have always the $\iota$ short. Compare the $v$ short in $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \hat{\lambda}^{\imath} \mu \mu \iota$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{v} \theta \eta \eta$ while it is long in $\lambda \hat{v} \omega, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \omega$.

The neuter $\phi \theta^{i} \nu \omega$ came into more general use in the later writers, who formed for themselves a new inflexion in - $\eta \sigma \omega$ : thus $\phi \theta \iota \nu \eta \eta_{\sigma} \nu \tau \varepsilon s$
 $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \theta a \nu \varepsilon v$, Plut. Cons. ad Ap., катєфөı $\nu \eta \kappa o ́ \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$, Vit. Cicer. 14.
In a verse thrice repeated (Od. $\varepsilon, 110.133 . \eta, 251$.) " $E \nu \theta^{\prime} \dot{a} \lambda \lambda o \iota \mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu$
 theme in $-\theta \omega$ (compare $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{v} \nu a \theta_{0} \nu$, p. 22.), has always maintained its ground in the text against $\dot{\pi} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \phi \theta_{\iota} \theta \varepsilon \nu$ : and yet it is decidedly incorrect. The latter is found in the best sources; and in the Etym. M. p. 532, 43. it is quoted as the established and only reading. If the former is supposed to be an imperfect, that tense does not suit persons suddenly perishing by shipwreck; if an aorist be required, nothing is more natural than ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \theta_{\iota} \theta_{\varepsilon}{ }^{\prime}$. The perf. ${ }^{\prime} \phi \phi \theta_{\mu} \mu \iota$ (without $\sigma$, and with $\iota$ short) is quite sufficient ground for an aorist $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi \theta i \theta \eta \nu$.

## $\Phi_{\imath \lambda e ́} \omega$, I love, is regular.

The Epic language has from the stem of this verb an aorist in the middle voice with c long, É申ìдazo, imperat. фī̀al. The analogy of ri $\lambda \lambda \omega$, ${ }_{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \bar{i} \lambda a$, enables us to form a correct opinion of this old form. In Hes. 9, 97. and Hom. Hymn. 25. (see Hermann on that passage) we find the conj. of this aorist $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu \tau a \iota$ corrupted in the text to фiлєṽyat ; while in Hymn. Cer. 117. Wolf has restored it from

$\Phi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega, I$ burn, transit. : fut. $\phi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \xi \varepsilon \omega$. The aor. 2. pass. is $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \eta \eta$ : see note under $\mathrm{B} \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \pi \pi \omega$.
$\Phi \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$, I am full to overflowing: used only in pres. and imperf. This verb is connected by Onomatopœia with $\phi \lambda \dot{v} \omega, I$ overflow;
 was formed also $\phi \lambda \dot{\prime} \zeta \omega, \phi \lambda \dot{\xi} \xi u$.* But $\phi \lambda \hat{v} \omega$, I singe, burn, is quite distinct from the above; of which we find $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \phi \lambda \hat{v} \varepsilon \iota$ in Aristoph.

[^268]
## 258

Nub. 395. with $v$ long, instead of which Herodotus $(5,77$.) has the diphthong $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \pi \varepsilon \phi \lambda \varepsilon v \sigma \mu$ ย́vos.


 without any difference of meaning, Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 19. 3, $3,30.6,7,15$. ; aor. 1. pass. छ̇фobrìnv ; perf. pass. $\pi \varepsilon \phi^{\prime} \dot{o}_{-}$ Enuкı. - Passow.] $^{\text {. }}$
[The perf. pass. has particularly the sense of to be put to fight, to fly, II. and Herodot. 9, 70. The aor. 1. midd. é $\phi 0$ हो ${ }^{2} \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ belongs to the latest and worst period of the language; e.g. Anacr. 3, 11. Passow.]

 perf. $\pi \varepsilon$ я́фража. Pass. (in Herodotus) I perceive, observe:
 part. $ф_{\rho} \alpha \sigma \theta$ síg, ib. 1, 84. 5, 92. 7, 46. 9, 19.; perf. $\pi \varepsilon$ $\phi \rho \alpha \hat{\rho} \mu \alpha$ or $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$. Midd. (in the Epic poets) I perceive, observe ; also I consider, reflect, consult, plan: fut. фро́бонаı; aor. 1. midd. ह̀ $\Phi \rho \alpha \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$.

The active voice has in the Epic poets a reduplicated aorist $\pi \dot{\varepsilon}$ ¢́poă-


 $\eta, 49 . \tau, 477$. ; optat. $\pi \varepsilon \phi \rho a ́ \delta o t$. The part. perf. pass. with a $\delta$, and in a passive sense, occurs in Hes. $\varepsilon, 653$. In a fragment in Athen. 11. p. 465. f. $\phi p a \dot{\delta} \eta$ is a false reading, instead of which there is a various reading фр́́ $\theta \eta$.
[The active of this verb is frequent in Xenophon; otherwise it is not often found in prose: the middle occurs only in the Epic poets and in an oracle in Herodotus, 3, 57. - Passow.]
$\Phi \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$, Att. ф $^{\prime} \dot{\tau} \tau \tau \omega$, (in the later writers $\phi_{\rho} \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \nu \cup \mu$, also), I fill, stop up, place close together, fortify: fut.

 (in the compound) $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon ф \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu$, Lucian. Dial. Mort. 28, 2.
$\Phi \rho \varepsilon ́ \omega, I$ suffer to pass : fut. Фpríco. This verb is used
 out, in, through: in addition to which we find a decompound $\varepsilon$ ย $\pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \phi \rho^{s} \epsilon \omega$ in Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1267. and Seidl. Eurip. El. 1028.* Midd. I suffer to pass to myself, take to myself, admit; e. g. єiбєфроúp $\begin{aligned} \\ \text {, Eurip. Tro. 647., to }\end{aligned}$ which belongs the fut. $\varepsilon i \sigma \not \subset \rho^{\prime} \sigma \in \sigma \theta \alpha!$, Demosth. Cherson.
 Aristoph. Vesp. 156. 892. Av. 193.) is in common use. The aor. 1. pass. є́ $₫ \not \rho \eta \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ occurs in Elian. ap. Suid. in voc.
 belongs to the syncopated formation of $\pi \tilde{\imath} \theta \iota, \kappa \lambda \tilde{v} \theta \iota, \sigma \chi^{\varepsilon} \varepsilon$, from $\pi i \nu \omega$, ${ }^{\kappa} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}\left(\omega,{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \chi \omega\right.$; but we know not any passage where it really occurs. $\dagger$ ' ${ }^{\prime} \zeta_{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \varepsilon i o \mu \varepsilon \nu$ in Aristoph. Vesp. 125. is a very singular form. $\ddagger$ Whether the unusual present $\pi \iota \phi \rho a ́ v a \iota$ belongs to $\phi \rho \varepsilon \epsilon \epsilon$, by a change of the radical vowel (compare $\delta \varepsilon \iota \pi \nu \varepsilon \in \omega$ and $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu t$ ), is uncertain: see Schneider in 'E $\mu \pi i \phi \rho \eta \mu \iota$ §, and on Aristot. H. A. 5, 5. Schæf. on Gregor. p. 521. not.||

Фрí $\sigma \omega$, Att. фрíт $\tau \omega, I$ shudder: fut. фрi $\xi \omega$; aor. 1. $\xi \not{ }^{\prime} \nsubseteq \rho \iota \xi \alpha$; perf. (its pure characteristic letter is $\pi$, as in the subst. фріхй) тє́фріха.

The Doric part. $\pi$ єфрiкоутаৎ (Pind. Pyth. 4, 326.) is either a perfect

 $\pi \varepsilon \phi \rho i ́ \kappa \omega$. Compare also ávєбтáková, Archim., and see Greg. Cor. in Etol. 56. Maitt. p. 239.

[^269][^270]$\Phi \rho^{\prime}$



ФYZ－．See Фє́́үш。
 －Midn．I stand on my guard，guard myself against， take heed of．
 way we explain it，is a very anomalous form．If we suppose it to be
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$ ，seems greatly in favour of that supposition，particularly as the imperat．perf．was also in use，e．g．in Hes．$\varepsilon, 795$ ．$\pi \varepsilon \emptyset \dot{\lambda} \lambda a \xi ̆ \omega$ ：but this form，as well as the whole of the middle voice，has always the definite sense of to be on one＇s guard，and with the accus．to be on one＇s guard against，watch against：whereas the simple meaning of watching over is expressed by the active only，фu入á $\sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \rho o \phi v \lambda$ á $\sigma \sigma o$ ：there is no reason，therefore，why we should adopt in this case the great anomaly of dropping the reduplication．Nor can it be the syncopated aorist； because，as we have just said，the passage requires the common meaning of the active voice，and a tense which shall strictly express duration．As we are reduced，then，to the necessity of supposing it to be some anomalous form，it appears most reasonable to preserve a regularity in the meaning．I consider therefore $\pi \rho \circ \phi u ́ \lambda a \chi \theta \varepsilon$ to be a syn－ copated form of the pres．act．like $\phi \hat{\varepsilon} \rho \tau \varepsilon$ ，consequently for $\pi \rho o \phi v \lambda a ́ \sigma-$ $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \varepsilon$ ，formed from the stem or root $\Phi \Upsilon \wedge A K-$ ，yet instead of the ter－ mination－$\kappa \tau \varepsilon$ taking that of $-\chi \theta \varepsilon$ ，like ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \omega \chi \theta \varepsilon$ ．＊
$\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\dot{u} \rho \omega, ~ I ~ m i x, ~ p a r t i c u l a r l y ~ b y ~ a d d i n g ~ m o i s t u r e ; ~ w h e n c e, ~}^{\text {；}}$ I knead；and in Homer，I wet，moisten，stain；it has in the older language a fut．фúpo $\omega$ ；aor．1．छ＇фирб $\alpha, \& c$ ．：but in prose it changes to the inflexion of－$\alpha \omega$ ，as fut．фup $\alpha \sigma \omega$ ， and in Hippocr．Diæt．2，8，10．фир $\quad \sigma \omega$ ；aor．1．द́ $\oint u ́ \rho \alpha \sigma \alpha ;$ aor．1．midd．$\varepsilon \neq \cup \rho \alpha \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$（infin．фир $\alpha \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, ~ A r i s t o p h . ~$
 Theæt．p．147．c．）；see Lobeck ad Phryn．p．205．In the perf．pass．both $\pi \varepsilon ф \dot{\rho} \rho \alpha \mu \iota$ and $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \cup \rho \mu \alpha \iota \dagger$ were in use ；

[^271]3，49．criticism has declared in favour of
$\pi \in \phi u p a \mu$ évos：but the exclusive usage of
$\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \rho \mu \notin \nu o s ~ i n ~ s u c c e e d i n g ~ w r i t e r s, ~ e . ~ g . ~ i n ~$
Lucian，Plutarch，and others，leads us to
the latter in Homer and Xenophon ; compare Od. 九, 397. and Xen. Ages. 2, 14.
 28.) : on the other hand the present $\phi \nu \rho \tilde{\omega}, \phi \nu \rho \tilde{q} v$ appears not to have been in use, except perhaps among some of the later writers. The formation of $\phi \dot{\rho} \rho \sigma \omega$ always remained in the language of poetry; and Pindar (Nem. 1, 104.) has also the fut. 3. (paullo-post) $\pi \varepsilon \phi \dot{v} \rho \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; which rather confirms than opposes the observation made in my Grammar, "that verbs with $\lambda, \mu, \nu$, or $\rho$, as their characteristic letter, seldom have a third future, if they are inflected regularly :" for $\phi \dot{\rho} \rho \omega$, by its inflexion in $-\sigma \omega$, no longer preserves its analogy with those verbs.

Фúw, I beget*, is inflected regularly. But the perf. $\pi \varepsilon^{\prime}-$ $\phi \bar{u} \varkappa \alpha$ and the aor. 2. ${ }^{\xi} \phi \bar{u} v$, infin. фũュaı, part. фúg (see note p. 53. and note p. 238.) have the immediate meaning of to spring up, be produced or begotten $\dagger$, to which belong also the pres. pass. фं́o $\mu \alpha$. and fut. midd. $\phi \dot{\prime} \sigma о \mu \alpha l$, e. g. Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 32. Táp os $\delta \stackrel{\text { ̀ }}{\text { ź } \mu ф u ́ \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha i . ~ C o m p a r e ~} \Delta u ́ \omega$ and the statement there made of this verb.

The moods of $\varepsilon \notin v \nu$ correspond also with those of $\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \delta v v$. The conj. $\phi \dot{v} \omega$ (probably with $v$ long) is found in Xenoph. Hier. 7, 3. oĩc $\delta^{\circ}$ âv
 this optative had followed strictly the analogy of verbs in $-\mu$, the optatives in - $\varepsilon i \eta \nu$, -ai $\eta$, -oi $\eta \nu$ would have required the corresponding termination to be vin $\nu$ : but as this diphthong is never found before a consonant, the passive optative could not be -ví $\eta \eta \nu$, -vï̃o, but became $-\dot{v} \mu \eta \nu,-v \tau 0$, and therefore to preserve conformity the active was written
 Lexil. p. 425. with note. $\ddagger$

Beside '̌quv, an aor. 2. pass. was formed with the same sense, viz.
 time of Hippocrates, and among the later writers became the commo̊n form. To this belongs also a fut. фипбогаи, of which we find the infin. àvaфиض̆ $\sigma \sigma \theta a \iota$ in Lucian. Jup. Trag. 19.
conjecture that there were older precedents for this latter. See Valck, ad Schol. Eurip. Phoen. 1201.

* [This verb is not confined to the above sense; it has the general meaning of to produce, bring forth, and is used of plants, trees, the hair, the teeth, \&c.; and
in Porson. Eurip. Phæen. 34, of a mother. - Passow.]
$\dagger$ In the later writers $\phi$ ús, oi $\phi u ́ v \tau e s$, is used in the causative sense ; see Bekker on Phot. Bibl. p. 17. a. (Appian.)
$\ddagger$ [Passow is however of opinion that $\phi \cdot v \eta \nu$ still remains very doubtful.]

Instead of $\pi \varepsilon \phi \dot{\kappa} \kappa \alpha \sigma \iota$ we find in Homer the Epic $\pi \varepsilon \phi \dot{v} a \sigma$, and instead
 the omission of the $\kappa$, see $\beta_{\varepsilon} 6 a \omega$ 's, p. 37., and on the length of the oblique
 Homer always uses the mere reduplication without the augment; while Hesiod ( $\varepsilon, 151 . a, 76.9,152.673$.) has in a particular instance re-


[Parmenides has ventured to use $\phi \tilde{v} v$ for $\phi \tilde{v} v a t$; but the 3. plur.


Фஸ́ткш. See Файชкш.

## X.

$\mathbf{X \alpha ́ \zeta о \mu \alpha ь , ~ \dot { \alpha } \nu \alpha \chi \alpha ́ \zeta о \mu \alpha ь * , ~ I ~ r e t i r e , ~ r e t r e a t : ~ d e p o n . ~ m i d d . ~}$
The prose usage of this verb is known only from Xenophon, who has the imperf. à $\nu \varepsilon \chi$ á'ó ${ }^{\prime} \eta \nu$, Anab. 4, 7, 7. and Cyr. 7, 1, 17. (24.); but he has also in the same sense an instance of the unusual active voice of this same verb, $\dot{a} v a \chi \dot{\text { áhoveєg, Anab. }} 4,1,12$. (16.). We find also ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \chi^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \zeta_{\varepsilon}$ quoted from Soph. in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 340. In the older language the active voice of this verb had also the causative sense of I cause to retire, drive back: see Pind. Nem. 10, 129. where the reading ${ }^{\text {en }}$ Yaraar is given, it must be confessed, by only one Codex, and yet both metre and sense leave no doubt of its being the true one.

Homer has an aor. 2. кéка $\delta o v$, and in the midd. a. 3. plur. кєка́ $\delta o y \tau o$, with a fut. act. кєкаঠ$\eta \sigma \omega$ formed from it. These forms came by an old. Ionicism (compare $\tau \varepsilon \tau v \kappa \varepsilon \tilde{\nu})$ from ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi a \delta o \nu$, which usage has retained in this unchanged shape under the cognate verb $\chi^{a \nu}{ }^{\nu} \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \omega$. Hence кєка́סovтo (II. $\delta, 497$.) is precisely the same as éxáaavto; but the active forms (II. $\lambda, 334$. Od. $\phi, 153$.) with the genitive have the sense of to deprive, in which lies the same causative sense as in àvađ́́ $\boldsymbol{c}_{\omega}$, I make a person yield or retire from any thing, expressed more simply in Latin by cedere facio. On кєкаঠ̀ŋ́бодає see Кйдे.

Xaiv. See Xáбкш.
X кipo, I rejoice: fut. $\chi^{\alpha \iota \rho} \mathrm{r}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}}$; aor. 2. (from the passive voice) ${ }^{e} \chi \chi^{\dot{\alpha}} \dot{\rho} \downarrow \boldsymbol{\nu}$; and from this aorist was formed again a perf. $x \varepsilon \chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \varkappa \alpha$ or $\varkappa \varepsilon \chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \mu \alpha l$, with the force of the present



[^272]mation of the perfect from the aorist see $\dot{\alpha} \alpha \alpha \chi \gamma \sigma \omega$ and note p. 12.

The perfect $\kappa \varepsilon \chi$ áp $\boldsymbol{q}_{\kappa \alpha}$ is found in Aristoph. Vesp. 764.; the part. $\kappa \varepsilon \chi a \rho \eta \kappa \dot{\omega} \varsigma$, rejoiced, is of frequent occurrence in Herodotus, and without the $\kappa$ ( $\kappa \varepsilon \chi$ арŋóra, \&c.) in the Epic poets: the perf. pass. кєұ́́pŋцає
 Hom. Hymn. 6, 10. Both the futures formed with reduplication from these perfects are found also in Homer, e. g. $\kappa \varepsilon \chi a \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu$, Il. o, 98., ${ }_{\kappa \varepsilon}$ Харйєтає, Od. $\psi, 266$.

Of the regular inflexion, we find in the poets (from an Epic aor. 1.
 Poet. p. 262. and (from a reduplicated aor. 2. midd. кєұаро́ $\eta \nu$ ) the 3.
 The part. perf. $\kappa \varepsilon \chi$ ар $\mu$ évos, rejoiced, occurs in Eurip. Or. 1122. El. 1077. and other tragedies of the same writer. The verbal adj. is $\chi$ aptós.

The aor. 1. Exaip $\begin{gathered}\text { ga } \\ \text { is found in the later writers, e. g. in Plut. }\end{gathered}$ Lucull. 25.* The fut. $\chi$ apíбoнac which occurs in the LXX., although formed analogically from é $\chi$ áp $\eta$, like ảкаХ $\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ from йккахov (see note p. 12.), is decidedly a form to be rejected : see Thom. Mag. [The pres. midd. $\chi$ aí $\rho \mu a \iota$ was a notorious barbarism, Aristoph. Fr. 291.:

$\mathrm{X} \alpha \lambda \alpha \dot{\prime} \omega$, I loosen, relax: fut. $\chi \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$, Dor. $\chi \alpha \lambda \alpha \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$, \&c. This verb has $\alpha$ short in the inflexion, and takes $\sigma$ in the passive; e. g. perf. pass. $\varkappa \varepsilon \chi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha!$.
 (synonymous with the present) ké $\chi a v \delta a$. This future is generally placed by mistake with a theme XEI $\Omega$, although it is evident that
 ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \pi a \theta o v$. It comes therefore from the root XAN $\Delta-$, with a change of the radical vowel. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 181.
$\mathbf{X} \alpha \dot{\sigma} x \omega, I$ open (intrans), open my mouth, gape: im. perf. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \chi \chi \sigma$ кov. This verb borrows from $\chi$ aive (which is

[^273][^274]not used by any of the older writers）a fut．$\chi \alpha \nu \circ \tilde{\mu} \mu \iota^{*}$ ，an aor．${ }^{8} \chi \chi \nu 0 \nu$ ，and a perf．（synonymous with the pres．） x＇́ $\chi^{\eta v a \dagger, ~ I ~ a m ~ o p e n, ~ h a v e ~ m y ~ m o u t h ~ o p e n . ~}$

Lucian（Dial．Mort．6，3．）is the earliest writer in which we find any instance of the pres．$\chi$ रiv $\quad \ddagger$
 $\nu a t \varepsilon$ ，Herodian found $\kappa \varepsilon \chi \dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ written（see Chœrobosc．in Bekk． Anecd．III．p．1287．where＂Opveซv is a corruption），which he considers to be an inflexion of the indicative for－ate．For that some of the older authors preferred writing the perf．act．of the verb with $\varepsilon$ ，is clear from Apollon．Synt．1，10．（p．37，9．Be．）：see also＇Avívo $\begin{aligned} & \text { a a } \\ & \text { and }\end{aligned}$ note，p．25．In the Attic language，indeed，this inflexion is inadmis－ sible，but for that very reason the reading of Herodian is most probably the true one，misunderstood by the Grammarians above mentioned． $K_{\varepsilon} \chi \dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ is the imperative，which mood is most suitable to the context of that passage；and the rarity of its occurrence misled the com－ mentators：see кєкра́ $\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ under Кра̧́ढ．

X ${ }^{\varepsilon} \zeta \omega$, caco ：fut．$\chi^{\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \tilde{u} \mu \alpha!}$ ；perf．$x^{\prime} \chi^{\circ \delta \alpha}$ ；aor．${ }^{\prime} \chi^{\varepsilon \sigma \alpha}$ and
 Ach．1185．）

I have some doubt whether the aor．${ }^{\prime \prime}$ モx $x o v$ be a genuine form；and I may say the same of the infin．$\chi$ ₹ $\sigma \varepsilon \bar{\nu}$ which is found in Aristoph． Thesm．570．As the word is only a vulgar term，individual forms do not occur often enough to enable us to speak of the two aorists with any degree of certainty．In the Attic language they appear to be con－ founded，as they are in $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon \tau \nu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \gamma \kappa \varepsilon \iota \nu$ ；compare $\begin{gathered}\varepsilon ँ \pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \nu\end{gathered}$ and $\ddot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \sigma a$ ，

 proves as little in favour of the aor．I．as it does of the middle voice of this verb，for it is used in that passage in a play on the word．

Xєíoдиа．See Xavóáv．



[^275][^276]

 only supposed to have existed from the derivative $\chi^{\varepsilon} \tilde{v} \mu a$ and the shortness of the $v$ in кє́ $\chi$ vка, \&c. That $\chi^{\varepsilon} \omega$ is fut. as well as pres. was first remarked by Elmsley, and proved by the following examples : кápa тє

 Com. ap. Athen. p. 665. c. To which we may add $\chi$ єó $\mu \varepsilon \nu \frac{\nu}{(s a i d ~ o f ~}$ pouring out the libation) каì ย̇vaүюи̃vтa, Isæus 6. p. 61.: which passages had been previously explained sometimes as harshness of syntax, at others as harshness of contraction. And thus $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \chi^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \tilde{\omega}$ in Jerem. VI. 11. and Act. Apost. II. 17., which has been hitherto cited as a barbarous form of the biblical writers, differs only in accent from the pure Attic $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \chi^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{\omega} . \ddagger$

The Epic language has an aor. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \chi \chi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon}$, conj. $\chi^{\varepsilon}{ }^{\varepsilon} \omega$ ( $\chi^{\varepsilon}{ }^{\varepsilon} \omega \sigma \iota \nu, 11 . \eta, 86$. ),
 which may be the conj. aor. supplying in Homer's usage the place of the future, quite as well as the Epic fut. $\chi^{\varepsilon} \dot{v} \omega$ answering to the Attic fut. $\chi^{\varepsilon} \omega$ (compare $\delta \eta^{\eta} \omega, \kappa \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \nu, \kappa \varepsilon ́ \omega \nu, \sigma \omega^{\prime} \omega$ ); both which views are in syntax fundamentally the same. Again סákpvat रevic, Eurip. El. 181. (where I proposed on a former occasion to read the false form $\chi^{\varepsilon} \dot{v} \sigma \omega$ ) is, as far as regards the verb, quite correct. X $\quad \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime} \omega$ in that passage is not the present (it never occurs as a present even in the Epic language, the metre being satisfied by $\chi$ عi ${ }^{\text {i }}$ : see Od. $\iota$, 10. Hes. $\vartheta, 83$.), but it is the Epic future of Homer which suits the lyric stanza, and may be joined with кpoviow in the preceding verse, without offending against $\mu \varepsilon$ ' $\lambda \varepsilon t$ in the following one.

The Epic language has also the syncop. aor. pass. $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \chi \dot{v} \mu \eta \nu,{ }^{\nu} \chi \chi \tau \%$, $\chi^{i} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$ (to be poured out), formed after the perfect.

[^277]$\ddagger$ Elmsley very correctly compares this future with $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, whose fut. $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \omega$, by the Ionic omission of the $\sigma$, becomes again $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \omega$, Attic $\tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$; the only difference is, that the shorter word did not admit the contraction in $\hat{\omega}$, ove, as it does in the present. But that $\chi \hat{\epsilon} \omega$, $\chi \in \sigma$ was the original formation is shown by the aorist ${ }^{2} \chi \chi{ }^{\epsilon} \theta \eta \nu$, which remained in common use to quite a late period: an additional cause for the other formation without the $\sigma$, was the coincidence of the fut, and aor. of $\chi \in \omega$ with those of $\chi \in\} \omega$.

## 266

On the aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon^{\chi} \chi^{\epsilon} \theta \eta \nu, \chi^{\varepsilon} \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a u$, which was very common in the later writers, see the preceding note, and Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 731.
$\mathrm{X} \wedge \mathrm{A} \Delta-$, whence an Ionic perf. ќ́ $\chi \lambda \bar{a} \delta a^{*}$, of which Pindar (Ol. 9, 3. Pyth. 4, 319.) has the part. $\kappa \varepsilon \chi \lambda \bar{a} \delta \omega^{\prime} s$, gen. $\kappa \varepsilon \chi \lambda$ dáovtos, swelling : compare $\pi \varepsilon \phi \rho i \kappa o v \tau a g$ under Фрí⿱宀бш. [We find also in Pind. Fr. 48. a perf. infin. $\kappa \varepsilon \chi \lambda a ̂ \partial \varepsilon \iota \nu$ for $\kappa \varepsilon \chi \lambda a \delta \varepsilon ́ v a l$. -Passow.]

Xów, I heap up (generally, a mound of earth): fut. $\chi^{\omega} \omega \omega, \& c$. ; infin. pres. $\chi^{\alpha}{ }^{\alpha} \nu$, part. $\chi^{\tilde{\omega} \nu . ~ T h e ~ p a s s i v e ~ t a k e s ~}$ $\sigma$, e. g. perf. $\chi^{\varepsilon} \chi \omega \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. $\varepsilon$ ย่ $\chi \dot{\omega} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, infin. $\chi \omega \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$.

The above formation is frequent in Herodotus, while the pres. $\chi{ }^{\omega} \nu$ $\nu \nu \mu \iota$ belongs to the later writers. X $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \alpha \iota$ may be found in its alphabetical place.

 and note p. 12. See also Buttm. Lexil. pp. 541.-548.

Xpócw. To this stem belong many verbs with particular meanings; all those, however, which are used in prose may be easily traced to the same idea, commodare, to give, lend. $\dagger$ All have the inflexion with the $\eta$, e. g. хр $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$, $\& c .$, and that even in the Doric dialect. The contracted forms take also $\eta$ as the vowel of contraction, as in $\zeta^{\prime} \omega$, $\varkappa \nu \alpha \omega, \sigma \mu \alpha^{\prime} \omega$, \&c., while this peculiarity is also to be remarked, that the Ionic dialect here takes $\bar{\alpha}$ as the vowel of contraction, as in $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\alpha} \nu, \sigma \mu \tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha l, \& c .$, Herodot. 9, 110. We will now describe five forms which are used in prose.

1. Xpá $\omega$, I give an oracle, foretell: fut. $\chi$ prí $\omega$; aor. 1.

[^278][^279]$x^{\prime} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon$ ह̀ $\chi p \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$. Thus the passive takes $\sigma$. See also $\chi р \eta^{\prime} \zeta \omega$.

In the Attic tragedians we find the present and imperfect contracted in $\eta$; thus $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \eta$ is 3. sing. pres. for $\chi \rho \tilde{q}$, Herm. Soph. El. 35., $\varepsilon^{\xi} \xi \in \chi \rho \eta$ is 3. sing. imperf., Seph. EEd. C. 87. On the other hand Herodotus has frequently the 2. sing. $\chi \rho \tilde{q} s, 3$. sing. $\chi \rho \tilde{q}$, and in the infin. $\chi \rho \tilde{q} \nu$; and he is followed by the later writers, as Lucian, \&c. In the Ionic dialect
 Herodot. 7, 111.; and in the Epic poetry it becomes $\chi \rho \varepsilon i(\omega$, whence the part. रpei $\omega \nu$, Od. $\because, 79$.

In many passages of Herodotus all the manuscripts have the perfect passive with the $\sigma$ : in others the $\sigma$ is wanting: see Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. It is easily seen that uniformity must be preserved by adopting it in all cases ; кє́ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \iota$ belongs to $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ only.

In the middle voice the meaning of this verb approaches very nearly to that of the common $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$, as in the expression $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \mu a \nu \tau \varepsilon i \varphi$, which appears to be exactly the same as $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \mu a v \tau \kappa \kappa \tilde{\eta}$ in Xenophon; sometimes however it stands absolutely, as $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota \pi \varepsilon \rho \grave{i} \pi 0 \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \mu o v:$ so that $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \eta$, to foretell, answers correctly to $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$, to consult an oracle. See Od. ' $9,79.81 . \kappa, 492$.
2. Хро́оцаь, I use, depon. midd.: fut. хри́бонаь; aor. 1. غ́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu$; perf. (without $\sigma$ ) $x^{\prime} \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha$. The present and imperf. are contracted in $\eta$ instead of the regular $\alpha$, thus $\chi р \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha l, \chi \rho \tilde{r}, \quad \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha l$, infin. $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha b, \& c$., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 61. Kє́ $\chi$ р $\quad$ раь is sometimes used in the strict sense of a perfect, e. g. in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 30. (24.) í $\pi ⿰ \lambda \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \varkappa \iota s ~ \alpha u ́ r \tilde{i}$ $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \chi$ ¢ $\eta \mu$ śvos: but it has generally the sense of the present,
 instances the force is increased, I am always using and therefore I have.* Verbal adj. хрлбто́s, хрท⿱тє́ov, Plat. Gorg. 136.

In the Epic language $\kappa \varepsilon \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ has the meaning of to be in need of $\dagger$; hence in Homer and Hesiod $\kappa \varepsilon \chi \rho \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu^{\prime}$ os is used as an adjective in the sense of needy. Tivos кє́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \theta \varepsilon$; Theocr. 26, 18. Fut. кє $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha$, id. 16, 73. Compare $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$ and the note under $\mathrm{X} \rho \dot{\eta} \zeta \omega$.

[^280]the Epic poets, but there are instances of it in the Attic also, e. g. in Elmsl. Eurip. Heracl. 801.-Passow.]

In the unusual case of a passive tense being formed from this middle verb (compare $\beta \iota a ́ \zeta о \mu \iota \iota)$, the aorist has the $\sigma$ (as in хрá $\omega, I$ foretell),

 verbal adjective agrees.

In this verb the forms of the Ionic dialect are difficult to be ascertained with any degree of certainty: for sometimes the passages and manuscripts of Herodotus give the contractions $\chi \rho \tilde{a} \tau \alpha \iota, \chi \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a$, $\chi \rho a ́ \sigma \theta \omega, \& c . ;$ at other times the $a$ is changed to $\varepsilon$ in the same forms,
 रю́́ovтат.* In the imperative Herodotus $(1,115$.) has, according to all the manuscripts, $\chi \rho \varepsilon ́ \omega$, while Hippocrates frequently uses $\chi \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma$ shortened from $\chi \rho \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon o$, like $\varepsilon$ ह́к $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma$, which see under K $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$.
3. Кі́хряии, I lend: fut. Хрท́б infin. pres. xíरрауся. Midd. xiхрацоя, I borrow.

It has been correctly remarked, that $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ in Herodotus means simply to give, grant (see Herodot. 7, 38. and Schweigh. in Lex.). But a present $\chi$ рá $\omega$ never occurs in this sense; we place, therefore, the present кiхрŋ $\mu$ instead of it, although in the instances where it occurs in Demosthenes and others, it has the proper meaning of to lend. The aor. 1. midd. É $\chi \rho \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ was avoided by the Attic writers in this sense : see Antiatt. Bekk. p. 116.
4. X $\rho \eta^{\prime}$, (oportet) it is necessary; an impersonal verb:
 Imperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$, or in prose $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu . ~ F u t . ~ \chi \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota . ~$

The indicative of this verb may be considered as the 3. sing of $\chi$ pá $\omega$ - $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta}$, with the tone or accent shortened. The participle also comes exactly, according to analogy, from Xpãov, like väós, Ion. v $\nu \varepsilon \omega \dot{s}$ (compare the subst. Хpéws and the neut. part. $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \varepsilon \omega \dot{\rho}$ ) : but it has the anomalous accent of $i \omega \nu$ and the Ionic $\varepsilon \in \omega v$. It is indeclinable; that is to say, it occurred so seldom in any construction requiring other

[^281]text. Whoever examines the passages and their various readings with the help of Schweighæuser's Lexicon Herodot., will find it most probable that Herodotus always contracted in a the forms which were grounded on $\alpha \epsilon$, while those in ao were changed to $\epsilon \omega$. To decide between $\epsilon \omega$ and $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is much more difficult. There can be, however, no besitation in rejecting from the text of Herodotus such forms as $\chi \rho \eta ิ \sigma \theta a t$ and Є̇ $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \tau 0$.
than the nominative or accusative case, that the other cases became obsolete. It is found sometimes as a genitive, e. g. in Eurip. Hippol. 1256., Herc. Fur. 21., Joseph. Ant. 8, 284., but there is perhaps no instance of its being used as a dative, $\tau \tilde{\omega} \chi \chi \rho \epsilon \omega^{\nu}$.

In the other three moods (opt., conj., and infin.) this verb follows the formation of verbs in $\mu$, retaining, however, the $\eta$ in the infinitive, and $\varepsilon \iota$ instead of $\alpha \iota$ in the optative, as in a similar case under $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \tau$.

We find twice in Euripides (Hecub. 258., Herc. Fur. 828.) tò х $\rho \tilde{\eta} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ which Thom. Mag. in voc. affirms to be a poetical infinitive; therefore contracted for $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$. At the same time it is not to be denied that the participle $\chi \rho \varepsilon \epsilon \nu$, which is preferred by some critics, and which may be pronounced as a monosyllable, would suit both passages better.

The imperfect, whether it followed the conjugation of contracted verbs or of those in $\mu$, would be ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \rho \eta$ : therefore $\varepsilon \in \chi \rho \bar{\eta} \nu$ or $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$ (the only forms ever used) are to be compared with the 3. sing. $\eta v$, Ion. ${ }^{\prime} \eta \eta$, from $\varepsilon i \mu i$. But the accent of the augmented form is so strikingly anomalous that we should be forced to consider it incorrect, did not the vain attempts of the Grammarians to explain it show (see Eustath. ad Od. $\kappa, 60$.) that it was founded firmly on tradition.*

In the older language this verb had also the meaning of opus est, one has need, I have need; and in this sense it was afterwards used or rather misused personally; e. g. $\psi^{\Psi}$ xp $\eta$ s, of which thou hast need,
 Aristoph. Acharn. 778.; compare $\Delta_{\hat{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{\omega}$. From this verb Herodotus (3, 117.) has a middle voice with a similar meaning in the form रepioro$\mu a \iota$. Compare кє́ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \iota$ above, and note on $X \rho \dot{\eta} \zeta \omega$ below.
5. 'Aлóxpr, is sufficient. This verb' has the anomaly of the preceding one in this 3 . sing, pres. indic. only, inasmuch as it is shortened from $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \chi \rho \tilde{n}$; in all its other forms it follows regularly $\chi$ р́́ш, \&c. : thus 3. plur. $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \chi$ р $\tilde{\sigma} \sigma \iota$; infin. pres. $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \chi<\tilde{\gamma^{\nu}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$; imperf. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon ́ \chi \rho \eta$; fut. $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \chi \rho \dot{\gamma} \sigma \varepsilon \iota$; aor. 1. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon ́ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \in \nu, \& c$. Midd. $\dot{\alpha} \pi ॰ \chi р \tilde{o} \mu \alpha$, Ihave enough; infin. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. In this voice it is inflected like $\chi \rho \dot{\alpha} о \mu \alpha \iota, 2$.

The Ionics have also the regular 3. sing. pres. indic. $a_{\pi} \pi \chi^{2} \rho \tilde{q}$. In the same or a similar sense Herodotus has other compounds, ката $\chi \rho \tilde{q}$,


This verb is not an impersonal, although, like other personal verbs, it

[^282]the augmented one was made by degrees to conform to it.

is sometimes used impersonally; on the contrary, in many instances its subject stands plainly before it, and hence it has the plural á àoхрш̈ $\sigma \iota$ : but as things or objects in the third person are its most natural subject, the other persons became obsolete; yet not entirely ; see Epicharmus in Heindorf's Note on Plat. Gorg. 131. Eif sufficient. See a similar appearance in Mé $\lambda \omega$, where however the 1 . and 2. person have remained in use somewhat more than in this verb. A solitary irregularity occurs in the middle voice in áme $\begin{aligned} & \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau o(H e r o d o t . ~\end{aligned}$ 8, 14.) used impersonally for á $\pi \varepsilon \in \chi \rho a$; compare $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \tau a \iota$ for $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon, * *$

X рท'לw, I desire, wish. $\dagger$ The Attics use it in present and imperfect only.

In the Ionic dialect it is $\chi \rho \eta i \hbar \omega$ : whence the more precise Grammarians write the common form $\chi \rho \underline{1} \zeta \zeta \omega$, like ${ }_{\mu}^{\mu} \tau \tau \omega$ : see Greg. Cor. in
 (Herodot. 7, 38. 5, 20. 65.), because in this form no confusion can possibly be made with the tenses of x ${ }^{\rho}{ }^{\prime} \omega$. But in the printed text all these are constantly written with $\eta$ in Herodotus also. X $\rho \dot{\eta} \zeta \omega$ in the sense of $\chi \rho \tilde{q} \nu$, to foretell, see in Schneid. Lex. $\ddagger$

Xрíc, I besmear, anoint: fut. хpí $\sigma \omega$, \&c.; perf. pass.
 is found in Com. ap. Athen. 13. p. 557. f. - Midd.

This verb has also the meaning of to sting, as spoken of insects and the like; on which Phrynichus (Appar. p. 46.) gives the following rule, that in this latter serise the perfect passive is written $\kappa \varepsilon \chi \rho i \sigma \theta a t$, in the former кєХрєï $\theta a \iota$. In this last incorrect form (although in that writer the diphthong $\varepsilon \iota$ is expressly named) we must look for nothing more than the correct form кєxpïotat; and the direction given by Phrynichus



## 

[^283][^284] but in both passages with the meaning of to touch, and the collateral idea of a polluting touch. Perhaps in the old Attic language this was the only meaning of $\chi \rho \omega \zeta \omega$, and кє $\chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu \iota \iota$ belonged to this present only: for according to the analogy of $\zeta \omega \nu \nu v \mu \varepsilon$ and $\sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \omega$, we might
 which appears merely as the various reading of кє́ $\chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu a \ell$, e. g. in Aristot. De Color. 3. But in Eth. Nicom. 2, 3. all the manuscripts have $\varepsilon$ ह́ $\gamma \kappa \varepsilon \chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s$.

X $\omega \dot{\nu} \nu v \mu$. See Xów.
X $\omega \dot{\prime} \mu \alpha \iota, I$ am angry, depon. midd. : fut. $\chi^{\omega \prime \sigma o \mu a \iota ; ~ a o r . ~ 1 . ~ غ ́ \chi \omega \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu . ~}$ X $\omega$ р́́ш, I yield, go: fut. midd. $\chi \omega \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha$, but sometimes also $\chi \omega \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ : see Poppo Obs. Crit. in Thucyd. p. 149. and Buttmann's Notes in the Auctarium ad Plat. Theæt. 117. Ed. 2.

## $\Psi$.

$\Psi \alpha^{\prime} \omega$, I touch: fut. 廿aúv $\omega$, \&cc. ; perf. pass. है४ $\neq v \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 1. pass. ह̇ұaúrөŋŋv.
[It is generally joined with the genitive, sometimes with the dative, whether with an accusative depends on Soph. Ant. 858. 962. Passow.]
$\Psi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, I rub: fut. $\psi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, \&cc., like $\kappa \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega, \sigma \mu \alpha \omega$; see also $\Pi \iota \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega$. The passive fluctuates between the formation with and without the $\sigma$; as, perf. है $\psi \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, ${ }^{\prime} \psi \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \ell$; aor. 1 .


See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 254. The sister-form $\psi \dot{\eta} \chi \omega$ (compare $\sigma \mu a ́ \omega, \sigma \mu \eta \chi \omega$ ) has the more precise sense of to rub down (a horse); to rub in pieces; to the latter of which belongs катє́ $\psi \eta к \tau a \iota$ in Soph. Trach. 698.


$\Psi$ е́vò $\omega$, I deceive, cheat: fut. $\psi$ śv́ $\sigma \omega$, \&c. ; perf. pass.
 oủx $\dot{\varepsilon} \psi s \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau 0 ~ \tau \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon i \lambda \alpha \dot{\varsigma}$, they did not make their threats false, made them good, Herodot. 6, 32.
$\Psi \Psi^{\prime} \chi^{\omega}$. See $\Psi a ́ \omega$.
$\Psi \bigcup^{\prime} \chi^{\omega}, I$ cool: fut. $\psi^{\prime} \dot{\xi} \omega$; aor. 1. pass. $\varepsilon^{\prime} \psi u ́ \chi^{\theta \eta \nu}$; aor. 2.


## $\Omega$.

' $\Omega \theta \varepsilon \epsilon, I$ push : fut. $\dot{\omega} \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ and $\omega \sigma \omega$. All the other tenses are formed

 Pors. Eurip. Med. 336., Plat. Tim. p. 79. e. - Midd.
 verb has also the syllabic augment, e.g. imperf. ह̇ $\omega \nu$ о́ $\mu \eta \nu$; aor. 1. ह̇ $\omega \nu \eta \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \nu \nu$, infin. $\omega \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \Delta$ : but instead of this aorist the pure Attic writers used è $\pi \rho \stackrel{\alpha}{\mu} \mu \nu, \pi \boldsymbol{\rho}^{\prime} \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha ı$.
[This verb was seldom or never used as a passive in the sense of to be sold, yet we find in Plat. Phæd. p. 69. b. the part. $\dot{\omega} \nu o v \mu^{\prime} \varepsilon \nu a$, where Heindorf's reading $\dot{\omega} \nu o v ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta a$ appears to be unnecessary. The pluperf. ह́ف́vทтo occurs in Aristoph. Fr. 1175. On the aor. 1. pass. infin. ह́ $\omega \nu \eta-$ $\theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota$ and $\omega \nu \eta \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota$ see Markl. Lys. p. 720. Isæus De Philoct. Hered. 19. A part. perf. act. $\varepsilon \omega \nu \eta \kappa \omega$ is is Lysias. - Passow.]

## INDEX．

N．B．－The following Index is intended to assist the Student，where the alphabetical arrangement of the work may fail him：consequently those forms only will be found here，which do not begin with the same letter or syllable as the verbs to which they respectively belong． Nor has it been thought necessary to mention all the persons，moods， participles，\＆c．，which occur in the work；in most cases the 1．pers． sing．of the indicative（if that form be in use）will be found a sufficient guide to all the other moods and persons of any particular tense． The references are to pages．

A．
＇Аує́оцає， 7.
à $\gamma \tilde{\eta} \lambda a t, 1$.
ä $\gamma \eta \mu \alpha \iota, ~ и ̆ \gamma \eta \mu \alpha,, 121$.
àñoхa，6， 7.

 бке，4． 223.
ả $\gamma$ opá $\sigma \omega, 152$ ．note．
à үорєи́ยє， 89.
สั $\gamma \boldsymbol{\chi} \zeta \varepsilon, 262$.
๙ं $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a, 24$.
äסov，$\dot{\delta} \delta \eta \sigma \omega, 24$.
ส̆ยєєє， 36.
äкєєя， 11.
аірєи́цєєоц， 10.
aíp．，10． 250.
úка́хŋлає，9． 12.
áкá $\chi \omega \nu$ ，6．note．
а́кєорає， 13.
àки́коа， 13.

á入á入 $\eta \mu \alpha \iota, 9$.
ä $\lambda \alpha \lambda \kappa о \nu$, 6．note， 15.
${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \sigma \sigma \theta a, 18$.

à $\lambda \in ́ \kappa \omega, 15$.
${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \in \nu, 83$.

äлетає， 18.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega, 15$.

ả入ク́入єка， 15.
á入и́ $\lambda є ф а, 14$.
á入च゙vat，ả入দцєvat， 83.
ä入ทraย， 18.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu \delta \varepsilon \iota \sigma \theta a \iota, 159$.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda i v \delta \omega, \dot{\alpha} \lambda i \bar{\sigma} \omega, 160$.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda o i ́ \eta \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega}, 16$.
ӓ $\lambda$ отто， 18.
${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \tau \sigma, \tilde{a}^{\top} \lambda \tau 0,18$.
ӓ $\mu \varepsilon \nu а \iota, 36$.
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \varepsilon \pi \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu, 198$.
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi i \sigma \chi \omega, 113$.
${ }_{\alpha} \mu \pi \nu v \varepsilon, \dot{a} \mu \pi \nu v \prime \nu \theta \eta, 216$.
$\dot{a} \mu \dot{\jmath} \zeta \varepsilon \iota v, 177$. note．
á $\mu \phi \varepsilon ́ \xi \omega, 113$.

$\dot{a} \mu \phi \iota \in ́ \sigma \omega, \dot{a} \mu \phi \dot{\omega}, 96$.

à ขa6ทба́ $\mu є \nu о$ ， 38.
ávabıы́кконая， 42.
ávabpátть，45．note．
á $\nu a 6 \rho o ́ \xi \varepsilon є \varepsilon v, 46$.
àva6роұє́v， 46.

àvaঠ̂pá $\mu \varepsilon т а \iota, 247$.
$\dot{a} \nu a \delta \tilde{\omega} \nu, 64$.
ávàє $\lambda \alpha ́ \mu \phi \theta a \ell$, note．
ăva入то̧， 14.
àvađहлย́табтац， 205.

ávaббєiaбкє， 223.
ávaté入入 $\omega, 235$.
ảvaтétгaфа，ảvaтétгo－ $\phi a, 244$ ．note．
ávафаขท́боขтає， 249.
ávaфvŋ́ŋєб $\theta a \ell, 261$.
ảvaХáלoua，ảvaхáלov－ $\tau \varepsilon \varsigma, 262$.
áve $\mathfrak{i} i \omega v, 42,43$.
a่ vย์ $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \alpha, 54$.
$\dot{a} \nu \varepsilon \tau ั \mu \varepsilon \nu$, ávะโัтє， 115.
$\dot{a} \nu \varepsilon \xi i ́ \tau \eta \tau o s, 86$ ．note．
ả véovт $\alpha, 115$.
ảvє́т $\lambda \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu, 209$ ．note．
ávย́бацц， 117.

àvєбтáкоvба， 259.
àvєтра́тєто， 244.
àvєХ$\chi^{\alpha}$ ఢо́ $\mu \eta \nu, 262$.
ávéХ $\omega$ ，\＆c．， 113.
ávéขya，5．note， 183.

ávย́ $\omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota, 115$.

à $\nu$ も $\mathfrak{a} v, 120$.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \tilde{\eta} \kappa \varepsilon \nu, 117$.
162．ávŋททтає， 23.
ả $\nu$ и́vo日a，6．note， 25.
à $\nu \eta \rho \varepsilon \iota \nprec$ á $\mu \eta \nu, 100$.

$\dot{\alpha} \nu t \varepsilon i t, \dot{a} v i \varepsilon \iota, 116$ ．note．

ảviєıv， 116.
avoí $\gamma \nu v \mu$ ，dंvol $\gamma \omega, 183$. àvoíซeเv，253．note． ส่ขтєітоข， 89. a่ขтє́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon, 269$. àขтє入є́ $\gamma \omega, 89$. àvтхคq̆，270．note．
äv $\omega$ रa，6．note． àv́̈іттоя， 252. ส้ขผิรัส， 183.
à $\nu \tilde{\omega} \sigma t, 252$.


解 $\xi a, 11$.
áदavтo，5， 7 ．


ä $\xi \omega, 4,6$.
аं $\pi a \gamma \gamma \bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta, \quad \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon ́ \lambda \omega-$ $\mu \varepsilon \nu, 2$.
а่та борєข́ш， 89.
аंта入є $\check{\eta} \sigma а \iota \mu, 14$.
$\boldsymbol{a} \pi \alpha \mu$ Є入ібк 21.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi a ́ \phi \omega \nu, 6$ ．note．
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \varepsilon \kappa \pi \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \chi \theta \eta \nu$ ， 58.
$\boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \delta \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu, 211$.
аं $\pi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{}, 240$.
๙лє́ঠрабаท， 68.


๙่тєะтоу， 89.
алєєруаттац， 99.
 91.

а̇тє́ктака，а̇тє́ктоүа， 157.
aं $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ ह́ $\lambda \alpha, 93$.
$\dot{\boldsymbol{a}} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \omega \nu, 215$.
аंтєрой $\mu ๙, 88$.


$\boldsymbol{a} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \eta \sigma \alpha, \quad \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta$－ $\theta \eta \nu, 229$.
à $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\prime} \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha, 231$.
атєvŋккашь， 109.
ai $\pi \varepsilon \not \subset \dot{a ́ y} \theta \eta, 249$.
a $\pi \varepsilon ́ \varphi \theta_{\imath} \theta o v, 257$.
aंтєфри́ $\gamma \eta \nu, 258$.

алє́ $\chi^{\theta о \mu а є, ~} 110$.
аіл $\chi$ рє́єто， 270.


$\dot{\boldsymbol{a}} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \varepsilon \iota \lambda \varepsilon \nu, \quad \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma^{\varepsilon}-$
$\lambda \in \nu, 2$.
aं $\pi \eta \gamma \gamma^{\text {É }} \lambda \eta$ ， 3.
аंті́ү $\gamma_{є} \lambda о \nu, 2,3$.
атй $\mu$ ротоу， 20.

$\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \dot{\nu} \omega \omega, 34$.
$\dot{\boldsymbol{a} \pi \eta} \chi^{\theta}{ }^{\circ} \mu \eta \nu, 110$.
а̇лікатаи， 132.
äлакєї，21．note．
ä $\pi \lambda a \tau \circ \varrho, 202$.
àто६єもávaı， 38.
а́то́bрєそая， 46.
ảлоঠıঠра́vau， 68.
íтодıঠра́ткєє， 240.
aंто́до七ขто， 69.
а่тодра̃ขац， 68.

алоорри́фои， 71.
aंтоб்́боцаи， 211.
а่тоєเтะіั， 88.
a่тоє́pүєє， 92.
ал по́єрбє， 103.
वंто弓єбөєíc， 117.
аंто日ข $\dot{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \omega, 127$.
a่тоӨоро́утєє， 128.
а̇лоөр́́ткєу， 128.
ג̇токлá $\gamma \xi a \sigma a, 149$. note．
àток入ác， 150.
גтокрі́гона， 156.

атоци́ттш， 177.
גлоу七єо́ $є$ Өa， 181.
атотаро́ш， 205.
áтотє́фаүка，249．note．
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma a$, 210．note．
аंтопขí彑єє，216．note． ȧтоб6́́бац，224．note．
ג்то́тєа， 134.
$\dot{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi о \sigma т \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon і ̈ \sigma \theta \varepsilon, ~} 230$.
аंтобтєрє́ $\omega, 229$.
ảтотєтєvүнє́vоৎ， 239.
aंтотєти́ $\eta^{\eta}$ та，239．note．
aimov́pą， 34.
 oovotv，34．note．
áтофаì $\omega, 249$.
ärox $\rho \tilde{,}, 270$ ．note．
ả̃oх $\rho \dot{\varepsilon} \omega, 270$.
а̇то́хрท， 269.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \mu \nu v, 188$.
а́раірұка，а́раір $\eta \boldsymbol{\mu}$ ， 9.
ảрápŋ̨，6．note．
ăpapoy， 30.
á $\rho \varepsilon i \varsigma, ~ a ̀ \rho \varepsilon і ̃ \sigma \theta \varepsilon, ~ 10 . ~$
а́рє́б $\theta a \iota, 10$.
а้рєбба， 31.

а́рирєєу， 30.
а́ри́река， 31.
а́рирєнає， 30.
а́рирораи， 32.
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \varepsilon v, 30$.
$\dot{\alpha} \rho \delta ́ \mu \eta \nu$, и́ $\rho о i \mu \eta \nu, 10$.
$\dot{\alpha} \rho о \tilde{\mu} \mu \varepsilon, 10$.
á $\rho \sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \nu$ оя， 30.
$\dot{\alpha} \rho \bar{\omega}, a^{\prime} \rho \omega \mu \alpha, 10$.
áp＇́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$ ，33．note．
ā $\sigma a$, ä $\sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \imath, 1$.
а̄ँ $\sigma, 36$.
я̌ $\sigma о \mu \alpha, 7,8$.
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, 6$.
ă $\sigma \sigma \omega$, ä $\sigma \sigma \omega, 11$.
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega, \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tilde{\omega}, 8$ ．
$\dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{c} \omega, \dot{a}^{\tau} \epsilon \in, 1$ ．
ă $\tau \tau \omega$, ä $\tau \tau \omega, 11$.
а́т $\bar{\omega} \mu a \iota, 1$.
à́áta， 1.
$\dot{a} \phi \varepsilon \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu, \dot{a} \phi \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon i \varsigma, 115$.
aфєілка，6．note．
aфєі̃入al，9．note．
बфєїvaı， 115.
áфєіขтає，6．note．
dфєіта⿱， 115.
а́фвітто， 116.
áфغíw， 116.
áфह́入aı，9．note．
đффє $\lambda_{0} \mu \alpha \iota, 9$.
áф́́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu о$ с， 116.
ä $ф \varepsilon \varepsilon, 115$.
áф́́бта入ка，173．note．
а’фєбт $\xi \varepsilon \varepsilon, 136$.
ӑфєтоя， 116.
à申є́ш， 109.
dंф́́ $\omega, 116$.
 note，115．note．
аंфїүнаи， 132.
 note．
а̇фиує́орац， 132.
aфioute， 116.
á申iove， 115.
$\boldsymbol{\phi} \phi \check{\phi} \chi \theta a, 132$.
dфй̃， 116.
д $\phi \bar{\phi}, 115,116$.
«хє́ $\omega \nu, 12$.
ӓхонаи，ӑхәขцаи， 12.
$\mathrm{A} \Omega, 1$.
ăшрто，6．note．

## B．

Bã $\mu \varepsilon \varsigma, 38$.
ßáv， 37.
ßабะй $\mu a, 37$.
ßӓтє，Ка́тпи， 38.

вє́bаници， 39.
вєҺа́р $\eta \mu$ и， 40.
вєбарпи́с， 37.
$\beta_{\varepsilon \in i \eta k \varepsilon \nu,} 40$.
ßе́єлаццаи， 43.
вєЄо́л $\eta \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}, 39$.



阝є́єршка， 41.
$\beta_{\varepsilon}$ Ершні́vос， 44.
$\beta_{\varepsilon}$ ер＇шя，37， 38.
$\beta \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} i \omega, 38.40$.
$\beta \varepsilon ́ \omega, \beta$ 亿й $\eta, 38$.
阝й́́oш，152．note．
З九о́ $\varepsilon \sigma \theta a, 40.42$.
阝ийvau， 42.
$\beta \lambda a ́ b \varepsilon \tau а я, 43$.
$\beta \lambda \varepsilon \dot{\mu} \mu \nu, 39$.
$\beta \lambda \eta \varepsilon \tau a \iota, \beta \lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a, 39$.
$\beta \lambda \tilde{\eta} \mu \eta \nu, \quad \beta \lambda \tilde{\eta} \quad, \quad 39$. note．
$\beta$ ийоодаи， 39.
$\beta \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，39．note．
врй́тодаі， 41.
$\beta \omega \theta \varepsilon \tau \nu, 44$.

6．$\beta \omega \dot{\sigma} \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon, ~ 43$.
｜К＇்гонаи， 44.
$16 . \quad \Gamma$ ．
Гé 1 aa，50， 51.
Үє́yova，5．note， 49.
$\gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu a, 48$.
уєүшрі́бкш， 48.
үєіvато， 50.
үモえoícv， 48.
$\gamma_{\varepsilon \nu} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu, 50$.
үєขа́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu о$ с， 9.
ує́vто，50， 51.
уєv́ $\mu \varepsilon \theta a, 51$.
үрทүорє́ш， 75.
$\Delta$.
$\Delta a ́ \eta \tau a, 5_{5}$.
баípu， 62.
баїаөєi¢， 56.
баца́q， 62.
баиа́ць， 62.
банвіс， 62.
ба $\mu \nu a ́ \omega$, да́ $\mu \nu \eta \mu,, 62$.
барибонаи， 62.
סарөєíc，סартós， 62.
ঠа́бодаи， 55.

ס́є́aтat， 58.
ס́́ $\mathbf{\gamma \mu} \mu, 63$.
ס́́̇̃a， 56.
ঠєठаiaтаи， 55.

бєठакрv $\mu$ е́vo૬，253．note．
д́́סарка， 62.
ঠéóa $\mu a, 55$.
ঠєбаข $\mu$ évoc， 56.




סє́дŋүцаи， 57.
ঠєठ币боцаи，64． 208.

ঠécia， 59.



ס̂́éouка，59， 60.
ঠєঠóкпиаи， 70.

д́́亢oua， 61.
де́гоцаи， 68.
ס́́́óoа， 62.
¿е́доркка，62．81．note．

ঠє́д́рака，67． 71.
ঠ́́ঠрацаи， 71.
бєঠоа́ $\mu \eta к а, 246$.

дє́гірабнає， 71.
д́є́ঠिоца， 247.
ঠєӨЯгораи， 64.
ঠєíঠє $\gamma \mu a$, ，59． 63.
סEióca，59， 60.
бєіठіткоиаи，59．note．
ঠеiठоика， 60.
ঠєккага̃̈Өaц，59．note．
бєіноиєу， 61.

ঠєєодаи， 61.
$\delta_{\varepsilon} \ell \omega, 62$.
де́кодаи， 63.
$\delta_{\varepsilon} \epsilon \xi \omega, 58$.
ঠ́єонає， 61.
д́́єи， 64.
ঠвиодаи， 66.
д́́रaтat， 63.
бі立оцаи， 57.
ঠйраи， 62.
$\delta \bar{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon v, 64$.
$\delta \dot{\eta} \omega, \delta$ биєє， 56.

ঠєа飞́vยтац， 47.
ס̀a
ঠиєєرє́vоц，87． 115.
ঠ̇а́кєєцає， 143.
$\delta \quad$ даакє́ $\omega, 164$.
ঠ̀a入є́ үоная， 165.
ঠиатрічая， 247.

бьафөарќоцає， 256.

діঠ $\eta \mu, 64$.
غ亢ঠिйбкь， 67.
סí， 61.
$\delta_{\epsilon \epsilon \zeta \omega \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ v o t, ~} 120$.

 165.

ঠ८єть申ஸ́гкш，251．note．
ঠє́́poas， 92.
$\delta i \varepsilon \sigma \theta a t, 61$.
סєєфАа́рато，ঠıєфӨарє́aтo，
256．note．
ס七́є́ $\phi$ Oopa， 256.
$\delta_{\ell \eta \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \eta, 3 .}$

$\delta і \eta \mu, 61$.
$\delta \bar{\eta} \sum a, 121$.
סйрєга， 100.
סюо́Хทขтаи， 186.
ठíw，ঠiov，ঠioual， 61.
$\delta \iota \omega \kappa \dot{\theta} \theta \varepsilon \iota \nu, 22.70$.
$\delta i \omega \mu a t, 61$.
б $\mu \eta \theta \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \varsigma, 62$.
ঠо́́धбато， 58.
סокє̃ข，т́́， 65.
ঠо́ткоу， 69.
סoũv，ถัข̃vтt， 64.
ঠрã̈и，$\delta \rho \alpha i \eta \nu, 67$.
браной $\mu \iota, 246$.
סрãvą， 67.
ঠраты́v， 71.
¿ла́голаи，ঠра́́s， 67.
¿ратóc， 62.
ঠрйборац， 67.
б $\rho \tilde{\omega}, 67$.
бочт $\mu і, \delta \rho \dot{о} о \mu, 71$.
סívаขта，ס̀́vavтos， 74.
ঠ́́бато，¿́vбєто，73．note． ঠ̀́ $\sigma \varepsilon$ ， 73.
ठขбо́ $\mu \varepsilon$ уос， 74.
סи́бкєу， 73.

$\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega, 68$.
$\delta \dot{\omega} \omega$, ， $\bar{\omega} \eta \mathrm{\eta}, 69$.

## E．

＂E $\alpha$ imperf．， 85.

そū̃ov， 24.

 ${ }_{\xi}^{\prime \prime} a \xi a,{ }^{\prime} a \xi \varepsilon, 4,5$ ．
हैas imperf．， 85.

ยare imperf， 85.
द́á $\phi \theta \eta, 29$.
ย̇ $6 \eta \nu, 37$.
ย่อท่бєто，7，8． 38.
と́bibarke， 39.
モ̇ל入áb $\eta \nu, 43$.
ย゙® $\lambda \eta \nu, 39$.




є่ $\gamma \delta 0 \dot{\pi} \pi \eta \pi a, 70$.
モ̌ $\gamma \eta \mu a, 47$.
ย̇үкаөєíवато， 131.
${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \gamma \kappa \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \lambda \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta, 160$.

є̌ $\gamma \rho \in \tau о, 75$.

є่ үрй $\gamma о \rho \theta a, 75,76$ ．note．
${ }_{\hat{\varepsilon}} \gamma \chi^{\varepsilon} \omega,{ }^{\varepsilon} \gamma \chi \varepsilon \tilde{\omega}, 265$.
${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu, 62$.

ย̇ठ́áp $\eta \nu, 62$.
モ̇oáá $\mu \eta \nu, 55$.



ย̇ठ́ $\theta \eta \nu, 64$.
ยуঠєиа， 61.

文 $\delta \varepsilon \xi a, 58$.

ย์́ $\dot{\sigma} \sigma, 108$.
ย́ข̇ยยєто， 66.


غंঠ்ं்ока，6．note，7． 108.
є்̇̀ंорац，6．note， 108.
ย́i $\eta \sigma a, 64$.




हो $\delta \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu, 62$.
єठ $\mu \eta \tau о, 62$ note．

ยঠіракоу， 62.

żठpav， 67.
\％бо $\rho \sigma a, 68$.
ย̇ $\varnothing \eta \nu, 67$.

${ }^{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{E} \Omega \Omega, 131$ ．note．
${ }^{\varepsilon} \delta \omega \nu, 68$.

ย้єєтоv， 88.
ย̇єஎа́aŋท，80． 87.
ยє́лории， 94.
${ }^{\ell} \varepsilon \in \lambda \mu a t, \epsilon_{\varepsilon} \in \lambda \mu \varepsilon \nu_{0} \varsigma, 83$.
ย＇є̇лтонаи，80．note， 94.

并 $\in \lambda \tau 0,84$.
 92． 221.

 ยє $\chi_{\chi}$ ато， 92.
ย̇єбаато， 118.


テ̈ $\eta \kappa а, 115$.
ยँ $\eta \nu, 85$.

ย $\because \eta \sigma a, 85$ ．

＇́ $\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \eta \eta, 124$.

ジ $\because \eta \nu, 115$.


${ }_{\varepsilon}^{*} \theta \rho a \xi \alpha, 234$.
モ $\theta \rho \varepsilon \xi \square, 246$.


ЁӨ $\boldsymbol{\omega} \kappa \alpha, 77$.
धौa
єїатаи，हíato， 117.
ย้ато，віато， 84.
Ėato， 95.

ยi $\eta, 87$.
モï $\eta, 115$.
єiӨضン， 115.
عïөเ $\sigma \mu \iota, 76$.
єika，81．note．
ยікка，єікєเข， 115.

 82．note．
єiкш́с，єiко́с， 81.

عỉ $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha$ ，89．note． єì $\lambda \varepsilon \iota, 84$.
عi入ク́入ov日a， 106.
عi入й $\lambda o v \theta \mu \varepsilon \nu, 200$.
モ้̌入ทфа，89．note， 162.
દ゙1入 $\eta \chi$ ，8，89．note， 162.




ки́бцає， 94.
$\varepsilon \bar{i} \lambda \xi \alpha, 94$.
घіँไоข， 9.
 єí入 $\omega, 9$ ．
 вїนи兀 from iє $\varepsilon \mu \iota, 115$.
غ้циартаи，89．note．
$\varepsilon \bar{i} \mu \varepsilon \nu, \varepsilon \bar{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon, 85$.

$\varepsilon i \ell \mu \eta \nu, 116$.
モivaย， 115.
єi้vขци， 96.
દ゙धa
ยіокขйаย， 81.

ยіँ $\pi \frac{1}{}, 97$.
ยipa， 92.
єіруабдає， 99.
єїрүvขци， 92.
єірє $\tilde{\sigma}<\iota, 89$.
غіррка，вірр $\mu \alpha, 88$.
єірйбонає，88． 102.
غірора兀，101， 102.
віри́ $\mu \varepsilon v a r, 105$.
غіриขтаи，ع̌！рขขто， 104.
є́рито， 105.
غ้ри， 88.
عíc， 115.
हІба， 117.
єíбá $\mu \eta \nu$ ，є̌兀бато， 87.
غібá $\mu \eta \nu, 131$.
єїац，віба́цєขоя， 117.
вїбєтац， 118.
єібєфрои́ $\mu \nu \nu, 259$.

єіँбо， 116.
є้єгоцаі，78． 87.
єібтйкєเ， 134.
 фрグбєбөą， 259.
єїтє，є⿺𠃊นทน， 85.
غїто， 116.
モi $\chi \varepsilon \varepsilon, 112$.

$\varepsilon ้ \omega$ for $i \omega, 87$.
عiしゃ0a，6．note， 76.
E้ $\omega \nu, 74$.
ย์каӨธ์ $\sigma \eta \nu, 131$.
в́каӨŋ́ $\mu \eta \nu, 118$.
ย์кауоу， 139.
ย̌каоу， 139.
ย̇ка́рŋン， 142.
 note．
є́кЄр́́ $\sigma \sigma о \mu а, ~ 45 . ~ n o t e . ~$
єєєбัขтая， 37.
є̇күєүа́ovтає， 51.
єєк $\delta \tilde{v} \mu \varepsilon \nu, 73$.
є́кєка́б $\mu \not \geqslant \nu, 138$.
є́кєкло́ $\mu \nu$ ，144． 207.
є́кє́крау $\mu \varepsilon \nu, 200$.
モ̇кє́раба，モ́кєраба́ $\mu \eta$ ， 144.

ย้кєрба，ย̇кย์ $\theta \eta \nu, 143$.
モ้кпа， 139.
ย์к兀その， 148.
ยккхоу， 147.
ย̇кк์์ดขтยร， 140.
モ̌клалоข， 149.
ह́клдаєу， 150.
${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\kappa} \kappa \lambda a \xi \alpha, 149$.
ย̇к $\lambda \alpha ́ \pi \eta \nu, 151$.
éк入є入áӨoṽa， 163.

モ́к入ウ́ $\theta a v \varepsilon \iota, 163$.
є́к
غ́клí⿱亠䒑⿱亠乂， 151.
єккцаіуш， 169.


в่ктлйттш， 215.
ёкрауоv， 154.

є́крє́ $\mu \omega, 155$.
єккрทуа， 154.
غ́кта́ $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\eta \nu}, 158$.
е̌ктака，53．note， 157.
غ́кта́ $\mu \eta \nu, 158$ ．note．
ย้ктау，ย̇кта́ข $\theta \eta \nu, 158$.

ย̇ктє́т $\mu \eta$ бӨоン， 39.
е̌ктора， 157.
є́кто́г $п к а, 158$.
ย้кขӨоу， 146
غ́кфрєíu，259．note．
є́кфоєе， 259.
 фрךб0चีvaı， 259.
ย̇кхрą，270．note．
غ́кхрйөєє， 269.

9．$̇ \lambda a ́ a q v, 93$ ．
ย้ $\lambda \alpha \theta$ Өv， 163.
ह̈ $\lambda \alpha \iota, 9$.
غ̇入áкทба， 164.
с́ $\lambda \alpha \not \mu \phi \theta \eta \nu, 162$.

ย̀ $\lambda a \chi o \nu, 162$.
ع̇入á $\omega, 93$.

ย่ $\lambda \varepsilon \tau ้, 9$.

モ̌ $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \psi a, 165$.


ह̇入 $\eta$ 入ádaто， 93.
 93.

 94.

$\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \mu \varepsilon v, \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \tau \varepsilon, 106$.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, ह́ $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 163$.
ह้入८тєข，3． 165.
ह́̀ $\lambda \tau \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, é $\lambda \iota \tau o ́ \mu \eta \nu, 166$.
غ́ $\lambda \lambda a ́ \mu \psi є \sigma \theta a \iota, 163$.
ह́ $\lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta v, 166$.
घ̇до́єvข， 167.

¿̇ $\lambda \dot{v} \mu \eta \nu, 169$.

غ่ $\lambda v \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota, 83$.


غ цкккоу， 175.
غ $\mu а \pi о \nu, 170$.

є゙ $\mu \varepsilon \iota \nu a, 175$.
в́ $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \eta к о \nu, 175$.
${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \nu,{ }^{\prime \prime} \varepsilon^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota, 85$.
$\tilde{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \nu, \tilde{\varepsilon} \tau \varepsilon, \varepsilon ँ \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \nu, 115$.
${ }_{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \nu, 116$.
\％$\mu \eta \nu \alpha, 169$.
द́цiŋva， 175.
$\varepsilon$ є $\mu \mu \varepsilon \nu,{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \mu \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota, 85$.
є $\mu \mu о \rho \varepsilon, 172$.
غ̇цขท́илика， 122.
${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\gamma} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \alpha, 176$.
${ }^{\kappa} \mu \mathrm{p}$ доу，39．note， 44.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi i \pi \lambda \eta \theta \iota, 209$.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \iota \pi \rho \varepsilon i \varsigma, 210$. note．
$\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi i \phi \rho \eta \mu$ ， 259.

＊$\varepsilon \mu \pi \lambda \varepsilon i \mu \eta \nu$ ，̇̇ $\mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu \circ$ ， 209.

ё $\mu v к о \nu, 178$.



غ̇vapẽ， 95.

モ̇עठiєбау， 61.
ย่ขธิขขย์๐ขส兀， 74.


ย̇ขєíкル， 252.
єขєє $\mu, 179$.
ย̇ขєєриє́ขоц， 93.
ย̇ขยі́Хєє，77． 114.
ย єєй $\eta_{\nu}$
 note， 95.

غ̇ขєข $\omega \mu \eta \nu, 182$.
 є́vєпі́ $\mu \pi \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu, 209$.
ย้ข $\nu \in \pi о \nu, 90$.

ยทย์ส $\frac{1}{} 89$.
ย̌ขยขสа， 181.

 252．$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \dot{\gamma} \eta \nu, 208$.

غ́vívoxa，6．note， 252.
єข $\nu \rho a ́ \mu \eta \nu, 95$.
ย่ข $\theta \varepsilon \tau ั, 106$.
ย์ขiสть，90． 95.
غ่vะสкグ入ŋ， 227.
ย่ขเбாท́न $\omega, 89$.
モ゙vเสォоу，89，90． 95.
ध́vívo 95.
ยขíしゃ， 89.
єขvєтоv， 90.
غ่ขvย์ $\pi \omega, 89$.
ย่ขv＇ш
غ่ $\nu \tau i, 84$.

白 $\xi_{\alpha} \lambda \iota \phi \tilde{\eta}, 14$.
є́ $\xi \mu\langle\lambda о \tilde{\mu} \mu \varepsilon \nu, 20$.
ह̇ $\xi a \pi \alpha ́ \phi \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu, 28$.
दُ $\xi \varepsilon a \gamma \varepsilon 亢 兀 \sigma a, 6$.

द̇ध६हрáбтоvто，45．note．


є́ $\xi$ вірац， 92.

єєєॄєра̃ $\sigma a, 98$.
є̇धєфрєіонєv， 259.
є́ $\xi \in \chi \rho \eta, 267$.
ย̇ย́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon, 269$.


$\varepsilon \xi^{\xi} \eta \mu \in \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha, 21$.
غ́धŋрал $\mu$ и，12．note．
є́ఢррйато， 9.
દ̇乡vคá $\mu \eta \nu, \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \dot{v} \rho \eta \mu \alpha, 182$.
．єoc $\gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu, 81,82$ ．note．
．єoi $\delta a, 82$ note．
हैонка，80，81，82．note．
єог $\mu, 84$.

94.

ย้оу，imperf．， 85.
ย้оขт兀， 84.
ย̇óvт $\omega v$ ，є̇óvт $\omega$ ，imperat．， 85.

हैँ $\pi a \theta o v, 199$.
є̇ $\pi \alpha \iota v$ ย́ $\omega, 8$ ．noté．

ย้ $\pi \alpha \rho \delta 亍 о \nu, 205$.
є̇тарєั̆， 10.
غ̇таба́ $\mu \eta \nu, 199$.
غ̇тaи́рабӨat， 9.
غ่ $\pi a \tilde{\nu} \rho \circ \nu, 34$.
ह̇пафаvávөnv， 35.
छ่ $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} ย \nu \tau 0,50$.
غ่ $\pi \varepsilon ́ \zeta \omega \sigma \varepsilon, 120$.
غ่ $\pi \varepsilon \iota \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu o v \mathrm{~g}, \quad 165$. note．

غ̇тєєрєо́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu \circ$ с， 103.
є̇тєєрйбоцає， 102.
ย̇тєєбфрє́ш， 259.


$\varepsilon ่ \pi \varepsilon \nu \eta \nu 0 \theta \varepsilon, 95$.
モ̇ $\pi \varepsilon \pi \eta ́ \gamma \varepsilon เ \nu, 208$.
غ̇лє́ $\pi \iota \theta \mu \varepsilon \nu, 200$.
$\varepsilon \pi \varepsilon ์ \pi \lambda \omega \nu, 215$.
$\varepsilon \in \pi \varepsilon \pi \nu \sigma \mu \eta \nu, 221$.
ย̇пย́ра $\sigma a, ~ غ ่ \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha \sigma \sigma \varepsilon, 211 . ~$

モ̈ $\pi \varepsilon \sigma a, 212$.

ยпє
ย̇єध $\sigma \pi о \nu, 97$.
ย่лє́бтоуто，97．note．
ย̇ $\pi \varepsilon \tau a ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 205,206$.
Еँтєтоу， 212.
ย่สย́тобनє， 243.
غ̇пє́єрачє， 244.

єँ $\pi \varepsilon ф \nu \frac{1}{}, 207$.
ย̇ாєфо́рढєเข， 251.

モ̇пє́фขкоข， 262.
ย̇пย́ $\chi \omega, 112$.
ย̇п $\eta \gamma$ о́ $\mu \eta \nu, 208$.
ย̇ாííта， 12.
हin $\eta \lambda a, 198$.
ย゙ $\pi \eta \xi a, 208$.

غ̇ாทั̃oov， 34.


є่ $\pi \iota$ бакє́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu, 38$.
ย̇ $\pi \iota \eta \dot{\sigma} \iota \nu, 37$.
ย่ $\pi \iota$ ทีтгท， 38.
ย่тเঠєঠра́㇒ $\mu \eta \tau \alpha \iota$, note．

غ̇ாเモ́ซабөaц， 96.

ย̇สєка入є́бєтац，141．note．
є̇тікєєцаи， 142.
غ่ пикікоь， 148.
ย̇лькр
ह̇ $\pi$ ィ $\lambda$ ह́ $\lambda \alpha \theta a, 163$.
ย̇ $\pi \iota \lambda \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \varrho, 165$. note．
モ̇ாı $\lambda_{1} \theta \omega, 163$.
غ̇пцца́ббонає，غ̇т兀ца́ба－ $\sigma \theta a, 172$.
ย̇тьєє́лоцац，173， 174.

 180.

ย̇สเขย์๐ขส兀， 179.
ह゙пtov， 210.
ย̇ $\pi$ tó $\neq \mu \mathrm{a}$ ， 192.
غ่ $\pi เ \pi \lambda о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о \varsigma, 203$.
غ่ $\pi \iota \pi \lambda \omega ́ \varsigma, 215$.


ย゙ $\pi \iota \sigma a, 210$.

є่ $\pi i \sigma \tau q, 96$.
ย̇สเซтย́шرน兀，96．note．

ย่ாเтย́入入 $\omega, 235$.
ย̇ாттєтра́фата兀，244．note． غ゙пเто́бनаия， 243.
ย̇лเтралє́оข兀є，159． 244.
غ̇тเтрáчоขтац， 244.
غ̇ँттрє́чоута兀，244．note． ย̇пะф由́бкєเข，251．note．

ह́ль $\omega \neq$ ато， 193.
 214.

ย̇ $\pi \lambda a ́ \theta \eta \nu, 202$.
غ́ $\pi \lambda$ ák $\eta \nu, 214$.

غ́̇л入á $\sigma \theta \eta \nu, 202$.
モँ $\pi \lambda \varepsilon, 203$.
$\varepsilon \pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu, 214$.
छँ $\pi \lambda \varepsilon о$, ，$\varepsilon \pi \lambda \varepsilon v, 203$.
ย้ $\pi \lambda \varepsilon v \sigma \alpha$, ย่ $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \dot{v} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 214$.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \mu \eta \nu, 202.209$.

${ }^{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \omega \nu, 215$.
$\varepsilon \pi \lambda \omega \sigma a, 214$.
$\varepsilon ̇ \pi \nu \dot{v} \nu \theta \eta, 216$.
ध̇ $\pi o ́ \theta \eta \nu, 210$.
є́торорац， 195.
غ́тороу， 217.
غ̇потátŋทv， 207.
غ̇по́ұато， 193.
ह̇по́ұоца兀， 192.
غ̇т $\mu \dot{\partial} \theta \eta \nu, 211$.
モँ $\pi \rho a \theta o v, 205$.
$\varepsilon ँ \pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon, 210$.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \eta \theta \eta \nu, 211$.
$\varepsilon \pi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon, 210$.
є̇прıá $\mu \eta{ }^{2}, 218$.
ह̇ $\pi \rho o ́ \omega \sigma a, ~ \tilde{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \omega \sigma \alpha .219$.

ย̇пта́ $\mu \eta, 206$.
${ }_{\varepsilon}^{*} \pi \tau \eta \chi \square, 220$.
ย゙ $\pi \tau \eta \nu, 206$.
غ̇лто́ $\mu \eta \nu, 97.206$.
غ́тш $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu, 188$.
غ̇пढ́ $\chi$ ато， 112.
غ่ $\pi$ ¢́ $^{\chi}$ ато， 186.
غ́ра́aбөє， 98.

ератає， 98.
єруш，91． 221.
єр $\varnothing \omega, 221$.
є́рє́єбӨą，є́рє́оито， 103.
غ́рєі́о $и \varepsilon, 103$.
$\varepsilon \in є \xi a, 221$.
є́ре́ретто， 100.
غрєбба， 100.
غ́єє́иєуоу， 10.
غ́рєиєчоає， 103.
દُрє́є，88，89． 103.
є́рךрє́סатац， 99.
є̇р $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ є́бато， 93.
 غриретитаи， 99.



ह่ $\sigma \varepsilon ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu, 225$.
ह̇бウ́入ato，18．note．
$\varepsilon \quad \varepsilon \eta \mu a, 224$.
ยँ $\sigma$ Өa， 116.
モ゙ $\sigma \theta \eta \nu, 131$.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \tilde{\omega}, 131$ ．note．
モ́бірауто， 226.

 226.

єँбкє $\mu \mu \alpha, 277$.
ย̇бкє́тทン， 278.
モ̇ $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \psi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu, 277$.
єँккท入a， 227.
ย้ $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$, है $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \nu, 227$.
ยєкоу， 85.
$\varepsilon \sigma \kappa \omega \downarrow$ ， 228.
है $\sigma \mu \eta \xi \alpha$ ，$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，$\dot{\varepsilon}-$
$\sigma \mu \eta \chi \theta \eta \nu, 228$.
єбоцає，95． 117.
غ่ซоข̃ $\mu \iota, 85$.
धँ $\sigma \pi а к а, 228$.
̇̇ $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ \rho \eta \nu$, है $\sigma \pi \alpha \rho \mu a, 228$.
हैं $\sigma \pi \alpha \sigma a$, ＇่ $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ，घ้－ $\sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha, 228$.
ह้ซтєยка， 229.
हैन $\sigma \varepsilon \iota \rho a, 228$.
ย$\sigma \pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \alpha, ~ \check{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 229$.
๕̋ $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon, 89$.
غ̇ $\sigma \pi \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu, 97$.
غ $\varepsilon \pi \pi о \nu, 97$.
と $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi о \rho a, 228$.

モ゙ $\sigma \sigma \alpha, 117$.
ย̇ббモiт兀ル， 85.
ย $\sigma \sigma \varepsilon ́ \sigma \mu а \iota, 122$.

बєvov，є่ $\sigma \sigma \varepsilon v o ́ \mu \eta \nu, 225$.
घ $\sigma \sigma \sigma, 84$.
है $\sigma \sigma о, 96$.
غ $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma о \mu \iota \iota, 85$.
غ̇ббоข̃リルน， 122.
غ̇ $\sigma \sigma \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$, ย̇ $\sigma \sigma \nu \mu a \iota, 225$.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu, 158$ ．note， 225.
ย $\sigma \sigma \omega, 95$ ．
غ $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \omega \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu, 122$.
غ̇бта入ádaто，غ̇бтá入ато， 229.


229．ย̇таข์́สӨทข， 234.



229．ह̇т $\dot{1} \phi \eta \nu, 122$.


бтє́рך $\mu \alpha, 230 . \quad$ ยтєєンа， 234.
єбттка， 134.
غ $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa, 135$. note．हैтєкоу， 240.
 136．｜入є́ $\sigma \theta \eta \nu, 235$.
 $230 . \quad$ हैт $\frac{1}{\varepsilon \mu} 235$.











 бтрюцає，231．
है $\sigma \tau v \xi a,{ }^{\ell} \sigma \tau v \gamma 0 \nu, 231$.
$\varepsilon \sigma \tau \omega ¢, 136$.
่̇ $\sigma \dot{\prime} \theta \eta \nu, 225$.

غт $\mu$ ท́ $\theta \eta \nu, 235$.




 $\sigma \phi a \lambda \mu \alpha, 232 . \quad$ है $\tau \rho \eta \sigma a, 241$.
है $\sigma \phi a \xi a, ~ \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \phi a ́ \chi \theta \eta \nu, 232 . ~ \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho i ́ b \eta \nu, ~ \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho i \phi \theta \eta \nu, 247$.
$\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \eta \lambda \alpha, 232$.


ย $\varepsilon \chi^{\varepsilon} \notin 0 \nu, 22.112$.
$\varepsilon \sigma \chi 0 \nu, 111$.
$\varepsilon ฮ \chi \chi \omega \nu, 232$.
$\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega, 95$.


غ̇ं $\dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu, 234$.
દ̇₹áкทข， 240.

モ̇та́ $\lambda \theta \eta \nu, 235$.

＇́фє $\sigma \pi \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu, 97$.
єфє́ббаі，єٌфєббаи， 117. モ̇фє́єбєбӨal，117．note． є́фє́ббонац， 117.
＇̇фєбта́кєє，137．note．
ย́фєбтஸ̄əє้， 136.
є́фŋ̈тта兀， 29.



モ $\phi \theta \eta \nu, 255$.
є́ $\phi \theta i \mu \eta \nu, 159$ ．note．
モ́ $\phi$ ө七七， 256.
そ$\phi$ Өора，5．note， 256.
غ́ $\phi \theta$ ós， 114.

єфібтацає， 96.
є́фора̃»， 192.
ยхニ兀оу， 263.
${ }^{\text {Ex }}$ Хavov， 264.
ย์х́́рๆข， 263.

モモモモニ， 264.



غ́хๆра́ $\mu \eta \nu, 263$.


ѐ $\chi \omega \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu, 271$.
モ̇ $\chi \bar{\omega} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 266$.
モ४єє，77． 114.
 271.
 $\theta \eta \nu, \varepsilon \in \psi \eta \sigma \eta \nu, 271$.
हैчoүa， 271.
 $\chi^{\theta \eta \nu}, 272$.
\％$\omega, 84$ ．
ย้ $\omega \theta \alpha, \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon, 77$.
દ่＇่́Oovv， 272.
हैшка， 272.
ह̈шка，6．note，115．note．
モ́ч́кєєข，80，81．note， 82. note．
$\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \lambda \pi \varepsilon \iota \nu, 94$.
$\varepsilon{ }_{\varepsilon} \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu, \dot{\varepsilon} \hat{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu, 36$.

艾 $\omega \nu, 74$.
白迫v， 84.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \omega \nu \eta \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota, 272$.


ह่ $\omega \nu \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，＇̇ $\omega \nu o v ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ， ย́ש́иทто， 272.
غ́єрака，єєєрацаи， 191. ع́єруєєข， 221.
غ́ $\omega$ рта弓ог， 96.
$\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \sigma \theta \eta \nu, \varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \omega \sigma \mu a t, 272$.
H．
${ }^{7} \mathrm{H}, 116$.
$\eta$ for $\begin{gathered} \\ \ell\end{gathered} \phi, 255$.
$\tilde{j}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ for $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu, 85$ ．
${ }_{7}^{7} \alpha, 85$.
ท̄ँ $\alpha, 86.106$.

ท้วауov， 6.
 ท่ $ү$ áббато， 2.
${ }^{\eta} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \iota \lambda a, 2$.
$\eta \gamma \gamma^{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \varsigma, ~ \eta \quad \gamma \gamma^{\varepsilon} \lambda \theta \eta \varsigma, 3$.
ท่ $\gamma \boldsymbol{v} \omega v$, ท่ $\gamma \gamma^{\eta} \eta \sigma a, 74$.
ท̆ $\gamma \varepsilon є \rho a, 74$.
ท่ $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ íроуто， 3.
ท่วєрє́єб $\theta a t, 3$.

 $\rho \varepsilon ́ \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a t, 3$.
引ु $\gamma \eta \lambda a, 1$.
गुү $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\mu}$,
ทүро́и $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{2}, 74$.
Пิอิะン，77，78．82．note．
भौठєба́ $\mu \eta, 8$.
ท้סєбаข， 79.

$\eta$ ท̀ $\delta \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 108$.
${ }_{\eta} \ddagger, 87$ ．
ท゙єıঠє，ทีєiঠєєข，78， 79.
$\eta \varepsilon i \delta \eta, 77$.
ท้ย $\varepsilon, 86$.
$\bar{\eta} \varepsilon \nu, 85$.
ทียе́́Өортац， 10.
$\eta{ }^{\eta} \eta \nu, 85$ ．
ไ̆＇$\gamma \mu \eta \nu$ ，82．note．
П̈ккто，81．note，82．note．
ぞiov， 87.

ท้tَav，79．8\％．
ท̄кк，7．note．
そॅка， 121.
$\tilde{\eta}^{\pi} \kappa a, 115$.
$\dot{\eta \kappa \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu, 116 . ~}$
ที้к $\alpha \sigma \alpha, \eta{ }^{2} к \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \ell, 80$.
йкахо́ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu, 12$.
ทккахоу，6．note， 12.
йки́ковєข， 13.
йкоука，йкоублає，икои́－ $\sigma \theta \eta \nu, 13$.
йкооа̃ бо，ท่крош̃， 13.
$\eta ँ \kappa \omega, 121.132$.
$\dot{\eta} \lambda a ́ \theta \eta \nu, 93$.
ŋ̈лалкоч， 15.
ท̀ $\lambda a ́ \mu \eta \nu, 18$.
$\grave{\eta} \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 93$.
グ入 $\delta \alpha \nu \varepsilon, 14$.
$\eta \lambda \varepsilon є \psi a, \eta{ }_{\eta} \lambda \varepsilon i \phi \theta \eta \nu, 14$.
ทㄱ $\lambda є \dot{\xi} \alpha \mu \eta \nu, 14$.
引̀лv́aто， 15.
$\dot{\eta} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta v, 13$.
グ入єขঠŋ $\mu \varepsilon ́ v \varphi, 160$.
ท̉入ıбко́ $\mu \eta \nu, 16$.
$\eta$ グлетоу， 17.
$\eta$ ทкл $\lambda \sigma a, 94$.

й $\lambda о ь ф а, 14$.
$\dot{\eta} \lambda о ́ \mu \eta \nu, 18$.
グ入ovy， 15.
$\eta{ }^{\eta} \lambda \nu \xi a, 19$.
$\eta{ }^{7} \lambda \phi о \nu, 20$.
ŋ̈ $\lambda \omega \kappa \alpha, 16,17$.
$\dot{\eta} \lambda \dot{\omega} \mu \eta \nu, 13$.
$\eta ゙ \lambda \omega \nu, 16,17$.
$\eta_{\mu} \mu \lambda \omega к a, ~ \eta \eta \mu 6 \lambda \omega \sigma a, 20$.
$\eta \mu$ юротор， 20.
$\eta_{\mu} \mu \ell, \eta \mu \eta \nu, 118$.
$\eta \mu \eta \nu, 84$.
$\dot{\eta} \mu i, 255$.
$\grave{\eta} \mu \pi \varepsilon \chi^{\chi} \chi \tau о, \quad \eta \mu \pi \varepsilon \sigma \chi \varepsilon \tau о$ ， 113.
$\eta ้ \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi \circ \nu, \eta$ й $\mu \iota \sigma \chi о ́ \mu \eta \nu$, 113.
$\eta \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \kappa o v, 21$.
й $\mu \phi і \varepsilon \sigma \alpha, \quad \eta \mu ф \imath \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, ізифієбнац，22． 96.
$\eta \mu \omega \nu, 20$.
$\|^{\nu} \nu$ for $\varepsilon 申 \eta \nu, 255$.

ที้นapov， 95.
ที้ $\delta a \nu 0 \nu, 24$.
ク้̈єүка，9． 251.
グขєукоу，6．note，9． 252. グขé $\theta \eta \nu, 8$.
$\eta \nu \varepsilon є к а, ~ \eta \nu \varepsilon i \chi \theta \eta \nu, 252$.

ไै $\nu$ ยка，ท้ขєба， 8.
$\dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon \sigma \chi \circ \boldsymbol{\mu} \eta, 113$.
$\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \varepsilon ์ \chi \forall \eta \nu, 252$.
ที้ $\eta \mu \alpha, 8$.
グขทขá $\mu \eta \nu, 23$.
$\eta_{\eta}^{\nu} \nu \eta \sigma a, 8$.
गे $\nu$ Oov， 106.
ทㄴітатє， 95.

ท้ขov，ทुャó $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu, 26$.
グนтєоข， 25.
ทัน $\omega$ \％ov， $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \omega \xi \alpha, 26,27$.
$\bar{\eta} \xi\} a, 11$.


$\eta \xi^{\prime} \alpha \mu \eta \nu, \eta \not \xi a \nu, 7$.
ท้ $\rho \mu \varepsilon \nu, 87$.
ท̀ँтафоv，6．note， 28.
ирароу，6．note， 30.
 ба́ $\eta \eta$ ，ท̄ра́ $\sigma \sigma а т о, 98$. ท้рато， 10.
ที้ $\varepsilon$ ย́ $\theta \nu, 9$.
ท̀рєібато， 99.
औреоу，89．note．
ทो $\rho \varepsilon \sigma a, ~ ท ̆ \rho \varepsilon \sigma \sigma a, ~ 100$.
 $\sigma \mu \alpha$, ท̉рє́ $\theta \eta \nu, 31$.
ทрєєто， 102.
ทีр $\eta \kappa \alpha$, ทีр $р \mu \alpha \iota, 9$.
ท̄ри́рєєь， 30.
ทри́рєєтто， 99.
$\eta \eta^{\eta} \rho \sigma \alpha, 9$.
$\dot{\eta} \rho \theta \eta \nu, 30$.
йркоу， 99.
ทјрєтоу，99， 100.
ทріттацєv， 32.
ทŋрта́ $\boldsymbol{\eta \nu , ~ ท ̆ \rho \pi а \xi а , ~} 33$.

ท̀ $\rho \sigma \alpha, 30$.
ทัрข $\frac{10 y,}{} 103$.
$\bar{\eta}_{\mathrm{s}}$ for $\dot{\eta} \nu, 85$ ．
$\bar{\eta}^{\bar{\eta}} \sigma \alpha, 8$.
ทีँav，78，79．82．note． ท̈бац， 121.
ท̈бато， 121.
${ }_{\eta}{ }^{*} \sigma \theta a, 85$.
ク̣б $\theta a \nu o ́ \mu \eta \nu, 11$.

ท̆ $\sigma \theta \eta \nu, \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \sigma \mu a, 121$.
$\eta \eta^{\eta} \sigma \theta \tau \tau, 108$.
$\eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \theta \dot{o} \mu \eta \nu, 11$.
गुँ $\sigma, 116$.
$\dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \varepsilon v, 78.82$. note．
$\eta ँ \sigma \omega, 115$.
ท̀ $\sigma \tau \varepsilon, \eta \bar{\eta} \sigma \tau 0 \nu, 78$.
ทै $\sigma \chi \nu \mu \mu \iota, 12$.
ที่ $\omega, 85$.
ท＇่ $\gamma \mu \eta \nu, 109$.
ทư $\delta a, 33$.
ทu์่อั， 108.
ทن้そ́á $\mu \eta \nu, 109$.
ที่ซสa， 35.
ทौфаба， 35.
$\eta \dot{\eta} \dot{\theta} \boldsymbol{\eta}, 115$.
ทффєии́гос， 109.
$\dot{\eta} \phi і є є \nu, 116$.

グфиба， 35.
${ }_{7}^{7} \chi^{\alpha}, 6,7$ ．
ウข $\chi$ ө́є $\sigma \eta \eta, 36$.
$\eta \chi \chi \theta \eta \mu, 110$.
ทхХо́ $\mu \eta, 110$.
$\theta$.
Өає́oцаи，Ұáoцає， 123.
Эвіорає， 236.
१є́оито， 125.
งย์р $\mu \varepsilon \tau о, 124$.

શทє́o $\mu$ аı， 123.
গท̃नa，Sทбаíato，Inбá－
$\mu \varepsilon \nu o$ ，Эท̂бато，Эที－
$\sigma \theta u, 123$.
จо́рvурає， 128.
શорои̃ $\mu$ а， 128.
 234.

Эрє́єорає， 246.

ๆрє́ $\psi \omega, 245$.

ง่์ч $\omega, 248$.

I．
＇Ia $\quad 8$.

iठ́є́ $\omega, 77,78$.
i $\delta \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，＇ $1 \delta \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha, 77,78$.
82．note．
ioov，77， 191.
iòvĩa， 78.
iє， 87.
iєца兀， 115.
іє $\varepsilon \alpha, 87$.
¿єцца，іє́ $\mu \eta \nu, 86$.
iєv， 87.
＇iєбо（ǐะбо）， 86.
¿そ $\zeta, 80$.
iӨ́vン 132.
iкáv， 132.

＇$\mu \varepsilon \nu, ~ ' \mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota, ~ 87$.
їขтшข， 86.
iлтанає， 206.
ícav，79．82．note．
ívaб८，78．82．note．
＇i $\sigma \theta$ t，77， 78.
โ $\sigma, 87$.
$i \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu, 78$ ．82．note．
ї $\tau \boldsymbol{\sigma \kappa \varepsilon ,} 134$.
iбтє́ov，78， 79.
＇iбтоу， 78.
$i \sigma \chi \omega, 111$.
＇iтทı， 87.
iтŋтós， 86.
＇itov，ітєш， 86.
i＇sv， 86.

## K．

Ka0єঠoṽ $\mu a \iota, 130,131$.
$\kappa а ө \varepsilon \tau \mu \varepsilon \nu, 115$.
каөєлє亢， 9.
каӨєбӨŋ̆тодац， 131.
ка́Өŋцат， 118.
$\kappa а \lambda \iota \nu \delta \varepsilon \tilde{\sigma} \sigma a \iota, 159$.
катába， 37.
катаваiveє， 38.
катаbрóそаба， 41.

катаЄро́ॄєєє，41． 46. катаЄрйяабає， 41. катауві¢， 6.
катад́ápөєєข， 57.
ката $\theta \rho \omega \boldsymbol{\sigma к \omega \nu , ~} 128$.
катакаเє́ $ย ย$ ，катакєเє́－
$\mu \varepsilon \nu$, катакךย́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu, 140$.
ката́кєєa，142．note．
ката́кєццає， 142.
катакทє́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu, 140$.
катак $\lambda \ell \nu \bar{\eta} \nu а \iota, 151$.
катаклеш̃， 151.
катакขш́баба，ката－
куผ́ббоуба， 152.
катакрпиขа́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota, 155$. катактаує́оขєєу， 158.
ката入оขєє， 168.
ката́दаขтє¢， 7.
катат $\lambda \alpha \gamma \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha, 215$.
$\kappa а т а \pi \lambda и ̆ т \tau, 215$.
кататтакш́v， 219.
каталтйт $\eta v, 220$.
кати́ббш， 6.
катабторєбӨ $\eta$ рає， 231. катабхо́ $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ ขоя， 112. кататри́धаитє૬， 248.
катафө七ทŋбая， 257.
катахє́ซаขтє， 264.
кат $\propto \chi \rho \bar{q}, 269$.
катахрйбӨає，катахрท－
$\sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a, 268$.
катєаүєі¢，катєа үр， 5.
катєа́乡аутєє， 6.
катєáб $\sigma \omega, 6$.
катモ́aтає， 118.

катєүท̆ра， 52.
$\kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \delta \alpha ́ \rho \theta \eta \nu, 57$.
катєঠı！่̣тท $\sigma, 67$.
катєілєүнац， 165.
катєі́руєє 92.
$\kappa а т \varepsilon к а и ์ \theta \eta \nu, 139$.
катє́кта， 158.
катย์ขดส $0 \varepsilon, 178$.
катєขท́ขоөє， 95.
$\kappa а т \varepsilon \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \eta, 216$.
катєптака́s， 219.
катєра̃ซац， 98.
катєрйрєттто， 100.

катє́ $\sigma$ Хєто， 112. катєфөıขךко́тєє， 257. катє́ $\downarrow \eta$ ктає， 271. ка́тпиає， 118.
катทขá入 $\omega \sigma a, 24$.
кит $\bar{\xi} \sigma, 5$.

каváधaıs， 5.
кúvəш， 139.
кє́агтєє， 140.
кє́aтаı，143．note．
$\kappa \varepsilon \delta \dot{\partial} \nu \nu v \mu, \kappa \varepsilon \delta a i ́ \omega, 226$.
кє́єтац，кย́єбӨaı， 143.

кєі́аутєя，140．note．
$\kappa \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu, \kappa \varepsilon i \omega \nu, 143$.
кєíwутає，142．nöte．
кєкаঠŋбо́ $ц$ ध $\alpha, 146.162$.
кє́каঠ $\mu \alpha \iota, 138$.
кє́кабоу， 262.
$\kappa є к а ́ \mu \omega, 141$.
кє́кариає， 143.
кє́каб $\mu \iota, 138$.
кєкафпю́с，37． 142.
кекє́раблає， 144.
кєкє́рдака，кєкє́рঠঠка，
кєкє́ $\rho$ да үка， 145.
кє́кทб́а，5．note， 146.
кє́кทфє， 142.
кย́к入аү 149 ．［note． кย́к $\lambda а \mu \mu a$ ，151． 244. кє́клаб $\mu \alpha, 150$.
кєклє́атац， 151.

150．［note． кє́к $\lambda є \mu \mu$ ци，151． 244. кย́к $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{a}, 149$.
кєк入й̈цає， 151.
кє́к $\lambda \eta \kappa \alpha, 141$.
ке́кл $\eta \mu a \iota, 150$.
кย́клєца兀， 115.
$\kappa є к \lambda о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о с, ~ 144 . ~$
$\kappa \varepsilon ́ \kappa \lambda о ф а, ~ 151$.
$\kappa \varepsilon ́ \kappa \lambda \nu \theta \iota, 152$.
кє́кцпкка， 141.
кєкцך $\omega$ с， 37.141.
$к є к о \rho \eta \omega ́ я, ~ 154$.
кє́кофа， 153.
кекра́àтаи， 154.

кє́краүа， 154.
кє́крака，202． 211.
кєкра́そонає， 154.
кє́крах ${ }^{\text {® }}, 200$.
кє́кр $\eta к а, 211$.
кє́крә $\mu \alpha, 145$.
кє́крєка，кє́крєцає， 156.
кєки́ $\theta \omega, 146$.
кย́ขба兀， 144.
кย́оута！， 143.
кย́ $\mathrm{\rho}$ ， 145.
кє́раєє，кє́раєрє， 145.
$\kappa \varepsilon \rho а ́ \sigma \omega, 144$.
$\kappa \varepsilon ́ \rho \sigma \omega, 143$.
кєрш̃， 144.
кย́คюขта兀，кєрต̃ขтац， 145.
кย́бкєто， 143.
$\kappa \varepsilon ́ \chi a \nu \delta a, 263$.
кєХа́рךка，кєХа́р $\eta \mu a t$, 263.
$\kappa \varepsilon \chi а \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \nu, \kappa \varepsilon \chi \propto \rho \bar{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon-$ тац， 263.
$\kappa \varepsilon \chi \alpha \rho \eta \omega ́ s, 37.262$.
$\kappa \varepsilon \chi a \rho \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu o \varsigma, \kappa \varepsilon \chi$ крó $\mu \eta \nu$ ， 263.

кย́ $\chi$ єб $\mu \boldsymbol{\iota}, 264$.
кє́хทขа， 264.
кє́ $\chi \lambda a \delta \alpha, 266$.

кє́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, ~ к \varepsilon ́ \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha!$, 267.

кє́ $\chi \omega \omega \sigma \mu$ ， 271.
кє́Хขка，кє́Хขนą， 265.
$\kappa \varepsilon ́ \chi \omega \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 266$.
кท̆aı，ки̃ov， 140.
$\kappa \tilde{\tau} \boldsymbol{1}, 143$.

кіठ̀ $\nu \eta \mu, 226$.
$\kappa i \rho \nu \eta \mu, 144$.
кєхєiŋข，кєхп̄ขац， 147.
кі $\chi \rho \eta \mu, 268$.
кіх ${ }^{\omega}, 147$.
$\kappa \lambda a \xi \tilde{\omega}, 151$.
к入аи́бонаи， 149.
$\kappa \lambda \eta$ п́горає， 141.
$\kappa \lambda \eta i \zeta \omega, 150$.
$\kappa \lambda \eta \hat{t} \omega, 150$.
$\kappa \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \omega, 150$.
клı $\bar{\omega}, 151$.
$\kappa о \lambda \tilde{\omega}, \kappa о \lambda \tilde{\omega} \mu a \ell, 152$. краєаі́vш， 154. $\kappa \rho а \varepsilon \varepsilon є \sigma \theta a!, 154$. крє $\mu$ о́ш，крє $\mu \tilde{\omega}, 155$.
крท $\nu$ гає， 154.
кр $\eta$ $\theta \varepsilon i ¢, 145$.
кри́ $\mu \nu \eta \mu$ ， 155.
крйขоу， 154.
кри́лттабкоข， 223.
$\kappa т а і \eta \nu, \kappa т а ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu, 158$.
ктával，53．note， 158.
ктаує́оута，ктаข日п̈vає， $\kappa \tau \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \theta a, 158$.
$\kappa т \varepsilon ́ \omega, \kappa \tau \varepsilon ́ \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu, 158$.
ктіขขขри， 159.
$\kappa v ́ \theta \varepsilon, 146$.

## $\Lambda$.

Мaөziv， 163.
$\lambda а к и \sigma \omega, 164$.
$\lambda \alpha ́ \mu \psi о \mu а \iota, 162,163$.
$\lambda a ́ \xi о \mu \alpha \iota, 162$.
$\lambda а \sigma \varepsilon \tilde{v} \mu a \iota, 163$.
$\lambda \alpha \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu, 163$.
$\lambda \alpha \sigma \tilde{\omega}, 163$.
$\lambda a \psi o \tilde{v} \mu \alpha!, \quad \lambda a \psi \varepsilon \tilde{v} \mu \alpha \iota$, 162.

入єїлє， 3.
入є入ábŋка， 162.

入غ́лака，入єла́коуто， 164.
入ह́ланиаі，$\lambda \varepsilon \lambda a ́ \phi \theta a \iota$, 162.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda a \mu \pi a, 163$.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu a \iota, 163$.
入є $\lambda a ́ \chi \omega \sigma \iota, 162$.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha \iota, 164$.
入єієєХ $\mu$ о́тєє， 166.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \theta a, 163$.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \kappa а, 164$.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \mu \mu a!, 162$.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \mu a, 163$.
入єлíquац， 166.
入é入oү $\chi$ a， 162.
入є́лоเта， 165.
入є入і́бонац，169． 208.
入є́ $\lambda \nu \tau$ о， 169.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \xi a \iota, \lambda \varepsilon ́ \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota, 165$.
$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \xi \varepsilon \varepsilon, \lambda \varepsilon ́ \xi o, 7,165$.

入ŋӨáv曰， 164.
$\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega, \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta о \mu \alpha, 163$.
入ієонає， 162.
$\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\imath}, 163$.
入оє́єбооцац，入óє，入óov， 167.
$\lambda \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu, \lambda u ́ \tau o, \lambda \tilde{v} \theta \imath, 169$.

## M．

Маө́́бонає， 170.
цаќ́v， 175.
$\mu а \nu \eta \boldsymbol{\nu о \mu а \iota , ~} 169$.
$\mu a \pi \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon เ \nu, 170$.
$\mu а ́ \sigma о \mu а є, 172$.
$\mu \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon і ̃ \mu \iota, 115.175$.
$\mu \varepsilon Ө$ ієто，116． 175.
$\mu \varepsilon \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\tilde{\eta}} \nu \alpha, 174$.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu a \alpha, 171.175$.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu а у \mu a \iota, 170$.
нєцакшйа， 38.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \alpha \lambda \varepsilon, 174$.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu a \mu \varepsilon \nu, 171$.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu \alpha ́ \nu \eta \mu \alpha \iota, 169$.
нє́ $\mu а р т о \nu, 170$.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu а \chi а, 170$.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu a \dot{\omega}$ ， 171.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu Є \lambda \varepsilon \tau \alpha, 174$.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu$ Бөка，39．note， 44.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta \kappa \varepsilon, 174$.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \eta \kappa \alpha, 175$.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon т \iota є ́ v o \varsigma, ~ 116 . ~ 175 . ~$
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \eta \kappa \alpha, 175$.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \eta \lambda \varepsilon, 174$.
нє́ $\mu \eta$ ขа，5．note， 169.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu і а б \mu а \iota, ~ 12 . ~ n o t e . ~$
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \nu \eta \mu \alpha, 176$.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu о ́ \lambda v \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, ~ 12 . ~ n o t e . ~$
нє́ коуа， 175.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu о ́ \rho \eta т а є, 173$.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu о р \mu \varepsilon ́ v о с, 173$.
$\mu \varepsilon \mu \nu \zeta$ о́тє， 166.
нє́ $\boldsymbol{\mu к к а , ~} 178$.
$\mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon a i ́ v \omega, ~ \mu \varepsilon ข \varepsilon ́ \eta \nu a, ~ 175 . ~$
$\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \theta \rho \in ́ \xi о \mu \alpha \iota, 246$.
нєтанє́入єє， 173.
$\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \pi \omega^{\prime} \nu, 97$.
$\mu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon i ́ \omega, 84$.
$\mu \varepsilon т \varepsilon к і а Ө о \nu, 149$.

｜$\mu \varepsilon \tau і є є, ~ \mu \varepsilon т і \varepsilon т о, 116.175$.

$\mu \nu a ̃ \sigma \theta a \ell, 177$.
$\mu \nu \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \tau \alpha \ell, \mu \nu \epsilon \omega ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu о \varsigma, 177$.
$\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, 176$.
$\mu \nu$ ผ́орто， 177.
$\mu о \lambda о \tilde{v} \mu a \iota$, 39．note， 44.
$\mu \bar{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota, 172$.

## N ．

Náббоцає， 178.
ขยі̃aц，ขยїта！， 181.
ขєí $\sigma \sigma \theta \varepsilon, 181$.
ขє́vактаı， 179.
ขย́va $\sigma \mu a \iota, 178$.
 180.

ขє́vєциая， 181.
ขย́vофа，179．note．
ขє́vюцน兀， 182.
$\nu \varepsilon \tilde{v} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}, 181$.
ขєข́тонац， 181.
$\nu$ ท́єov， 180.
$\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \omega, \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, 180$.
访 $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ ，ขท่хоцає， 181.
ขіббоуто， 182.
$\nu \omega \dot{\mu \varepsilon \nu o \varsigma, ~ \nu \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau а, ~ \nu \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu, ~}$ 180.

## E．

Zンүкатак入ерєíc， 151.
$\xi v \gamma \chi \varepsilon ́ \omega, 265$.
छv $\lambda \lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\varepsilon} \gamma \mu$ ย́vos， 165.

## note．


$\xi_{\nu \mu} \boldsymbol{\text { б }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu, 39$.
ч́и $\mu \mu \varepsilon є к т а, 176$.
そuv่є，そúvtov， 116.
O．
＂О $0 \omega \delta, 183$.
öóvívaтat， 183.
ó弓 ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \omega, 183$.
oỉ 1,78 ．82．note．
oiñaनөa， 185.
oîka，77．note，81， 82.
note．
ō $\mu$ ає， 184.
оібӨі́бонаı， 252.
oï $\sigma \omega, 251$.
оіххшка， 112.
óкw $\chi^{\alpha}, 112$.
อ̉入є́кєбкєv，ỏ入о́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu \circ ¢, 188$. oै $\lambda \omega \lambda a, 5$ ．note， 187. © $\mu о ข ̃ \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma, 188$.

 ${ }^{\text {o้v }} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \boldsymbol{}$ ，imperat．， 85. ம் $\pi \dot{v} \sigma \omega, 190$. оัт $\pi \pi \alpha, 192$. о் $\pi \dot{\omega} \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon, 77.192$. ореєттає，193， 194. о́рє́оуто， 194. öрךтаи，18．note， 193. о้рӨа兀，о̊ риє́vos， 193. ороутає， 194. \％＇рбабкє， 193. \％้рбєо，7． 193. \％้ $\rho \sigma \varepsilon v, 193$. ӧршра，6．note， 193. оро́рєуцає， 194. өрорєдає， 194. орю́риурає， 195. ӧбфраขто，9． 195. oṽ，imperat．， 116.
 จข้ขє $\sigma \theta \varepsilon, 190$.
 ö $\chi$ ， 112. охшка，112．186．note． oै $\psi о \mu$ и， 191.

## II．

Па̃лто， 198.
тараЄєєацає， 37.
таракалойขтая， note．
тара́әта， 134.
$\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho а \sigma \chi \varepsilon, 112$.
$\pi а \rho a ́ \sigma \chi \omega, 111$.
тарафөаіךбє， 255.
тарахє́ $\omega v, 265$.
таро̀́јбонає， 205. тарєкаөє́ לєто， 130. $\pi a \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \omega \nu, 215$. тарй $\gamma \gamma_{є \lambda є, ~ 2, ~}^{2}$. тарє $ш \mu \varepsilon y, 116$. note．
тароіхонає，таро́х $\eta \kappa \varepsilon \nu$ ， тарфхच $\mu \boldsymbol{\iota}$ ， 186.
та́бабөац， 199.
$\pi a \tau a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, 215$.
$\pi \varepsilon i v, \pi \varepsilon i v, 210$. $\pi \varepsilon і б о \mu а є, 199$. $\pi \varepsilon \lambda a ́ \theta \omega, 203$. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \xi_{\omega}, 201$.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \alpha \theta \nu$ и̃a， 199.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota, 198$ ．note．
тєтарєі้̃， 217.
$\pi$ ќтабацц， 199.
лє́лєєка， 200.
$\pi є \pi \varepsilon i ́ \rho a \nu \tau а \iota, 202.205$. тєпеíparaı，205．note．

$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \varepsilon \mu \mu \alpha \iota, 205$.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ v$ ос， 204.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \iota \iota, 205$.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \rho \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \circ \varsigma, 204.211$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \varepsilon \phi \theta a \iota, 205$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \eta \gamma a$ ，5．note， 208.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \eta \theta a, 199$.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi i \varepsilon \gamma \mu a \iota, \quad \pi \varepsilon \pi i \varepsilon \sigma \mu a \iota$, $\pi \varepsilon \pi i \varepsilon \chi \theta a \iota, 208$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \iota \theta o v, 200.251$.
$\pi \varepsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha \iota, 214$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \varepsilon v \kappa \alpha, \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \varepsilon v \sigma \mu a \iota$, 214.
$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha, \quad \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \mu \alpha$, 215.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \gamma o v, 6$. note， 216.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \varepsilon \pi \lambda \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \varsigma$, 202.
$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 209$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \omega к а, 214$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \nu v \mu a \iota, \pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \nu v \sigma o, 216$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi o t \theta a, ~ 5 . ~ n o t e, ~ 200, ~$ 201.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi т о а \iota, 210$.
тє́тоцфа，151． 204.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi о \nu \theta a, 199$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi о р \delta а, ~ 205$.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi о р \varepsilon і ้, 217$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi о р \theta a, 205$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi о \sigma \theta \varepsilon, 76$. note． 199.
тєто́тацаи，тєло́тŋцаи， 207.
$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho a \gamma \alpha, 218$.
тє́трака，202． 211.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \rho а \mu \alpha!, \pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \theta \alpha!$, $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho a ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, 211 . \quad \pi \varepsilon \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega, 254$.
＇лє́ $\pi \rho a \chi \alpha, 218$.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v$ ос， 210.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi р \iota \sigma \mu \alpha, 219$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \rho \omega \mu \alpha, 217$.
пє́ттацає，205． 207. note．
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \varepsilon \dot{\omega} g, 212$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \eta к а, 207$.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \eta \omega ' s, 37.207$ ．note， 220.
$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \omega, 205$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega \kappa \alpha$, 6．note， 207.
note， 212.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \omega \dot{\varrho}, 212$.
$\pi \varepsilon \pi \dot{v} \theta$ оєто，$\quad \pi \varepsilon ́ \pi v \sigma \mu a \iota$, 220.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega \kappa a, 210$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha ́ \omega, \pi \varepsilon \rho a ́ \sigma \omega, \pi \varepsilon \rho \not ̨ \nu$, $\pi \varepsilon р a ́ q \nu, 211$.
$\pi \varepsilon р і \delta \delta \varepsilon і ̈ \sigma a, 59$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho เ \varepsilon і \pi \varepsilon ย, 97$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho є \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega}, 9$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varepsilon ́ \rho \xi а \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma, 91$. note．
$\pi \varepsilon \rho$ ย́ $\sigma \pi \varepsilon, 97$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varepsilon ф \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota, \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varepsilon ф \theta$ 亿́－ बєन $\theta a \ell, \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varepsilon ́ \psi \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, 97.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \eta \gamma \varepsilon ́ \omega, 121$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho ı ́ n \rho \chi \varepsilon \tau о, 107$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \theta \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \alpha \iota, 246$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \nu \varepsilon ์ \varepsilon \iota \nu, 179$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \pi \varepsilon ф \lambda \varepsilon v \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \varsigma, 258$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \pi \lambda б \mu \varepsilon \nu о \varsigma, 203$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \sigma \pi \varepsilon і ้, 97$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota ф \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon, 257$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \nu \eta \mu$ ， 211 ．
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}, 211$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varepsilon є \varepsilon, \pi \varepsilon \sigma о ข ̃ \mu \alpha \iota, 212$.
$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau a \mu a \iota, \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota, 206$, 207.
$\pi \varepsilon \tau \tilde{a} \sigma a t, 207$ ．note．
$\pi \varepsilon \tau \tilde{\omega}, 205$.
$\pi \varepsilon \dot{v} \theta о \mu a i, \pi \varepsilon \dot{v} \sigma о \mu a \iota, 220$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi а \gamma к а, 249$.
тє́фа $\mu a \iota, 208$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi а \sigma \mu \alpha$, 12． 249.
$\pi \varepsilon ф а \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \varsigma, ~ 208 . ~ 249 . ~$ 254.
$\pi \varepsilon ่ ф \eta \nu a, 5$. note， 249.
$\pi \varepsilon ф и$ понає，208． 250.

$\pi \varepsilon ф і \delta \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota, 251$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi о р 6 a, 251$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \iota, 258$.
$\pi \varepsilon ф р а б \mu \mu \iota, ~ \pi \varepsilon ́ ф р а б \mu а є$,
258.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \rho a \delta o v, 258$.
тє́фрика，тєфрі́коутая， 259.

тєфv́aティ， 262.
$\pi \varepsilon ф и \zeta$ б́тєя， 166.
тєфи́рбонаь， 261.
$\pi \varepsilon ф ข \omega ́ я, 262$.
лй $\lambda a \sigma \theta a, 198$.
$\pi \dot{\eta} \xi \omega, 208$.
$\pi \dot{\eta} \sigma$ ая， 199.
$\pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega, 208$.
$\pi เ \varepsilon \tau \sigma \theta \varepsilon, 210$.
$\pi \iota \in ́ \zeta \varepsilon \nu \nu, \quad \pi \iota \varepsilon \zeta \varepsilon \dot{\jmath} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 \varsigma$ ，
11．74．note．
$\pi เ \varepsilon \zeta$ иั้ขтоя， 208.

$\pi \tilde{\imath} \theta \iota, 210$.
$\pi i \theta \eta \sigma \omega, 200,201$.
$\pi i \lambda \nu \eta \mu, 203$.
$\pi i v, \pi i v, 210$.
$\pi เ v \varepsilon \dot{v} \mu \varepsilon \nu \neq c, 11$.
тіонаи，тьоулаи， 210.
$\pi เ \pi р а ́ \sigma \kappa \omega, 204$.
$\pi i \sigma \omega, 211$.
тítva，$\pi i$ itvav，$\pi$ itvác， 206.
$\pi \iota \tau \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega, \pi i ́ \tau \nu \omega, \pi i ́ \tau \nu \eta \mu \iota$, 206.
$\pi เ \tau \nu \varepsilon ์ \omega$ for $\pi i \pi \tau \omega, 213$.
тьфаи́бкш， 251.
тьфа́⿱亠乂兀， 259.
$\pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \xi \omega, 203.214$.
$\pi \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta \omega, \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \theta \omega, 203$.
$\pi \lambda \varepsilon i \mu \eta \nu, 209$.
$\pi \lambda \varepsilon i \nu, \tau \dot{\text { o }}, 66$.
$\pi \lambda \varepsilon \dot{v} \sigma о \mu a \iota, \pi \lambda \varepsilon v \sigma o \tilde{\nu} \mu \iota$ ， 214.
$\pi \lambda \eta \gamma \nu \nu \mu, 216$.
$\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma о, 209$.
$\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, 208$.
$\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \tau о, 202$.
$\pi \lambda \omega \varrho, \pi \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau 0 \varsigma, 215$.
$\pi \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \omega, 214$.
$\pi о \lambda v \pi \alpha ́ \mu \mu \omega v, 198$ ．note． тота́она！，тотє́оутаи， 207.

тотє́os， 210.

тото́с， 210.
$\pi \rho a \theta \varepsilon i v, 205$.
$\pi \rho \alpha \theta$ пбонає， 211.
$\pi \rho i ́ a \sigma \theta a \iota, 218$.
$\pi \rho i ́ \omega, \pi \rho i \omega \mu \alpha, 219$.
$\pi \rho о ́ 6 a, \pi \rho \circ$ б̃ข $\tau \varepsilon, 37$.
$\pi \rho о ́ \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon, \pi \rho \circ \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \ell, 116$.
$\pi \rho о \varepsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ a \tau \varepsilon, \quad \pi \rho о \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau a \tau \varepsilon$, 137.
$\pi \rho о \varepsilon ́ \omega \sigma a, 219$.
$\pi$ ро́ŋтає， 116.
$\pi \rho о$ ккка $\theta \varepsilon, 116$.
$\pi \rho о$ и́ $\phi$ агє， 250.
прои̃ $\chi$ а， 7.
$\pi \rho о \theta$ モ́оvбт， 125.
$\pi \rho o i ̂ \varepsilon \iota, ~ 116$ ．note．
$\pi \rho 0$ й $\varepsilon \iota, 116$.

$\pi \rho о о$ І̃бтає， 253.
троой， 116.
$\pi \rho о \sigma а р \eta \dot{\sigma \varepsilon \tau \kappa 兀,} 30$.
$\pi \rho п \sigma \delta$ ย́єтац， 65.
$\pi$ робєикє́vaı， 81.
$\pi \rho о б \varepsilon і ข a เ, 87$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tau \nu, 84$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon o v \rho o v v, ~ 196 . ~ n o t e . ~$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon ́ \pi \varepsilon \sigma a, 212$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda a \zeta \varepsilon, 203$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \eta$ خ̈ктаи，тробท̈ізаи，
81.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \tilde{\eta} \xi \alpha \nu, 7$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \theta i \xi \varepsilon \iota \varsigma, 125$. note．
$\pi \rho о \sigma к а \theta \iota \zeta$ ท＇$\sigma \varepsilon, 131$ ．note．
трошкєкєрঠ́ŋ́каб८， 145.
$\pi \rho о б к ข у \varepsilon \omega, ~ 160$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma о ф \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha, 197$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \pi \lambda a ́ \zeta o v, 203$.
$\pi \rho о \cup \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon і ข, 84$.
тןоvбке́ $\pi$ тєто，227， 228. note．
$\pi \rho о ф v \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \rho о ф u ́ \lambda a-$ $\chi^{\theta \varepsilon,} 260$.
$\pi \rho о \omega \theta \varepsilon ́ \omega, 219$.
$\pi \rho о ́ \omega \mu a \iota, 116$.
$\pi \rho о \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota, \pi \rho \tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha \iota, \pi \rho \omega^{\prime}-$
бac， 219.
$\pi \tau \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta a$, 97． 206.

$\pi \omega \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \mu \iota, 204$.

## P．

${ }^{\text {＇Pá }} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \omega, 222$.
คंєои́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu$ оц， 222.
рєрїфӘа， 223.
рєи́бонаи， 222.
рпӨŋ̆тонаи， 88.
ค́グббш， 222.
$\rho \eta$ то́с， 88.
คீоі́८абкє， 223.
р̀ขпбоцаи， 222.
คvба́ $\mu \eta, 104$.
$\Sigma$
इaoĩ，ซáov，баoṽб兀， 233. баó $\omega$ ，$\sigma$ á $\sigma \omega, 232,233$. баро́ш， 224.
$\sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega, 233$.


бєбарvĩa， 224.
бध́धєє $\sigma \mu \alpha, 225$.
бє́ $\eta \eta \pi a$, 5．note， 226.
бє́ $\quad \eta \rho a, 224$.
бє́бч $\mu \mu a \iota, 12$. note， 226.
бє́ $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha$, бє́ $\omega \omega \sigma \mu \downarrow, 232$.
бєṽтає，226．note．
бйрая， 224.
бкá入入 $\frac{227}{}$.
$\sigma \kappa i \delta \nu \eta \mu, 226$.
$\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, \quad \sigma \kappa \lambda \alpha i \not \eta \nu$ ， $\sigma \kappa \lambda \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota, 227$.
бо́q，бо́ทุс， 233.

 бо， 226.
бо́шテıv， 233.
$\sigma \pi \varepsilon \pi \nu, \sigma \pi \varepsilon i o, \sigma \pi \varepsilon ์ 0, \sigma \pi \varepsilon ́-$ $\sigma \theta a \imath, \sigma \pi o \bar{v}, \sigma \pi \omega \dot{\nu}, 97$.
бтаӨ＇порає， 134.
отаï $\nu, \sigma \tau а \tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \nu, 73.134$.
бта́ $\sigma к о у, 134$.

бтєіоцєу， 236.
बтєi $\omega, 73.135$.
бтєи̃тац， 230.
$\sigma \tau \varepsilon \epsilon, 73.134$.

бтйкєтє，$\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\kappa o \nu \tau \varepsilon}$ ， 135.
note．
$\sigma \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu a, 134$. $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \omega, \sigma \tau \eta \sigma о \mu a t, 134$. бтрढ́vvv $\mu, 231$.

биүкє́ŋтац，би́үкєєтає， 143.

бvц६ал入єо́дєขос， note．
 бं $\mu \varepsilon$ vos， 225 ．
бขниахє́єгаи， 171.
 11.

ธขขаขафvрє́ยтє६， 261.



бvขยvєікєтаи， 252.
$\sigma \nu \nu \varepsilon \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \alpha,, 98$.
бvрйчаs， 114.
бvi $\chi \bar{a} \varsigma, 7$.
 179.

бขvоХшко́те， 112.
бvбхб́нєvos， 112.
$\sigma \chi \ell, 112$.
$\sigma_{\chi \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon \tau \nu} \sigma_{\chi \varepsilon \theta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu,} 22$. 112.

бхยі， 97.111.
${ }_{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \sigma \theta a$ ，111．note．
$\sigma \omega \pi \tilde{q} v, 43$.
テテ̈̃น， 224.
$\sigma \dot{\omega} \omega, 232$.

> T.

Ta入́á $\sigma \omega, 243$.
 236.
$\tau a ́ p \phi \theta \eta, \tau \dot{a} \rho \phi \theta \varepsilon v, 236$.
$\tau \varepsilon ́ \theta a \lambda a, 122$.
$\tau \in \theta a ́ \phi \theta \omega, 123$.
тєӨє́̀ $\eta к а, 76$.

Té $\theta \eta \lambda a, 122$.
$\tau \varepsilon ́ \theta \eta \pi a, 123$.

$\tau \in \theta \lambda \iota \mu \mu$ и́ $\eta, 126$.

$\tau \varepsilon \theta v \dot{\xi} \xi \omega, \quad \tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \xi \rho a$, 126， 127.
тध́धoра， 128.
тє́өрациаи， 245.
T＇धि $a \phi \theta \varepsilon, 245$ ．note．
те́өvццає， 248.
те́кето， 241.
$\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \omega, 243$ ．note．


тє́таүиаи， 234.
тєтаүш́v， 233.
те́така，233， 234.
тย̇тад $\mu \iota, 235$.
тє́тацаи，208． 234.
тéávvø $\mu a, 234$.
тєтарто́ $\boldsymbol{\eta \nu , 2 3 6 . ~}$
тย́тафа， 122.
тє́єєүнаи， 241.
$\tau \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \mu \mu \iota, 235$.
тє́тєvүиа兀， 239.
тєтєйцодац，238， 239.
тétevха， 238.
 239.
 239．note．
т $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \chi$ Й $\sigma \theta a u, 237$.
тétทкa，5．note， 240.
 240.

тetin $\sigma \theta o v, 240$.
тєт $\eta \omega \dot{\varrho}, 37.240$.

тє́т $\lambda \eta \kappa \alpha, 243$.
тєє $\lambda \eta \dot{\omega} \dot{\prime}, 37.243$.
т $\tau$ т $\mu \eta, 237$.

тє́тนทุя， 237.
$\tau \varepsilon \tau \mu \eta \sigma о \mu a, 235$.
т $\tau \mu \eta \omega ́ \varrho, 37.235$ ．note．
тє́т $\mu о \nu, 237$.
те́тоүиає， 241.
те́тока， 240.

тєторทं $\sigma \omega$ ，тє́торор， 243.
тє́тра $\mu \mu и$ ，тє́тратто， 244.

тє́трафа，тєтра́фатаи，тє－ тра́фато， 244.
тéтрафӨ̇u，245．note，
тєтра́ $\theta \omega, 244$.
тєтрах $\nu \mu$ ย́vog，12．note．

тетр $\eta$ ข $\omega$ ，241．note．
тย́т $\quad \eta \chi a, 234$.
 247.

тє́трццди， 247.
тє́трофа，151．243． 245.
тยтрих $\omega \mu$ ย́vos， 247.
тет $\rho \omega \mu$ и́vos， 241.
тє́тvүцаи， 238.
 239.

тยтú $\eta$ пка，238， 239.
т $̇$ т́x $\theta a u, 238$.
$\tau \varepsilon v \chi \theta \dot{\nu} \nu, \tau \dot{\sigma}, 239$.
$\tau \tilde{\eta}, \tau \tilde{\eta} \tau \varepsilon, 233$.
тitaive，240．note．

т入ás， 242.
$\tau \mu \eta \gamma \omega, 236$.
торви́ш， 243.
$\tau \rho a \pi \varepsilon і ̈ о \mu \varepsilon \nu, 236$.
$\tau \rho a \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \omega, 244$.
$\tau \rho a \pi \varepsilon ́ \omega \mu \varepsilon \nu, 236$.
тра́т $\omega, 244$.
$\tau \rho a \pi \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu, 236$.
$\tau \rho a \phi \theta \varepsilon i{ }^{2} 244$.
тра́ұш， 246.
трєí 247.
$\tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \varepsilon, \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma a \nu, 247$.
$\tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma \omega, 247$.
трєфӫ̈гat， 244.
$\tau \rho \eta \sigma \omega, 241$.
$\tau \rho \omega \sigma \omega, 241$.
$\tau \rho \dot{\omega} \omega, 242$.

## $\Upsilon$ ．

＇Yォa入єย́ยo， 15.
$\dot{v \pi \varepsilon \mu \nu \eta} \mu \nu \kappa \alpha, 122$.
ข่тєрБа入入є́єєv，74．note．

vi $\pi \varepsilon \delta \rho \propto \mu \tilde{\omega}, 246$ ．note．
 ข $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \chi$ о́ $\mu \eta \nu, 114$. ข๋ாเ๐ $\chi^{\nu \varepsilon ์ o \mu a \iota, ~} 114$. ข̇т́́єкоу， 80.

ขтокрірорає， 156.
ข̀тоцо́Өєขтоц， 188.
ขлтоиоб $\theta$ síaŋ， 188.

ілтобхŋ́бонає， 113.
v̇офф́шккєє，251．note．
Ф.

Фа́үш，фáүoца兀， 108. фáध，фаєiv，фаєív $\omega, 250$. фа́ $\ell$ 九，фаíp $\nu, 254$.
$\phi$ аї $\mu v, 255$.
фа́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu о$ с， 254.
ф ́́v， 255.
фávat，254， 255.
фáovaat， 250.
фác，ф́́⿱өat，фá $\sigma \kappa \omega, 254$.
фє́рєбкє，фє́рךб兀，фє́ртє， 253.
$\phi \eta \eta_{\uparrow}, 255$.
$\phi \eta \mu i, 89.254$.
$\phi \tilde{\eta} \nu, 255$.
$\phi \theta a ́ s, \phi \theta a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s, \phi \theta a ́ \xi \omega$ ， 255.

фөарйбонац， 256.
$\phi \theta \varepsilon і ̈ \tau o, ~ 256 . ~ n o t e . ~$
$\phi \theta \varepsilon ́ \rho \sigma \omega, \phi \theta \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}, 256$.
$\phi \theta i \quad \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, \phi \theta \tilde{\omega}, 255$.
 ing）， 251.
форє́ш， 253.
$\phi \rho a ́ \delta \eta$（false reading）， 258.
$\phi v \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega, \phi v \rho \eta ́ \sigma \omega, 260$.

## X．

Xaiv ${ }^{2}$ रаvõ̃ $\mu \alpha, 264$.
харท́бонаи， 263.
$\chi^{\varepsilon}$ Ө̄̄̀ии， 266.
хвібораи， 263.
$\chi^{\varepsilon о ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o v, ~ f u t ., ~} 265$.
$\chi^{\varepsilon} \dot{\nu}^{\omega} \omega$ ，fut．， 265.
$\chi^{\varepsilon} \dot{v} \omega$ aor．1．conjunct．， 265.

хทрато， 263.
хра̃та！，хра̃бөаь， 268.
хрє́єтац， 268.
$\chi \rho \varepsilon i \omega v, 267$.
$\chi \rho \varepsilon ́ \omega, 268$.
хрŋіткодає， 269.
$\chi \rho \dot{\omega} \zeta \omega, 271$.
хи́ $\mu \varepsilon \nu o s, 265$.
$\chi ш \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha, 266$.
хє́тонац， 271.
$\chi \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega, 266$.
$\Psi v ́ \omega, 220$.
$\Psi$.

## $\Omega$.

${ }^{\top} \Omega, 115$.
ف்ठَváá $\eta \nu, 183$.
ありЕ $\sigma a, ~ あ \zeta \eta \sigma a, 183$.
$\omega^{\dot{\omega}} \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu, 184$.
ஸ̈̈ ஸ̀vขто，$^{183 .}$
だँ゙そ a， 183.
 $\sigma \theta \eta \nu, 185$.
ढ̈ $\lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha, \dot{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 187$.
$\dot{\omega} \lambda i ́ \sigma \theta \eta \kappa \alpha, \quad \dot{\omega} \lambda i ́ \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a$ ， 187.

$\omega^{\top} \mu \alpha \iota, 116$.
थ゙ $\mu \eta \nu, 184$.
ఉ $\mu \mu a \iota, 191$.
๘นขvє， 188.
ॐ $\mu о р \xi а, 188$.
ڤ̈ $\mu \sigma \sigma a, \dot{\omega} \mu \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu, 188$.
$\ddot{\varphi} \mu \omega \xi \approx, 184$.
ஸ̀ $\nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ，from $\dot{o} v i v \eta \mu$ ， 189.

ต̀vá $\mu \eta \nu$ ，from ővoца兀， 190.

ढ̈ท $\eta \sigma a, 189$.


సे $\xi a, 183$.
ढ̈ргоу， 191.
ढ̈рєто，18．note， 193.
ढ́рє́ $\chi$ Ө $\eta \nu, 193$.
б́р $\mu \nu$, 158．note， 193.
ढ́рv́́ $\mu \eta, 193$.
ढроуто， 194.
Єрорє，6．note， 193.
屯рvұцаи， 195.
ఉрю́рєє， 193.
$\dot{\omega}^{\circ} \rho \sigma \alpha, 53.193$.
ఉं $\rho \tau$ т，18．note，51．note．
$\omega_{\omega} \rho \omega \nu, 191$.
$\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho o ́ \mu \eta \nu, \quad \dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ， $\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu,-195$.
$\omega \bar{\omega} \omega \omega, 272$.
$\ddot{\omega} \phi \varepsilon \lambda o \nu, \ddot{\omega} \phi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu, ~ \ddot{\omega} \phi \varepsilon \iota-$ $\lambda o v, 196$.
むं $\phi \theta \alpha \iota, \ddot{\omega} \phi \theta \eta, 191$.
ひ̈ф $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon, 77.114 .197$.

थ̈ $\chi \eta \mu a \iota, 186$.
ยхо́ $\mu \eta \nu, 185,186$.


[^0]:    8

[^1]:    * Of these $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ only has an aor. 2. consequently is placed in the following catalogue as an exception to a general analogy.

[^2]:    [* used in an active sense; but see Lexilog. p. 8. and note.-Ed.]
    [ $\dagger$ I find the $\alpha$ in $\dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ marked long both in Maltby's Lex. Prosod. and in Passow's Gr. and Germ. Lex. I know of only two passages where the word occurs, viz.

[^3]:    ＊Bekker has however，following the majority of his manuscripts，placed it in the text at the former of these passages； in which I think he has acted less judi－

[^4]:    ciously than at 15 ．p．149，32．of the same work，where he has adopted from one ma－ nuscript the imperfect in the place of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \in \lambda o \nu$ ，which is evidently incorrect．

[^5]:    tain Buttmann must have confounded this with some other passage.]
    $\dagger$ [Yet Schweighäuser has retained ant $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \mathrm{y} \in \lambda o \nu$ in Herodot. 4, 153.]
    $\ddagger$ [Dindorf reads $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ons.]

[^6]:    * Formed according to the general rule of verbs in $\mu \mathrm{l}$ from the obsolete $\alpha \gamma \omega$, like
    

[^7]:    $\dagger$ As the perf. 2. generally gives the preference to the intrans. sense, we find in a great number even of transitive verbs

[^8]:    
    
    
    
    
    
     under $\beta$ oúлoua. From this its connexion with passive or middle forms arose the improper appellation of the perfect midd.

[^9]:    ＊Thus we find in prose the similar form 茙иєүкоу，е̇уеүкєî̀（see фє́рш）；and the following poetic aorists：ypăpoy，conj．
     \＆c．；see AX $\Omega$ ．方 $\pi \alpha \phi o \nu, ~ \alpha \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \nu$ ；see
     ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda a \lambda \kappa \epsilon i \nu, \& c . ;$ see $ఓ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \xi \omega$ ．ఓрорє，3．pers．
     vimтov）；see evintw．If we compare these forms with 万̄ $\gamma a \gamma o \nu, \lambda e ́ \lambda \alpha \theta o \nu, \pi \epsilon ́-$ $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma o v$, we shall see that they are un－ doubted aorists，notwithstanding all which has been said to the contrary．

[^10]:    [* ${ }^{\top} \mathrm{Hka}$ is the regularly formed perfect of ${ }^{6} \delta \omega$; but there is no trace of its haviag been ever in use.-Ed.]
    

[^11]:    ${ }^{2}$ A $\sigma$ ouau is properly Attic (see Markl. Eurip. Suppl. 932. Brunck. Aristoph. Vesp. 1228. Fr. 1294.), but is found in Hom. Hymn. 5, 2. Less pure is the fu.

[^12]:    $\$ \sigma \omega$, but found sometimes in the Attics, as in Eurip. Herc. F.681. Dor. $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \sigma \hat{\omega}$, Theocrit. 1,145 . 'Acíco is used by the nonAttic poets, and is found in Hom. Epig. 14, 1. attributed by Pollux to Hesiod. Passow.]

    * [Homer uses in the present both

[^13]:    aðōoual and aiठéo $\mu a t$, but forms all his tenses from the latter, which is also the prevailing form in prose.- Passow.]
    $+[\mathrm{In}$ good prose writers we seldom if ever find aivéw, always etaivém.-Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ See note under $\Delta \epsilon \in \omega, I$ bind.

[^14]:    * See note under $\Delta \epsilon^{\epsilon} \omega$, I bind.
    $\dagger$ Not a few instances of the others are however to be found in the dialects; àфе́лаı, Inscr. ap. Chishull. p. 138. 1. 5.éçdi入a in Maittaire from a Byzantine writer, and the part. ajodyas in Hesy-

[^15]:    * The sense of this passage has however been obscured by all the editors before Seidler, by misunderstanding the construction of $\mu$ év- $\delta \hat{\text { É }}$
    + Porson (on Eurip. Med, 848.) first introduced this spondaic future, but by a

[^16]:    slight mistake he thought to be able to form aip $\hat{\omega}$ also from $\alpha \bar{i} \rho \hat{\omega}$, in order to approach nearer to the text as handed down: and thus this barbaric form actually crept into some later editions. Elmsley (on Eurip. Heracl. 323.) corrected it.

[^17]:    *This is the article Aipéj $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$; for so it is now written, and the spiritus is repeated several times, until the grammarian quotes the form again; and then, as well as in the verse of Hesiod which is subjoined, it is expressly written aipev́ $\mu \in \nu o \nu$. But the beginning of the article, until we come to one grand mistake, is quite correct in the old Venetian editions, of which I will here transcribe the whole: A ipcú-
    
    
    
     In Sylburg's edition the first word and the three which follow $\pi \lambda$ govar $\mu \dot{0}$ have the aspirate; whence arose the unintelligible sentence, aipw....кard $\pi \lambda \in o \nu \alpha-$ $\sigma \mu \delta{ }^{\nu}$ aip $\omega$, which Sylburg himself confessed he did not understand. It must be alp . ...ккатג $\pi \lambda \in о \nu \alpha \sigma \mu \partial \nu$ aip $\omega$, and the pleonasm consists in the circumflex, i. e. in the cencealed under it, from which

[^18]:    * Before the termination $\mu \alpha l$ of the perf. pass, the $\nu$ undergoes three changes:
     ( $\xi \eta p a i \nu \omega$ ), Athen. 3. p. 80., and in $\sigma \in-$ бıццаı ( $\sigma l \nu \omega)$, $\sigma \in \sigma t \mu \mu \in ́ \nu o s$, Inser. Chish. p. 130.

    2. Generally into $\sigma$, as in $\pi$ е́фаб $\mu a$,
    
    3. The $\nu$ is rejected and the vowel remains long, тєт $\propto \propto \chi \nu \mu$ ย́vos, Aristot. H. A. 4,9. This takes place very rarely.

    + See note on drayeiv under "Ayw.
    $\ddagger$ From the aor. 2. act., as being a most necessary and consequently a most ancient

[^19]:    * In forming the Attic reduplication the temp. augm, of the second syllable is sometimes neglected; for instance in
     $\chi \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\rho} \rho \eta \kappa \alpha$, д̀ $\rho \alpha i ́ \rho \eta \mu \alpha$.
    $\dagger$ [No pure Attic writer has the fut, act. ákov́ $\sigma \omega$, Schæf. Greg. p. 1063. It first

[^20]:    occurs three times in Lycophr., then in the LXX and the N. T., and more frequently in later writers, as Dion. Hal., Lucian Navig. 11. Jacobs' Anth. Poet. vol. i. p. l., vol. 3. pp. 552. 580.1024. and particularly Schæf. Appar. Demosth. vol. 2. p. 232.Passow.

[^21]:     －Passow．］
    ＋One can hardly help suspecting that this，by a very common mistake，is cor－ rupted from $\dot{a} \lambda \delta i \sigma \kappa \omega$ ：but the great unanimity of authorities forbids it．［Pas－ sow marks $\dot{\omega} \lambda \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \kappa \omega$ in his Lexicon as very doubtful．Schneider gives a transi－ tive sense of àдठ̄クбк from Schæf．Theocr． $17,78$.

[^22]:    $\ddagger$［＇Ava入ōhбкоутєs，Apollon．Rhod．3， 1363．＇Албोбкоvба！，Eratosthenes，where
     Suid．＇Adסalyovot，Nicand．Al．402．${ }^{2}$ Ev．
     $\nu a \sigma \alpha$ ，transit．409．＇A ${ }^{\prime} \hat{\prime} \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \kappa \in \nu$ ，from à $\lambda \delta \epsilon \in \omega$ ，Orph．Lith．364．＇ $\mathrm{A} \lambda \delta \dot{\cup} \nu \eta \tau a l$ ， Quint．Sm．9，473．where Rhodomannus
     Schneid．Suppl．］

[^23]:    ＊＇A $a \lambda$ кwiv is，as far as I know，always correctly written thus，and with the infin． む入a入кєล̆ will therefore prove 行алкоу， に $\lambda а \lambda \kappa о \nu$ to be undoubted aorists ；although the only Homeric passage of this indica－ tive（II．$\psi, 185$. ）requires the imperfect． But then in Hes． ，527．it is as plainly an aorist．This single exception in Hom．may quite as likely arise from a false reading having crept in during the transmission of

[^24]:    those very ancient poems，as from an in－ distinctness of tense：and as $\alpha_{\mu} \mu \nu y_{0}$ is a various reading for $\dot{\alpha} \lambda d \lambda$ rot at II．$\phi, 138$. 539，so may auve have been the true reading in 11．$\psi, 185$.

    + See note on गै $\gamma a y$ oy under ${ }^{\text {NA }}$ 人w．And Buttm．Lexilog．pp．132． 548.
    $\ddagger$［Its root seems to be akin to $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ， ỏ $\lambda \alpha$ l，oủ $\lambda \alpha$ ，mola，molere：Buttm．Lexilog． p． 259.

[^25]:    ＊The Epics frequently shorten on ac－ count of the metre the long vowel of the conjunctive，changing $\omega$ and $\eta$ back again into o and e；instances may be found in I1．$\beta .440 . \xi, 87 . v, 173$ ．Od．$\alpha, 41 . ~ \delta, 672$. $\kappa, 355$.
    $\dagger$［It is generally used with an accus． but also with infin．I1．§，167，ע，356．－ In Apoll．Rh．3，650．à a deelveiv is intransit．to retire．－Schneid．and Pas－ sow．］

[^26]:    $\ddagger$［We find $\dot{d \lambda} \theta$ lorco twice in Hippocr． 7，563．D．＇A $\lambda \theta d \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，Aretæus p．61．B． इivva入өd $\sigma \sigma \omega$, Hippoer．p．758．＇A入ө́́ $\sigma \sigma \omega$ Aret．3．13．${ }^{\text {＇} A \lambda \theta \in \xi \in \tau \alpha!, ~ A r e t . ~ p . ~ 42 . ~ C . ~}$ ${ }^{\prime} A \lambda \theta \in \xi!s$, Aret．2，1．and a various reading in Hippocr．758．E．－Schneider．］
     am broken，torn；in．later writers $\pi$ é $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha$ ， I am struck；in Hom．тeтevx由́s；and in the Lat．vapulo．See note p． 5 ．
    $\|$ See note under 「iqvaronc．

[^27]:    ＊These，like many other irregular forms， had originally the digamma，and were therefore＇E－FAA $\Omega$ N FE－FAA $\Omega K A,{ }^{\prime} E-F E \Sigma$ ミATS FE－FEETO．But when the digamma was changed to the aspirate，they took the augment according to the analogy of other aspirated verbs，consequently $\varepsilon \cdot d \lambda \omega \nu$ ， whence ${ }^{5} \lambda \omega \nu$ ，as $7 p \mu o \delta o \nu$ was formed from áp $\mu \dot{\text { ® }}$（ $\omega$ ．
    ＋See note on Aluөávo
    $\$$［Passow calls it a part．pres．from an
    
    § I hope to defend $\langle\lambda$ irhuevov $E b$－ puöñ in this second passage against d $\lambda \iota \tau \eta \mu \epsilon p o \nu$ ，which has been taken from the Scholium of Tzetzes and the Etym． Mag．v． $\bar{\eta} \lambda \iota \tau \dot{\mu} \boldsymbol{e v o s}$ ．See Hermann．in Add． ad Greg．Cor．p．879．The reading of the text has been always so generally pre－ ferred，that the emendation can be offered as nothing more than a various reading．

[^28]:    * See Fisch. ad Well. iii. a. p. 29. On the 2. pers. $\begin{array}{r} \\ \lambda \omega \\ \text { and } \\ \eta \\ \lambda\end{array} o u$ see Erf. ad CEd. Tyr. 1310, where Hermann now reads the imperf., which is very harsh in that passage.
    $\dagger$ The Grammarians accounted for this lenis by the consonant following the $\lambda$; see Lex. de Spirit. p. 210. Valck. Their rule, like every thing similar, is bad : but when we consider that the same takes place in the metathesis ${ }^{\circ} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \epsilon i v, ~ \eta \mu 6 \rho o-$ тov, $\alpha 8 \rho o \tau d \delta \omega$, we see at once, without following the process throughout, that such changes had an influence on the aspirate; other changes of the same nature, though the reverse of the above (i.e. from the lenis to the aspirate), we may see in $\delta \rho \omega$, $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \rho \mu \delta \delta \delta \omega$, in $\delta \rho \omega, \delta \rho \mu \alpha \omega, \& c_{0}$ : see Buttm. Lexil. p. 300. No one with common sense will suppose that a grammatical caprice can have produced this old and fixed tradition.
    $\ddagger$ While the orthography of $\bar{\delta} \lambda \tau 0$ has been handed down invariably the same, that of $\alpha \lambda \eta \tau \alpha u$ has been uncertain from

[^29]:    * [Homer uses the pres. and imperf., which thus supply the place of those tenses in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \omega .-\mathrm{Passow}$.
    t The only meaning of this verb is to be beside oneself - either with grief or joy; those who give it the sense of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \theta a t$ are in error: in the two passages quoted by Schneider in his Lexicon (Il. $w, 12$. Apoll. Rh. 4, 1289.) as instances of this

[^30]:    * Under 'Е $\xi \not \boldsymbol{T}_{\mu} 5 \lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$ we find, it is true, these same words with the form
     perf. does not suit the context when completed as it is under ${ }^{*} \mathrm{H} \mu 8 \lambda \omega$, even this very "H $\mu \delta \lambda \omega$ speaks plainly in favour of the amended $\varepsilon \xi \eta \mu 5 \lambda \omega$.
    + Verbs in $\epsilon \omega$ sometimes have a present in tokw, although their tenses are formed from the infin. of the aor. 2. in eiv, as
     рібконат.
    $\ddagger$ The present in $\omega \boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega$ occurs in Theagenes ap. Stob. Serm. 1. Schow. p. 22., where this

[^31]:    * Elmsley quotes, as an authority of the old Grammarians in favour of the aorist, the single gloss of Photius, $\eta \mu \nu \nu \nu \theta o \nu$, $ク \mu \nu=$ vav; while he passes over in silence the great number of instances in all glossographers of such forms explained to be pres. and imperf. But even if all these forms were really aorists, the accentuation of $\epsilon i v, \omega \nu$ must be a doubtful point, unless there be a precedent for it in the old Grammarians, as these aorists form a very peculiar analogy, which we are not justified

[^32]:    ＊In Eschin．c．Timarch．p．8．9．à ad－ $\lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon$, àv $\lambda \omega \omega \kappa \omega$ s，have a various reading， but one of no great authority．
    $\dagger$ Notwithstanding this distinction，the similarity of meaning in \＆$\AA \hat{\lambda} \sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a u$ sumi， and えขa入ioкєь consumere，and the rela－ tion of the aorists prove the actual iden－

[^33]:    tity of the root．The active form of
     that the passive sense gave a neuter idea， as in the similar case of vapulare；and so the relation which the aor．1．in aya入 $\omega \bar{\sigma} \alpha$ bears to the above is causative，according to the leading analogy which I have drawn

[^34]:    out in my Grammar；that is to say，to the
    
    
    
    
    －In these three passages incorrectly quoted as a perfect by Fischer，3．p． 21.

    + Пи

[^35]:    to tense，quantity，and accent，I can come to no decision．
    $\ddagger$ The idea of this form signifying well－pleased，is not to be entertained for a moment，as the above analogy proves． Had this been the case，we must have met with such expressions as $\tilde{\delta} \delta \in \nu \in \bar{\nu}$ ，$\epsilon \mathcal{J}$ रà $\rho$
    

[^36]:    ＊Thus $\gamma \in ́ \gamma \omega v a, I$ call，3．pers．$\gamma$ é $\gamma \omega$－ $\nu \in(\nu)$ ，he calls，Od．ک．294．，whence a new form in ov gives a 3．pers．éré $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \boldsymbol{y}(\nu)$ ， which，by dropping the augment，becomes again $\gamma \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \overline{(\nu)}(\nu)$ ；see II．$\xi, 469 . \infty, 703$. Herein it is very conceivable that the mean－ ing．of this form fluctuates between the imperf．and aorist．Of this kind we bave in Homer the following ：

[^37]:    * 'Avúro (like dopvo, ג̇pútco) is the common form in the older Attics, so that for this dialect we may form $\alpha \nu u ́ \tau \omega$, ¿ขv́бw. But as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\sigma}, \dot{\alpha} v \dot{v} \sigma \omega$, was the usual formation in the oldest Epic, as well as afterwards in the common language of the day, we had better take this as the leading form, and the other as a sister-

[^38]:    form used only in pres. and imperf., just as $\gamma \lambda \dot{u} \phi \omega$ and $\gamma \lambda \boldsymbol{u} \pi \tau \omega$. On these verbs, as well as on the false way of writing them in-v́rt $\omega$, see Koen. et Schæf. ad Greg. Cor. in Att. 26., Hemst. ad Plut. 607., and the notes to Thom. Mag.
    $\dagger$ See é $\gamma \rho \dot{\eta} \gamma \quad \rho \theta$ and note under ${ }^{\prime}$ E $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon i \rho \omega$.

[^39]:    * But whoever examines the whole context of that passage will perhaps agree with me in thinking it still more probable that $\eta \nu \omega(\gamma \in i$, supported by the same digamma, was copied from v. 386. and used again here (v. 394.) where Priam's words are repeated from v. 375 .

[^40]:    $\dagger$ There would then remain of the pres. in $\omega$ nothing in Homer but the above-mentioned $\alpha \nu \omega \gamma \in \tau o \nu$, which again is very suspicious, as it is scarcely to be supposed that a writer who did not make use of àvoras should have used à $\nu \omega$. rarov.

[^41]:    * As these are aor., not imperf., the correct accentuation of the part. is $d \pi \alpha$ $\phi \omega \nu \nu$ (not $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega \nu$ ) as we find it in Hymn. Ven. 38. Eurip. Ion. 705. ; and other passages ought to be corrected according to these. As to the reduplication see note
    
    $\dagger$ Nothing however is more probable

[^42]:    * [From an obsolete root ${ }^{\|} \pi \omega$, answering to the old Latin apo, whence apiscor, capio, capto, and apto. Some (but without any grounds) consider $\tilde{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$, $I$ set fire to, a different word from aँтт I fasten, deriving it from avo, Passow.]
    $\dagger$ The same holds gaod of the subst. ajpá. But in Homer a regular distinction is observed between d̀py with a long,

[^43]:    * Formed with the reduplication; see note on ${ }^{2} \gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon$ â under "A $\gamma \omega$.
    + The temporal augm. of the second syllable is sometimes omitted. In the poetical verb kpäpa however, which, from the mere formation of the perf. 2. and without any regard to the augment, ought to have the $\eta$ in its middle syllable, and is therefore written in Ionic poetry áp $p \rho \alpha$, the $\alpha$ in the Attic form is only a consequence of the $\rho$ preceding (compare the termination $\rho a$ of the 1. declension, the contractions like ap appâ, the future in

[^44]:    - $\rho \alpha \sigma \omega)$, and the augment is therefore no so much omitted as invisible.
    $\ddagger$ At Od. $\in, 248$, we find typpev transitive, but from the Scholia it is evidently a false reading for ${ }^{2} \rho a \sigma \sigma \in \nu$.
    $\$$ The lengthened vowel of the perf. 2. may be shortened again, of which we bave examples in the Epic participles $\sigma \in \sigma \alpha \rho v i a, \mu \epsilon \mu a \kappa v i \alpha, \tau \in \theta a \lambda v i a$, etc., where the $\ddot{\alpha}$ is restored in place of the ग. In Hes. N, 607. ¿qpàpviav is undoubtedly false for denpuiav.

[^45]:    ＊This participle occurs three times in Apollon．Rh．1，787．3，833．4，677．where Brunck changed it into an aor．apppd－ $\mu \in \nu o s$, which was a reading of the first pas－ sage in some manuscripts．Now from app－ $p a$ it may be allowable to derive a pres． áрभpopal；but for an aor．1．formed again from this pres．or immediately from the perf．I know neither proof nor autho－ rity ；for 1 do not reckon as such Quintus Sm．，who has this apqpá $\mu \in v o s$ frequently， and read it so in Apollonius．In the first of the three passages quoted above the aor．1．would be unnatural．

    + The word however is suspicious in this passage．That is to say，its con－ struction there depends on $\epsilon\left\langle\tau^{\circ} \not \approx \nu\right.$ ，and it is therefore conjunct．for тробарipєтat．

[^46]:    * Verbs which do not lengthen their vowel in the future take a $\sigma$ in their perf. passive; as, тє $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega}, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega-\tau e \tau \epsilon \lambda \in \sigma \mu a t$;
    

    ```
    *бта\sigma\mua.
    \(\dagger\) The text and many MSS. have \({ }_{\alpha} \rho \delta \mu\) -
    ```

[^47]:    uevas, many have also ápóevar, which was the only reading of the Scholiasts, who merely recommend its being read and written in the former way. This ápo$\mu \epsilon v a t$ is by syncope for dpoé $\mu \in \nu a t$, and may be therefore classed with $\begin{gathered} \\ \mu\end{gathered} \in \nu \alpha$ and sipúpevai, But a great number of the MSS. have according to Lanzi à $\omega^{\circ}-$ $\mu \in \nu \mathcal{L}$, and it was and still is a question for the critic in what way the oldest wri-

[^48]:    * See both examined more at length in Buttm. Lexil. p. 144. \&c.
    + If I am right in my conjecture (Lexil. p. 145. \&zc.), we may add a future also in the various reading dสovphrovorv. (Il $\chi$, 489. where the common reading is $\alpha \pi o v$ -

[^49]:    ploбovatv), from a verb, which does not occur again in Homer, à $\phi o \rho l\langle\bar{\zeta}$; under which some of the Grammarians, contrary to all analogy, place also the acknowledged form ḋooupas.
    $\ddagger$ See last paragraph under Aifét.

[^50]:    * Verbs beginning with $\alpha, \alpha v$, os, followed by a vowel, do not take the aug-
     oibc, oiaki\{ $\zeta$, oi $\omega \nu i\{\rho \mu \alpha t$ : but the $\alpha$ if

[^51]:    * See note under Гіүעผ́oкш.
     $\Delta i \delta \rho d \sigma k \omega$ toward the end and note.

[^52]:    * See Heraclid. ap. Eust. Il. a, 24. p. 22, 14. Od. $\mu, 89$. p. 478, 12. Basil.
    + We always find for instance in the

[^53]:    * See Græv. ad Lucian. Solæc. 7. Tho. M. v. Bapuyetv, where the intrans. $\beta \in 6 \alpha-$ $\rho \eta r a$ is given as the genuine Attic form, and the rhetorician Aristides quoted in confirmation of it, but his words appear to be an intentional imitation of Homer. With respect however to the authority quoted above from Plato for $\beta \in \delta \alpha \dot{p} \mu \mu$ it

[^54]:    has been observed, and not without reason, that the words in that passage sound very poetical.

    + There are many deponents of which the poets use an active form with the same
     for $\delta \omega \rho \epsilon о \mu \alpha i, \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu d \omega$ for $\mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu d o \mu \omega$.

[^55]:    * On the analogy of this verb with some others by metathesis of the stem or root BOP, BPO, see note under Bd $\lambda \lambda \omega$, and Buttm. Lexil. p. 84.
    + See note under $\Gamma \imath \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ Like $\pi i \pi \tau \omega$, perf. $\pi$ éлт $\omega \kappa \alpha$, part.
     $\pi \tau \in \omega$.
    § There is one other instance, viz. $\kappa \alpha-$

[^56]:    * Perhaps from Pherecydes, who is mentioned there, and from whom the story is quoted in Schol. Pind. p. 3, 96. with the expression dyabเoûy Érolet.
    + See following note under $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau \alpha \nu \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ All verbs beginning with $\gamma \nu$, and some with $\gamma \lambda, \beta \lambda$, take in the perfect, instead of the reduplication, the syllabic augment e. Of verbs beginning with $\beta \lambda$, the only one which I find with the reduplication is $\beta \lambda d \pi \tau \omega, \beta \in ́ 6 \lambda a \mu \mu \alpha u$; and of

[^57]:    ＊We find also in Aristoph．Pac． 1154. $\beta \omega \sigma a r o$ ；and in the Etym．M．vevwtat is quoted from a satirical piece of Sophocles． ＋Of all the changes which take place in forming the different presents of verbs， the easiest is that of $\omega$ into $\epsilon \omega$ ，as $\beta$ inv $\omega$
     rAM』．Hence as often as the regular in－ flexion of a verb presented any difficulty， sounded badly，or caused obscurity，it was inflected as if the present had been in t $\omega$ ．
    $\ddagger$ In the three verbs Bov́лopar，$\delta \boldsymbol{v}$－ $\nu a \mu a s$ ，and $\mu \dot{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，the Attics very com－ monly increase the syllabic augm．of the

[^58]:    * [I compile from that untranslated Lexicon the following:

    Intrans.-to boil up, foam, ferment ; тov̂
     193. where Jacobs conjectures Bpuá̧ovtos. Olvos $\beta \rho \alpha \dot{S}(\omega \nu$, fermenting, Alex. Aphrod. Probl. p. 282. Bpáscy vóos, a turbulent spirit. It also expresses the roaring of the bear, Pollux 5, 58. Its compound is used for the rushing forth of fire,
     1, 6.

    Trans. - to throw up with violence (as boiling water or a tempestuous sea does),
    
     $\pi a p^{\prime}$ ท̉but, Antip. Thess. Epig. 61. "Ebpa-
    
    
     $\sigma$ ars, ib . 137. In the same sense is used

[^59]:    * [According to Moeris Bpú $\chi \omega$ was the common form, $\beta$ हिíco the Attic: in opposition to which see Herm. Soph. Phil. 735. -Passow.]
    t [Yet I find in Passow's Lexicon, under
    

[^60]:    77. Bри̂коv $\sigma \tau \delta \mu \alpha$, Nicand. and aor. 2. モ6pǔХє, Epigr. Adesp. 418.- under Bpú$\chi \omega$ the perf. $\beta \in \in \rho \rho \bar{\chi} \chi \in, \beta \in \in \rho \bar{\chi} \chi \omega$ ćs, pluperf. é6e6pú $\subset \in$. In addition to which the aor. 1. $\because 6 \rho \nu \xi \in$, Eryci. Epig. 2. Bpúgas, Diodor. 16. - ED.]
[^61]:    * See note under $\Delta \in ́ \omega, I$ bind. [But Passow gives it as his opinion that wher-

[^62]:    ＊There are three verbs which do not follow the general analogy of verbs in $\nu v \mu$ ，viz．dvvo，ravv́w，خdyv $\mu \alpha$ ，all three with $v$ short．
    ＋See Buttm．Lexil．p．202．note．
    $\ddagger$ At Od．$v, 347.390$ ．we find however another form，$\gamma \in \lambda o l a y$ for $\langle\gamma \in \lambda \omega y$ ，and the part．$\gamma \in \lambda$ oicovres，although in both passages the text is uncertain，from there being various readings without the di－ phthong．In itself it is very conceivable that，as the resolution of ooo is by far the

[^63]:    * For an account of the meaning of this form see note under "A ${ }^{\text {A }}$ vul.
    $\dagger$ Instances of this use of $\gamma$ 'yova are,
     all been kings, Plat. Alcib. I. 41. c. p.
     クुра́ $\sigma \eta$, ib. 55. a. p. 131.
    \# For instance, in Plat. Phad. p. 76. c.
     men, i. e. have been born men. Hence
     old, i. e, have been born sixty years.

[^64]:    * [rivo䒑ue was unknown not only to Homer but also to the Tragedians. - Passow.]
    + These passive aor. are formed from the simple present of the verb; and when that pres. is the one in common use, they are distinguished from the imperf. and the moods of the pres. merely by this syncope. Hence they are exactly like the perfect

[^65]:    and pluperfect pass. of those verbs, but without the reduplication; and may therefore be compared, but must not be confounded, with them. In meaning, whether active, passive, or middle, they follow their pres. in $\mu a t$; and they belong only to the oldest period of the language, e. g. -
    

[^66]:    * [Passow has the form $\gamma h \theta \omega$ as a pres. not in use, from which he deduces the perf. ү́́ $\gamma \eta$ Өa.]
    $\dagger$ [The earliest writer in which it occurs is Quintus Smyrn. - Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ In Simonid. 1. (Gnom. Brunck.) the active form $\gamma \eta p a \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ occurs, in which the double $\sigma$ at all events is false : but it is possible that the true reading there
    
    
    

[^67]:    || It is true that the only historical evidences in favour of this quantity are the circumflex on रmpâvas in correct editions (see Oud. ad Tho. M. in v.), and the $\alpha$ in both the iambic verses quoted by Pierson ad Moer. in v. falling in the place where a long syllable is admissible: but the above analogy makes it certain.
    
     exception, which see.

[^68]:    * Many verbs have a syncopated aorist which must be either compared with the aor. 2. or reckoned as such. The 1st pers. of this aor. always ends in $\nu$, and the vowel preceding it is (with the single exception of $\phi \theta d y(\omega)$ the same as that of the perfect ; thus it corresponds exactly with the aor. 2. of verbs in $\mu \mathrm{l}$ in all its moods and its participle: thus -
     $\mu \in \nu, \sigma$ 万ิทे $\alpha$, $\sigma 6 \in \mathfrak{i} \eta \nu$.
     ß̣̂vai, ßaịv, Bds.

[^69]:    * With the syncopated act. aor. described in the last note may be classed a passive aor. in $\mu \eta \nu, \sigma 0, \tau 0, \& c$, corresponding therefore with the regular aor. 2. midd., in which however three things may be remarked; l.that most of the instances of this aor. have a completely passive sense; 2. that they follow the vowel of the perfect passive; 3. that they belong only to the language of the older poets. Some of them do indeed serve as passive to the above-mentioned active aorists, for in-

[^70]:    
    
    
    

    See also ov̇rd $\mu \in y=s$, and $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \theta$ t with the old particip. $\kappa \lambda \nu \hat{u}_{\mu} \boldsymbol{e v o s}$.

    + The quotation of the aor. 2 . in this sense by some of the Grammarians (see Hemst. Hesych. Erot. Galen.) arises from false readings in Herodot. and Hippoer. See Steph. Rec. Voc. Herod. in v. and Fces. EE. Hippocr. in v.

[^71]:    * The two passages from Demosth. c. Dionysod. pp. 1291, 1293, are quoted erroneously, as they come from the verb สapaov $\gamma \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon i v$, to act contrary to agreement.
    + The verbal termination of $\alpha i \omega$ for $\alpha \omega$ in the Epic language is not, like cic for éco, a mere help to the metre; for $d \omega$ is seldom used without the contraction, and the a might be long of itself: but aíw, like $\dot{\alpha} \leqslant \omega$ and $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu v \mu$, is a mode of strengthening in the pres, the $a$ which is short in the inflexion: beside the above-mentioned

[^72]:    * This last is generally but erroneously given to $\delta \in \delta \delta \alpha$ with the other meaning. That it was the old aor. is shown by the gloss in Hesych. $\Delta \in ́ \delta \alpha o \nu \cdot \epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha \nu, \epsilon \in \delta i-$ $\delta \alpha \xi \alpha \nu$.
    $t$ See for this formation Bébaa, \&c., under Bailyw.

[^73]:    $\ddagger$ According to the Etym. M. v. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o s$, Alcæus had a pres. $\delta \in \epsilon$, I find; which coincides with our adoption of $\delta \alpha \dot{d}$.
    § An exactly similar contraction we find in one of the declensions of nouns, viz. $\kappa \lambda \epsilon i \alpha, \sigma \pi \hat{\eta} \hat{i}$, for $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \alpha, \sigma \pi \epsilon \in \epsilon i$.

[^74]:    * In forming a new present $\nu$ is sometimes inserted before the termination; as $\delta d \kappa \nu \omega$, aor. $\delta \delta a \kappa o \nu:$ compare кd́ $\mu \nu \omega$, $\tau \epsilon ́ \mu \nu \omega$.
    + Little importance can be attached to quotations like éváp $\theta \eta$ and $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \alpha^{\prime} \theta \eta$ in He sychius; and àrroōap0év $\alpha$, quoted from a Comic writer in Lex. Seguer. p. 349., will,

[^75]:    * Though many passages still have $\delta \in i \ell \xi a t$, at least among the various readings, and even taken from good manuscripts, this ought not to militate against the correctness of restoring $\delta \in \hat{\xi} a i$ universally.

[^76]:    * That is to say, many bring the form $\delta \in(\delta \in \kappa \tau 0$ under $\delta$ é $\chi o \mu \alpha t$, by which they hope to deduce the meaning of to receive, welcome, with greater facility. But the above forms ought not to be separated from the present $\delta$ eincyvuct, which occurs in a similar sense, nor from its sister-form $\delta \epsilon \varkappa a \nu \hat{a} \sigma \theta a l$; and to these again belong the synonymous presents $\delta \in i \delta i \sigma \kappa о \mu \alpha, \delta \varepsilon-$ ठібкораь ; whence also Apolionius 1, 558. might say $\delta \in i(\bar{\sigma} \kappa \kappa \in \tau о$ тatpl in the common sense of $\epsilon \delta \epsilon!\kappa \nu v e$. The original idea is indisputably the stretching out and offering of the band, the cup, \&c., with which that of pointing with the finger, or showing, corresponds very well.

[^77]:    * The only exceptions to an immense number of instances are ข่тобєíqurє, Od.
     663., the last of which, as being taken from $\omega$, is of no weight.
    + And thus it includes $\delta e i \sigma \alpha t$, according to the statement here given of it. But when we consider the peculiarity of this verb, as noticed above, according to which the $\delta$ in its stem or root was originally equivalent to $d w$, it follows that in Homer's pronunciation the first syllable of both $\delta$ éסouka and $\delta \epsilon \in \delta a$ must have been also long by position. After the disappearance of the digamma the syllable $\delta$ es discharged the same office in these forms as the double $\delta$ did in $\epsilon \delta \delta \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon$. This is the most accurate and detailed account which I can give of these perfects.
    $\ddagger$ This form is a clear proof how firmly the length of the augment-syllable had established itself in the old Epic; otherwise they would have said $\delta \in \delta \iota v \hat{\imath} a$, the sound of which could have been no objection to those who used $\pi є \phi v v i a$. The form $\delta \in \delta$ l $\alpha \sigma \iota y$ in Il. $\omega, 663$. has been al-

[^78]:    * Nay the theme exists unshortened, but in a poem which can hardly be quoted with such a view as this, in Orph. de Lapid. 335. $\delta є \iota \epsilon \in \epsilon \nu$, where however Hermann has adopted (I see no reason why) Tyrwhitt's correction $\delta \epsilon \iota \delta \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$. See the preceding note.
    + The pretended verb $\delta i \eta \mu$, , said to have the same meaning as $\bar{\delta}$ olva, to wuter, and which is so described in Schneider's Lexicon, is erroneous. All the forms of that kind belong to $\delta i$ inp $:$ : see Riemer's Lex. and Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 27. [Passow places the different forms סicís, ठьє́ $\notin v o s$,

[^79]:    ＊Bespide these two synonymous aorists there has been quoted a syncop．aor． e $\delta \mu \eta \tau \sigma$ ；the only authority for which is Antim．Fragm，19．ap．Pausan．8．p． 651. ； where however the reading $\gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\epsilon} \delta \mu \eta \theta^{\prime}$ is false．The manuscripts have $\delta^{\prime} \approx \delta \mu \eta \theta^{\prime}$ contrary to the context．But Schellenberg saw that the true reading is，＂Os $\beta \alpha \tau \delta \tau^{3}$
    
    $\dagger$ Like $\tau є \rho \nu \alpha ́ \omega$ тє́ $\rho \nu \eta \mu \iota$ from $\pi \in \rho \alpha ́ \omega$ ； and with the change of $\epsilon$ into $\iota$ ，кı $\rho \nu \alpha, \omega$ $\kappa โ \rho \nu \eta \mu$ from кєра́ $\omega$（ $\kappa \in р \alpha ́ \nu \nu \nu \mu i)$ ，жi入．

[^80]:    * See I'éuo.
    + That is to say, according to the analogy laid down in that note, from ঠéкоцая

[^81]:    * This verb, like aivé $\omega$, aipé $\omega$, $\pi \circ \theta \in \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, and many others, inflects some of its tenses regularly with $\eta, \mathrm{e} . \mathrm{g}$. its future and

[^82]:    * Compare the preceding verb, particularly toward the end of the first paragraph.
    + $\Delta \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon \in \theta a t$, Mem. 1, 6, 10. Anab. 7, 7, 31. ; ס́́єєal, Anab. 7, 4, 8. ; סє́єтаl and тробסє́єтаt three times in Mem. 3, 6, 13. 14.; ह̇ঠ́éєтo, Hell. 6, 1, 18. In some of these passages no manuscript can be quoted against this reading, in others very few; notwithstanding which, the common form has been of late introduced by the editors into all; while in another passage (Mem. $4,8,11$.) this was done long ago, although the old editions and four manuscripts have трогд́єєтаt. Eight passages in a single author, while not one is quoted from any of the older writers, are sufficient to warrant our attributing with certainty, to this author at least, an Ionicism, of which the existence is very probable at that æra of the Atticism and in that particular verb; while we can see no reason for this form, which was unknown to the other Atties, having been foisted into this one writer by copyists or grammarians. In addition to this we have the gloss of the Antiatticist in Bekker, p. 94. 'Eóé тov̂ $\begin{gathered}\text { Ėढiтo, which merely proves the great }\end{gathered}$ probability of what was most probable before. The only usuge of later writers and Grammarians (see Schefer ad Greg.

[^83]:    * The circumflex need not excite our suspicion against this form ; not only because we find it so often erroneously placed over the termination in dvat, but because the radical long $a$ in this verb might certainly produce a present in $\alpha \mu$, аิvaь.
    $\dagger$ Thus it is easy to conceive that $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0-$ סpdious and -áбara, wherever they are now met with in Attic writers, are corruptions of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \delta \partial \alpha_{s}$ and $-\hat{\alpha} \sigma a$. See Bekker on Andoc. Myst. 125. Lys. c. Andoc. 28. and compare Гəpáw.
    $\ddagger$ Thus the Dorics and Epics use $\begin{gathered}\text { enev, }\end{gathered}$
    

[^84]:    * On this iterative see $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \in \nu$ toward the end of $\Delta v \dot{w}$.
    + See Mus. Ant. Stud. 1. p. 242. sqq.
    $\ddagger$ In Brunck's Anal. 3, 216. is $\delta \iota \zeta \rho \mu \epsilon(\nu \eta$.
    § In Apollon. 1, 1208, the reading 81 §єто крךvains has been preferred perhaps a little too hastily, on account of the rare
    occurrence of $\delta\{\zeta \rho \mu a i$. But $\boldsymbol{\ell} \delta\{\zeta \in \tau$ Moschus 2,28. stands undisputed, as it does in the following fraginent, perhaps of Callimachus, in Suid. v. aүкоs; $\pi о \sigma \sigma l \delta^{\prime}$ àve入-
     to mention (see Ind. Gesn.) the Orphic poems.

[^85]:    * I suppose for instance that $\gamma \delta o u \pi$ and $\kappa \tau u \pi-$ are essentially the same onomatopoia for the sound proceeding from a heavy body, whether striking or struck;

[^86]:    and hence that $\delta o v \pi \epsilon$ î came to signify the falling of such a body, $\tau \dot{u} \pi \tau \in L \nu$ the beating it.

[^87]:    * Thus $\beta \lambda d \alpha_{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \iota$ in Hom. for $\beta \lambda \alpha \pi \tau \omega$, $\lambda i \tau о \mu a s$ in the Hom. Hymns for $\lambda i \sigma \sigma о \mu a t$,
    $\dagger$ On the double augment see $\beta$ об́лодає and note. $\sigma \tau \in \nu$ áx $\omega$ Epic for $\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu$ áऽ $\omega$.

[^88]:    * Notwithstanding ôbvauas as a proparoxyton is the only form in use, according to which we find $\delta$ ívial (I1. §, 229.) accented in the same way, yet the Ionians
     e. g. in Herodot. 4, 97. Compare 'Eォ $\{$ $\sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha$.
    $\dagger$ [Yet Passow says that $\delta 6 \nu \eta$ is in good writers conjunctive only, though it does occur in Eurip. Hec. 257., and that the Att. and Dor. is $\delta \dot{v} \nu$ ¢, Schæf. Soph. Phil. 798.$]$

[^89]:    $\ddagger$ [That is, of Buttmann's large detailed Grammar (Ausführliche Sprachlehre), of which this Catalogue forms part of the second volume. The section referred to, consisting of twelve pages, is of course too long to be inserted here, and to make extracts or an abridgement would be most unsatisfactory. - ED.]
    $\oint$ Like è $\lambda \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$, évívnv, and the perf. pass. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \bar{\nu} \mu \alpha u$, although from $\lambda \psi \omega, \delta \hat{v} \omega$, Now, fut, $-\dot{v} \sigma \omega$, \&c., all with $v$ long. See $\Delta \epsilon \in, I$ bind, with note; also Teivc.

[^90]:    * For an account of this aorist see note under $\mathrm{\Gamma} \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$; and for its meaning see note under Tє́ひ́ $\chi \omega$.
    + Compare фúqv, p. 261.
    $\ddagger$ See Buttm. Lexil. p. 425, and note.
    \$ Amidst the uncertainty which prevails in Homer's text between évóaro and -єто, it is very probable that the form in -aco

[^91]:    * Thus we find $\sigma v \mu 6 a \lambda \lambda \epsilon \delta \mu \in \nu 0 s$, vi $\pi \in \rho-$
     rodot.
    $\dagger$ The following verbs do the same: $\epsilon \chi \omega$,
    
    
    $\ddagger$ See Reisk. Ind. in Isæum. It is remarkable too that the aor. 1. ev $\nu \in \gamma \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma a$, èverrunoduŋv occurs frequently: see Bu dæus, p. 76, 77. Stephan. Thesaur, and

[^92]:    * Sce note under "A $\gamma \nu \nu \mu$.
    + The participle érpnүopov̂ $\sigma$ a in Hippocr. de Insomn. 1. is therefore defensible,

[^93]:    $\gamma$ रé $\tau \omega$ ，came $\hbar_{2} \nu \omega \chi \theta \epsilon$ ，$\partial \nu \dot{\theta} \chi \theta \omega \omega$ ；and this seems the most natural way of accounting for the Epic $\pi \dot{e} \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon$（see $\pi \dot{d} \sigma \chi \omega$ ），viz． $\pi \in ́ \pi о \nu \theta \alpha, \pi \in \pi \delta \nu \theta a \tau \epsilon, \pi \in ́ \pi \sigma \sigma \sigma \epsilon$ ．See under ＂A $\omega \omega$ \％
    ＊These forms do indeed appear in their external relations like a series of anoma－ lies ；but I think I can point out a general regularity running through the whole． The transition of eypmropare to the pas－ sive form erpfryop $\theta$ e was justified by the neuter meaning of $\begin{aligned} & \text { z } \gamma \text { phropa，which suited }\end{aligned}$

[^94]:    * See note on $\alpha \lambda$ ho $\chi$ a under *A $\gamma \omega$, and Buttm. Lexil. p. 136. \&c.
    + Those who attributed to $\mathbb{C \delta \omega}$ as a present the two meanings of to see and to know were guilty of an inaccuracy: etow meant $I$ see, $I$ see into it ; the perf. oto $\alpha$, $I$ have ssen into it, and consequently $I$ know.

[^95]:    $\ddagger$ Properly the perf. 2. of $\epsilon$ t $\delta \omega$ with the augment thrown aside (like єॉкш, єоєка, Jon. olka), but always used as a present, and consequently its pluperf. has the force of an imperfect. For the very remarkable analogy between the formation of this perf. and touk see last note but one under Eไкш.

[^96]:    * On these syncopated forms of the dual and plural see Piers, ad Moer. p. 174.
    $\dagger$ Isocr. ad Demonic. 4. สuveiohjeers; 5. ei8hֹడets; more frequently in the Ionic dialect.
    \& Hippoer. De Dec. Orn. 3. De Vict. Acut. 46. Aristot. Eth. 8, 3. Theophr. Proœm. extr.

[^97]:    
    $\dagger$ In the three perfects, \%oiк $\alpha$, єол $\pi \alpha$, Eopya, the $o$ is the usual change from the

[^98]:    * See the conclusion of ELow.
    + Some of the Grammarians, principally the more modern, class these forms by themselves under a theme AAHMI, which

[^99]:    * These two forms ( $\dot{\delta} \delta \lambda \in \iota, \& c$.) together with Boeckh's derivation of them are examined fully in Buttm. Lexil. p. 63.
    + This is a point which still requires critical examination: see Piers. ad Moer. p. 172. Fisch. 2. p. 502. Lobeck ad

[^100]:    * This form has always the $\nu$, whether before a vowel or consonant.
    + As far as this is supposed to depend on prose authorities, it arises from entire misunderstanding: see Sturz, Lex. Xen. 2. p. 47. Herodot. 5, 12. where the nom. which follows it is not a plural but two singulars.

[^101]:    § See this form in a verse in Lucian. Alex. 29. where the text incor|| The longer form is merely a lengthening of the shorter one by a repetition of the reduplication, like Ervuos, é $\tau \eta \tau v \mu o s$. In the simple
    verb the above verbals cannot well occur except in the neuter, ireov, ir $\eta$ -
    
    

    + Instead of ITwo $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eschyl. Eumen. 32. has ITcv, the same as the }\end{aligned}$ dual, a circumstance which otherwise occurs only in the passive formation. Compare in E' $\mu^{\prime} \hat{i}$ - $\tilde{E}^{\prime} \sigma \tau \omega \nu$, and Elmsley on Markland's Iphig. T.
    $\ddagger$ Plat. Tim. p. 26. c.d. Euthyphr. p. 4. d. according to the present corrected text.

[^102]:    * See these exceptions in Herm. de ※schyl. Danaïd. p. 8.
    + Two other passages quoted also in confirmation of it (Herodotus 5, 108. Eschyl. Suppl. 300.), may be classed with that of Hesiod.
     2,372.) rather from $\epsilon \tau_{\mu}$, ใ $\in \mu \alpha u$, than from $\delta i n \mu$. A perfect eifut from that verb is not more surprising than elfaтo, катоei $\sigma a \tau 0$, according to which it is formed.

[^103]:    * In Plat. Soph. p. 240, d. elmaumev has been restored from the best manuscripts. So has also cimatєy in Demosth. c. Nicostr. p. 1254. This opt. is more frequent in Aristotle. There is also an instance of єัтєє.
    + See Buttm. Lexil. p. 131. The occurrence of émovat (e.g. in Nicand. Ther. 738.) shows enly the usage of a late gram-marian-poet.

[^104]:    ＊This syllable $\epsilon 6$ is found instead of the reduplication in the perf．of several verbs beginning with a liquid，in which case the pluperf．is the same：thus

    є $\lambda \eta \emptyset \propto$ from $\Lambda H B \Omega$ ．See $\Lambda \alpha \mu 6 \alpha \nu \omega$ ．
    є1̀ $\eta \chi$ a from $\Lambda H X \Omega$ ．See $\Lambda a \gamma \chi$ d́v．
    
    єॅцартаи from $\mu є$ іронаи．

    + We may indeed，as many do，form єlрпка from elpw，or even from the fut． $e^{\prime} \rho^{\prime} \epsilon \omega$ ，as a new theme by means of the augm． $e t$ ；but by the method which I have fol－ lowed above，the perf．pass．，the aor．pass．， and the verbals $\rho \bar{\eta} \mu \alpha, \beta \eta \tau \delta \delta$ ，all agree to－ gether；and the grand analogy of the lan－ guage is in favour of this plan．

[^105]:    ${ }^{*}$ See Od. $\gamma .93$. Eurip. Suppl. 435. In Hes. A. 369, the old accentuation must therefore be restored from the first edition. In Apollonius the modern editors have most arbitrarily rejected the circumflex; see Beck on Apoll. 1, 1333. and 3. 917.

    + The same editors have given to Apollonius 2, 1165. from some manuscripts the non-Homeric form èvé $\psi \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ The above observation is grounded on

[^106]:    this circumstance, that we find in the common dialects merely such monosyllabic imperatives as స̀és, òós, és, $\sigma \chi$ És, $\phi \rho$ és, with their compounds. To prove है। no compound by comparing it with ̧arés, àjés, in Hesychius, would throw that form into a most improbable dialect, which could only be justified by indications much surer than any we have to guide us.

[^107]:    * It is singular to find this form in Thucyd. 5, 11. where $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \in \xi \propto \omega \tau \epsilon$ is the reading of all the known manuscripts except one which has $\boldsymbol{\epsilon t}$; for in all the other passages of this writer we find the diphthong. We may however compare with it K$\phi \in \rho \kappa \tau=s$ in Aschyl. Choeph. 444.
    + This is also proved in various instances by the manuscripts: compare for example the passages in Sturz, Lex. Xenoph. and Brunck's Index to Aristophanes, as well as Andoc. 4. p. 31, 27. 32,36. There are however manuscripts which have flpy w without exception (see

[^108]:    ＊Once in the text of our Homer we
     but it is indisputably a false reading：for as elpyw is contracted from éf $\rho \gamma \omega$ ，it can－ not have had the digamma，which the hiatus before the verb shows to have been in the verse ；for ${ }^{\text {éf }} \rho \gamma \mathrm{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ，i．e．E•EPI $\Omega$ ，has

[^109]:     èбк心，which in the older language had the digamma．

    + It is however to be observed that this diphthong is found also in the pre－ sent，and even，though not frequently，

[^110]:    in prose：see Lobeck ad Phryn．p． 30.
    $\ddagger$ In stating these rules we must how－ ever remember the rarity of this form， and that I know only some instances of it quoted by Maitaire from Pausanias．

[^111]:    * [Yet Homer has frequently $\pi \epsilon \rho l \tau \epsilon u^{\chi} \chi{ }^{\text { }}$ ${ }_{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \sigma \sigma \iota \nu$, e. g. in Il. $o, 555$. $\alpha \mu \phi^{\prime}{ }^{2} \mathrm{O} \delta v \sigma \hat{\eta} \alpha$ ${ }^{\boldsymbol{q} \pi \pi \nu}$, II. $\lambda, 483$. and many other similar expressions, which Buttmann, it would seem, considered as compounds. - Ev.]

[^112]:    * See the note in Buttm. Schol. Od. ad h.1. Bekker in his critique on Wolf's Homer has ventured a conjecture that all those Epic moods, £̇бтย́ $\sigma \theta a u$, \&c., have crept into Homer's poems by false readings, because in every instance the verse would admit
     the later Epics, in whose verse this is not always the case, imitated the false reading. This view of the subject is much strengthened by the circumstance of the compounds being invariably written in Homer $2 \pi \iota \sigma \pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a$, , $\mu \in \tau a \sigma \pi b \mu \epsilon \nu o s, \& c$. However as the origin of such a reading, if there were no grounds for it in the language, is difficult to be conceived; and (which is the most important point) these forms are as fixed in Pindar ( $0.8,123.9,15$. Isth. 4, 40.) as they are in the Alexandrine poets,

[^113]:    * As this aor. 2. occurs in no other passage, it is not to be wondered at if later poets used it transitively : thus Euphor. Fr. 40. and Alex. Etol. in Piers, ad Moer.
    p. 194. whose admirable emendation of the whole fragment was not understood by his neglecting in this verse to change $\kappa a \lambda \delta^{v}$
    

[^114]:    * I know not whether this perf. occurs in any other passage beside the fragment of Hesiod ap. Clem. Alex. in Strom. p. 716. (603.) et in Cohort. p.63. (48.) or No. 53. Gaisf. : but there, notwithstanding the faults of transcribers, its connexion with the context makes it unquestionable; and by comparing the two quotations it most probably ran thus, Avirds yàp $\pi d \nu \tau \omega \nu$ BaбL $\lambda \in \nu ̀ s ~ k a l ~ k o l p a \nu o ́ s ~ E \sigma \tau t \nu, ~ ' A \theta a \nu d i t \omega \nu ~ т E ́ ~$ oi oйтเs éptiptoтаи кра́тоs йл入оs.
    + This way of writing it Wolf has very

[^115]:    *That the Greek Grammarians supposed $\ell \rho \in \sigma \theta a t$ to be falsely accented is clear from the Etym. M. v. Etpas and Attéceau, however faulty these articles may be in other respects.

[^116]:    + In that passage however Bekker pro-
     to read $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \mu$ évots.

[^117]:    ＊I have inserted this fut．without hesitation as it is the necessary result of the analogies laid down in my grammar，

[^118]:    and it is by mere chance that I have not been able to find any instance of its actual occurrence．

[^119]:    * Not that I mean by this expression, "without the $\epsilon$," that this form is the later of the two; I rather think there are good grounds for concluding it to be the older, and that the $\epsilon$ was added afterwards as in నิé $\lambda \omega$, ę $\theta$ é $\lambda \omega$.
    + Because $\bar{\sim} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ with $v$ long was usual in the Attic and common language, this quantity was supposed to be the ground of the Epic usage also, and $\beta$ v̌có$\mu \eta \nu$ to be an Epic shortening of the syllable. Again in Épv́ $\sigma \sigma \theta a$ the earlier editors made a distinction between épv̌ $\sigma a-$ $\sigma \theta a t$, '́púv $\sigma a \sigma \theta a u$, to $d r a w$, and Ép̄̀ $\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$, to save: See Buttm. Lexil. The justice of the conclusions which I have drawn both there and here is evident; and there is but one alternative, either to suppose with me a radical shortness through all the meanings, and to write the lengthened syllable in all instances with $\sigma \sigma$, or to explain $\rho v \sigma \alpha \alpha \mu \eta \nu$ to be a corruption (see Spitzner's Prosody, p. 68.), a mode of proceeding which the moderate critic will never wish to encourage. That the difference of quantity might have in time produced a difference of meaning is certain; and Attic usage shows it to have done so: but that it was not so at an earlier period

[^120]:    the vowel in the inflexion, I find no instance. Only in very late writers $\epsilon^{2} \beta \rho\langle\sigma \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ is quoted from pécotal, to save. See Stephan. Thesaur.

    * Some similar futures of verbs in -éa and -áw will be found in the last note

[^121]:    * This distinction of $\bar{\eta} \lambda v \theta o \nu$ and $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$ into Ep. and Att. is not quite accurate, as Homer has both forms; so has Pindar; but afterwards the latter became the one in general use.
    $\dagger$ The 2. sing. imperat. act, of five verbs is an exception to the general analogy of
     the common, and $\lambda a E_{6}$, $\hat{\imath b E}$ in the Attic language.
    $\ddagger$ In this word the first production only is pure Epic, as in ${ }^{2} \mu \nu \eta \mu v \kappa \epsilon$. The ov is

[^122]:    * Instances of this meaning are the fol-
     Phil. 1182. el 8,9. although this may be interpreted as a coming to the distant place: $\sigma \nu \mu$ bov.
     $3,1,5$. that is lévat eis $\Delta$., кal è $\lambda \theta \delta \nu \tau \alpha$
    
    + They principally oceur only where the immediate context expresses a coming,
     $\chi^{\text {б丷pav, Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 6. or in an anti- }}$
    
    $\ddagger$ A more accurate examination will show that the distinction of the meanings go and come does not depend so much on the radical sense of the verb as on the ideas which we have of the time. The German and Latin with their cognate languages express, for instance, the going to the place where the speaker is or to which the thought is directed by the verb to come,
     particular relation come is announced by the context. The Aorist $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$, ss expressing the moment when the action is com-

[^123]:    * We can scarcely reckon as belonging to the Greek language solitary forms from the root $\Phi A \Gamma$ - which are occasionally found in the later writers, as фáyovat in

[^124]:    ＊For the accentuation of this imperat． see the second note under＂Epxouat．
    ＋See the last note under＇Epúw．
    $\ddagger$［The active voice is found in Eschyl．

[^125]:    ＊Bekker has never yet found it in any manuscript．The quotation of the above－ mentioned verse of Eurip．in Plutarch with む̀ $\pi \in \chi \theta \in \hat{\sigma} \theta \theta a$ contains a trace of it；see Elmsley，who has written it $\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \chi \theta$ é $\sigma \theta a u$ ． + ［Theognis has for the 2．sing．É $\chi \in \iota \sigma \theta \alpha$ ， 1316．like $\sigma \chi \eta \sigma \epsilon เ \sigma \theta a$ below．－Passow．］
    $\ddagger$［Homer has the imperf．also without the augm．ÉXov．－Passow．］

[^126]:    * The reading ėrú $\chi a r o$, from a supposed pres. $e^{2} \pi o l \gamma \nu \nu \mu$, is quite untenable; for as the simple oizvúvai means to open, this compound of it cannot mean to shut.

[^127]:    Derived from otxouas it might be in itself defensible, but in the passage in question it gives no idea recommended by its combining easily with the context.

[^128]:    * The critic must not be misled by find-
     stoph. in so excellent a manuscript as the Cod. Ravenn., when the internal analogy is so decisive. Besides it is clear that a form so strange to the common grammarian as $\alpha_{\mu} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \chi \boldsymbol{v o v} \mu \alpha l$, and which is verified by such pure avalogy, cannot have come into the manuscripts by chance or mistake; consequently that the worst which has it, is in such a case of more weight than the best which has it not.

[^129]:    * It may however be shortened in Att. poetry; see Lex. Seg. 6. p. 471, 10. Dobr. ad Aristoph. Plut. 75.
    + [Instead of iéval Homer has ié $\mu \in \nu a i$, Hesiod iépev: and in the imperf. Homer has lev 3. plur. for I T $\sigma a y$, Il. $\mu, 33$. Passow.]
    
     $\chi \alpha$ under $\alpha$. I will mention here a trace of the same form in Herodot. 2, 165. where the text has àéovicu is $\tau \delta \mu \mathrm{d}$.

[^130]:    * Examples may be found in Fisch. ad Well. 2. $\mu$. 484. where we must restore $\pi \rho о \eta к а \sigma \theta є$.
    $\dagger$ Xenoph. Hier. 7, 11. Eurip. Suppl. 1199.
    $\ddagger$ Yet we find in the Attics instances of the regular form, as $\pi a \rho i \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ Plat. Phæd. p. 90., ג̀ фเทิтє Xen. Hell. 2, 4, 10. (16.), $\dot{\alpha} \phi \in \in \in \in \nu \mathrm{ib} .6,4,2$. and 3., still with the various reading aфiotev in both passages.
    © For instance dytei is from 'IER, but aviet pres. of 'I $\Omega$. Compare II. a, 326. with $336 ., \beta, 752$, with $\gamma, 118$, where

[^131]:    * It might appear as if the fut. $\& \phi \in \sigma$ $\sigma \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ (II. 九. 455.) could not be separated from $\% \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a b$, as the curse of Amyn-
    
     derstood by all commentators thus, " that a son born of me may never sit on his knees," and in this sense we find éф'́şeтo

[^132]:    at II. $\phi, 506$. But a much more evident comparison is furnished by Od. $\pi, 443$.
     є $\phi \in \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0$. The meaning of éфé $\sigma \sigma \in-$ $\sigma \theta a s$ therefore in the above passage of the Iliad is "he will never seat," consequently it must not be separated from ${ }^{q} \sigma a \sigma \theta a i$, E゙ $\sigma a$.

[^133]:    * This writing eferaato, with the lenis, to distinguish it from éfoбato the aor. of ${ }^{\prime} \nu \nu v \mu$, is an arbitrary proceeding of the Grammarians, and scarcely correct, as the syllabic augment takes the aspirate before aspirated vowels, as in ecopoev, єŋка.
    + This form may be considered either as a perf. pass. (I have been seated, or $I$ have seated myself, consequently $I$ sit), or as a separate formation in $\mu$, like 8 f-

[^134]:    * It is singular that Pierson (ad Moer. p. 148.) was so far misled by Herodian's authority as to reject contemptuously the very intelligible opinion of the grammarian in the Etym. M. p. 413, 8. (to which we may add Ib. p. 410, 49. \&c. and Tho. M. $v . z(\omega \nu)$, and to defend $\Psi(\eta \nu$, which is there much censured, as the true reading of Eurip. Alc. 651. where some Codd. certainly have it. It is anything but probable that transcribers should have introduced into so many passages of the old writers ésov, which sounds so differently from | $Z$ |
    | :--- |
    | , | , nay the contrary is the more probable. See Fischer, 1. p. 125. In Demosth. Timocr. 702, 2. we certainly find $<(\eta v$ without any known various

[^135]:    * This formation may be supposed to arise from the mere lengthening of §a, § $\hat{\omega}$, making ऽ $\omega \omega$; but when 1 compare $\beta \dot{\omega} \sigma \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ (see Bıठw) and Béopaı with § $\omega \in t \nu$ and $\zeta \tilde{\eta} \nu$, and the well-known forms

[^136]:    * Schneider's remark in his Lexicon must be taken in this limited sense. See the word in Lucian Piscat. 14. Paus. 10, 6, 32. Some older examples would be desirable. I find it also in Hipp. Min. p.

[^137]:    ＊The conclusion that because we have ท̀j $\tau \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ we must necessarily have $\hat{\eta} \tau \tau \hat{q} \nu$ is false： $\mathfrak{\eta} \tau \tau \hat{a} \sigma \theta a t$ is a neuter idea，㫚 $\tau \tau \omega$ cipi $\tau$ vyos，whence it can be joined only with the gen． $\mathfrak{\eta} \tau \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta a l$ tuvos．The pas－ sive form，as in many other verbs，took
     En $\lambda d \gamma \chi \theta \eta \nu$, \＆c．，and might therefore have an active voice in a causative sense，but not necessarily．The common reading in Isæus condemns itself．If the orator had wished merely to contrast the ac－ tive and passive，he must have said $\tau \delta \nu$
    

[^138]:    * A perfect té $\theta a \phi a$ with a causative meaning, I astonish, in Schweighæuser's Athen.6. p. 258. c. is suspected, because the manuscript has (contrary to the metre
     ${ }^{\epsilon} \theta d \mu 6 \eta$ in Hesych. supposes a theme, Ná $\mu 6 \omega$; perhaps therefore it ought to be
     instead of $\mu \in \tau 0 \hat{v} \sigma 0 \hat{v}$.

[^139]:    $\dagger$ This verb is contracted in $\eta$ instead of $\alpha$. See Z $\alpha, \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ This is more of an Eolic than a Doric contraction: here the $o$ is swallowed up by the $\alpha$ preceding it, which consequently becomes long; thus the part. $\gamma \in \lambda \hat{\alpha} \nu$ for $\gamma \in \lambda \alpha \omega \nu, \phi v \sigma \hat{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ for $\phi v \sigma d o \nu \tau \epsilon s, \gamma \in \lambda \alpha \hat{\imath} \sigma a$ for $\gamma \in \lambda \operatorname{dot} \sigma \alpha$, \&c.

[^140]:    * Blomfield on Eschyl, Sept. 378. (he has made some mistakes) and Elmsley on Eurip. Heracl. 272. We must not be

[^141]:    surprised at the $\epsilon$ in an aor. 2. any more than in ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \mu$ : it was necessary on ac. count of *acyov.

[^142]:    ＊Six verbs in écu take $\epsilon v$ in the fut．or
    
     $\chi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha$, \＆c．And two in alw take av，viz． $\kappa a l \omega, \kappa \lambda a l \omega$（Att．$\kappa d \dot{\omega}, \kappa \lambda d \alpha \omega)$ ，fut，$\kappa \pi v ́ \sigma \omega$ ， к入аи́бо $\mu \alpha$ ．
    $\dagger$ In Eurip．Heracl．652．the reading of the text was $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta$ i $\xi \in t s$ ，but it is now amended from the manuscripts to $-\in \iota$ ． ［Passow has a fut．act． 2 i $\xi \omega$ ，but without example or remark，further than that Ni－ $\xi o \mu a u$ is more general．］
    $\ddagger$ Schneider in his Lexicon quotes 㫿－ $\gamma \in \nu$ from Apollon．Rh．4，1013．as an im－ perf．and $\mathrm{N}^{2} \gamma \omega \nu$ from Eschyl．Prom． 855. as a present：but the immediate context does not agree with this statement．If we

[^143]:    * An unwillingness to recognize the idea of a perfect in $\tau \in \theta \nu \hat{\eta} \xi 0 \mu \alpha \iota$ arises partly from the custom of our language, particularly from such expressions as $\beta \iota \omega \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \downarrow$ \#

[^144]:    * Even in Quint. Sm. 1, 542. Nopeî should be amended to the far more suitable poetical aor. Nopev.

[^145]:    ＊Instances occur where there is no $\nu$ in the pres．of a verb，and yet it is found in the aor．1．pass．，as $i \delta \rho \dot{v} \nu \theta \eta v, ~ ¿ \mu \pi \nu u{ }^{\prime} \nu 0 \eta$ under＇1 $\delta \rho v^{\prime} \omega$ and $\Pi \nu \epsilon ́ \omega$ ．In such cases it is not necessary to suppose an actual theme in－v́vc．Compare i0v́ytaza for i日útara．See also Telyw．

[^146]:    $\dagger$［Passow has also a fut．i̧グテ$\sigma$, Att． ia ；and in the compound he has fut．кa－
    
     Aristoph．Ran．911．The Epic part．ка－ Oíroas is used by Homer．］

[^147]:    ＊［Wolf always accents the imperf．кd－ Oıऽov，not кa0iऽov，and his is indisputably the more correct way if we suppose the original form to be $\dot{\text { codergov ：but Butt－}}$ mann does not allow this to hold good in all cases．－Passow．］
    ＋［Diogen．Laert．has also a fut．caөc－ 8 ппооцаи．－Passow．］
    $\ddagger$ In Lucian Solœc．11．$\tau$ б́ $\gamma \in \mu \geqslant \nu$
     Here is a various reading каӨlऽєбөal． Now when we find further on，$\tau \delta \delta \delta \kappa \alpha-$
    
     （we do that to another），rd кa0ifeny $\lambda \in \gamma \omega$ ，
    

[^148]:    * That is to say, that in this verb the short syllable of the stem or root, as seen in the aorist (iкєiv) ikefoar, instead of being strengthened in the present by changing it

[^149]:    to $\epsilon t$, as in $\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega \pi t \theta \epsilon i v$, passed over into $i$ or $\eta$; making therefore "ik or ${ }^{7 j} \kappa \omega$ instead of єiкс.

[^150]:    ＊We must compare these imperatives with $\sigma \tau \eta 0 b$ ，eбттฑк，\＆c．，and suppose that the pres．and aor，1．took the causative sense to make gracious ；of which iरdouct， $i \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu$ ，would then be the middle，$I$ make gracious to me，appease．
    $\dagger$ The characteristic $\sigma \sigma$ of this verb may

[^151]:    ＊The length of the $\alpha$ is sufficiently evident from two passages in Menand．ap．

[^152]:    p．81．that some Atticists considered this

[^153]:    * In the later and corrupted state of the language a pres. was formed from $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$, viz. $\sigma \tau$ 万ккш, whence $\sigma \tau$ भкєтє, 1 Cor. 16, 13.
    and $\sigma \tau$ 亿юкovtes, Alex. Aphrod. Probl. 1, 49. And again another pres. £̇ $\sigma \tau \hbar \kappa \omega$, Posidippi Epigr. 15.

[^154]:    ＊For which Homer has $\varepsilon \sigma \tau d \mu \in \nu$ and € $\sigma \tau d \mu \in \nu \alpha$ ．
    ＋For which Homer has also ËбTทTE， 11．$\delta, 243.246$.
    $\ddagger$ In Andoc．2，8．ка日ध́otare is pluperf．， and at 1，112．тарє́ $\sigma \tau \alpha \mu \nu$ according to Bekker is the same．［Homer has $\begin{gathered}\text { E } \sigma \text { ütov }\end{gathered}$ as dual of both perf．and pluperf．；and
     as pluperfects．－Passow．］
    \％We may gather from different parts of Buttmann＇s Grammar the following

[^155]:    * An opposite case is found in Callim. L. P. 83. $\epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{d} \eta$ with $a$ long; if it is not a false reading for $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\kappa} \eta$ ( $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon \iota$ ); for it is translated stabat, and we shall find that the sense gains by this correction, particularly in comparison with the unsuitable passive. [In the above passage from II. $\mu, 55,56$. Passow differs in one

[^156]:    * For the terminations - $\nu \omega$ and $-\nu v \mu \iota$ are essentially the same; as in Tivw tiv$\nu \nu \mu$, ктєі́ขш ктіข $\nu \boldsymbol{\mu}$.
    + [Passow supposes it to be probably from каiv $\boldsymbol{\kappa r e i \nu \omega , ~ c o n s e q u e n t l y ~ f r o m ~ a ~}$ radical form KEN $\Omega$ in the sense of to overpower, conquer.]
    $\ddagger$ The above account does not agree with the usage of Eurip. in Elect. 616., where the walls of the town фpoupaîs кéкабтая
     evidently means are furnished, equipped,

[^157]:    a deviation in every respect from the usage of Homer, of which it is a partial imitation.
    § Some verbs form their aor. 1. in a instead of $\sigma \alpha$. In the common language there are only three, ${ }^{*} \chi \in \alpha$ (Ep. E $\chi \in \cup a$ )
     $\phi$ ¢́ $\omega$. The poets have also êккј from кaiw and éroveva from $\sigma \in \dot{\omega}$. As these aorists go over into the middle voice also ( $\chi \chi \in \alpha \mu \eta \nu, ~ \ell \sigma \sigma \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} a \tau o, \& z c$.), the Epic
     be considered as belonging to the same.

[^158]:    ＊As $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \omega$ for $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \omega, \sigma \tau \eta \eta s$ for $\sigma \tau \epsilon \nmid \eta$ ； again $\sigma \tau \epsilon l o \mu \epsilon y$ for $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ $\sigma \tau h e \tau o y ~ f o r ~$ $\sigma \tau \eta \eta \tau o v$, \＆cc．See Balvw and＂I $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$ ．
    $t$ The form with $\epsilon t$ is found once in Sophocl．El．759．relaytes with the va－ rious reading кhayrєs，the alteration of which to кéavtes－I cannot approve of．

[^159]:    * Brunck thought indeed that he had found in the Argument of the Antigone of
     a different form and meaning; but it is a mere error of transcription for кa兀aлр $\quad$ бөิิขat.
    $\dagger$ That is to say, mpoik had the general sense of a gift, as originally dos had in Latin; thence $\pi \rho о \hat{\kappa} \alpha$, like бшреа́y, without pay or reward, gratis. The verb from which this word is derived meant therefore to make a present of; and thus катапроіछєє is a neat sarcasm, "thou shalt not give me that for nothing," i.e. I will give thee something in return, I will pay thee for it. The connexion is here plain and certain.

[^160]:    ＊кéatal is properly the Ion．3．plur． shortened from кєiacal，but used as a 3. sing．by those later writers to whom the Ion．dialect was no longer natural．See Reitz ad Luc．de D．S． 6.
    t See Herm．ad Vig，not．526．and De Metr．1．p．86．where the very analogous

[^161]:    Again $\kappa \iota \rho \nu d \omega, \kappa i \rho \nu \eta \mu t$ are formed from $\kappa \epsilon \rho d \omega$ by changing -á $\omega$ into $-\nu \alpha ́ \omega$, , $\nu \eta \mu$, and in some verbs changing the $\epsilon$ of the
     compare $\Delta \epsilon ́ \mu \omega$, and $\Pi i \lambda \lambda \eta \eta \mu$ from $\pi \in \lambda d \omega$.

[^162]:    ［See Sophocl．Aj．634．El．868．Ed． T．968．Ant．Y11．，Eschyl．Sept． 590. Ed．］
    $\dagger$ In order to explain it in that way we must first understand $\chi \alpha \hat{\beta} \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \mathfrak{q} \tau \iota \nu o s$ （which in its common acceptation means to give way to any one）in the sense of to cease from pursuing anyone；and then sup－ pose that the two goddesses blame them－ selves with a certain severity of expres－ sion，because，when their friends are pur－ sued by the enemy，they do not assist them against the pursuit of the other

[^163]:    ＊See Monk and Matthiæ ou Eurip． Hipp．1434．（1442．）．Hitherto however this reading has not been introduced into any passage of the Tragedians from manu－ scripts，except that Victorius has written it so on the margin of a copy in the Alcest． 480．（495．）．These critics appear to me therefore to have been very premature ： for Hesych．and the others quote pecu－ liarities from all writers．Now that Pho－ tius and Suidas expressly quote $\kappa \gamma \chi \chi d \nu \in เ y$ from Solon；that Eustathius（on Od． p．209，32．）cites not merely $\kappa \iota \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ but also ir久dyw，and that as＂more analogi－ cal＂－these two things appear to me much ore against than in favour of the intro－

[^164]:    ＊Some verbs in $\zeta$ have $\gamma \gamma$ for their characteristic，as for instance $\kappa \lambda \alpha \delta \omega, \pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime}$－ $\zeta \omega, \sigma a \lambda \pi l \delta \omega$ ．

    + ［Passow however makes no mention of клarүávo being a suspected form，and quotes it from Eschyl．Eum．126．and Xen．

[^165]:    Ven．6，23．He has also $\kappa \lambda a \gamma \gamma \alpha\left[\nu \omega_{0}\right]$ $\ddagger$ This aor．was formerly quoted from Archiæ Epigr．28．，but the true reading ảлок入ᄉ́ $\gamma \xi \alpha \sigma \alpha$ is now adopted by Jacobs．
    § On the formation of this future see ®éw．

[^166]:    * [The article in Schneider runs thus: K $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, -єí $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, whence perf. pass. кєк $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in ⿺-$ $\sigma \mu$ évos. According to the Etym. Mag.
     Demosth. Philipp. p. 22 Bekker reads

[^167]:    $\kappa \in \kappa \lambda \eta \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu$ é $\mu \pi \tau о \rho i \omega \nu$. In Eur. Hel. 983. stands $\kappa \in \kappa \lambda \eta \mu \in \theta a$ : and in Aschyl.
     --Ed.]

[^168]:    ＊It is certain that in the older language the $o$ ，which is supposed to be peculiar to the perf．2．（perf．midd．），belonged to the perf．1．act．；but as it is not generally so in the language as now grammatically formed，we put down as deviations from the established analogy three perfects， viz．т＇́ $\mu \pi \omega-$－тє́тонфф，клє́ттш－кє́－ $\kappa \lambda о ф и$ ，тре́тн－те́трофа．But this o never goes into the perf．passive．

    + This form，which does not appear to have been ever in use，but which I have

[^169]:     X $\rho$ óeo，$\delta$ เ४
    ＋Most of the polysyllabic verbs in－［كん prefer the Attic fut．to the other；but of those in－dsw nothing like a decided ana－

[^170]:    ＊See the examples in Stephens，and compare the various readings．Brunck was therefore quite right in Theocr．1， 30. in preferring the reading of the majority of the manuscripts ；as was Jacobs in He－ gesippi Epigr．3．（Anth．Vat．p．164．）in suspecting the reading of the Vatican ma－ nuscript кєкоขฑ $\mu \in v^{\nu}$ to be，what is much more probable，and must at all events be preferred in the hexameter，－i $\mu$ éva． The assertion of Hemsterhuys（on Lucian

[^171]:    * As the Epic aor. of фaiva is Éфaáv$\theta \eta v$ because that verb is contracted from фativos, so is the remarkable production of the tenses of rраivco the result of contraction, and most probably of краivos

[^172]:    and again produced to the Ep. фóws: compare also Nิิкоs, Nowkos and Náko Buttm. Lexil.

    * On the accentuation of these forms see $\Delta \dot{v} \boldsymbol{y} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$.
    + Stephens quotes it from two works falsely attributed to Aristotle: Hist. Mirab. c.6. and EEc. 2.

[^173]:    $\ddagger$ This verb is the only instance of the change of $\epsilon$ to $\eta, \kappa \rho є \mu d \omega$ and $\kappa \rho є \mu d \nu \nu \nu \mu \iota$
    
    $\oint$ See Müncker ad Ant. Lib. 13. extr. Var. Lect. ad Eurip. El. 1217. Barnes, et Musgr. ad Eurip. Herc. 520. Piers, ad Mœr. v. ${ }^{3}$ Ек $\rho \in \mu$ аиvvev.

[^174]:    ＊On the formation of the two perfects and the aor．1．pass．，see Teivw．

    + Aristoph．Ach．459．according to the manuscripts．
    $\ddagger$ The perf．кє́ктпиat，like $\mu$ é $\mu \nu \eta \mu a \leqslant$ from $\mu \nu d \omega$ ，is formed with the regular re－ duplication；but ěкт $\eta \mu$ к．follows the ana－

[^175]:    ＊Phrynichus in Lex．Seguer，1．p．29， 7．prefers＇writing ictivvu and rejects the $\nu \nu$ ；but he has no grounds for doing so． If we suppose that this form came from a root without any $\nu$ ，there is nothing to lead us to a stem кть－or ктєь－only to $\kappa т \alpha-$（єктаv，еккта），and analogy would therefore require nctavyuf．But if it is formed from crety－as a stem，we have （like $\delta \in\{\kappa \nu \nu \mu i$ ）the completely analogous word $\kappa \tau \in \mathfrak{i} \nu-\nu \nu \mu \varepsilon$ ：and as a diphthong be－ fore $\nu v$ is something unusual，it was to be expected that the pronunciation would

[^176]:     on the corrupted passage of Eurip. Cycl. 171.: the comp. тробкvעไбш (Plat. Rep. p. 469. a.) is no argument in favour of the simple form, for in the comp. we find $\pi \rho a \sigma \epsilon \kappa \dot{v} \eta \eta \sigma \alpha$ as well as $\pi$ робє́кरиба, in the simple ërváa only. In Aristoph. Thesm. 915. $\kappa \dot{b} \sigma \omega$ is conjunctive.
    $\dagger$ The midd. кvadueval, kissing or earessing each other, is in Athen. 9. p. 394. d.
    $\ddagger$ Kєкир ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha$ in the second Alcibiades 6. belongs to the orthography of Plato,

[^177]:    * In Hippocr. I find more than once кขéovo (e.g. in De Superfetat.), which I think may be reconciled with $\kappa v ́ \in \iota ~ o c-~$ curring frequently in the same writer.
    + Macrob. De Verbo Græco cap. 5. acknowledges both forms ; but they are not easy to be recognised there on account of an error of transcription in $t$ for $v$.
    $\ddagger$ Schneider in the Supplement to his

[^178]:    ＊In order to bring this change of vowel into an acknowledged analogy，it is per－ fectly allowable to suppose a change of the stem to $\triangle \mathbf{E P X}$－on account of $\pi \epsilon v \theta o s$, $\pi \alpha \theta \in i ̀ v, \pi \in ́ \pi o \nu \theta \alpha$.
     $\chi \alpha \nu \omega$＂$\lambda \alpha \alpha \chi o v$ ，and see note under Aír0d－ vouat．
    $\ddagger$ The infin．dya入e入d $\mu \phi \theta \alpha$ stands in the text of Hippocr．Offic．Med．7．The

[^179]:    gloss àva入e入d́фөai in Erotian and $\mathrm{He}-$ sychius refers without doubt to it：but although this latter way of writing the perf．corresponds with the Ionicism（ $\lambda \epsilon$－
     as in $\lambda \epsilon \in \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha, \lambda \alpha \xi \circ \mu \alpha \iota, \& c$.$) ，yet the$ former way agrees too well with the other forms，and（to mention one）with $\lambda a \mu$－ $\pi \tau$ éos，Herodot．3，127．extr．，for us to hesitate a moment in retaining it．

[^180]:    * [The old pres. $\lambda \hat{y} \theta \omega$, midd. $\lambda \eta \theta 0-$ $\mu u$, , is seldom used by the Attics, frequently by Homer, who on the other hand never uses $\lambda a v \theta d \nu \omega$, though he has the imperf. of it three times and the imperf, midd. once. - Passow.]
     кoû̃a, for $\lambda d \dot{\theta} \theta o t$, is an Epic inaccuracy.
    $\ddagger$ It is quite a mistake to compare this form with those presents of Theocritus

[^181]:    ＊Through Aristarchus this is now be－ come the established reading．That this adj．occurs nowhere else would be no ob－ jection to it，but there is nothing in the passage to render its adoption necessary． The common meaning too of the simple $\lambda \eta \theta \omega$ may be considered as the causative of $\lambda$ t $\theta$ ouas，I forget；in as much as to for－ get is＂to lose the consideration of an ob－
     oneself from the observation or considera－ tion of another．＂This therefore has the causative idea from the object itself，but e a $2 \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{a}$ h）wever conceivable that usage adopted different forms to express that difference， a ad thus $\lambda e \lambda a \theta$ eiv and the compound

[^182]:    ＊The difficulty of ascertaining whether the Greeks ever used a fut．$\lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma \omega$ is greatly increased by our finding the pre－ sent very commonly written in the manu－ scripts with a single $\sigma$ ．
    $\dagger$［Passow says that $\lambda i ́ f(\omega$ occurs only

[^183]:    ＊The Germans say＂the heavens are （gestirnt）starred，＂but they cannot say ＂God（stirnte）starred the heavens．＂－ ［So our word frosted is formed like a participle，without however the existence of a verb to frost．－Ed．］

[^184]:    ＊The Scholiast on Aristoph．Plut． 657. has both opinions；＇E入ov̂ $\mu \in \nu$＇ $2 \pi \delta$ тoû $\lambda 6 \omega$（the corrupted $\lambda v \tilde{\omega}$ of the first edi－ tions has been erroneously altered to
     котクข．But Plutarch（De Poesi Hom．） quotes $\lambda о \bar{\tau} a t$ and ol $\mu \alpha$, as instances of the Attic usage тồ écaupeîv тà Bpaxє́a．
    $\dagger$ If those forms were abridged by syn－ cope，then，according to general analogy， we should find between $\lambda$ ov̂ $\mu a t-\lambda$－ $0 \hat{\tau} \alpha$, and between é $\lambda \frac{\partial}{\prime} \mu \eta \nu-E \in \lambda o u ́ t o ~ t h e ~ s e c o n d ~$ persons $\lambda o v ิ \sigma a u$ and ề $\lambda o v \sigma o$ ，nor would the imperat．$\lambda o \hat{v} \sigma o$ be defective．But these nowhere occur either in authors or grammarians：for $\lambda 0 \hat{v} \sigma \alpha l$ ，which stands in some editions of Phrynichus（see Ed． Pauw．p．80．），is a mere corruption of入ov̂тau．Lobeck has extracted the whole article from the first edition，according to which the forms disapproved of by Phry－ nichus（and they are the common ones）
    
    
     posed as pure Attic $\lambda о \hat{v} \sigma \theta a t$ каl $\lambda о \hat{v}$－
     è $\lambda o \hat{v} v \tau o$ ．Here $\lambda o v \in \in$ is omitted in the first series between $\lambda o v o \mu a i$ and $\lambda o v \in \tau a l$ ， and is therefore silently approved of： while no notice is taken of $\lambda$ bet（which we have brought forward above），pro－

[^185]:    * [Passow says that the Attics use $\mu \alpha-$ ขńбоцat as a kind of exclamation, as we

[^186]:    * See Heyne's critical notes on Il. a, 153. $\beta, 801 . \gamma, 137$. 254. and on $\alpha, 304$. $\beta, 377 . \gamma, 393$. $o, 633$. It would be a very hazardous step therefore to follow Aristarchus and Wolf in introducing the reading with the $\eta$ in all the passages. Besides, if we wish to observe analogy, we should rather make the $\epsilon \sigma \sigma$ the universal reading, as some of the older critics have proposed: see Heyne on Il. $\alpha, 298$. Compare the verb Arōouat (for although aibéopar became the common form in a later period, it is still to be looked upon
     ropat is the only defensible form in II . $\chi, 419$, while in Od. $\xi, 388$. it is opposed by aiठओборин: on this passage see Porson in Postscripto.
    + The three verbs which we have here joined together on account of their having the same letters in the stem, are certainly so similar to each other in meaning also, that no one would take it on himself to

[^187]:    $\ddagger$ [Thus Passow has $\mu$ е $\{\rho о \mu \boldsymbol{u}$; aor. $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\mu} \mu о р о \nu ;$ perf. $\left.{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \mu \rho \rho \alpha.\right]$
    § In many primitive verbs the fut. and aor. 1. act. give the preference to the causative meaning: the aor. 2 . and perf. act., particularly the perf. 2. (perf. midd.) prefer the immediate and indeed principally the intransitive.

[^188]:    * The aspirate on this word may be compared with that on $\because \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$, and on the presents $/ \sigma \tau \eta \mu$ and inт $\alpha \mu \alpha$, whence we may conclude that it was intended as a substitute for the reduplication; but this prisciple, like many others, was observed only partially. We find however a trace of its having extended in the dialects further than might at first appear, by a

[^189]:    * As no other forms occur than the 3. sing. $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu 6 \lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha l, \mu \epsilon ́ \mu 6 \lambda \in \tau 0$, a first person $\mu^{\prime} \notin 6 \lambda о \mu a \iota$ has been supposed to exist as the present from which these might be

[^190]:    * The verbs in $\mu \omega$ ( $\nu \in \notin \omega, \delta \epsilon \in \mu \omega$, $\beta \rho \epsilon \in \mu \omega$, $\tau \rho \epsilon \in \mu \omega)$ cannot follow the analogy of verbs which have $\lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho$ as their characteristic, further than the fut. and aor. ; hence in their other tenses they are sometimes

[^191]:    * I must not conceal that in a Cretan inscription in Chishull, p. 111., $\delta \in \in \lambda \in \gamma \eta \nu$ occurs as a plural ; but as the other Cretan inscriptions in the same collection have $\delta(\epsilon \lambda \in \gamma \in \nu$, it naturally throws great suspi. cion on the former, which however, whether true or not, would be of very little authority in deciding on a Homeric form.

[^192]:    + [Mio $\sigma \omega$ is used by Homer and the Attics, and by Herodot. exclusively, particularly in the pass, voice. The common pres. $\mu$ l $\nu v \mu \boldsymbol{\text { is }}$ never found in Hom. either act. or pass. : in the fut. he has the midd. $\mu \xi$ ( $\mu \alpha$, , and the pass. $\mu i \gamma h \sigma o \mu \alpha$, while Hes. has $\mu є \mu i \xi o \mu a \iota$. - Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ See Kтd́opas with notes.

[^193]:    ＊See Hemst．ad Lucian．Tim．8．and Schneider＇s Lexicon．That $\mu u ́ \int \omega$ is the older form appears certain not only from the glosses of Hesychius，who explains
     $\pi . \varepsilon^{2} p \chi$ ．8．we find $\mu\langle\zeta \epsilon t$ and $\mu \nu \zeta \epsilon \nu$ ，and

[^194]:    in Xen．Auab．4，5，27．，where the text
     dent that this last form，which occurs no－ where else，is corrupted by the addition of a superfluous $a$ ．

[^195]:    * That this was the old traditionary form is clear from the observations of the Grammarians in Schol. 11. $\gamma, 387$, in the Etym. M. in voc., and particularly from Aristarchus having written vaterówoa
    (Schol. Il. §, 415.). Uncritically enough. Aristarchus having written vaterowra
    (Schol. Il. ऽ, 415.). Uncritically enough. For if we suppose that Homer, having For if we suppose that Homer, having
    used vaserdovot, could not use vautтd́woa, both analogy and the old way of
     manuscripts have here and there, and which in Hymn. 17,6. is the only reading. And if this be the traditionary form, there
    must have been some grounds for it. Compare the imperat. $\sigma d d^{2} \omega$ under $\sum \hat{\alpha} \delta_{S}^{\prime} \omega$.
    + The termination -aim, like $-\alpha \dot{S} \omega$ and $-\alpha \nu \nu \nu \mu$, serves to strengthen the pres. where the $\alpha$ is short in the other tenses.
    $\ddagger$ This verb, like áqú$\sigma \sigma \omega$ and some others, follows therefore in its act. voice the general analogy of verbs in $-\sigma \sigma \omega$, with a palatic as its characteristic letter; but in the perf. pass. and verbal adj. its characteristic seems to have been a labial: compare B $\alpha \sigma \tau \alpha ́ S \omega$, $\Delta \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́ S \omega$. See also 'Ар $\quad$ о́ттш.

[^196]:    * We find $\nu \epsilon \mu \eta \theta \omega ิ \sigma \iota$, Demosth. Neær. 1380. ult., and $\nu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon i \sigma \eta s$, id. Phorm. 956, 12.
    + [Passow in his lex. has the follow-

[^197]:    * Photius has also Nôvtos, $\sigma \omega \rho \in \dot{o} o v$. тos, belonging therefore to Néw 1. This agrees also very well with the sup-

[^198]:    position, which indeed is pretty certain, that the meanings of to heap up (glomerare) and to spin are properly the

[^199]:    ＊See Stephan．Thesaur．in кагavvбтásw．Fisch．2．p．328．Asclep．Epig． 10. （e่v่ $\sigma \tau \tau \sigma \epsilon$ ）．

[^200]:    * [Passow says that the Attic fut. is
    
    only in the Orac. Sibyll.: see Jac. Anim. in Athen, p. 170.]

[^201]:    * The formation of this perf. corresponds exactly with that of ô $\chi \omega \kappa \alpha$ from é $\chi \omega$; thus ol $\chi \omega$, perf. ol $\chi \alpha$, with redupl. olk $\omega$ $\chi a$ (for the s of the second syllable could be omitted for no other reason than because there was one in the first ; compare $\delta \in(\delta \epsilon \kappa \tau о$ from $\delta$ einvupai), and thence, by transpo-

[^202]:    ＊［According to Porson $\mathrm{b}_{\ell \iota \sigma \theta d \nu \omega}$ is the only form used by good writers，but $\dot{\Delta \lambda l}$ realvw is found in Aristoph．Equ． 494. and is therefore as pure Attic as the other：$\dot{\lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta e ́ \omega \text { on the contrary is not a }}$ genuine form．－Passow．］
    ＋If we compare the analogy of G$\gamma \nu v \mu$ ， \＆c．，with this verb，we shall see that the latter is a euphonic change for $\delta \lambda \nu v u$ ．

[^203]:    * This verb is formed according to the analogy of $\alpha_{\gamma \nu v \mu}$ : compare also $\Delta \in\{-$ $\kappa \nu v \mu$, " $\mathrm{O} \lambda \lambda \nu \mu$.
    + In Andocides de Pace, p. 27, 43., the text still has ómoб日nбcтat; in Hy-

[^204]:    * See Grammat. ap. Herm. de Em. Gr. Gr.
    $\dagger$ [The imperf. midd. however occurs in Plato. The perf. avpuat is also found, but rarely. - Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ The manuscripts fluctuate indeed between ỏvival, -ivat, -eîval, -ท̂val, and Bekker has thence adopted ỏvท̂vat; but I

[^205]:    * [The radical idea of the old root ON $\Omega$ was perhaps to speak of a person in his absence, give him a good or bad character; whence byoua (by some incorrectly derived from עє́ $\mu \omega$ ), a good or bad name; and the same double meaning was originally in б̈veєठоos (likewise a derivative from this word), as in the Lat. honns: bvivnus on the other hand belongs to a different root, and has no connexion with буоиат.——Passow.]
    + Both ancient and modern commentators, mistaking the Epic language, were led by the explanation or place this form under obivqu. But grammatical analogy gains nothing by

[^206]:    * The general form of this perfect, as handed down to us in all the writers both of the Attic and common dialect, is ébpo, кa. But as in Aristoph. Plut. 98. 1046. Av. 1572. and in Comic. ap. Athen. 1. p. 15. 7. p. 279. a trisyllable was required, Dawes (Misc. p. 202. and 313.) introduced as an Attic form the Ion. ※paca. There were however other passages where this did not suit; these he altered arbitrarily, substituting for instance in Aristoph. Thesm. 32, 33. ¿@́pas: and he supported his general principle by the analogy of éd́ $\lambda \omega \nu$ and forms. Tyrwhitt however (ad Dawes. p. 454.) quoted two passages of the Alexandrine comic poet Machon, from Athen. 6. p. 244. with éwpasa, as Miे rapє $\omega$ ра-
     ка триิтоs..., both of which verses re-

[^207]:    * [Passow speaks of the aor. midd. $\dot{\omega} \psi a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ being merely a rare form, whence

    CEd. T. 1271. See Lobeck ad Phryn.
    p. 734.] p. 734.] the 3. plur. opt. b$\psi$ aıvzo in Herm. Soph.

[^208]:    * The same phrase ought undoubtedly to be restored to Plat. Legg. 12. p. 947. c. in the following passage, "a hundred youths from the Gymnasia obs tav of
     mon reading is enóquytal, but the best manuscript has $2 \pi \delta \psi \omega \nu \tau a l$, which is evidently a corruption of that old Attic and unusual form.
    $\dagger$ [Homer forms his imper. from the verb
     pres, and the imperf, from obpvbo ( $-\cdots$ ).pres. and the imperf, from opvow ( $-v-$.-
    Passow.]

[^209]:    * [Passow has given this verb a place in his Lexicon, and supposes it to be synonymous with ${ }^{\circ} \rho \nu \nu \mu \alpha u$.]
    + [Passow has the following article:
    "Opopar (from oupos, ठpda), I watch,

[^210]:    - This verb, like $\omega \theta \in \omega$ and $\omega^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\nu} \neq \mu a t$, took the syllabic augment instead of the temporal ; thus, $\pi \rho o \sigma e o u$ pouy, Demosth. c. Conon. init., ęvєovрทкóтas, Aristoph. Lys., Zoúpet, Lucian. Conviv. 35. Compare گoka under Elкс.
    + Oủp$\hat{p} \nu$ is joined by the Grammarians Gaza and Chrysoloras (see Fisch. 1. p. 127.) with $\pi \epsilon เ \nu \eta ิ \nu$ and $\delta เ \psi \hat{\nu \nu \nu}$ as an acknowledged form; we may therefore be sure that they had precedents for it from the older Grammarians.

[^211]:    ＊If all the above suppositions are cor－ rect，it will follow that there was an old
     $\sigma \phi \in i \lambda \alpha$ with a twofold meaning；1．I increase：2．I owe：of which the former became obsolete，and the latter took in the present the form of $\delta \phi \varepsilon i \lambda \omega$ ．

[^212]:    $\dagger$ Some verbs have a pres．both in－$\sigma \kappa \omega$ and－$\alpha \nu \omega$ ，as $\dot{\alpha} \mu 6 \lambda i \sigma \kappa \omega, \dot{\alpha} \mu 6 \lambda \iota \sigma \kappa \alpha{ }^{2} \omega \omega$ ：see
     oкáva no other present is in use than the one thus doubly strengthened by com－ bining both terminations．

[^213]:    - See Mué ${ }^{\prime} \omega$.
    + A false reading $\pi є ́ \pi \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota$, as also $\pi o \lambda v \pi \alpha \mu \mu \omega \nu$, is now banished from the printed text. Compare the subst. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \mu a$, ктทินа.

[^214]:    \$ Schneider in his Lexicon attempts to unite these two verbs, but he does it by etymological art, which ought to have no influence on grammatical treatment.

[^215]:    * Doderlein has a very good remark, that while from MAO- is formed $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$ by affixing the termination $-\sigma \kappa \omega$, the aspiration of the $\theta$, which disappears, is thrown on the $\kappa$, making $\pi \dot{d} \sigma \chi \omega$.
    $\dagger$ The fut. $\pi a \theta \eta \sigma \omega$, which is quoted by the old Grammarians, rests on a false separation of єU̇ாaӨخ $\sigma \omega$.

[^216]:    * As the verb occurs but seldom, (in the former sense кeipen is more usual, in
     be said with any certainty on the use of its forms. Whether $\pi$ éк $\omega$ is ever found I know not. Stephens has $\pi \in \kappa \delta \mu \in \nu=\nu$ ठépua, but without giving the passage from which he has taken it. The Epics have тeiкw, $\pi \epsilon \in \omega$, \&ec.; and this is the only formation which occurs. That the old Grammarians also considered $\pi$ eík as the pres. of $\pi \xi \xi \omega$, is clear from Schol.

[^217]:    * Wherever we find in the common language a verb in $-\dot{d} \zeta \omega$, which is not admissible in the hexameter, the Epics generally use a sister-form in -d. $\omega$.
    $\dagger$ This aor. must not be confounded with ${ }^{2} \pi \lambda \eta \mu \eta \nu$ under $\Pi / \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$.
    $\ddagger$ According to general analogy; this

[^218]:    contraction should take place in both dialects in $\eta$; for the $\alpha$ in кéкралка arises from the influence of the $p$. Perhaps, therefore, the Atticism in this verb was only to avoid a similarity with $\pi \lambda \eta \theta \omega$, particularly in $\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$ mentioned at the top of the next page.

[^219]:    * [Homer has also a 2. sing. imperf. midd. $\pi \in \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \kappa о$, Il. $\chi$, 433. and in Hes. Fr. 22, 4. is the 3. sing. те入є́oneтo. Passow.]

[^220]:    * Like кє́клофа from $\kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega$, and тÉтрофа from трє́тш; see note under K入є́ $\pi \tau \omega$.
    + I have not yet found any certain instances of this meaning in its strict and

[^221]:    * [Hermann doubts the admissibility of this Epic form in an Attic poet, and prefers reading $\pi \in \pi \epsilon$ [ратаь. - Passow.]

[^222]:    * [Passow adds the perf. act. $\pi \in \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha:$ on which see however the end of this article.]
    + Porson did not venture to reject the imperfect which occurs in Euripides, although he remarks that in both the passages where it is found (Iph. A. 1608. and Fragm. Polyidi 1.) the aorist would be more accurate. Doubtless he was deterred by the somewhat bold alteration of $\dot{a \pi \epsilon-}$

[^223]:    สтão for $\dot{\alpha} ф i \pi \tau a \tau o$ in the former of the two passages. But as Lucian will not
     кикбу, this emendation does not appear to me too bold.
    $\ddagger$ Hermann's opinion on Soph. CEd. T. 17., that $\pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta$ ac is an imperf., still wants the necessary proofs : in the passage itself the sense of the imperfect is by no means decisive.

[^224]:    * e.g. in Eurip. Ion. 90. and Aristoph. Av. 573, 574. where Brunck, contrary to all the manuscripts, reads as Attic $\pi \epsilon$ тєта.
    + Whatever may be our opinion of the odes of Anacreon, the 9th is clearly of too pure a period for us to endure such a barbarism as $\pi e \tau \tilde{\tau} \tau \alpha$. Compare épaббau from 'pquav, and $\partial \nu о \sigma \sigma o$ from $\overline{\nu \nu о \mu \alpha .}$
    $\ddagger$ The perfects $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \alpha \mu a t, \pi \in ́ \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$,
     $\tau о \mu \alpha, \Pi(\pi \tau \omega$, and $\Pi \tau h \sigma \sigma \omega)$, formed from verbs coming from the root ПET $\Omega$, are to be explained by syncope as for $\pi \in \pi \epsilon-$

[^225]:    * [The earliest occurrence of the pres. тє́ф [ 133.-Passow.]
    $\dagger$ See ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~A} \gamma \nu v \mu \ell,{ }^{2} \mathrm{~A} \xi \omega$.
    

[^226]:    * An aor. 2. act. of this form, ${ }^{2} \pi \lambda \eta \nu$ like $\sigma \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, appears also in the later lan. guage, but contrary to general analogy it has the same causative sense as $\pi i \mu$ $\pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu,{ }^{2} \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$; if indeed the reading àvE$\pi \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ in Alciphron 3, 46. be genuine.
    $\dagger$ We have shown in the note on $\beta \lambda$ кio under Bd $\lambda \lambda \omega$, that there are no grounds in the analogy of this optative for anything but the pure diphthong $a_{s}$ or $\epsilon$. I cannot therefore adopt $\pi \lambda \not{ }_{p} \mu \eta \nu$ as proposed by Dawes, although in Aristoph. Ach. 236. the reading ${ }^{2} \mu \pi \lambda \hat{y} \mu \eta \nu$ is supported by the Cod. Rav. instead of the common ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon<\mu \eta \nu$; and in Lysistr. 235., where the opt. is required, the emendation first suggested by the common corrupted reading ${ }^{e} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \eta \theta \eta$ is that judiciously adopted by Dawes, $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \hat{\hat{\eta} \theta}{ }^{\circ} \hat{\eta}$. In this case then, as in $\beta \lambda \epsilon$ io, $\beta$ 人и̂̀, I recognise a twofold

[^227]:    * It is true that in Heyne I find no variety of reading mentioned; but in Seber's Index this verse is quoted under $\pi \in \pi \epsilon-$
    $\rho \eta \mu$ évos, and under $\pi$ erp $\quad$ iúévos, and in each case the other form is expressly referred to as a various reading.

[^228]:    - See Draco, p. 73, 18. 79, 21. Hermann ad Eurip. Herc.F.1371.-Passow.]
    + Compare żv́бeтo, p. 73. and olve under $\Phi \in \rho^{\rho} \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ That the common form should be found in both passages even in the best manuscripts, as a various reading, is natural; but this can be no reason why any one should reject here, more than in other similar cases, the less usual form selected by the poet, unless it be from having fallen into the error (certainly a very pardonable one) of condemning it at once as a barbarism because it is found in the Alexandrine dialect: in which, to mention particulars, it appears to belong: to the class of aorists ending in $\alpha$ instead

[^229]:    - In the passage of Soph. CEd. Col. 1732. I consider the sense of $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ \pi\end{gathered} \tau \nu \in$ to be evidently that of an aorist, though Reisig doubts it; for the imperfect can hardly be compatible with the meaning of $a \tau c-$ фos (cadebat insepultus). On the other hand he appears to me to be perfectly right in his opinion that $\pi \iota \tau \nu \partial \nu \tau \omega \nu$ in Eurip. Supp. 691. is a present. But then

[^230]:    * See also Xen. Anab. 5, 9, 5. This passage alone would however leave the point still problematical. The old reading
     which there are nowhere any grounds; with a various reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \in \nu a b$. But from the context it would be much more

[^231]:    ＊On the formation of the two perfects and the aor．1．pass．see Teivw．

    + A more strict analogy would have given $\epsilon \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \nu, \zeta_{\mu} \mu \nu \bar{u} \theta \iota$ ，to which $\zeta_{\mu} \mu \nu \nu \in$ bears the same relation as $\pi i \in$ does to $\pi i \theta l$ ，only that $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ \pi \\ \text { a } \\ \text { is actually in use．}\end{gathered}$
    $\ddagger$ It has been stated rather hastily that the Doric $\pi \nu \xi \xi \frac{v}{\mu} \mu$ is the only acknow－ ledged future of this active verb．I find but one instance of it，viz．in Stephan．Thesaur． $h . v .$, but the passage is useless as a proof on account of its being in the Doric dialect， and from the uncertainty of the reading：
    

[^232]:    * Perhaps this verb might have arisen from the sense of the preposition $\pi \alpha \rho d$, as $\pi \alpha p \alpha$, it is there.

[^233]:    * [With the exception of the Tragedians, who always use $\pi \rho \alpha \sigma \sigma \omega$, Herm. ad Soph. Phil. 1435. - Passow.]
    + That the perfect in $-\gamma \alpha$ was the older form, is clear from the Epic poets generally using the perfect 2. But as the perfect active, particularly in transitive verbs, was not much wanted in Greek, it is conceivable that the ear might have become accustomed to what was of most frequent occurrence, какюิs $\pi$ ย́$\pi \rho \alpha \gamma a, \in \bar{\delta} \pi \in \pi \rho \alpha \gamma{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} s, \& c . ;$ so that when it was wished to express the transitive sense in the perfect, they endeavoured to represent it by the other form, which is also agreeable to analogy. I do not think the above decision of the At-

[^234]:    * Like ${ }^{2} \nu \delta \delta \partial \nu \omega, \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \lambda \alpha \mu \delta \alpha \nu \omega, \lambda \alpha \gamma-$ $\chi^{\alpha} \nu \omega, \mu \alpha \nu \theta \dot{\nu} \nu \omega$, and others: see note under AicӨd́vouar.
    $\dagger$ Perhaps also $\pi \in v \sigma o v ̂ \mu u$, , see Brunck
    ad Eurip. Hippol. 1104. Æsehyl. Prom. 987.
    $\ddagger$ On the $v$ of this perf. see note under X $\epsilon$.

[^235]:    * Though there is neither $\delta$ nor $\zeta$ in the present to account for the $\delta$ in this form, yet there are sufficient grounds for it in the $\sigma$ of ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \rho \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; for this perf. may be considered as the connecting link with a form in $\alpha \hat{S} \omega$, from which comes $\delta \alpha \sigma \sigma a \tau \epsilon$.

[^236]:    * Here the Teutonic languages offer us a comparison so palpable and unsought for, that we cannot but make use of it ; namely, in the English verb work, whence the perf. wrought, and the subst. wright; in which the $w$ before the $r$ is not pro-

[^237]:    ＊［The form $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ เสт $\epsilon \omega$ is found only in the pres．and imperf．，and seems to bear the same relation to pínte as jactare does in Latin to jacere，i．e．it has the collate－ ral idea of frequency，Herm．Soph．Aj． 235．Antig．131．It occurs first in $\mathrm{He}-$

[^238]:    rodot．4，94．188．\＆c．，afterwards in Xen． and other Attic writers．Elmsley ex－ cludes it from the Tragedians，but with－ out grounds；while Buttmann confines
     to the Attic writers．－Passow．］

[^239]:    ＊The direction in Phryn．Appar．p． 16. that the aor．1．act．should be written with an $\eta$ ，not with $\epsilon$ ，appears to be an error． Aristophanes Plut．668．has àmoбb＇́ $\sigma \alpha$ ．
    ［Passow，however，advises us not to be too hasty in condemning it，on account of the fut．$\sigma$ ह 万бо $\mu \boldsymbol{\text { a }}$ ．］
    $\dagger$ See note under Té́X $\boldsymbol{t}$ ．

[^240]:    * On the change from the diphthong to the $v$ of this perf. pass. see note unler Xéw.

[^241]:    * As $\sigma \epsilon \hat{v} \tau a t$ is indisputably a syncopated form, we class the others with it on account of the greater simplicity of the analogy; therefore $\sigma \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$, $\sigma o v \omega^{*} \sigma \in \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$, бо仑ิтal. Otherwise we may suppose a theme $\Sigma O \Omega$, particularly on account of $\sigma o \hat{v}$; as then $\sigma o v ̃ \sigma$ would be from $\sigma \delta \delta o-$ $\mu u$, contr. $\sigma o \hat{\mu} \mu a$, like ऊє́jpvoo from

[^242]:    * The above account of the genuine Attic usage of this verb does not, it is true, rest on any statement of the old

    Grammarians; but that the great rarity of the pres. $\sigma \kappa$ 免 $\tau \in \sigma \theta a$ is not accidental, is proved by the very frequent occurrence

[^243]:    ＊［Reisig conjectures that we should read a fut．$\sigma \tau \in \nu \in \hat{\imath}$ in Soph．©el．Col． 1710. －Passow．］

[^244]:    

    + Stephens in his Thesaurus quotes $\kappa \alpha$－ $\tau \in \sigma \tau \delta р \eta \nu \tau o$ from Herodot．8，53．，where
    however the text has кат $\alpha_{\sigma \tau \rho \omega}$ ． any various reading．
    

[^245]:    * [Hence the part. $\sigma \omega$ ovtes, Od. $\iota, 430$. and the Ionic imperf. $\sigma \omega \in \sigma \kappa о \nu$, Il. श, 363. Apoll. Rhod. has also $\sigma \omega \in \tau \epsilon$, and the midd. $\sigma \omega \in \sigma \theta a \iota$. - Passow.]
    $\dagger$ Bekker has in many cases restored the old form from the manuscripts.

[^246]:    ＊The false reading $\sigma$ áouvt，and the similar error of $\sigma$ do（amended by Bekker in the above quoted passage of Theognis），

[^247]:    * See the end of the article on $\sum \omega \omega_{6} \omega$, and the references there given.
    + [Thucyd. 7, 36. has the fut. midd. $\tau а р \alpha \xi о \mu a t$ in a passive sense,-Passow.]

[^248]:    * [In Homer, where the metre requires it, $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \omega_{0}$ - Passow.]
    $\dagger$ See the note on T入ฑิva.
    $\ddagger$ The part. perf. тeт $\mu \eta \alpha^{\prime}$ is found in

[^249]:    Apoll. Rhod. 4, 156. in a passive sense. See кєкорךш́s under Kоре́vขvди, and кє$\kappa \mu \eta \omega_{s}^{s}$ under Káu»ш.
    § See note, p. 39.

[^250]:    * Indeed the use of the two forms $\boldsymbol{\ell \tau \epsilon} \mathrm{f}$. $\phi \theta \eta v$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \rho \pi \eta \nu$, as there is no metrical cause for it, is very remarkable, and is perhaps one of the numerous traces of these poems having passed though a variety of mouths. Probably therefore $\tau d \rho$ $\phi \theta \eta$ (for which indeed at Od. т. 213. some have read $\tau d \rho \pi \eta$ ) is a mixture of the two genuine old readings above-mentioned.
    † Heyne's objection to the derivation

[^251]:    - It is true that there is no other in. stance of an aor. 2. pass. in $\sigma \eta \nu$; but this arises only from there being in the common language no verb with $\sigma$ as its characteristic. This aorist is therefore quite regular; and consequently to suppose an intransitive active TEPEE , to which these infinitives might belong according to the analogy of фор $\eta \nu \alpha$, , форй$\mu \in \nu a u$, would be to increase unnecessarily the number of themes. Besides these forms must then be in the present, synonymous with тépoeaөal, the meaning of which is "to continue to get drier," whereas in both the above passages the idea is that of "being completely dry." And the plan of the older Grammarians of joining

[^252]:    * On the change of the diphthong to $v$, see note under Xéw.
    + See the end of Art. on $\Lambda \in i \pi \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ Wherever the causative and the immediate meaning are expressed by different active forms, the perf. (whether perf. 1. or 2.) and the nor. 2. beiong always to the immerliate sense, as
    

[^253]:    ＊In I1．$\nu, 346$ ．the reading of most of the manuscripts，and，until very lately， of the text also，was $\tau \in \tau \in$ údarov in the sense of to prepare．But as the perfect cannot possibly stand in that passage， the other reading retev́ŋєтov，which the Scholiast also follows，has been adopted． This，however，is equally inadmissible． For whether it be considered as a pre－ sent（which is contrary to Homer＇s prac－ tice in the narrative），or as an imperfect with the termination of－Toy for－Tทע， such a form as retєúX $\omega$ for $\tau \in \dot{\chi} \chi \omega$ or $\tau \in$－ revðov for éreṽov is quite unheard of， and（which is decisive），not required by the metre．There is no doubt，therefore， that the reading of the Schol．Ven．，ex－ tracted from some old copies（ETcuरetov
     That is to say，as the termination in－Tov of this imperfect，though not without pa－

[^254]:    * [Passow is of opinion that Buttmann has not sufficient grounds for suspecting these two forms.]
    $\dagger$ We find also in Hippocr. De Nat.

[^255]:    Puer. c. 4, an Ionic form $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \nmid \nu \omega$, which Passow pronounces to be a false reading for тетраiv.

[^256]:    * [Passow objects to the writing of this form with $\nu \nu$, and prefers $\tau\{\nu \nu \mu$ in all cuses, with the $t$ long in the Epic, and
    short in the Attic writers, like $\tau\left\{\nu \omega_{.}\right]$
    $\dagger$ The conjunctive is not in use.

[^257]:    ＊Among the laws which regulate the Greek aspirates，we may observe the fol－ lowing；that where two successive syl－ lables begin each with an aspirate，one of the aspirates，generally the first，is changed to the tenuis of the same organ：and when by any formation the second disappears， the first is restored．Thus，the root of this verb is $\Theta P E \Phi-$ ，whence $\tau \rho \in ́ \phi \omega$ ，and again Tpé $\psi \omega$ ．
    $\dagger$ Not тéтрaф0au，which belongs to $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \omega$ ，and which；though found in all the manuscripts in Xen．Hell．2，3， 24. （17．），must nevertheless be a corruption． Téधpaфөє in Plat．Legg，init．is the cor－ rect reading．Compare $\tau \epsilon \theta \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta \alpha$ under Өव́лт $\omega$ ．
    $\ddagger$［Yet in Callim．Jov．55．we find
    
    § Of the passages in which these pas－ sive forms are now found，we must first reject 11．$\beta, 661$ ，，where the old reading
     pots ยข̈nク久ктots was first changed by Barnes to $\tau \rho \alpha \dot{d} \eta \in V$ ，to the injury of the rhythm，and at the same time in op－ position to almost all the manuscripts； for not one has $\tau \rho \alpha^{\prime} \phi \eta$ dv in regular order， nor is there the least trace of such a read－

[^258]:    ＊On the formation of this future see T $\rho \hat{\varepsilon} \phi \omega$, ，Npé $\psi \omega$ ，and note．

[^259]:    * Dinarchus has àmoтєфवरка twice.

[^260]:    * See note under Kpailv.
    + It is singular that Apollonius does not, as might have been expected, quote ap $\hat{\omega}$ from alpco as similar in quantity to $\phi \alpha \nu \omega \overline{\text {, }}$ but $\beta a y \hat{\omega}$, of which the proofs are not so strong as they are of the two others. But perhaps the original word there was $\kappa \rho a-$ $\nu \hat{w}$, which is very similar to $\phi$ aivo and

[^261]:    
    
    
     Sic. 13, 18.]

    + To these must be added the Epic infin. oi $\sigma \in \epsilon \in \nu$, ol $\sigma^{\ell} \mu \in \nu a l$ (which occurs as

[^262]:    * Compare also $\alpha y d \gamma \kappa \eta$, which is evidently a reduplication from the stem ${ }^{2} \gamma \chi \epsilon \omega$.

[^263]:    ＊Reiz，Schneider in his Lexicon voc． ayต́̈бтos，and Lobeck，Parerg．p．733．，con－ sider both as corruptions and read avoi－ $\sigma a s$ ，Kyon $\sigma \tau o s$ ；and certainly in Herodot． 7，149．we find the fut．dvoi⿱㇒日⿰㇇⿰亅⿱丿丶丶⿱⿰㇒一乂，in a si－ milar sense（referre ad populum），without any various reading．Hermann on the contrary conjectures it to be an old Ionicism，and he has this in his favour； that Aretæus，who affects the Ionic dia－ lect，has（2，11．），¿ขvótaтos from àvaфє́－ peo，consequently an imitation of Herodo－ tus．But errors are frequently found even in works of great antiquity；and as we meet with this incorrect form in this compound only，the mistake was perhaps caused by the similar sound of the other avaíaros，unexpected，which is correctly formed from à and（otopai）di̋ $\sigma \delta \delta$ ，like ¿עひ́vvuos，¿עш́ $\mu \alpha \lambda o s, \& c$ ．And why should

[^264]:    －The Grammarians are at variance on the accent of this form：see Schol． Aristoph．Equ．22．Lobeck（ad Phryn． pp．60．172．），unhesitatingly rejects $\phi \dot{d} \theta \iota$ ， but I prefer it to $\phi a \theta^{\prime}$ ，as this imperative is not enclitic like $\phi \eta \mu$ ．
    ＋Matthie in his Grammar directs that the 2．sing．indic．should be written with－

[^265]:    ＊However，in Plat．Hipp．Maj．p． 289. 9．，фávat is considered as a genuine pre－ sent．
    $\dagger$［The $a$ is long in the Epic，but short

[^266]:    - $\Delta$ tєфөapéaro in Herodot. 8, 90. would be 3. plur, aor. 2. midd., of which tense however there is no other instance whatever. Some manuscripts have the imperfect, but we must adopt, with Her-

[^267]:    mann, the pluperfect $\delta \iota є \phi \theta$ dipato.

    + In the latter passage the reading of the text was until lately $\phi \theta$ eĩ $o$, arising from a false conception of the unusual form $\phi$ өíтo.

[^268]:    - [Mavins $\mathrm{vino}^{\mu v p l a} \phi \lambda u ́ \zeta \omega \nu$, Nicand. Alex. 214.-Schneid. Lex.]

[^269]:    * 'ETte $\sigma \phi \rho \in$ !'s is also quoted by Hermann from Eurip. Phaëth. 2, 50.
    $\dagger$ This form is mentioned by all the Grammarians and in Stephan. Thesaur. in voc., but I know not from what writer it is taken. The simple $\phi$ pés is in the Etym. M. p. 740, 12. This compound surely could not have found its way into such general tradition (as there is nothing elsewhere to lead to it), had it not been in actual use at some earlier period. I almost think that érфреs must have been the original reading in Aristoph. Vesp. 162. instead of $\kappa \kappa \in \rho \in$, which cannot be

[^270]:    $\ddagger$ [Passow has 'Eıфрєíw Poet. for 'Eкфре́ш.]
    § [In Schneider's Lexicon we find 'E $\mu$ m
     order to fill up an aperture, Aristot. H. A. 5, 6. Є$\mu \pi t ф \rho \alpha \dot{\nu} \alpha \iota$ єis $\tau \delta \nu \mu \nu \kappa \tau \bar{\eta} \rho a$. But the word is suspicious, - Passow omits it allogether in his Lexicon.]
    || Фрéc has been most improperly reckoned among the sister-forms of $\phi \in \rho \omega$ : for though it may be wished to class it etymologically with that verb, still its totally distinct meaning requires a grammatical treatment equally distinct.

[^271]:    ＊In Xen．Cyr．8，6，3．ठıатєфи入dкабь is a false reading for $-\lambda \dot{\alpha} \chi \alpha \sigma \iota$ ．

    + Whether both were used in Attic prose，is still a question．In Thucyd．

[^272]:    * [There is no instance of the simple $\chi \alpha \delta \omega$ in the active voice. - Passow.]

[^273]:    * Lobeck (ad Phryn. p. 740.) is wrong in speaking of this reading as suspicious. The expression où $\chi u \iota \eta \sigma \sigma \iota s$, "you shall have cause to rue it," was so common, that the transition to the aorist became quite natural, and it is at the same time very conceivable that oinc $\dot{\varepsilon}^{\chi} \chi d \rho \eta$ would

[^274]:    have given a somewhat different meaning. Hence I cannot but think it a question worth considering, whether the earlier writers would not bave used the same expression in this case, and whether Plutarch had not some precedent for his use of $i t$.

[^275]:    ＊［Buttmann，in his Lexil．p．181．，sup－ poses another fut．$\chi$ nбо⿱口木，of which the 3．sing．$\chi$ hoterat may be read in a cor－ rupted passage of Hom Hymn．Ven． 253．］

[^276]:    ＋［According to Ap．Dysc．there was also a perf．кє́ $\chi$ аүка．－Passow．］
    $\ddagger$ The mention by Chrysoloras in his Grammar that $\chi$ aliv was not in use， shows that the older Grammarians had before taught the same．

[^277]:    * Some verbs change the diphthong ev of the radical syllable in the perf. pass, to
    
     $\sigma \mu a l$. Xé $\omega$, as one of the verbs in - $\epsilon \omega$ which take $\varepsilon v$ in the inflexion, follows the same analogy. In all these perfects the $v$ is short.
    + Whatever appearance there was in Homer of these forms, has now been changed on the best authority to the Epic formation mentioned in the following paragraph of the text.

[^278]:    * If we suppose a present from which to form this perfect, it must be $\chi \lambda \boldsymbol{1} \delta \omega$ (like $\pi \lambda \eta \theta \omega \pi \epsilon \in \pi \lambda \eta \theta \alpha$ ) ; which is connected with $\chi \lambda \wedge \bar{\eta} \eta$, but not with ках $\lambda \dot{d} \delta \omega$, a term signifying sound; nor is it akin to $\kappa \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \omega$, partly because the stem of this latter has $\gamma \gamma$, partly because analogy gives us the change of $\chi$ to $\kappa$ (in кeкáס and the like), but not the converse of $\kappa$ to $\chi$ which would be required in this case. [Passow, however, forms this perfect from a present $\chi^{\lambda} \alpha \delta \omega$, Dor. $\chi^{\lambda} \dot{\eta} \delta \omega$, which be makes exactly synonymous with its com-
    

[^279]:    $\chi \lambda d(\sigma \sigma \alpha)$, supposing both to mean the bursting forth of water from a spring or any confined place, or the bubbling of boiling water.]

    + Some other old deviations of meaning in this verb come from the idea of to lay hold on: see $\chi \rho d \omega$, è $\pi \imath \chi \rho a ́ \omega, ~ \chi p a v ́ \omega$, and xpaiva, in Schneider's Lexicon; where, however, there are no striking peculiarities of deviation. It appears to me evident that all these and the meaning of to give, \&c., come etymologically from $\chi \in$ ¢p, $\chi \in \rho \delta$ s.

[^280]:    
    

    + [This meaning properly belongs to

[^281]:    * All the above-mentioned forms are undoubtedly pure Ionic ; and this uncertainty of usage is not otherwise than surprising, even in a dialect. That the same writer should have had a twofold usage in the same form, is an unreasonable supposition. Undoubtedly, therefore, the variation in the forms of this verb in Herodotus arose entirely from the uncertainty of tradition, and from the different Grammarians who employed themselves on the

[^282]:    * Perhaps the shorter form $\chi p \hat{\eta} \nu$ had become so general in common life, that

[^283]:    * Such an irregularity could arise only from the original meaning of the expression being entirely forgotten. In these compounds the active $\chi$ paco is used exactly in its true sense. The thing supplies us with what we need; in dmo $\chi \rho \hat{\mathrm{q}}$, enर $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \underset{q}{\text { q. }}$ it supplies us to the extent of our need; in $\alpha \nu \tau \iota \chi \rho \hat{a}$ it supplies us by acting in opposition to our need. The similarity of the German expression to the Greek illustrates this in a most striking manner: in German darreichen means to reach

[^284]:    (any thing) forward, offer; hinreichen, to reach or extend to any certain point, und also to be sufficient.
    $\dagger$ This meaning arises from those forms of Xpdoc which have the meaning of $I$ need, in which sense, however, the verb xpņco itself occurs in the later writers only: see Stephan. Thesaur.
    $\ddagger$ [Schneider quotes $\chi$ phso in this sense from Eschyl. Choeph. 338., Soph. Ed. C. 1246., Eurip. Hel. 523.]

