







CATALOGUE

A

OF

IRREGULAR GREEK VERBS,

WITH

ALL THE TENSES EXTANT,

THEIR

FORMATION, MEANING, AND USAGE.

BY

PHILIP BUTTMANN, LL.D.,

LATE PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN, AND LIBRARIAN OF THE ROYAL LIBRARY.

TRANSLATED AND EDITED,

WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES, AND A VERY COPIOUS INDEX,

BY THE REV. J. R. FISHLAKE,

Late Fellow of Wadham Coll., Oxford ; TRANSLATOR OF "BUTTMANN'S LEXILOGUS."

Second Edition.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1844.

SLACKHEATH PROPRIETARY SCHOOL.

LONDON : Printed by A. Sportiswoode, New-Street-Square.

) Wayne (w a)

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.

A 2

1097756

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 -\alpha\u00e7\u00e9, -1\u00e7\u00e9, -\u00e4\u00e7\u00e9, -\u00e9\u00e9\u00e9, -\u00e9\u00e9\u00e9\u00e9, -\u00e9 - $\epsilon i \omega$, $-\delta \omega$, $-\dot{z} \omega$, and $-\dot{\epsilon} \omega$, 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 -xa, and are invariably defective in the aor. 2. active and passive. For the same reason he has excluded those also which are formed in $-\omega$ with the preceding syllable of the radical word strengthened; consequently those ending in $-\alpha i\rho \omega$, $-\lambda \lambda \omega$, $-\pi \tau \omega$, - $\tau\tau\omega$, 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 alitalia, aor. 2. ήλιτον; in κτυπέω, aor. 2. (from ΚΤΥΠΩ) έκτυπον,-such verbs have a place in the following Catalogue; as have also all those ending in -avw, 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

^{*} Of these $\delta\lambda\lambda d\sigma\sigma\omega$ only has an aor. 2. consequently is placed in the following catalogue as an exception to a general analogy.

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 $-\omega$, they are generally distinguished merely thus, 'AA-, AHB-, &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 σ ," 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.

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 $\Lambda HB-$ for $\lambda \eta \psi_{0\mu\alpha i}$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda \alpha \tilde{\epsilon} \omega$, but of many which are merely apparent, i. e. where a change, for which there is no foundation in the regular inflexion, 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 $K \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \omega$.

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 $\chi^{\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega}$, $\chi^{\acute{\alpha}}\acute{\zeta}_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$, $\chi^{\alpha\nu\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega}$ are etymologically the same, and yet each must be preserved distinct from the others, to render the explanation of each the more clear and intelligible; $\chi^{\alpha\delta\epsiloni\nu}$ must be confined to the sense of containing, $\chi^{\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\sigma\delta\alpha\iota}$ to that of yielding, and $\chi^{\alpha\nu\epsiloni\nu}$ 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 CHEVEREL, Nov. 1837.

viii

IRREGULAR VERBS.

A.

[']Aá ω , *I harm*, *lead into error*. Of this verb Homer has the 3. pres. pass. $\dot{a}\tilde{a}\tau a\iota^*$, the aor. 1. act. $\ddot{a}a\sigma a$, cont. $\ddot{a}\sigma a$ (Od. λ , 61.), and of the pass. and midd. $\dot{a}\dot{a}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, $\dot{a}a\sigma\dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$, $\ddot{a}\sigma a\sigma\theta a\iota$. Both alphas are common. Verbal adj. $\dot{a}a\tau \delta c$, whence with \dot{a} priv. $\dot{a}\dot{a}a\tau \delta c$ ($-- \simeq$) *inviolable*.

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

It may perhaps be thought that $A\Omega$ is the original form of this verb, and $d\dot{\alpha}\omega$, $d\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ 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 $d\tau d\omega$ the original, and that the τ was dropped afterwards. The true original form is AFA Ω , as is evident from the Pindaric $a\dot{v}d\sigma a$ (Pyth. 2, 28.), and the Laconian $d\dot{\alpha}\delta\kappa\tau\sigma_{\Omega}$ (Hesych.) for $d\dot{\alpha}a\tau\sigma_{\Omega}$. On the other hand the meaning of to satiate is classed under $\ddot{\alpha}\omega$, 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 $d\dot{\alpha}a\tau\sigma_{\Omega} (d\dot{\alpha}\omega)$ inviolable, and $d\tau\sigma_{\Omega} (\ddot{\alpha}\omega)$ insatiable.

"AAΩ, I satiate. See "Aω.

'Αγάλλω[‡], I deck, adorn : fut. ἀγάλῶ; aor. ήγηλα,

[* used in an active sense; but see Lexilog. p. 8. and note.—ED.] [+ I find the α in $\dot{\alpha}\tau\dot{\alpha}\omega$ marked long

[\dagger I find the α in $d\pi d\omega$ 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. Soph. Aj. 269. and Eurip. Suppl. 182. The former is decisive in favour of the length of the α , in the latter it is uncertain. — ED.]

[‡ The active does not occur in Homer, Hesiod, or Herodotus. Pindar is the earliest writer in which it is found.—Ep.] αγήλαι (Eurip. Med. 1027. Lex. Seguer. p. 328.)—Midd. ἀγάλλομαι, I pride myself on, delight in : the aor. of this voice is nowhere found.

^{*}Αγαμαι, I admire: Depon. Pres. and imperf. like ^{*}σταμαι, Od. ζ, 168.; fut. midd. ἀγάσομαι; aor. ἠγάσθην, Eurip. Herc. F. 845. Epist. 3, 8., part. ἀγασθεὶς; Epic [†]γασάμην, but found also in Demosth. pro Cor. 59. and Aristid., and in Il. γ, 181. ἠγάσσατο.

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 $d\gamma \dot{a} \phi \mu a u$ in the Epic poets (Hes. 9. 619. $d\gamma \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon v \sigma_{5}$, Od. ϵ , 119. 122. $\eta \gamma \dot{a} a \sigma \theta \epsilon$); $d\gamma a (\phi \mu a u$ has it in Ionic prose also. The other tenses have both meanings in common, e. g. II. ρ , 71. $d\gamma \dot{a} \sigma \sigma a \tau \sigma$, he envied; Od. σ , 71. $\dot{a} \gamma \dot{a} \sigma a \tau \tau \sigma$, they admired.

"Ayaµaı is used by all writers in a good sense. The above induction appears sufficient to confine $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha\iota$ to the other meaning; to which one passage only, Od. π , 203., seems at first sight to be an exception. But $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\alpha}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ in that passage would be utterly superfluous, if we understand it in the sense of merely admiring ($O\breve{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon \ \vartheta\alpha\upsilon\mu\dot{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\dot{\omega}\sigma\iota\sigma\nu\ o\check{\upsilon}\tau'\ \dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\alpha}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$). Hence I think that the idea of admiration is heightened to the collateral idea of envy, i.e. Ulysses represents the excessive admiration of his son as bordering on envy or jealousy.

'Αγγέλλω, I announce : fut. ἄγγελῶ; aor. 1. ήγγειλα. — 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 depends on a single letter. Thus in Eurip. Androm. 1242. $(\dot{a}\pi a\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\eta)$, in Iph. A. 353. $(\delta\iota\dot{\eta}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\sigma\nu)$, and in Thuc. 8, 86. $(\dot{a}\pi\dot{\eta}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\sigma\nu)$ 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. $\dot{a}\pi\dot{\eta}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$ is actually restored to the text from the best manuscripts. The same has been done in Xen. Anab. 3, 4, 14, where, contrary to Xenophon's usage, $\pi a\rho\dot{\eta}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\epsilon$ formerly stood. But in Lycurg. 18. p. 150, 8. and 87. p. 158, 26. the manuscripts offer no alternative for $\dot{a}\pi\dot{\eta}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\eta}\gamma\epsilon\iota\epsilon$, but the imperfect, which does not suit the context*: and so in Plat. Meno 2. $\dot{a}\pi a\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, though otherwise weakly

* 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 judiciously than at 15. p. 149, 32. of the same work, where he has adopted from one manuscript the imperfect in the place of $a\pi/\eta\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\sigma\nu$, which is evidently incorrect.

supported, may be defended by the sense against the present, which is found in a great majority of the manuscripts. In Soph. Œd. T. 955. the reading $\dot{a}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu$ is from Triclinius only; the Codd. and the old editions have ἀγγελών, 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 ἀγγέλωμεν in Eurip. Or. 1539. (1533. Matth.) and my note on Demosth. Mid. 11, 2. Least of all should I have thought of altering $\pi a \rho h \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon +$ 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. $(\eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \eta \varsigma)$ without any various reading, although $\eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \theta \eta \varsigma \pm$ would be admissible. In Æl. V. H. 9, 2. occurs διηγγέλη. In Plut. Galb. 25. απηγγέλη.-In $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu$ and $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon i \nu$ 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.

'Aγείρω, I collect together; Att. redupl.-MIDD.

Of the aor. 2. midd. the Epic language has $d\gamma\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu\tau\sigma$, $d\gamma\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, and the syncopated part. $d\gamma\rho\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$. — Compare Έγείρω.

From *ήγερέθομαι* an Epic sister-form of the perf. and imperf. midd. come *ήγερέθονται*, -oντo; to which we may without doubt refer the reading of Aristarchus *ήγερέθοσθαι*, II. κ, 127. instead of the common reading *ήγερέεσθαι*.—Compare *ήερέθονται* under Α*ἴρω*.

We may certainly feel some hesitation in explaining $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\rho\rho\nu\tau\sigma$ II. β , 94. to be an aorist, and $\dot{\eta}\gamma\epsilon\rho\nu\tau\sigma$ β , 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. β , 106. 171. $\ddot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon$. $\pi\epsilon\nu$ and $\lambda\epsilon\bar{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon$ (at least according to form) as aor. and imperf., as little must we hesitate here. And when at II. β , 52. we read $\tau o \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \rho \rho \tau \tau \sigma$ $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda' \ddot{\omega}\kappa \alpha$, and at Od. ξ , 248. $9o\bar{\omega}_{\zeta} \delta' \dot{\epsilon}\sigma \alpha \gamma \epsilon i\rho \alpha \tau \delta \alpha \dot{\epsilon}$, we have a similar 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. β , 52. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon i\rho \rho \tau \tau \sigma$ at the side of $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa \dot{\eta} \rho \nu \sigma \sigma \nu$ is a very natural imperfect, and at v. 94. $\dot{\alpha}\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \rho \nu \tau \sigma$,

* [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 Sophoeles, the sense so plainly requires the future, that I feel certain Buttmann must have confounded this with some other passage.]

† [Yet Schweighäuser has retained απήγγελον in Herodot. 4, 153.]

t [Dindorf reads ηγγέλθης.]

в 2

it is true, stands in the midst of imperfects. But when it is said oi δ' $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \rho \nu \tau o$. $T \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \chi \epsilon \iota \delta' d\gamma o \rho \eta$, it is quite as natural to render it, "And now they were assembled [not assembling]: the crowd heaved restlessly." Besides, as $d\gamma \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$ (by syncope for $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$) is undoubtedly an aor. particip. assembled, so $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$) is undoubtedly an aor. particip. assembled, so $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$) is undoubtedly an aor. particip. assembled, so $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$) is undoubtedly an aor. particip. assembled, so $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$) is undoubtedly an aor. particip. assembled, so $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$) as the considered an aorist also. Nor is there anything in Od. β , 385. to prevent our accenting, with Barnes and Porson, $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, and the silent traditionary accent on an infinitive occurring but once can be of no authority.— Compare "Expecteda.

"Αγημαι. See Ηγέομαι.

'Αγνοέω, I am ignorant of: fut. ἀγνοήσομαι, but also ἀγνοήσω, Demosth. c. Zenoth. p. 885. Conon. p. 1266. Theocrin. p. 1337. whence the passive sense of ἀγνοήσεσθαι in Demosth. pro Cor. p. 310. is less surprising. [Vid. Hemsterh. ad Thom. Mag. in v.]

[']Αγνώσσασκε Od. ψ, 95. has a various reading ἀγνώσσεσκε as old as itself. These iteratives are sometimes formed from the aorists, sometimes from the imperfect; thus ἕτυπτον becomes τύπτεσκον; ἕτυψα τύψασκον; ἕλιπον — λίπεσκον: and there are a few which take in the Epic poets a instead of ϵ after the characteristic of the present, as ρίπτασκον, κρύπτασκον, in which case they correspond in meaning with those formed from the aorists. Now there is nothing in the sense of Od. ψ, 95. to induce us to prefer either form. If we take ἀγνώσσεσκε, it must be from the imperf. of ἀγνώσσω: if we decide in favour of the aorist, nothing appears more natural than ἀγνώσασκε for ἀγνόήσασκε, as Homer uses elsewhere the verb ἀγνοέω only, and this explanation is supported by the ἀλλόγνωσας of Herodot. 1, 85.

["]Ayvoµ, I break (trans.): fut. $\mathring{a}\xi\omega^*$; the past tenses nave the syllabic augment: aor. act. $\check{\epsilon}a\xi\alpha$ (II. η , 270. contr. $\check{\eta}\xi\alpha$, II. ψ , 392. Od. τ , 539.), aor. pass. $\check{\epsilon}a\gamma\eta\nu$ with α long: the perf. 2. $\check{\epsilon}a\gamma\alpha$ (Sappho), Ion. $\check{\epsilon}\eta\gamma\alpha$, has the passive or intransitive sense, I am broken \dagger . — MIDD.

The *a* in this verb is originally long, as shown particularly in its derivatives $\bar{a}\gamma \eta$, $d\bar{a}\gamma \eta \varsigma$, which are connected with $\epsilon \dot{a}\gamma \eta \nu$ in the same way as $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma \eta$ is with $\epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \eta \nu$, and $\epsilon \nu \bar{\iota} \pi \eta$ with $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \bar{\iota} \pi \sigma \nu$. Hence the *a* of the

+ As the perf. 2. generally gives the preference to the intrans. sense, we find in a great number even of transitive verbs

^{*} Formed according to the general rule of verbs in μ from the obsolete $\check{\alpha}\gamma\omega$, like Δ EIK Ω , $\delta\epsilon(\kappa\nu\nu\mu)$, $\delta\epsilon(\xi\omega)$, &c.

root is long in the aor. 2. pass. $i \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu$, as we see from some passages of the Attics (Brunck on Aristoph. Ach. 928.), and from II. λ , 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 II. γ , 367., who tries to establish and not without probability, the digamma and the long α uniformly. In the latter poets, as Theorr. 22, 190. it is most certainly short. Compare $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \pi \tau \omega$, 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 kavážaıç (ϵ , 664. 691.), which can be explained in no other way. That is to say, FAZAI became in composition KAFFAZAI, as $\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega$ kać- $\xi \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega$. 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 V, Y and F, it passed over into v, and consequently with the a into the diphthong av. See the same process in $\epsilon \dot{v} a \delta \epsilon v$, under 'Avdárw.

This makes the occurrence of $\tilde{\eta}\xi\varepsilon$ for $\check{\epsilon}a\xi\varepsilon$ twice in Homer (II. ψ , 392. Od. τ , 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 $\kappa \dot{a}\tau \eta \xi\iota\varsigma$, $\kappa \dot{a}\tau \eta \gamma \mu a$ (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 η in the root: in Homer on the other hand, who elsewhere invariably uses $\check{\epsilon}a\xi a$, and, dropping the augment, $\check{a}\xi a\nu\tau\sigma$ II. ζ , 40. π , 371. (see below the same form under $\check{A}\gamma\omega$), $\tilde{\eta}\xi a$ can be only the augment. If however we compare $\check{a}\tau\eta$, which comes from AFATA, we shall be the less surprised at $\tilde{\eta}\xi a$ 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 $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \alpha \gamma \tilde{\eta}$, $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \alpha \gamma \tilde{\epsilon} (\varsigma)$, as for instance in De Artic. 35. bis. Vectiar.

See also κήδομαι κέκηδα, μαίνομαι μέμηγα, οίγω ἀνοίγομαι ἀνέφγα, ὅλλυμαι ὅλωλα, πείθομαι πέποιθα, πήγνυμαι πέπηγα, ἡήγνυμαι ἕβρωγα, σήπομαι σέσηπα, τήκομαι τέτηκα, φαίνομαι πέφηνα, φθείρομαι ἕφθορα, γίγνομαι γέγονα. Compare also δέρκομαι, μείρομαι, and προβέβουλα under βούλομαι. From this its connexion with passive or middle forms arose the improper appellation of the perfect midd.

this form only with the immediate meaning, which in almost all cases is of an intransitive nature : thus-

άγνυμι--- άγνυμαι, I break (intrans.); perf. ἕāγa, I am broken.

δαίω — δαίομαι and δέδηα, I burn (intrans.).

 $[\]epsilon \gamma \epsilon l \rho \omega - \epsilon \gamma \epsilon l \rho \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, I wake (intrans.); $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \rho \rho \alpha$, I am on the watch.

 $[\]tilde{\epsilon}$ λπω — $\tilde{\epsilon}$ λπομαι, and $\tilde{\epsilon}$ ολπα, I hope.

1. 2.— Apollon. Rh. 4, 1686. has $i\xi\epsilon\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma\alpha$, 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. κατεαγείς, according to Bekker's MSS. καταγείς; ib. p. 100, 5. κατεάζαντες 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 until a very late æra; for instance, $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\omega\sigma\theta\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\sigma\varsigma$ in Pæanius 9., $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\dot{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in Theod. Prodr. p. 17., $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu$ 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 $\ddot{\alpha}\gamma\nu\nu\mu\iota$, in which verb this irregularity was probably introduced and sanctioned by usage earlier than it was in others, in order to avoid confusion with $\ddot{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ and $\ddot{\alpha}\tau\tau\omega$.

Of the latter forms ἄσσω and κατάσσω for ἄγνυμι, Schneider in his Lexicon quotes the Schol. Hom., Celsus ap. Orig. 7. p. 368., Hesych. v. ἄγνυτον and ἐνιῆλαι, Artemid. sæpe; and from Æsop. August. F. 3. 55. and 213. the form κατεάσσω.

'Αγνώσσασκε . See 'Αγνοέω.

Άγνώσσεσκε

'Αγορεύω. See Είπεῖν.

'Aγρέω, I take: imperat. ἄγρει, ἀγρεῖτε, used often in Homer as common interjectional particles, like age in Latin and tenez in French. The rest of the verb disappeared before aiρ i ω, 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.

"Ayyw, I choke, transitive. Midd. intransitive.

* Ayw, I lead: fut. $\mathring{a}\xi\omega$; takes in the aor. 2. the reduplication, $\mathring{\eta}\gamma\alpha\gamma\sigma\nu$, $\mathring{a}\gamma\alpha\gamma\tilde{s}\nu$ *; perf. $\mathring{\eta}\chi\alpha$, common form $\mathring{a}\gamma\eta\sigma\chi\alpha$; aor. 1. act. $\mathring{\eta}\xi\alpha$, imperat. $\mathring{a}\xi\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon$, Hom.; aor. 1.

* Thus we find in prose the similar form ήνεγκον, ένεγκεῦν (see φέρω); and the following poetic aorists: ήρὰρον, conj. ἀράρη, &c.; see ΑΡΩ. ήκαχον, ἀκάχων, &c.; see ΑΧΩ. ήπαφον, ἀπάφων; see ἀπαφίσκω. ἄλαλκον (Hom. for ήλαλκον), ἀλαλκεῦν, &c.; see ἀλέξω. ὥρορε, 3. pers. — see ὅρνυμι (perf. ὅρωρα). ἐνένīπον (ἐνένιπτον); see ἐνίπτω. If we compare these forms with ήγαγον, λέλαθον, πέπληγον, we shall see that they are undoubted aorists, notwithstanding all which has been said to the contrary. † With ἀγήοχα we may class some other anomalous forms which change their vowel to o in both perfects : ἔρμογα (perf. intransit.) from ῥήγνυμι. πέπτωκα from ΠΕΓΩ, πίπτω. ἐίωθα for čίθα from ἔθω. ἄωρτο plusq. perf. pass. for ἦρτο or ἤερτο, from aἰρω or ἀείρω. ἕωκα, ἀρέωκα, Dor. (whence in N. T. ἀφέωνται) for ἐἶκα, ἀφείκα, ἀρέινται, from ἀφίημι. ἐδήδοκα, and in Hom. pass. ἐδήδομαι, from ἔδω. ἐνήνοχα from ΕΝΕΚΩ. And the very defective Epic perfects ἅνωγα, ἀνήνοθα, ἐνήνοδα.

^{&#}x27;Αγνώσασκε -

midd. ήξάμην, seldom in the Attic, but its compounds frequent in Herodotus: perf. pass. ηγμαι.-MIDD.

For a full account of $\dot{\alpha}\gamma \dot{\eta} \alpha \chi a$ 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. (Econ. 1, 7. shows that it was an old and familiar form, which, being in no respect worse than $\dot{\epsilon}\partial\dot{\eta}\partial\alpha\kappa a$, recommended itself for use instead of the indistinct $\bar{\eta}\chi a$, as $\dot{\epsilon}\partial\dot{\eta}\partial\alpha\kappa a$ took the place of $\bar{\eta}\kappa a$.* The Attic writers, however, preferred the shorter form. See $\pi\rho o\bar{\eta}\chi a$ in Reisken's Ind. ad Demosth. $\sigma vr\bar{\eta}\chi a c$ in Xen. Mem. 4, 2, 8. note. In general the perfect was avoided as much as possible; and hence the later grammarians sometimes marked $\bar{\eta}\chi a$ as obsolete, sometimes rejected $\dot{a}\gamma \dot{\eta} \alpha \chi a$ as bad Attic. See Dorv. ad Charit. p. 481. (494.) Lob. ad Phryn. p. 121.

An aor. 1. $\frac{1}{3}\xi_{\alpha}$, $\frac{1}{4}\xi_{\alpha}$, $\frac{1}{4}\xi_{\alpha}$, was also in use, but rejected by the Attics. It is found however in $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\eta\xi_{\alpha\nu}$, Thue. 2, 97., in $\frac{1}{4}\xi_{\alpha\nu}$, Antiph. 5, 46. p. 134. in $\tau\sigma\vartheta\varsigma\phi\nu\gamma\dot{\alpha}\vartheta\alpha\varsigma\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{\alpha}\xi_{\alpha\nu\tau}\varepsilon_{\varsigma}$, Xen. Hell. 2, 2, 20. (12.), in $\frac{1}{3}\xi_{\alpha\nu}$, $\frac{1}{4}\xi_{\alpha\varsigma}$, Batrachom. 115. 119., in $\frac{1}{4}\xi_{\alpha\sigma}\sigma_{\epsilon}$, $\frac{1}{4}\xi_{\alpha\nu\tau\sigma}$, Il. ϑ , 505. 545. with many other passages which need the examination of the critic. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 287. 735. In Aristoph. Ran. 468. $\frac{1}{4}\pi\eta\xi_{\alpha\varsigma}$ is from $\frac{1}{4}\pi\alpha\tau\tau\omega$; hence the latest editors have distinguished it by the ι : see $\frac{1}{4}\tau\sigma\sigma\omega$.

The Epic imperat. $\mathring{a}\xi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, like $\check{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\nu$, $\grave{\epsilon}\check{c}\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\sigma$, $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\sigma$, $\check{\sigma}\rho\sigma\epsilon\sigma$, $\grave{a}\epsilon\acute{a}\sigma\epsilon\sigma$, is one of those aor. 2. which take the characteristic σ of the aor. 1. but are commonly mistaken for anomalous derivatives of the fut. 1. Homer uses it instead of $\grave{a}\gamma\acute{a}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, which would not be admissible in the hexameter; $\check{a}\gamma a\gamma\epsilon$ he does use at Il. ω , 337. With this form we may join $\grave{a}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, Il. ω , 663. as inf. aor. for $\check{a}\xia\iota$ or $\grave{a}\gamma a\gamma\epsilon\epsilon\nu$.

'AFEOMAI. The reading $d\gamma\epsilon \delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$ in Herodot. 3, 14. might be adopted without hesitation, if Schæfer's opinion, that this too is corrupted from $d\gamma\iota\nu\epsilon\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$, were not still more probable. See also $\eta\gamma\epsilon \delta\mu\alpha\iota$.

'Aδησαι, to feel dislike. Of this verb Homer has in the Odyssey the forms $\dot{a}\delta\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$ and $\dot{a}\delta\eta\kappa\dot{\sigma}\epsilon\varsigma$, which are generally connected with $\tau\dot{o}$ $\ddot{a}\deltao\varsigma$, Il. λ , 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, $\dot{a}\delta\dot{\partial}\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$, $\dot{a}\delta\partial\eta\kappa\dot{o}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. See this point discussed in Lexilog. p. 22. : see also $\ddot{a}\sigma a\iota$, to satiate, under "A ω .

'Aδω (old and poet. ἀείδω†), I sing : fut. ἄσομαι, ἀείσομαι.

† [Homer always uses ἀείδω, ἀείσομαι.

Άσομαι is properly Attic (see Markl. Eurip. Suppl. 932. Branck. Aristoph. Vesp. 1228. Fr. 1294.), but is found in Hom. Hymn. 5, 2. Less pure is the fu.

B 4

^{[* &}lt;sup>7</sup>Hκα is the regularly formed perfect of έδω; but there is no trace of its having been ever in use.— ED.]

The future midd. is Attic (Aristoph.); see Piers. ad Mær. p. 38.: $\dot{a}\epsilon l\sigma \omega$, $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$, is in other dialects, Theogn. 4. Theorer. 7, 72. 78. The imperative $\dot{a}\epsilon l\sigma \epsilon o$ is one of those aor. 2. which take the characteristic σ of the aor. 1. See above $\ddot{a}\xi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, under "Ay ω .

Hermann has very properly defended $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon(\sigma\epsilon\sigma)$ in the 17th Hom. Hymn against $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon(\delta\epsilon\sigma)$ (in Hymn 20., where $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon(\delta\epsilon\sigma)$ stands without any known various reading, it must remain); for $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon(\delta\sigma\mu\alpha)$ as active is an unheard of form. Now as the aor. midd. of $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon(\delta\omega)$ and $\ddot{\alpha}\delta\omega$ is equally unknown, this $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon(\sigma\epsilon\sigma)$ may be an imperative formed from the future $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon(\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha)$. But there are as little grounds in common usage for the Epic aorist $\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon'(\delta\sigma\epsilon\tau\sigma)$ as for the one in question; and as that stands in the same relation to $\ddot{\epsilon}\epsilon'(\eta\nu)$ and $\beta'(\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha)$ (tenses in common use) as $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon(\sigma\epsilon\sigma)$ does to $\ddot{\eta}\sigma\alpha$ and $\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$, 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.

Aidéopan, I feel shame: fut. aidéoopan; perf. $\eta \delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \alpha_i$; aor. 1. pass. $\eta \delta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; aor. 1. midd. $\eta \delta \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu$. The aor. pass. and midd. have the same meaning; but in the Attic language aidéo ao $\theta \alpha_i$ 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 aidoµau*, from which arose the one in common use. It never has the augment : aidero. Of the fut. aidήσοµau for aidéroµau see the note to Máχοµau.

Aiνέω[†], I praise: fut. αἰνέσω[‡]; aor. ἤνεσα; perf. act. ^{*}_{ηνεκα}; perf. pass. ^{*}_{ηνημαι}; aor. 1. pass. ^{*}_{ηνεθην}. Also αἰνήσω, ^{*}_{ηνησα}, in the Epic poets and Pindar.

Aivirrouan, I speak enigmatically: Depon. midd.

 $4\sigma\omega$, but found sometimes in the Attics, as in Eurip. Herc. F. 681. Dor. $4\sigma\omega$, Theocrit. 1, 145. 'Aeí $\sigma\omega$ is used by the non-Attic poets, and is found in Hom. Epig. 14, 1. attributed by Pollux to Hesiod.— Passow.]

* [Homer uses in the present both

αίδομαι and αἰδόμαι, but forms all his tenses from the latter, which is also the prevailing form in prose.—Passow.]

† [In good prose writers we seldom if ever find alνέω, always ἐπαινέω.— Passow.]

 \ddagger See note under $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, I bind.

Aivuµau, I take. Only pres. and imperf.: without augment therefore, aivuro. [Hom. and Hes.]

A less frequent future is $\delta \lambda \tilde{\omega}$; thus we find $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega}$, Aristoph. Equ. 290., $\kappa a \theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$, Antiphil. Epig. 15., $\dot{a} \phi \epsilon \lambda \delta \tilde{\upsilon} \mu a \iota$, Com. ap. Antiattic, Seguer. p. 80, 12., and occasional examples down to the latest writers.

The aor. 1. $\eta \rho \eta \sigma a$ too is found in the common language; and even in Aristoph. Thesm. 760. we have $\xi \chi \rho \eta \sigma a \tau o$, which cannot be rejected as a false reading. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 716.

The Ionians have a peculiar reduplication for the perfect, ἀραίρηκα, ἀραίρημαι with the spir. lenis, the usual form in Ionic prose for the common ἥρηκα, ἥρημαι. Compare ἀλαλύκτημαι from ἀλυκτέω, ἀλάλημαι from ἀλάομαι, ἀκάχημαι for ἀκήχεμαι, and ἐληλίγμαι from ἑλίσσω.

Είλα, έλαι, and εύρα from εύρισκω, forms occurring in the later writers, as the Alexandrine, the Orphic poems, &c., are regular por. 1. by virtue of the characteristic; but as only the aor. 2. of these verbs, είλον, εύρον, was in common use elsewhere, it is plain that these 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 aç, the infin. in a, the part. in aç, are seldom found, but in their place the regular terminations of the aor. 2. + Hence it is clear that the indiscriminate use of $\epsilon i \pi o \nu$ and $\epsilon i \pi a$, of $h \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa o \nu$ and $h \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa a$, 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. είλάμην, -ω, -ατο, -αντο, &c., in ευράμην, &c., in έπαύρασθαι for -έσθαι, in the Dor. yeváµevoç, and in oσφραντο for ωσφροντο, Herodot. 1, 80, 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. $\epsilon i \lambda \omega$, see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 139. 183. The Homeric yévro will be found in its alphabetical place.

Alpow (Att. and poet. asipow, I raise) is formed regularly

* See note under $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, I bind.

† Not a few instances of the others are however to be found in the dialects; $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\iota$, Inscr. ap. Chishull. p. 138. 1. 5. – $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\deltad\lambda\alpha\iota$ in Maittaire from a Byzantine writer, and the part. $\dot{\alpha}\gamma d\gamma \alpha s$ in Hesychius. 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, otherwise it would be $d\phi\epsilon i\lambda \alpha t$, $\epsilon k \epsilon \eta \lambda \alpha t$. according to the rules of verbs having as their characteristic one of the liquids λ , μ , ν , ρ . — MIDD. Compare "Appupul.

The Attics were enabled to use the *a* of the fut. long because $\dot{a}\epsilon\rho\tilde{\omega}$ is contracted from $\dot{a}\epsilon i\rho\omega$. As the same thing is expressly mentioned by one of the grammarians with regard to $\phi a i \nu \omega \phi a \nu \tilde{\omega}$, 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 $a i \rho \omega$ or $a i \rho \epsilon \omega$, all becomes correct by adopting some form of $i a \rho \tilde{\omega}$: and in Eurip. Jph. T. 117. the emendation of $\dot{a}\rho \tilde{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$ is indeed confirmed by all the manuscripts.* In Æschyl. Pers. 797. $\dot{a}\rho \tilde{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$ is likewise the old and acknowledged reading: and in Eurip. Heracl. 323. $\dot{a}\rho\tilde{\omega}$, in Jph. A. 125. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi a\rho\epsilon \tilde{i}$, and in Tro. 1148. $\dot{a}\rho \tilde{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$ are, according to this analogy, placed beyond a doubt both by the sense and context.† This however need not make us doubt the correctness of the form $\dot{a}\rho\tilde{\omega}$ with a short; as in Soph. Aj. 75. $\dot{a}\rho\epsilon\tilde{i}\epsilon$ and in Ced. Col. 460. $\dot{a}\rho\epsilon\tilde{i}\sigma\theta\epsilon$, 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 $(\dot{\eta}\rho\dot{\alpha}-\mu\epsilon\theta a, \ddot{\eta}\rho a\tau o)$, and without the augment the aor. 2. $\dot{a}\rho \dot{\rho}\mu\eta\nu$; in all the other moods the aor. 2. only, $\ddot{a}\rho\omega\mu\alpha i$ (α short), $\dot{a}\rho oi\mu\eta\nu$, $\dot{a}\rho\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha i$. The Tragedians were able to use the same moods when the metre allowed it (e. g. in Soph. El. 34. $\dot{a}\rho oi\mu\eta\nu$), otherwise they have always the aor. 1. of which the α is long.

For $\ddot{a}\omega\rho\tau\sigma$ see note on $\dot{a}\gamma\eta\sigma\chi\alpha$ under $A\gamma\omega$, and Lexilog. p. 135. &c.

'Η ερέθονται, -οντο, for ἀείρονται, comes from the Epic ἡερέθομαι, lengthened from ἀείρομαι, with the quantity of the root changed. Compare ἠγερέθομαι under 'Αγείρω.

And lastly by resolution into $-\epsilon\omega$ comes the form $ai\rho\epsilon\psi\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{c}$ for $ai\rho\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{c}$ in Hes. ϵ 474., where however it has been hitherto obscured by a mistaken reading in almost all the manuscripts of $\beta_{i}\delta\sigma\sigma_{i}\delta\rho\epsilon\psi-\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$, and still more by the present $\beta_{i}\delta\sigma\sigma_{i}$ $ai\rho\epsilon\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$. The poet is speaking of the vessels being all full, and he then says, $\kappa ai \sigma\epsilon$ $\epsilon\delta\lambda\pi a \Gamma\eta\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu \beta_{i}\delta\sigma\sigma\sigma ai\rho\epsilon\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu \epsilon\nu\delta\sigma\nu \epsilon\delta\sigma\tau\sigma_{c}$, i. e. "when thou takest from the stores which are therein :" this is the only natural construction of $ai\rho\epsilon\sigma\thetaa\iota$. But $ai\rho\epsilon\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$ stands for $ai\rho\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$, as is sufficiently

* The sense of this passage has however been obscured by all the editors before Seidler, by misunderstanding the construction of $\mu \ell \nu - \delta \ell$.

+ Porson (on Eurip. Med. 848.) first introduced this spondaic future, but by a slight mistake he thought to be able to form $di\rho\hat{\omega}$ also from $di\rho\hat{\omega}$, 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. certain by comparing it with both the earlier and later Ionisms $\pi\iota \dot{\epsilon} \zeta \epsilon \upsilon \nu$, $\pi\iota \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \dot{\upsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu c c$, $\pi\iota \nu \epsilon \dot{\upsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu c c$, &c. And this, which is the only true reading, is actually preserved in the Etym. M., but in an article disfigured by mistakes.*

Aἰσθάνομαι, I perceive: Depon. midd. Imperf. ήσθανόμην; fut. αἰσθήσομαι; aor. ήσθόμην.† [Later writers have also a passive form αἰσθηθηναι, as the LXX.]

Ai $\sigma\theta o\mu a\iota$ also must have been in use, as some grammarians have wished to distinguish it from $ai\sigma\theta divo\mu a\iota$; see Lex. Seguer. pp. 183. 216. 359. : and in Plat. Rep. 10. p. 608, a. Bekker has adopted from the manuscripts $ai\sigma\theta \delta\mu\epsilon\theta a$ instead of $ai\sigma\theta \delta\mu\epsilon\theta a$, 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.

'Atσσω (in Hom. a depon. pass. also), I rush, hasten. In the Attics a dissyllable, and even in the Tragedians $\mathring{q}\sigma\sigma\omega$ or $\mathring{a}\sigma\sigma\omega$, commonly $\mathring{q}\tau\tau\omega$ or $\mathring{a}\tau\tau\omega$, and so also $\mathring{g}\xi\alpha$, $\mathring{g}\xi\alpha_{4}$, with and without the iota. \ddagger

From the subst. $\ddot{a}i\kappa\epsilon_{5}$ we may conclude that the ι in the complete form is long by nature, and therefore the infin. aor. must be accented $\ddot{a}i\xi_{al}$.

The pretended syncopated form $\sigma \nu \nu a t \kappa \tau \eta \nu$ in Hes. a, 189. must now yield to the true form $\sigma \nu \nu a t \gamma \delta \eta \nu$, as Gaisford reads it.

Aio χύνω, I make ashamed, treat in a shameful manner :

* This is the article Alpebuevov; for so it is now written, and the spiritus is re-peated several times, until the grammarian quotes the form again; and then, as well as in the verse of Hesiod which is sub-joined, it is expressly written $alpeb\mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$. 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: Alpevμενον, αίροντα, λαμβάνοντα· παρά το αίρῶ τό σημαίνον τό λαμβάνω, κατά πλεονα. σμόν αίρω, αίρουμαι, αίρούμενον καί τροπή Αλολική αιρεύμενον. 'Ησίοδος, &c. In Sylburg's edition the first word and the three which follow *masovaouov* have the aspirate; whence arose the unintelligible sentence, $aip\hat{\omega} \dots \kappa a \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \epsilon o \nu a - \sigma \mu \delta \nu$ aip $\hat{\omega}$, which Sylburg himself confessed he did not understand. It must be alpw.... karà $\pi \lambda \epsilon ova \sigma \mu \delta \nu$ alp $\hat{\omega}$, and the pleonasm consists in the circumflex, i. e. in the e concealed under it, from which

now comes alpointeror or alpeinteror. Whether the reading of the Hesiodic manuscripts from which Gravius quotes be alpeinteror, or whether it be alpeinteror, which he rejected without mentioning it, is uncertain.

+ Verbs of three or more syllables in άνω and some in αίνω come from a redical form without the alpha, which supplies it with some tenses as formed from έω: thus αὕξω and αὐξάνω; βλαστάνω, αυτ. ἕδλαστον, fut. βλαστήσω: see also ἁμαρτάνω, ὀλισθάνω, αἰσθάνομαι, &c.ἀλφάνω and ἀλφαίνω; ἀλιταίνω, ἡλιτον, ἀλιτήσω; ἐρυθαίνω, κερδαίνω, ὀσφραίνομαι.

‡ 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 Phœniss. 1388, and compare the various readings of the passages there mentioned. In pronunciation it was naturally distinguished by lengthening the a. pass. I am dshamed; perf. pass. ησχυμμαι*, part. ησχυμμένος, Il. σ, 180. with a genuine various reading ησχυμένος. Αἰτέω, I ask.—MIDD.

Airiáopan, I accuse : Depon. midd.

'Atw, I hear. Used only in pres. and imperf.

Verbs beginning with a, av, and o_i , followed by a vowel, have no augment, as $dt\omega$, $d\eta\mu_i$, $d\eta\delta\ell_i$ oµai[•] $a\delta a\ell\nu\omega$, $o\ell\omega_i$, $o\ell\omega_i$, $o\ell\omega_i$ oµai[•]; but the a if short becomes long, therefore "aïov, &c. O'ioµai and $d\epsilon\ell\delta\omega$ are exceptions; as is also $\ell\pi\eta$ ioa (from $\ell\pi a\ell\omega$, Herodot. 3, 29. Heind. Plat. Hipp. Maj. p. 289. E.), Herodot. 9, 93. Apoll. Rhod. 1, 1023. 2, 195. with the augment and ι short.

[Passow in his Lexicon marks $dt \omega - -$, 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 II. *o*, 252. Spohn Hes. ϵ , 215.]

'Aκαχίζω, transit. Igrieve, vex any one. The theme AXΩ gives the following forms: $\eta \kappa \alpha \chi or$, $\delta \kappa \alpha \chi \epsilon \tilde{i} v^+$, from which is formed the present in common use. From the same aor. as a new theme \ddagger came the fut. $\delta \kappa \alpha \chi \eta \sigma \omega$, Hymn. Merc. 286., and again an aor. 1. $\delta \kappa \delta \chi \eta \sigma \epsilon$, II. ψ , 223. — Midd. $\delta \chi o$ - $\mu \alpha \iota or \delta \chi v \nu \mu \alpha$, Igrieve (myself); aor. $\eta \kappa \alpha \chi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$. Perf. pass. (Iam grieved) $\delta \kappa \eta \chi \epsilon \mu \alpha \iota S$, $\delta \kappa \eta \chi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu o c$, II. σ , 29., and transposing the quantity, $\delta \kappa \delta \chi \eta - \mu \alpha \iota$, $\delta \kappa \alpha \chi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu o c$, II. τ , 312., infin. $\delta \kappa \delta \chi \eta \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. 'Aκη $\chi \epsilon \delta \alpha \tau \alpha \iota$, II. ρ , 637. is most probably a corruption of $\delta \kappa \eta \chi \epsilon \delta \alpha \tau \alpha \iota$, which is a various reading, is regular, and supported by $\delta \kappa \alpha \chi \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \tau o$, II. μ . 179. (while for the δ there are no grounds whatever). — To the same intransitive meaning of the middle "belongs also the part. pres. act. $\delta \chi \epsilon \omega v$, $-\omega \sigma \alpha$, grieving, lamenting.

'A $\kappa a \chi \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$, sharpened, pointed. Hom. — If this perf. part. pass. (the only part of the verb which occurs) be compared with the substantive $\dot{a}\kappa \eta$ and $\dot{a}\kappa \omega \kappa \eta$, a point, it leads us to a verb AK Ω (acuo), because the

* Before the termination µaı of the perf. pass. the v undergoes three changes :

 Ιπτο μ in ήσχυμμαι; in έξήραμμαι (ξηραίνω), Athen. 3. p. 80., and in σέσιμμαι (σίνω), σεσιμμένος, Inscr. Chish. p. 130.

2. Generally into σ, as in πέφασμαι, μεμίασμαι, μεμόλυσμαι, &c.

3. The ν is rejected and the vowel remains long, $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \chi \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, Aristot. H. A. 4, 9. This takes place very rarely.

+ See note on ayayeiv under "Ayw.

‡ From the aor. 2. act., as being a most necessary and consequently a most ancient

tense, were taken very naturally new forms. Thus from $\epsilon \delta \rho \rho \nu$, $\xi \tau \upsilon \chi \sigma \nu$, infin. $\epsilon \delta \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu}$, $\tau \upsilon \chi \epsilon \hat{\mu}$, were formed $\epsilon \delta \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, $\tau \upsilon \tau \omega \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, not from $\epsilon \delta \rho \epsilon \omega$, $\tau \upsilon \chi \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, which were 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 accept of the present; thus $\ell\lambda\eta\lambda\alpha\mu\alpha$, $\ell\lambda\eta\lambda\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s; $\delta\rho\eta\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha$, $\delta\rho\eta\rho\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s, and many others. χ of the perf. act. before the μ is not changed into γ . For the *a* instead of η in the second syllable see below, note*.

'Aκέομαι, I heal, cure: Dep. midd. Fut. ακέσομαι; the perf. takes the σ . [The act. is found once in Hippocr. Loc. in Homin. c. 5. The aor. pass. ἀκεσθῆναι has a pass. sense in Pausan. 2, 27, 3. 'Ακειάμενος is a false reading for ἀκειόμενος, from ἀκείομαι, Epic sister-form of ἀκέομαι, Od. ξ, 383. II. π, 29.—Passow.]

'Ακήδεσεν. See Κήδω.

'Ακούω, I hear †: fut. midd. ἀκούσομαι; perf. Att. ἀκήκοα, Dor. ἄκουκα, later ἤκουκα; plusq. perf. ἠκήκοειν. The pass. takes σ, and the perf. pass. is formed without reduplication, ἤκουσμαι, ἠκούσθην.

'Ακροάομαι, I hear: Depon. midd. The fut. is ἀκροάσομαι, not -ήσομαι, an exception to the general rule. Of this verb the 2. pers. ἀκροᾶσαι, ήκροᾶσο, for ἀκροᾶ, ήκροῶ, 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.

'Αλαλάζω, I shout: fut. -ξω, &c.

'Αλαλκεῖν. See 'Αλέξω.

'Αλαλύκτημαι. See 'Αλυκτέω.

'Αλάομαι, I wander : Depon. pass. [Imperf. ήλώμην; aor. ήλήθην, poet. αλήθην.—Passow.]

The Epic form $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{a}\lambda\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{a}\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$, $\dot{a}\lambda\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$, with the meaning of a present, is supposed to be a form in $\mu\iota$, according to the analogy of $\ddot{a}\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\dot{l}\zeta\eta\mu\alpha\iota$: 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 such undoubted perfects as $\dot{a}\kappa\dot{\eta}\chi\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\eta}\lambda\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$, and others (see note on $\dot{a}\kappa\dot{\eta}\chi\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ under ' $A\kappa\alpha\chi\dot{l}\omega$); and the meaning of the present is so

† [No pure Attic writer has the fut. act. ἀκούσω, Schæf. Greg. p. 1063. It first 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 Schaf. Appar. Demosth. vol. 2. p. 232.— Passow.

In forming the Attic reduplication the temp. augm. of the second syllable is sometimes neglected; for instance in ἀκαχμέμος, ἀλάλημαι, ἀλαλύκτημαι, ἀκάχημαι, ἀραίρηκα, ἀραίρημαι.

similar to that of the perfect, that usage is constantly confounding them. See Buttm. Lexilog. pp. 112. and 202. note.

'Aλδaίνω^{*}, I make large and strong. The present is found in the later Epic poets, as Nicand. Alex. 402. Homer has $\eta\lambda\delta a\nu\epsilon$, Od. σ , 70. ω , 768. where, particularly in the second passage, it appears to be completely an aorist. At II. ψ , 599. stands the intransitive $\lambda\lambda\delta\eta\sigma\omega$ ⁺, 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[‡]; among them is the intransitive $\lambda\lambda\delta\sigma\mu a\iota$ in Nicander, for which undoubtedly he had an older precedent : compare $\lambda\lambda\sigma\sigma\mu a\iota$, $\lambda\lambda\sigma a\iota\nu\omega$. From this came the verbal adj. $\lambda\lambda\tau\delta c$, whence in Homer $\lambda\nu\lambda\sigma c$, insatiable, literally whom nothing fills and nourishes, Od. ρ , 228. σ , 113. 363.

'Aλείφω, I anoint: [fut. -ψω, aor. ήλειψα; aor. pass. ήλείφθην; aor. 2. conjunct. ἐξαλιφή, Plat. Phædr. p. 258, B. as restored by Bekker from the best Manuscripts. Midd. αλειψάμην, αλείψασθαι, αλειψαμένος, Hom. The perf. ήλοιφα, the Att. αλήλιφα (Demosth. in Callipp. 29.), and the pass. αλήλιμμαι were in post-Homeric use.—Passow].

In the Attic reduplication $\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon i\phi\omega$, like $\dot{a}\kappa o i\omega$, takes a short vowel in the third syllable, even shortening the vowel of the root: $\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon i\phi\omega$, $\dot{a}\lambda \eta \lambda i\phi a$, $\dot{a}\lambda \eta \lambda i\mu\mu a$; $\dot{a}\kappa o i\omega$, $\dot{a}\kappa \eta \kappa o a$. There occurs also frequently $\dot{a}\lambda \eta \lambda \epsilon i\pi \tau a$; but whether this be a correct form, or a false reading for $\dot{a}\lambda \eta \lambda i\pi \tau a$ or $\eta \lambda \epsilon i\pi \tau a$, is uncertain.

'Αλέξω, I ward off, and in the midd. I ward off from myself: fut. act. ἀλεξήσω, fut. midd. ἀλεξήσομαι; aor. midd. ἠλεξάμην, ἀλέξασθαι, ἀλεξάμενος, as from ΑΛΕΚΩ.

See Schneid. on Xenoph. Anab. 1,3,6. From the aor. 1. act., formed according to the analogy of the future, come the Homeric $\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon\xi\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$ and $\dot{a}\pi a\lambda\epsilon\xi\dot{\eta}\sigma a\iota\mu\iota$. There are no grounds in Pind. Ol. 13, 12. for a present $\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon\iota\nu$. The pres. $\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon\xi\rho\mu a\iota$, which sounds so like a future,

‡ ['Αναλδήσκοντες, Apollon. Rhod. 3, 1363. 'Αλδήσκουται, Eratosthenes, where Scaliger reads ἀλδίσκουσαι. 'Αλδίσκω, Suid. 'Αλδά/νουσι, Nicand. Al. 402. 'Εναλδίμενον, Nicand. Al. 532. 'Εναλδήνασα, transit. 409. 'Αλδήσασκεν, from ἀλδέω, Orph. Lith. 364. 'Αλδύνηται, Quint. Sm. 9, 473. where Rhodomannus reads ἀλδά/νηται, 'Αλδυνομένους, Suid.— Schneid. Suppl.]

^{* [}Akin to άλω, άλδω, άλθω, άρδω, alo. -- Passow.]

[†] One can hardly help suspecting that this, by a very common mistake, is corrupted from $\lambda\lambda\delta(\sigma\kappa\omega)$: but the great unanimity of authorities forbids it. [Passow marks $\lambda\lambda\delta(\sigma\kappa\omega)$ in his Lexicon as very doubtful. Schneider gives a transitive sense of $\lambda\lambda\delta/\sigma\kappa\omega$ from Schæf. Theorer. 17, 78.]

and is thought suspicious (see Schneid.) in Xenophon, appears certain in Sophoel. Œd. T. 171. and particularly 539.

The Poets have in the active the aorist $\eta \lambda a \lambda \kappa \delta \nu$, $d \lambda a \lambda \kappa \delta \nu$, with the reduplication \dagger from AAK Ω , whence $d \lambda \kappa \tau \eta \rho$ and $d \lambda \kappa d \theta \epsilon \nu$. Hence (according to the note on $d \kappa a \chi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, $d \kappa a \chi (\zeta \omega)$ came a new future $d \lambda a \lambda \kappa \eta \sigma \omega$.

A present $d\lambda \dot{\epsilon}\kappa\omega$ appears to have been actually used by the epigrammatic poet Diodorus (Epig. 1. Anthol. 6, 245.), although it is only as a conjecture instead of the $d\lambda \dot{\epsilon}\gamma o\iota_{\zeta}$ 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 $d\lambda \dot{\epsilon}\kappa\omega$ bears the same relation to the forms which we have seen above from the root AAK-, as $d\rho \dot{\epsilon}\gamma \omega$ does to $d\rho\gamma\nu\iota\dot{a}, d\rho\gamma\dot{\eta}$: see also Buttm. Lexilog. p. 132. From the aorist of this verb $d\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \xi a\iota$ was formed the present in common use $d\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \xi \omega$, which then took again its own proper inflexion $d\lambda \epsilon \xi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$. In the same way the similar verb $d\dot{\epsilon} \xi \omega$, $a \dot{\upsilon} \xi \omega$, arose from the root AET-AYT-, which beside that has produced only the Latin verb.

'Aλέω[‡], I bruise or stamp to pieces, grind: fut. $d\lambda \acute{e}\sigma \omega$, Att. $d\lambda \widetilde{\omega}$; imperf. $\eta'\lambda \circ \omega \omega$; perf. act. Att. $d\lambda \eta'\lambda \epsilon \varkappa \alpha$; perf. pass. $d\lambda \eta'\lambda \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ [altered by Bekker in Thucyd. 4, 26. to $d\lambda \eta'\lambda \epsilon \mu \alpha \iota$, 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 $d\lambda \eta' \partial \omega$, which however was still an ancient form. See Piers. ad Moer. p. 17. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 151.

'Αλέομαι or ἀλεύομαι, I avoid: Depon. midd. An active ἀλέω is doubtful. From this present we find ἀλεῦμαι for -οῦμαι, Theogn. 575. ἀλεύμενος, Simon de Mul. 61. ἀλέοντο, ἀλέοιτο, Hom. ἀλευόμενος, Hes. ε, 533. ὑπαλεύεο, ib. 758. The aorist is the aor. 1. without σ : ἀλέασθαι and ἀλεύασθαι, ἡλεύατο, ἀλέαιτο, ἀλευάμενος, &c. The conjunctive therefore is as to form undecided between the pres. and aor. At Od. ξ, 400. ἀλεύεται is the conjunctive shortened according to the custom of

* 'Ararkúv is, as far as I know, always correctly written thus, and with the infin. $\Delta tarkeiv$ will therefore prove $\hbar/a \lambda kov$, $\hbar/a \lambda kov$ to be undoubted aorists; although the only Homeric passage of this indicative (II. ψ , 185.) requires the imperfect. But then in Hes, ϑ , 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 those very ancient poems, as from an indistinctness of tense: and as $\dot{a}_{\mu\nu}\omega_{\nu\sigma\iota}$ is a various reading for $\dot{a}_{\lambda}\dot{a}_{\lambda}\omega_{\iota}$ at II. ϕ , 138. 539, so may $\ddot{a}_{\mu\nu\nu\epsilon}$ have been the true reading in II. ψ , 185.

† See note on ήγαγον under 'Αγω. And Buttm. Lexilog. pp. 132. 548.

‡ [Its root seems to be akin to έλω, δλαί, οδλαί, mola, molere: Buttm. Lexilog. p. 259. the Epic poets*; and at ω , 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. $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\omega$ with the regular aorist $(\ddot{\eta}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma a)$ $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\bar{\upsilon}\sigma a\iota$. Its exact causative meaning, as deduced from that of $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\mu a\iota$, is to snatch away, protect; and in this sense it is quoted from Sophocles in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 383, 4. $(\dot{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\omega, \phi\upsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\xi\omega)$. In Æschyl. Sept. 141. also nothing is wanting to $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\sigma\nu$ but to supply $\dot{\eta}\mu\bar{\alpha}c$: while ib. 88. and Suppl. 544. have the accus. of the evil to be warded off; and at Prom. 567. with $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon$ either sense is admissible.

An Epic present is $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \omega^+$, but with the meaning of the middle $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \phi \mu a \iota$. Compare $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \omega$.

'Αληναι, άλημεναι. See Είλω.

^{*} $\Lambda\lambda\theta\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, to heal, i. e. become healed [there is no known instance of the pres. act. or pass.—Passow.]: imperf. pass. $\lambda\lambda\theta\epsilon\tau o$, II. ϵ , 417.; fut. $\lambda\lambda\theta\eta\sigma\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, II. η , 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; $\lambda\lambda\theta\alpha\iota\nu\omega$, $\lambda\lambda\theta\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$ or $\lambda\lambda\theta\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\lambda\lambda\theta\alpha\sigma\omega$ or $\lambda\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omega^{\ddagger}$, whence the fut. $\lambda\lambda\theta\epsilon\xi\omega$, &c.; which forms are found in the Ionic prose of Hippocrates and others, but still need the help of the critic. See Foës. C. Hippocr. ' $\lambda\lambda\iota\nu\delta\omega$. See Ku $\lambda\iota\nu\delta\omega$.

'Αλίσχομαι, I am taken: imperf. ήλισχόμην. Of this verb. the active is not in use, but its place is supplied by αἰρεῖν, of which again ἀλίσχομαι is used as the passive, and always in the same or a cognate sense. It forms its other tenses from 'ΑΛΟΩ (compare ἀμβλίσχω), and with the additional irregularity, that aorist and perfect have the passive sense in the active form§: aor. ήλων (Herodot. 3, 15. Xen. Anab. 4, 4, 21.), Att. ἑάλων||, with α long; the other moods with α short, as opt. ἀλοίην (Il. χ , 253.), and Ion. ἀλώην (Hom. sæpe), conj. ἀλῶ, ϣ̃s, &c., infin. ἀλῶναι,

* The Epics frequently shorten on account of the metre the long vowel of the conjunctive, changing ω and η back again into o and ϵ ; instances may be found in 11. β . 440. ξ , 87. v, 173. Od. α , 41. δ , 672. κ , 355.

h, both an accus. + [I is generally used with an accus. but also with infin. II. ζ , 167. ν . 356.— In Apoll. Rh. 3, 650. $d\psi \, \delta\lambda\epsilon\epsilon i\nu\epsilon\nu$ is intransit. to retire.— Schneid. and Passow.] ‡ [We find ἀλθίσκω twice in Hippoer. 7, 563. D. 'Αλθάσσω, Aretaeus p. 61. B. Συναλθάσσω, Hippoer. p. 758. 'Αλθέσσω Aret. 3. 13. 'Αλθέξεται, Aret. p. 42. C. 'Αλθεζις, Aret. 2, 1. and a various reading in Hippoer. 758. E. — Schneider.]

§ Thus the perfects $\xi a \gamma a$, $\xi \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \omega \gamma a$, Iam broken, torn; in later writers $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma a$, I am struck; in Hom. $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \upsilon \chi \omega s$; and in the Lat. vapulo. See note p. 5.

|| See note under Γιγνώσκω.

part. άλούς; Perf. ἐάλωκα with α short [the usual form in Thucyd. and Demosth.]; Ion. and Att. ήλωκα. The fut. is from the middle voice, άλώσομαι. — See 'Αναλίσκω.

The augment of $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu$ deserves particular attention. It is not merely the syllabic augment before the vowel of the root; but, as this vowel is long in $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu$ while it is short in $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$, &c., the length of the α must be looked upon as a parallel case to the ω in $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\rho\omega\nu$. Besides, in $\dot{\eta}\lambda\omega\nu$ the regular augment is as old as the other, and as early as Homer (Od. χ , 230.) and Herodotus (7, 175. $\dot{\eta}\lambda\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$); while $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu$ is properly the Attic form. In the perfect this is reversed; $\dot{\eta}\lambda\omega\kappa\alpha$ is a strict Atticism, and $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\lambda\omega\kappa\alpha$ the common form. See Dawes's Misc. p. 315. and Piers. ad Moer. p. 178. But this $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\lambda\omega\kappa\alpha$ is distinguished from $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu$ by the quantity of the α , the reason of which it is difficult to ascertain.* Compare $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$ and note under 'Op $\dot{\alpha}\omega$.

Homer has once (II. ϵ , 487.) the long α in a form which has not the augment, the part. $\dot{\alpha}\lambda \delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$, which appears to be the original quantity : compare $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda (\sigma \kappa \omega$.

'Αλιταίνω, to commit a fault, sin against : fut. ἀλιτήσω; aor. act. η λιτον +, aor. mid. ἀλιτόμην. 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, $\dot{a}\lambda\iota\tau\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{0}$ ‡ in an act. sense, sinning, Od. δ , 807, Hes. a, 91. § This form may be considered as a shortened perf. (for $\dot{\eta}\lambda\iota\tau\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{0}$), or a syncopated aorist (like $\beta\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{0}$): as regards its active sense we may compare it with the similar passive part. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{0}$, $\dot{o}\lambda\dot{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{0}$.

* These, like many other irregular forms, had originally the digamma, and were therefore 'E-FAAΩN FE-FAAΩKA, 'E-FEZ ZATΩ FE-FEZTO. But when the digamma was changed to the aspirate, they took the augment according to the analogy of other aspirated verbs, consequently $\dot{\epsilon}$ - $d\lambda\omega\nu$, whence $\hbar/\lambda\omega\nu$, as $\hbar\rho\mu\sigma\langle\sigma\nu$ was formed from $\dot{\alpha}\omega\delta\langle\omega$.

+ See note on Alσθάνομαι.

‡ [Passow calls it a part. pres. from an obsolete verb ἀλίτημι, ἀλίτημαι.]

§ I hope to defend $\lambda\lambda\iota\tau\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$ Ebpurdha in this second passage against $\lambda\lambda\iota\tau\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu$, which has been taken from the Scholium of Tzetzes and the Etym. Mag. v. $\eta\lambda\iota\tau\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigmas$. See Hermann. in Add. ad Greg. Cor. p. 879. The reading of the text has been always so generally preferred, that the emendation can be offered as nothing more than a various reading.

But considered accurately I cannot acknowledge it to be such. The utmost we can draw from the Schol. of Tzetzes is that some old grammarians thought there was meaning enough in the common reading ali-Thuevor to explain it as synonymous with ηλιτόμηνον, which Homer uses with reference to the same Eurystheus (but not as an epithet), so that alitounvos or alithnevos might be each formed from unv according 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 άλιτήμεροs is an error of transcription; for in the whole passage nothing is mentioned but the derivation from $\mu \eta \nu$, whereas if the etymologist had really used the other word, he must have given his reasons for it.

'Αλίω. See Κυλίνδω.

'ΑΛΚ-, άλαλκεῖν. See 'Αλέξω.

'Αλλάσσω, -ττω, I change. [Aor. 1. pass. ήλλάχθην, always in Herodot., frequently in the Traged., sometimes in Aristoph.] Aor. 2. ήλλάγην, common in Attic prose.

^αΑλλομαι, *I leap*. Usage seems balanced between the two aorists, ήλάμην, ἄλασθαι (with α long), and ήλόμην, άλέσθαι (with α short); but the forms ήλατο, άλάμενος and άλεσθαι, άλοιτο, appear to have the preference. *

The Epic language has the syncopated aorist, which takes the lenis, and from which come the 2. and 3. pers. $\delta\lambda\sigma\sigma$, $\delta\lambda\tau\sigma$; part. $\delta\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\rho$, $\epsilon\pi\delta\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\rho$, and $\epsilon\pi\iota\delta\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\rho$.⁺ The long a of the indicative of this form, which is shown by the circumflex, is an augment after the Doric manner; whence $\epsilon\pi\delta\lambda\tau\sigma$ not $\epsilon\pi\lambda\sigma\sigma$. The conjunct. which does not admit of such a syncope, is the conjunct. of the regular aor. 2. $\delta\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, and this shortened (according to note on ' $\lambda\lambda\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\iota$) becomes $\delta\lambda\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, which some of the grammarians have likewise written with the lenis, but on false grounds.⁺

'Αλοάω, I thrash : fut. ἀλοήσω, and in the older Attics -άσω. The greater number of examples are in -ήσω : see

* See Fisch. ad Well. iii, a. p. 29. On the 2, pers. $\hbar \lambda \omega$ and $\hbar \lambda \omega \nu$ see Erf. ad Cfd. Tyr. 1310. where Hermann now reads the imperf., which is very harsh in that passage.

† The Grammarians accounted for this lenis by the consonant following the λ ; 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 $\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu\alpha\rho\tau}\epsilon\hat{w}$, $\dot{\eta}_{\mu\beta\rho\rho-\tau\sigma\nu}$, $\dot{\alpha}_{\beta\rho\sigma}r_{d}\zeta\omega$, 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 $\dot{\alpha}_{\rho\nu}$, $\dot{\epsilon}_{\rho\mu}d\zeta\omega$, in $\delta\rho\omega$, $\delta\rho\mu d\omega$, &c.: see Butm. Lexil. p. 300. No one with common sense will suppose that a grammatical caprice can have produced this old and fixed tradition.

And ano

‡ While the orthography of $\tilde{\alpha}\lambda\tau o$ has been handed down invariably the same, that of $\tilde{\alpha}\lambda\eta\tau\alpha u$ has been uncertain from the oldest times, as is clear from the Scholia on the Homeric passages (II. λ , 192. ϕ . 536.) and the copies of the Grammarians. In this however it is to be observed, that those who wrote $\lambda \lambda \eta \tau a_i$ derived the word, inverting the usual way, from $d\lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha$; although they could not decide between the two spiritus; see Schol. on both the above passages : - but those who classed the word with αλλεσθαι, did not change the aspirate ; see Eustath. and Schol. Min. ad A, 192. Now as the grounds for the spiritus of arro, which were touched on in the last note, cannot (look at them in what light we will) be applicable to $\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, so neither is there any thing throughout to direct us to anyrai with the lenis; and analogy therefore requires us to write ant and to join it to the regular aor. 2., which had as good a title, through that $\tilde{a}\lambda\tau o$, to be admitted into the Epic language, as Epero (to which belongs opnrai) has through apro. Beside the above, Homer has also once the aor. 1. έσήλατο, ΙΙ. μ. 438.

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. άλοάω; Poet. άλοιάω.—Passow.]

'ΑΛΟΩ. See 'Αλίσκομαι and 'Αναλίσκω.

'Αλυκτέω and (II. κ, 94.) ἀλαλύκτημαι, I am uneasy, full of anxiety. Beside Homer, Hippocrates, according to Erotian, used this present (compare Foes. Oec. Hipp. v. ἀλύζει); and ἀλυκταίνω (Etym. M.), ἀλυκτάζω (Herodot. 9, 70.) are analogous sister-forms. We abandon therefore all analogy when we attempt to make ἀλαλύκτημαι a present; while as perf. pass. it can still have the sense of the present increased in force; compare κεχάρημαι, τέτυγμαι, δεδακρυμένος; see also note on 'Aκαχμένος. — Quintus Sm. 14, 24. has also ἀλάλυκτο, which, if we 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 ἀλύσκω, ἀλύξω, but rather with ἀλύω and ἀλύσσω, which also mean a confusion and uneasiness of mind.

'Αλύσκω, I avoid: fut. ἀλύξω, &c. [Homer generally uses the fut. and aor. 1. ἤλυξα; in Hes. Fr. 22. we find ἄλυξεν; the midd. occurs only in Hes. ϵ , 365. — Passow.]

This verb is evidently formed from $\lambda \lambda \epsilon i \omega \mu \alpha \iota$: the κ therefore is not a radical letter with σ inserted, as in $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\tau \iota \tau \dot{\nu} \sigma \kappa \omega$; but it is the appendant verbal form in $-\sigma \kappa \omega$ (as in $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$, &c.) which in its inflexion rejects the σ , as in $\partial \iota \partial \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$.

The lengthened form $d\lambda v \sigma \kappa d\zeta \omega^*$ is a frequentative like $\delta \iota \pi \tau d\zeta \epsilon \iota v$, $\epsilon \rho \pi \dot{v} \zeta \epsilon \iota v$. But this idea does not suit the aorist $d\lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa a \sigma \epsilon$, which has been the general reading of Od. χ , 330.; and Wolf was therefore right in adopting (from the Lex. of Apollon. and the Harl. MS.) the reading $d\lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa a v \epsilon$; for the context requires the imperfect, and $d\lambda v \sigma \kappa \dot{a} v \epsilon$ is lengthened in a perfectly analogical manner without any change of meaning.

'Aλύω, I am beside myself[†], has only the pres. and imperf.

* [Homer uses the pres. and imperf., which thus supply the place of those tenses in $\lambda\lambda\delta\sigma\kappa\omega$.— Passow.]

† The only meaning of this verb is to be beside oneself — either with grief or joy; those who give it the sense of $\lambda\lambda\bar{a}\sigma\delta a_i$ are in error: in the two passages quoted by Schneider in his Lexicon (11. ω , 12. Apoll. Rh. 4, 1289.) as instances of this meaning, there is a verb of such a sense ($\delta i \nu \epsilon i \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, $\epsilon j \sigma m \delta j \sigma r \epsilon s$), but $\lambda \lambda \delta i \epsilon \nu$ refers only to distraction of mind. — On the doubtful aspirate, $\lambda \lambda \delta \epsilon \nu$, $\lambda \lambda \delta \epsilon \nu$, see Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 380. [Passow calls $\lambda \lambda \delta \epsilon \nu$ the Attic form, but says that the latter Attic ists kept to the older form $\lambda \lambda \delta \epsilon \nu$, Locella Xen, Eph. p. 172.]

c 2

This verb must not be confounded with the former one, as its meaning is always decidedly different. But the Homeric present $d\lambda \, i \sigma \sigma \, \omega$ (II. χ , 70.) appears to belong to it, although with some deviation or additional force of meaning.

'Aλφάνω or ἀλφαίνω, I find, obtain. It forms its tenses from ἄλφω (see note on Aiσθάνομαι); thus aor. 2. ἦλφον, ἄλφοιμι, Hom. [Passow has both ἀλφαίνω and ἀλφάνω 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 ἀλφάζω, ἀλφαίω, ἀλφάω, ἀλφέω, ἕλφω, Dor. ἀλφάδδω.]

'Αμαρτάνω, I err: fut. ἁμαρτήσομαι; perf. ἡμάρτηκα; aor. ἡμαρτον, infin. ἀμαρτεῖν; [the fut. act. ἀμαρτήσω is found only in the Alexandrians; the aor. 1. ἡμάρτησα only in later writers, Lobeck. Phryn. p. 732.—Passow.]

For $\eta\mu\alpha\rho\tau\sigma\nu$ the Epic language has often $\eta\mu\beta\rho\sigma\tau\sigma\nu$, $d\pi\eta\mu\beta\rho\sigma\tau\sigma\nu$, formed by transposition, by the change of a to o, and the necessary insertion of β . See Buttm. Lexilogus, p. 82. &c. On the change of the spiritus compare the note on $\lambda\tau\sigma$.

'Aμάω, I (mow and) collect together, bind up in sheaves. - MIDD.

The first a is long (II. σ , 551. Hes. ϵ , 390.) and short (II. γ , 359. Hes. ϵ , 763.); but the augment is always regular, $\eta \mu \omega \nu$, &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 Theorer. 10, 7. 10, 16. 11, 73. it is common.]

'Αμελίσκω, I have an abortion, miscarry : fut. (formed from the less frequent ἀμελόω) ἀμελώσω; aor. 1. ἤμελωσα; perf. ἤμελωκα.

Euripides, among the older writers, has the pres. $d\mu \ell \lambda \delta \omega$ in Androm. 356.; and from this passage, viewed on one side of the question only, $\epsilon i \sigma \eta \nu \pi a \bar{i} \delta a \phi a \rho \mu a \kappa \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \Lambda \delta \nu \nu \epsilon \bar{i} \delta a \mu \ell \lambda \delta \bar{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\dot{\omega}_c a \nu \tau \eta \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota$, arose the supposition that $i \xi a \mu \ell \lambda \delta \omega$ 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 -άπελθόντες δέ (metaphorically transferred to scholars) έξημέλωσαν διά πονηράν συνουσίαν. In Æl. V. H. 13, 6, 3. βουλόμεναι άμβλωσαι, wishing to miscarry. In Plut. Lycurg. 3. ούκ έφη δειν αμελίσκουσαν αυτήν --κινδυνεύειν. But one who helps or injures may also be the subject, and then the production is generally the object expressed. In Plut. Arat. 32. metaphorically spoken of the fruits of the field, $\kappa a \rho \pi o \dot{v}_{S} \dot{a} \pi a \mu \mathcal{E} \lambda i \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota v$. In Æl. ap. Suid. v. $i\xi\eta\mu\ell\lambda\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$: $\dot{\eta}\,\epsilon\lambda\pi\iota\varsigma\,\epsilon\xi\eta\mu\ell\lambda\omega\tau\sigma\,a\dot{\upsilon}\tau\eta$. In Aristoph. Nub. 137. $i\xi\eta\mu\beta\lambda\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ ($\eta\mu\tilde{\imath}\nu$) $\phi\rho\rho\nu\taui\delta\alpha$, and immediately afterwards $\tau\delta$ έξημελωμένον; again in Plat. Theæt. 149. d. άμελίσκειν and άμελίσκουσιν seem to have the midwives as their subject. And so in the passage of Euripides the phrase ¿ξαμέλοῦν την νηδύν is very intelligible, particularly as a poetical expression, without its following as a necessary consequence that ¿ξαμέλοῦν γυναϊκα had been also made use of. However, 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 μ E $\lambda \omega$ with a fragment of Ælian, έξήμελω ή έννοια τῷ ἀνοσίφ *; which again is strongly confirmed by Pollux, in whose collection of the terms relating to this subject (II, c. 2.), instead of the untenable authora, authora, we must read from the manuscripts άμβλωναι, άμβλωσαι.

'Aµɛíćw, I exchange. — MIDD. [The act. is seldom used by Homer, more frequently by the Attic writers. — Passow.]

'Αμπέχω and 'Αμπισχνοῦμαι. See under "Εχω.

'Αμπλακίσκω, I commit a fault, err: fut. ἀμπλακήσω; aor. 2. ήμπλακον, ἀμπλακεῖν.+ The Doric dialect has ἀμβλακίσκω, &c. ‡

'Aµúva, I ward off. The perf. is wanting both in the

* Under $E\xi\eta\mu\beta\lambda\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$ we find, it is true, these same words with the form $\xi\xi\eta\mu\beta\lambda\omega\tau\sigma$; but beside that the pluperf. does not suit the context when completed as it is under " $H\mu\beta\lambda\omega$, even this very " $H\mu\beta\lambda\omega$ speaks plainly in favour of the amended $\xi\xi\eta\mu\beta\lambda\omega$.

† Verbs in $\epsilon\omega$ sometimes have a present in $\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$, although their tenses are formed from the infin. of the aor. 2. in $\epsilon i\nu$, as $\epsilon i\rho for \kappa\omega$, $d\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa for \kappa\omega$, $d\pi\alpha\phi for \kappa\omega$, $\epsilon \pi a \nu$ - $\rho for \kappa\rho_{aa}$.

t The present in ωκω occurs in Theagenes ap. Stob. Serm. 1. Schow. p. 22., where this editor has corrupted the old reading to $\dot{a}\mu$ - $\pi\lambda a\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau t$. Gaisford has given the whole paragraph from his manuscripts with $\dot{a}\mu$ - $\delta\lambda a\kappa i \sigma \kappa p$ (for so he reads it), three times; but in the first-quoted passage $\dot{a}\mu\pi\lambda a\kappa l$ - $\sigma\kappa \rho \tau t$. The form $\dot{a}\mu\delta\lambda a\kappa \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ is also in Archilochus, 30. As to the other forms, $\dot{a}\mu\pi\lambda a\kappa \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ and some that come from it, found in the Tragedians with the first syllable short, are now written in such passages $\dot{a}\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa \hat{\epsilon}\nu \dot{s}c.$, 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.

c 3

act. and pass.—MIDD.—'Αμύναθον, ἀμυνάθειν, ἀμυναθοίμην, · are formed from ἀμυνάθω, a lengthened form of ἀμύνω, like διωκάθειν, εἰργάθειν.

On these forms Elmsley (ad Eurip. Med. 186.) was the first to observe that the pres. indic. in $-\dot{\alpha}\theta_{\epsilon\nu}$ never occurs; but he was hasty in adding that they are always aorists, and must therefore be accented in the infin. - $\epsilon \tilde{i} \nu$. It is true that the examples quoted by him of $\dot{a} \mu \nu \nu \dot{a} \theta \epsilon i \nu$ have the momentary meaning of the aorist; but διωκάθειν, Plat. Euthyphr. p. 15. d. and έδιώκαθες, 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 $\delta\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ contains the duration in itself. * — More certain is it, that $\xi \sigma_{\chi} \varepsilon \theta_{0\nu}$ is always an aorist, and the same as $\xi \sigma_{\chi} \sigma_{\nu}$; and the accentuation of the infinitive of this verb $\sigma_{\chi\epsilon}\theta_{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\nu$ is confirmed by the Homeric $\sigma_{\chi\epsilon}\theta_{\epsilon\iota\nu}$. But I do not therefore think we are justified in writing σχεθών, σχεθόντες, Pind. Pyth. 6, 19. Soph. El. 744.; nay πέφνων (see 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.

'Aµφιέννυμι [and ἀµφιεννύω: fut. ἀµφιέσω, Att. ἀµφιῶ; aor. ἡµφίεσα, Poet. ἀµφίεσα.—Midd. ἀµφιέννυμαι, aor. ἡµφιεσάµην, whence 3. plur. ἀµφιέσαντο, Il., and imperat. ἀµφιέσασθε, Od.; perf. pass. ἡµφίεσµαι, less frequently ἀµφιεῖµαι. In prose the compound is more used than the simple.—Passow.] See "Εννυμι.

'Αμφισ6ητέω, I am of a different opinion, dispute. [Herodot. 4, 14.: imperf. ήμφισ6ήτουν; aor. ήμφισ6ήτησα, Demosth.— Passow.]

As $\dot{a}\mu\phi\iota\sigma \delta\eta\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ is compounded of $\dot{a}\mu\phi\iota\varsigma$ and $\beta a\iota\nu\omega$, $\dot{\eta}\mu\phi\iota\sigma\delta\eta\tau\sigma\nu\nu$,

* Elmsley quotes, as an authority of the old Grammarians in favour of the aorist, the single gloss of Photius, $\eta_{\mu}\omega_{\nu\alpha}\partial_{\nu\nu}$, $\eta_{\mu\nu-\nu\alpha}$; 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 $\epsilon_{i\nu}$, ω_{ν} 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 in joining with the aor 2. merely on account of the termination in or. 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 $\theta\omega$ the pres. indic. is found pretty frequently, for instance of $\pi\epsilon\lambda d\theta\omega$, the a of which belongs to the root, $\pi\epsilon\lambda d\sigma$. Ran. 1265. Thesm. 58.

 $-\eta\sigma a$, $-\eta\kappa a$ are regular formations; but the custom generally observed in compounds with $\dot{a}_{\mu}\phi i$ caused quite early a false separation in the word, whence $\dot{a}\mu\phi\epsilon\sigma\delta\eta\tau\sigma\sigma\nu$, and with double augment $\dot{\eta}\mu\phi\epsilon\sigma\delta\eta\tau\sigma\nu\nu$. Whether άμφεσθήτουν actually occurs I know not, but ήμφεσθήτουν has been uniformly 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 altered by Sylburg without authority. And further, in the passage quoted there from Andocides de Myster. p. 4, 38. ημφεσβήτουν 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 ἀμφεσθήτουν.

'Avaivouai, I refuse : [imperf. yvaivounv, Poet. avaivounv, and in later authors like Agathias frequently auguoun. --Passow.] aor. nunvaunv, avnvaobas, conjunct. avnvntas.

This is a verb in $aiv\omega$ formed from the negation av (see Buttm. Lexil. p. 118.); its agrist is therefore quite regular, like $i\lambda \nu\mu\eta\nu\dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$. The other tenses are not in use; for in Il. , 510. Theocr. 25, 6., where άνήνηται is quoted as a perfect, it is the aor. conjunct.

'Aνaλloxw, I employ, expend, consume: imperf. aνήλισκον. The older form αναλόω is found in Thucyd. and the dramatic poets : imperf. without augm. avanouv, Thucyd. 22 8, 45. The other tenses are formed entirely according to the old form, as fut. αναλώσω, while the aor. and perf. have sometimes the augment, sometimes not; thus the Att. aor. is avanwoa, without augm. (Herm. Soph. Aj. 1028.), in the non-Attic writers sometimes ανήλωσα, sometimes juálwoa; in the same way the Att. perf. is ανάλωκα, the non-Att. ανήλωκα and ήνάλωκα, Valck. ad Phoen. 591.* Perf. pass. avanouna, aor. pass. avan wohn and annholmy. The pres. avahow is rare.

This verb is distinguished from $\delta\lambda/\sigma\kappa\rho\mu\alpha$ by the second α being invariably long. + And thence arises also the uncertainty of the augment,

c 4

* In Æschin. c. Timarch. p. 8. 9. aváλωσε, dynλωκώs, have a various reading, but one of no great authority.

† Notwithstanding this distinction, the similarity of meaning in άλίσκεσθαι sumi, and avallokeiv consumere, and the relation of the aorists prove the actual identity of the root. The active form of άλωναι, έαλωκέναι, shows for instance that the passive sense gave a neuter idea, as in the similar case of vapulare; and so the relation which the aor. 1. in avalaoau bears to the above is causative, according to the leading analogy which I have drawn

as the long a was sometimes read without any (see 'Αδησαι). 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 ; although among modern critics aval- was long the favourite. See Thom. Mag. with Hemsterh. note; Moeris. p. 25. Valck. ad Phœn. 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, aval-; and Bekker, following the Codex on which he places most reliance, has uniformly restored $dv\eta\lambda$ -. For $\eta v d\lambda \omega \sigma a$ in this semi-compound form there appears to be no authority whatever; but κατηνάλωσεν in Isocr. Euag. 22. (Bekker, 73.), and κατηναλωμένα, Nicocl. 9. (Bekker, 37.), are established firmly by the same manuscript.

'Αναγάζομαι. See Χάζομαι.

'Ardárw, I please : imperf. ¿árdaror, Herodot. 9, 5., ¿ýrdaror and ήνδανον in Homer : aor. εαδον, Herodot. 1, 151. 4, 145. 153.*, εὐαδον, Hom. and άδον, Poet.; infin. άδεῖν, &c., all with a short; fut. ἁδήσω, Herodot. 5, 39.; perf. žada. + A passive voice does not occur; but in the Doric dialect is found a synonymous middle ἁδέσθαι in Fragm. Pythagor. p. 749. Gale. [We find also ἀνδάνεται, Archias Epig. 16. - This verb is mostly Ion. and Poet. - Passow.]

The Homeric aor. Evador is to be explained by the digamma E-FA Δ ON ξ - $\dot{a}\delta ov$ $\xi a \delta ov$. But F might be doubled on account of the metre. EFFA Δ ON, and, as it could not therefore entirely disappear from the verse, it passed over into the cognate v, evador as in κανάξαις under "Ayvou.t

The double augment έήνδανον follows the analogy of έώρων and έαλων, and therefore undoubtedly there were grounds for it in the old language, though hardly in the Homeric, in which the aor. was EFAAON, EAAON, A Δ ON. This was caused by the uncertainty of tradition in the old times of those dialectic forms; and from the same cause arose the confusion of ¿ávdave and ñvdave in Herodotus. The pure Homeric forms, as soon as the digamma disappeared, were without doubt έάνδανεν, and, where nvoave now stands, avdave; while that of Herodotus was ήνδανον, according to the analogy of ώρων.

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

out in my Grammar; that is to say, to the analogy of δύω, έδυσα, δύσω, — έδυν, δέ δυκα, δύσομαι, belongs, 'ΑΛΟΩ (I take), ἀναλόω, ἀνάλωσα, ἀναλώσω, — ἑάλων, ἑάλωκα, ἁλώσομαι.

* In these three passages incorrectly quoted as a perfect by Fischer, 3. p. 21. † On έαδε, Theor. 27, 22. suspected as

to tense, quantity, and accent, I can come to no decision.

t 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 abev ed, ed yap άδεν.

dialects and poets, is properly the same as $\hbar \delta \omega$ (compare $\lambda a \nu \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$, $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$), and distinguished from it by nothing more than a slight deviation of meaning and a difference of construction.

'Aνέσει [3 sing. fut. of ἀνίημι, Od. σ, 265.; ἀνεσαν, 3. plur. aor. 2., II. φ, 537; ἀνέσαιμι, opt. aor. 1. act., II. ξ, 209.— Passow.]. These Epic forms compounded with ἀνά, and which, if we judge by their meaning, can be joined only with ἀνίημι, have this peculiarity, that they take ε instead of η in the future, with which they unite the regular formation of the aor. 1. in σα instead of κα. 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. β, 276. ξ, 362. ἀνήσει, ἀνῆκεν have merely the sense of to excite. ['Aνέσαντες, II. ν, 657., is called by the best of the old Grammarians the part. aor. 1. act. of ἀνέζω, although both in form and meaning it belongs to the above.— Passow.]

'Aνήνοθα, 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 ANOΩ or ANEOΩ, a detailed account of which see in Buttm. Lexil. pp. 110. 133. &c.

'Aνιάω, I grieve or vex any one : fut. ἀνιάσω, Ion. -ήσω. Passive with fut. midd. I grieve or vex (myself). ['Aνιώατο, 3. plur. opt. pres. pass. in Herodot. 4, 130. This form is more frequent in prose than ἀνιάζω. In Homer the ι is always long, in later writers short also. The α of the penult. in pres. is always short, in fut. &c. always long; whence by the Ionic writers it was changed to η .— Passow.]

'Avoiyw. See Oiyw.

'Aντάω, I meet. In prose its compounds only are used, particularly ἀπαντάω, απαντήσομαι (Xen. Hell. 1, 6, 3.), ἀπήντησα, &c.

For the Homeric $\eta \nu \tau \epsilon o \nu$ we must not suppose any form in $\epsilon \omega + :$ like $\mu \epsilon \nu o (\nu \epsilon o \nu, \delta \mu o \kappa \lambda \epsilon o \nu)$, it is Ionic for $\eta \nu \tau a o \nu$. — Of the barytone form in ω we find only the passive $\eta \nu \tau o \mu a \iota$, $\eta \nu \tau \epsilon \tau o$, with the same meaning as $d \nu \tau a \omega$, but with no other tenses.

* Thus $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu a$, *I* call, 3. pers. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu \epsilon(\nu)$, he calls, Od. ζ . 294., whence a new form in $\omega \nu$ gives a 3. pers. $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu \epsilon(\nu)$, which, by dropping the augment, becomes again $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu \epsilon(\nu)$; see 11. ξ , 469. ω , 703. Hereinit is very conceivable that the meaning of this form fluctuates between the imperf. and aorist. Of this kind we have in Homer the following:

δείδιε pres. Od. π, 306. — imperf. II. σ. 34. μμωγε pres. II. ω, 90. — aor. Od. ε, 276. μμνωθε pres. Od. ρ, 270. — imperf. II. λ, 266.

ἐνήνοθε pres. Od. 3, 365. — imperf. II. β, 209.

† [Passow however has ἀντέω, Ion. for ἀντάω.] 'Aνύω, Att. ανύτω*, I complete : fut. ἀνύσω, &c. The pass. takes σ.— MIDD. — [The α and υ are always short. — Passow.]

A more restricted Atticism was $\delta \nu i \omega$ with the aspirate, $\kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \nu i \omega$. See Piers. ad Moer. v. $\eta \nu \nu \sigma \alpha$. Lex. Seguer. p. 14. Hesych. v. $\kappa \alpha \theta \alpha - \nu i \sigma \alpha \varsigma$.

Theocritus, 7, 10. has a syncopated form (or, which comes to the same, one formed from $avv\mu\iota$), $avv\mu\epsilon_s$, imperf. act., and at 2, 92. $avv\tau\sigma$, imperf. pass. or midd. To the same formation belongs also the opt. pass. $avv\tau\sigma$, on which see the following.

"Avw, an older form of $d\nu \dot{\nu} \omega$: used only in pres. and imperf. $d\nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, Plat. Cratyl. p. 415. a. $\tilde{\eta} \nu o \nu$, Od. γ , 496. $d\nu o \nu \tau \sigma c$, Aristoph. Vesp. 369. $d\nu o \mu a \iota$, *I draw to a close*, Il. κ , 251. Æschyl. Choeph. 788-(795.) Valck. Herodot. 7, 20. $\tilde{\eta} \nu \epsilon \tau o$, Herodot. 8, 71.

This verb, with regard to quantity, is a solitary exception to the general rule, having its a uniformly long. Hence $\epsilon\rho\gamma\sigma\nu$ $\ddot{a}\nu\sigma\iota\tau\sigma$, Od. σ , 473. must be left as an instance of Epic uncertainty : compare $d\mu \dot{a}\omega$. But the opinion of Barnes is more probable, that the various reading $\ddot{a}\nu\bar{v}\tau\sigma$ is the true reading, as optat. of $\ddot{a}\nu\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ (see the preceding), like $\delta\alpha i\nu\bar{v}\tau\sigma$, II. ω , 665. from $\delta\alpha i\nu\nu\mu\alpha\iota$: compare Od. π , 373. $\dot{a}\nu i\sigma\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\tau\dot{a}\delta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha$.

"Avwya, 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, $\ddot{a}vwy\mu\epsilon\nu$, Hymn. Apoll. 528. — Pluperf. with the force of an imperf. $(\dot{\eta}v\dot{w}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu)\dot{\eta}v\dot{w}\gamma\epsilon$ a, 3. pers. $\dot{\eta}v\dot{w}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ — To the perf. belong, according to the general analogy of perfects, other moods, as $\dot{a}v\dot{w}\gamma\eta$, $\dot{a}v\dot{w}\gamma o\epsilon$; infin. $\dot{a}vw\gamma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $\dot{a}vw\gamma\epsilon va\iota$, and the imperat. $\ddot{a}vw\gamma\epsilon$, Eurip. Or. 119. Callim. Fr. 440. But the more common imperat. is $\ddot{a}vw\chi\theta\iota$, formed from $\ddot{a}vw\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$, as $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\chi\theta\iota$ from $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon-\kappa\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$; and again, by a similar formation, from $\dot{a}v\dot{w}\gamma\epsilon\epsilon$ (Od. ψ , 132.) and $\dot{a}vw\gamma\epsilon\epsilon$ (Hom.) and Eurip. and $\dot{a}v\dot{w}\chi\theta\omega$ (Hom.).†

The sense of the present introduced also the inflexion of a present; thus Homer and Herodotus (7, 104.) have 3. sing pres. $d\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\iota$, and Homer (II. δ , 287.) has $d\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\tau\sigma\nu$ as indicative. Again $\eta\nu\omega\gamma\sigma\nu$ (II. ι , 578.) or $d\nu\omega\gamma\sigma\nu$ (II. ϵ , 805. Od. ι , 331.) is imperf. or rather aor., of

* 'Arbirw (like $\dot{\alpha}\rho \delta w$, $\dot{\alpha}\rho b r \omega$) is the common form in the older Attics, so that for this dialect we may form $\dot{\alpha}\nu b r \omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\nu b \sigma \omega$. But as $\dot{\alpha}\nu b \omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\nu b \sigma \omega$, 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 sisterform used only in pres. and imperf., just as $\gamma\lambda\phi\phi\omega$ and $\gamma\lambda\phi\pi\tau\omega$. On these verbs, as well as on the false way of writing them in $-\dot{\nu}\tau\tau\omega$, see Koen. et Schæf. ad Greg. Cor. in Att. 26., Hemst. ad Plut. 607., and the notes to Thom. Mag.

+ See έγρηγορθε and note under Έγείρω.

which the 3. pers. $\hbar\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon$ stands full and complete in the Hymn. Cer. 298. and Hes. ϵ , 68. : elsewhere it is always without an augment, consequently like the present (or perfect) $\hbar\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$ or $\hbar\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon$, Herodot. 3, 81. To these were added a fut. $d\nu\omega\xi\omega$ and aor. $\hbar\nu\omega\xi a$, Od. π , 404. κ , 531. Hes. a, 479.

It were unnecessary to suppose a theme $d\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\omega$, from which to form the 3. sing. perf. $\eta\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\iota$; for this belongs to $\eta\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\alpha$: but at II. η , 394. we read also the 3. pl. $\eta\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\sigma\nu$. This form however certainly crept into the text after the digamma, which followed in $\epsilon i\pi\epsilon i\nu$, 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 $\check{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon(\nu)$ from $\check{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\alpha$, sometimes $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon i$ (II. ζ , 439. η , 74.) from a theme in ω , but also as a preterit either $\check{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon(\nu)$ from $\check{\eta}\nu\omega\gamma\sigma\nu$, or $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ (II. β , 280. δ , 301.) for $\dot{\eta}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ from $\dot{\eta}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\alpha$. 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 $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ as a pres. to be not Homeric, as it stands (without any reason for it) in the same expression and the same part of the metre as $\check{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, e. g. $\vartheta\nu\mu\dot{\alpha}c\,\check{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, II. ξ , 195. $\vartheta\nu\mu\dot{\alpha}c\,\check{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\iota$, χ , 142., and in every instance it can be changed for $\check{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, 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 II. o, 180. σ , 176.†

* But whoever examines the whole context of that passage will perhaps agree with ine in thinking it still more probable that $\hbar\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon_i$, 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. † There would then remain of the pres. in ω nothing in Homer but the above-mentioned ἀνώγετον, which again is very suspicious, as it is scarcely to be supposed that a writer who did not make use of ἅνωγαs should have used ἀνώγατον. an old perfect like $\delta \delta a$, 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.

'Απαντάω. See 'Αντάω.

'Απαυράω. See AYP-.

'Απαφίσκω, I deceive: fut. ἀπαφήσω; aor. ἤπαφον, ἀπαφεῖν^{*}; conj. ἀπάφω, &c.: the middle has the active sense, as in the opt. aor. ἀπάφοιτο, Od. ψ, 216. These aorists are reduplications from 'ΑΦΩ, whence ἁφή and ἅπτομαι, properly to handle, stroke down, caress, palpo. From these aorists was formed the present ἀπαφίσκω (Od. λ, 217. Hes. β, 536.), as εὐρίσκω from εὖρον, εὐρεῖν; see note on 'Αμπλακίσκω: but of a new formation arising out of the same aorist (according to the rule laid down in a note on 'Ακαχίζω) nothing has been preserved except the aor. 1. ἐξαπάφησεν, Hymn. Apoll. 376. All the rest disappeared before the new verb ἀπατάω, ἀπατήσω, ἤπάτησα, which are now the only forms in Homer.[†]

'Απολαύω, I enjoy: [fut. ἀπολαύσω in Dion. Hal. and Lucian, but more generally] ἀπολαύσομαι, Xen.; aor. 1. ἀπέλαυσα, and aor. 2. ἀπέλαυον, Thucyd. and Xen.: but in later writers these aor. took, in addition to the syllabic, the temporal augment, thus ἀπήλαυον, ἀπήλαυσα‡, Isocr. ad Demon. c. 3. Ælian. 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. ἀπελαυσάμην nowhere occurs. The perfects are formed regularly, and are in Attic usage. A simple λαύω is not found; and probably ἀπολαύω comes from the same root as λαμβάνω, λαδεῖν.—Passow.]

'Απόχρη. See Χρή. 'Απούρας. See AYP-.

* As these are aor., not imperf., the correct accentuation of the part. is $d\pi \alpha$ - $\phi \dot{\omega} \nu$ (not $\dot{\alpha}\pi \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega \nu$) 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 on $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\hat{\nu}$ under "A $\gamma\omega$.

+ Nothing however is more probable

than that these forms expelled at some later æra the old and genuine $d\pi a\phi h\sigma \omega$, $d\pi d\phi \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$. Homer certainly had only the subst. $d\pi d\sigma \eta$, which was formed by itself from 'A $\Phi \Omega$, $\dot{a}\phi d\omega$ (see Buttm. Lexil. p. 117.), and from which again came the new verb $d\pi d\sigma \eta \nu$ used in prose.

‡ See note under Βούλομαι.

 $^{\circ}A\pi\tau\omega^*$, in both its senses, *I set fire to* and *I fasten*, is regular. From $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\eta}$ we see that its characteristic letter is ϕ . Its second meaning is the causative one of to hold firm, which is the proper sense of the middle $\ddot{\alpha}\pi\tau\circ\mu\alpha\iota$ (II. 9, 67.), and from which came the common meaning, to touch.

'Εάφθη, or ἐάφθη (for the aspirate is doubtful), which occurs twice in Homer, viz. II. ν, 543. ξ, 419., appears to belong to this verb; for if we compare at II. β, 15. η, 402. φ, 513. the perf. ἐφῆπται (necessity, evil, death) is fixed upon, we must then take for ἐπὶ—ἑάφθη in both passages the physical meaning of inflicta 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 εa is found in those verbs only which had the digamma, of which there is nowhere any trace in ἅπτω, ἅπτομαι. This form requires therefore a further examination. [It is fully examined in Buttm. Lexil. p. 242—246.]

'Apáopan, I pray, curse. The first a in the Epics is long, in the Attics short. †_Depon. midd.

There is one instance, Od. χ , 322., of an act. infin. $\dot{a}\rho\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, which, as the context requires a past tense, like Od. δ , 378. and ξ , 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 ($\ddot{a}\rho\rho\mu\alpha\iota$), of which there remains nothing but this solitary instance of the aor. 2. pass. $\dot{a}\rho\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ (with long vowel like $\dot{\epsilon}a\gamma\eta\nu$) for $\dot{a}\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$; just as Homer uses elsewhere both the aor. pass. and aor. midd. of other deponents, of $a\dot{i}\delta\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ for instance.—'A $\rho\eta\mu\epsilon\nuo\varsigma$ is a very different word : see it in its alphabetical place.

'Aραρίσκω, I fit. The simple theme APΩ is one of the most fruitful of the Greek radical verbs: from it are derived immediately the following, $-\dot{a}\rho\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\dot{a}\rho\tau\dot{a}\omega$, $\dot{a}\rho\tau\dot{\omega}$, $\dot{a}\rho\dot{\omega}$, $\dot{a}\mu\dot{\omega}$, $\dot{a}\rho\nu\nu\mu\alpha\iota$. The pres. $\ddot{a}\rho\omega$ never occurs. Its meaning is both transit. and intransit. according to which the tenses may thus be divided :—

* [From an obsolete root $\delta\pi\omega$, answering to the old Latin *apo*, whence *apiscor*, *capio*, *capto*, and *apto*. Some (but without any grounds) consider $\delta\pi\tau\omega$, *I* set fire to, a different word from $\delta\pi\tau\omega$ *I* fasten, deriving it from $a\delta\omega$.— Passow.]

+ The same holds good of the subst. $d\rho d$. But in Homer a regular distinction is observed between $d\rho \eta$ with α long, meaning a prayer or curse (as at 11. o, 598. Od. ρ , 496.), and $\dot{a}\rho\dot{n}$ with a short, in the sense of evil, destruction (as at 11. μ , 334.). We must however remark that a third Homeric form $\dot{a}\rho\epsilon i\eta$, harsh words, threatening (11. ρ , 431.) has a short. [Passow makes the above difference depend not on the meaning but on the position of the word in the verse; viz. in the arsis long, in the thesis short.] 1. Transit. — Act. fut. $\dot{a}\rho\omega$, Ion. $\ddot{a}\rho\sigma\omega$; aor. 1. $\ddot{\eta}\rho\sigma\sigma$, Ion. $\ddot{a}\rho\sigma\sigma$, infin. $\ddot{a}\rho\sigma\alpha$; part. $\ddot{a}\rho\sigma\alpha$; Hom. More used than the aor. 1. is the aor. 2. $\ddot{\eta}\rho\breve{a}\rho\sigma\nu^*$, Ion. $\ddot{a}\rho\alpha\rho\sigma\nu$ (```), infin. $\dot{a}\rho\alpha\rho\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, part. $\dot{a}\rho\alpha\rho\omega\nu$, Hom. passim; and from this aor. 2., which in Hom. is twice intransit. also, comes the transit. pres. $\dot{a}\rho\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$ (see note on $\dot{a}\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$), which we see in the imperf. $\dot{a}\rho\acute{a}\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu$, Od. ξ , 23.—Pass. perf. $\dot{a}\rho\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ to which may be joined both in formation and sense the new pres. $\dot{a}\rho\acute{e}\sigma\kappa\omega$; aor. 1. $\ddot{\eta}\rho\eta\rho\nu$, of which Homer has only 3. plur. $\ddot{a}\rho\delta\epsilon\nu$ for $\ddot{\eta}\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, II. π , 211. Of the midd. we find the aor. 1. part. $\dot{a}\rho\sigma\acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$, Hes. a, 320.

2. Intransit. - This sense, as arising from the continuity of action represented by the perfect, belongs to that tense almost exclusively; άραρα+, (~~), Ion. and Ep. άρηρα‡, part άραρώς, Ion. and Ep. άρηρώς, fem. ἀραρυΐα, but in the Epics ἀραρυΐα§, with the second syllable short ; pluperf. ήράρειν (ā), Ion. and Ep. ἀρήρειν or ήρήρειν. The perf. 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. δ, 777. ήραρεν ήμιν, was pleasing to us; and II. π , 214., where we find both the meanings of this form within a line of each other, Ω_{ς} öre τοῖχον ἀνὴρ ἀράρη— Ω_{ς} ἄραρον κόρυθες. In 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] heta e \nu$ which is in the preceding line, and which would have been literally repeated but for the intentional repetition of ws apapy-ws apapov; consequently the sense is, "so the helmets fitted themselves to each other" (compare Il. μ , 105. oi $\delta' \epsilon \pi \epsilon i$ $\dot{a}\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda ovc$ $\ddot{a}\rho a\rho ov$); and the description then follows correctly in the imperf. άσπις αρ' άσπίδ' έρειδεν, &c.

^{*} Λρμενος, fitting, suited, is a syncopated aor. 2. midd., used as an adjective, exactly like the part. ἀρηρώς, Hom. — And in the same way as ἄρμενος and ἄρθεν with a passive formation had an intransitive or reflective meaning, there was also a perfect ἀρήρεμαι (like ἀκήχεμαι and

* Formed with the reduplication; see note on ἀγαγεῖν under Ἄγω.

+ The temporal augm. of the second syllable is sometimes omitted. In the poetical verb $& \phi \bar{\rho} \rho a$ however, which, from the mere formation of the perf. 2. and without any regard to the augment, ought to have the η in its middle syllable, and is therefore written in Ionic poetry $& \phi \eta \rho a$, the a in the Attic form is only a consequence of the ρ preceding (compare the termination ρa of the 1. declension, the contractions like $& \phi \gamma \nu \rho \hat{a}$, the future in - $\rho \dot{a} \sigma \omega$), and the augment is therefore no so much omitted as invisible.

‡ At Od. ϵ , 248, we find $\delta\rho\eta\rho\epsilon\nu$ transitive, but from the Scholia it is evidently a false reading for $\delta\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$.

§ The lengthened vowel of the perf. 2. § The lengthened vowel of the perf. 2. may be shortened again, of which we have examples in the Epic participles $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\alpha\rho\hat{v}\hat{a}$, $\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\kappa\hat{v}\hat{a}$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\alpha\lambda\hat{v}\hat{a}$, etc., where the \check{a} is restored in place of the η . In Hes. 3, 607. $\dot{a}\rho\hat{a}\rho\hat{v}\hat{a}\nu$ is undoubtedly false for $\dot{a}\rho\eta\rho\hat{v}a\nu$. όρώρεμαι), of which we find the part. ἀρηρέμενος* with the accent hrown back on the antepenult. according to the note on ἀκήχεμαι under ἀΛκαχίζω. The same perf. as a midd. with transit. meaning occurs in Hes. ε, 429. προσαρήρεται. \uparrow

For the aor. part. apppauevos see the 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. δ , 777. $\delta \delta \delta h$ καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἡραρεν ἡμῖν. Soph. El. 147. ἐμὲ...ἄραρε φρένας. II. a, 136. ἄρσαντες κατὰ θυμὸν, where we must understand ἐμὲ τῷ γέρα, and compare it with πώμασιν ἄρσον ἅπαντας (τοὺς ἀμφορέας) Od. β, 353. and ἡραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῆ, ε, 95. It is clear therefore that ἀρέσκω, ἀρέσω, which is used in the same sense, comes from this APΩ with the inflexion -έσω.

^{*}Apô ω , *I water*: fut. $\check{\alpha}\rho\sigma\omega$, &c. It has no perf., and in the passive neither perf. nor aor. For its meaning see Buttm. Lexil. p. 157.

'Αρέσκω, I please (compare 'Αραρίσκω): fut. ἀρέσω [midd. ἀρέσομαι, Poet. ἀρέσσομαι; aor. 1. ἤρεσα, midd. ἀρεσάμεν, Poet. ἄρεσσα, ἀρεσσάμην; aor. pass. ἠρέσθην]; perf. ἦρεσμαι. — MIDD.

Sextus (adv. Gr. 10, 266.) quotes the perf. act. $\dot{a}\rho\dot{\eta}\rho\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ as in common use.

'Aρημένος, hurt, injured: a solitary part. perf. with a long, Od. ι, 403. σ, 53, &c. [The ancients explained it by βεβλαμμένος. It is of

* This participle occurs three times in Apollon. Rh. 1, 787. 3, 833. 4, 677. where Brunck changed it into an aor. $\delta \rho \eta \rho d$ - $\mu e \nu os$, which was a reading of the first passage in some manuscripts. Now from $\delta \rho \eta$ - ρa it may be allowable to derive a pres. $\delta \rho \dot{\eta} \rho \rho \mu a$; but for an aor. 1. formed again from this pres. or immediately from the perf. I know neither proof nor authority; for 1 do not reckon as such Quintus Sm., who has this $\delta \rho \eta \rho \dot{a} \mu e \nu os$ frequently, and read it so in Apollonius. In the first of the three passages quoted above the aor. 1. would be unnatural.

and read it so in Appinonus. In the inst of the three passages quoted above the aor. 1. would be unnatural. \dagger The word however is suspicious in this passage. That is to say, its construction there depends on $\epsilon \delta \tau^* \delta \nu$, and it is therefore conjunct. for mporaphperat. 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. $(e\bar{v}r^* \dot{v}...\dot{v}\phi\phi\eta)$ is admissible. In this case $\dot{d}\phi h \rho erau$ must therefore be the conjunct. of $\dot{d}\rho\eta\rho \phi_{-\mu\eta\nu}$; which Brunck indeed thought he had found in Apollonius, though the had not only no grounds for it, but the sense was intransitive. If we look for an aor. which might supply the place of $\dot{d}\rho d\phi \mu$ in the metre, a comparison of $d\rho\sigma d\mu erav$ in Hes. Scut. 320. used likewise of fitting a piece of workmanship, will furnish us with $\ddot{d}\rho\sigma\eta rat$, $\ddot{d}\rho\sigma erat$. Perhaps therefore the old reading was $\pi\rho bs$ $\ddot{d}\rho'$ $\dot{d}\rho\sigma erat$ lora- $Go\ddot{\eta}i$. Some Codd. of Lanzi have $\pi\rho\sigma\sigmaa$. doubtful origin: the derivation from $d\rho d\omega$, $d\rho dou \rho a\iota$ is very uncertain, but its connexion with $d\rho a\iota \delta c$ undoubted.—Passow.]

'Aριστάω, -ήσω, &c. Of this verb we find two remarkable forms used in familiar Attic quoted from some lost comedies by Atheneeus (10. p. 423.), ήρίσταμεν, ήριστάναι, and from δειπνεῖν two, δεδείπναμεν, δεδειπνάναι, which appear to have been formed similarly because they were words of similar meaning; for the *a* in δεδειπνάναι cannot be regularly derived from δειπνέω, δεδειπνηκέναι. See Mus. Antiq. Stud. I. p. 249.

'Apzéw, I suffice: fut. dpzé σw , &c. The passive, which has the same meaning as the active, takes σ .

'Aρμόττω, and άρμόζω, to fit: fut. άρμόσω, &c. - MIDD.

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 σ instead of the ξ , γ , κ , χ of the other verbs in $\sigma\sigma\omega$. The principal verbs of this kind in prose are $\pi\lambda\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, $\pi\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\pi\tau\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\beta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, $\beta\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\tau\omega$, and $\dot{\alpha}\rho\mu\dot{\epsilon}\tau\omega$, for which last $\dot{\alpha}\rho\mu\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ is also used. In poetry $\kappa\rho\rho\dot{\nu}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $i\mu\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$, and $\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$. To these we may add two which partake of both characteristics, viz. $\nu\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$, fut. $\nu\dot{\alpha}\xi\omega$, &c.; but perf. pass. $\nu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$; verbal adj. $\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\dot{\epsilon}c$, --- and $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\nu}\sigma\sigma\omega$, an Epic word of which Homer has the fut. $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\nu}\xi\epsilon\nu$, but in the aor. $\ddot{\eta}\phi\nu\sigma\alpha$, &c.

'Αρνέομαι, *I deny*: depon. pass. with fut. midd. ἀρνήσομαι (Eurip. Ion. 1026.), and aor. pass. ἀρνηθηναι; the aor. midd. ἀρνήσασθαι is generally Poet. but occurs also in Herodot. 3, 1. Æschin. Ctesiph. 81.

^{*}Αρνυμαι, I acquire, gain by my exertions, a lengthened form of alpw, as πτάρνυμαι is of πταίρω: it is a defective deponent, used only in the pres. and imperf., and takes its other tenses from alpoμαι, fut. ἀροῦμαι: compare Il. ζ, 446. with σ , 121., and χ , 160. with ι , 124.

'Αρόω, I plow: fut. ἀρόσω, &c.; but, contrary to analogy*, it takes no σ in the passive. It has the Att. reduplication. The Ionic perf. pass is ἀρήρομαι, part. ἀρηρομένος, Hom. and Herodot. The Ionic. inf. pres. is ἀρώμεναι, ἀρόμεναι, or ἀρόμμεναι, Hes. ε, 22.†

άνύω, -ὕσω,— ἤνυσμαι; -σπάω, -ἄσω ἔσπασμαι.

+ The text and many MSS. have ἀρόμ-

^{*} Verbs which do not lengthen their vowel in the future take a σ in their perf. passive; as, $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega$, $\epsilon \sigma \omega - \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \mu a \iota$;

'Aρπάζω, I carry off by violence: fut. Att. άρπάσω, Xen. Mag. Eq. 4, 17., also fut. midd. άρπάσομαι, Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 5. Aristoph. Pac. 1120.; aor. 1. act. ήρπασα, aor. 1. pass. ήρπάσθην. Also in common use, but later than the former, a fut. άρπάξω. aor. 1. act. ήρπαξα, aor. 2. pass. ήρπάγην. Homer has both formations.

A form $\delta\rho\pi\delta\mu\epsilon\nuo\varsigma$ (according to the analogy of $obr\delta\mu\epsilon\nuo\varsigma$, $\kappa\tau\delta\mu\epsilon\nuo\varsigma$, &c.) is found in the later poets, as in Nonnus and the Anthologia (Cod. Vat. pp. 462. 516.).

'Aρτάω, I hang, fasten on: fut. ἀρτήσω, &c. - MIDD.

'Αρύω, Att. ἀρύτω, I draw or dip up: fut. ἀρύσω, &c. See note under 'Ανύω. The pass. takes σ.—ΜΙDD. The v is always short.

"Ap $\chi \omega$, 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.

ΑΡΩ. See Άραρίσκω.

'Ασάομαι, I feel disgust or dislike: generally a depon. pass. [The aor. 1. pass. ἀσηθῆναι occurs in Herodot. 3, 41., the aor. 1. midd. ἀσασθαι Φρένα in Theogn. 567.] The act. ἀσάω is more rare, Theogn. 593., Bekker. Galen. ap. Foes. in voc. 'Ασσάομαι, Hippocr.

'Ασπάζομαι, I greet : fut. ἀσπάσομαι, &c. — Depon. midd.

Aὐδάω, I speak: fut. -ήσω, Att. -άσω. The tenses principally in use are the imperf. 3. pers. ηὕδα as aorist, and the aor. 1. αὐδῆσαι. Pindar.

μεναι, many have also ἀρόμεναι, which was the only reading of the Scholiasts, who merely recommend its being read and written in the former way. This ἀρόμεναι is by syncope for ἀροέμεναι, and may be therefore classed with ἔδμεναι and εἰρύμεναι. But a great number of the MSS. have according to Lanzi ἀρώμεναι, and it was and still is a question for the critic in what way the oldest writing APOMENAI is to be read. Now surely the same criticism, which in Homer from $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \omega$, $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \sigma \omega$, wrote $\kappa \alpha \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \alpha$, could not in Hesiod from $\delta \rho \delta \omega$, $\delta \rho \delta \sigma \omega$, write $d \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \alpha$ or $d \rho \delta \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \alpha$. The reading $d \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \alpha$, which undoubtedly came from some old critic, deserves therefore, on account of its analogy with those Homeric forms, our maturest consideration. (Ol. 2, 166.) uses αὐδάομαι as a depon. midd., as does Soph. Aj. 772. Phil. 130. 852.

As the Doric dialect is not used by Herodotus, αὐδάξασθαι, ηὐδάξατο in Ionic prose must be formed from a pres. αὐδάζομαι. The act. αὐδάζω, -άξω, occurs in Lycophr. 892.

Aⁱξω, and aⁱξάνω, I increase, add to: fut. aⁱξήσω, &c.: see note under Aⁱσθάνομαι. Pass. with fut. midd. I increase, grow. [Passow says the act. has a transit. sense, but in the Poets frequently intransit. Musgr. Soph. (Ed. T. 1085. Erf. and in N.T. e. g. Luc. i. 80. The fut. midd. has a pass. meaning. The regular fut. act. aⁱξανῶ is found only in the LXX.]

In the Epic language the sound of this $a\ddot{v}\xi\omega$ is $\dot{a}\xi\bar{\omega}$; but it occurs only in the pres. and imperf. See 'A $\lambda\xi\bar{\omega}$, toward the end.

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

1. $\dot{\alpha}\pi a v \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$, *I take away.* Of this verb we find only the imperf. (with the meaning of an aorist) $\dot{\alpha}\pi\eta \dot{\nu}\rho \omega v$, $\dot{\alpha}\pi\eta \dot{\nu}\rho \alpha s$, $\dot{\alpha}\pi\eta \dot{\nu}\rho \alpha$, all three in Homer; and (from a theme AYP Ω) an aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\alpha}\pi\eta \dot{\nu}\rho \alpha \tau o$, Od. \dot{o} , 646., but with a various reading $\dot{\alpha}\pi\eta \dot{\nu}\rho \alpha$. Connected by meaning with the above forms are also the participles aor. 1. act. $\dot{\alpha}\pi \sigma \dot{\nu}\rho \alpha s$, and midd. with a passive sense $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma \sigma \nu \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$ (Hes. α , 173.), by a change of vowel which never occurs elsewhere. \uparrow

2. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\rho\ell\sigma\varkappa\nu\mu\alpha\iota$, I reap advantage or disadvantage from, enjoy; depon. midd.: fut. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\rho\eta\sigma\nu\mu\alpha\iota$, II. ζ , 353.; aor. act. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\eta\nu\rho\nu\nu$, Dor. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\rho\nu\nu$, Pind. P. 3, 65. [of this aor. Homer has only 3. pers. conjunc. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\rho\eta$, II. λ , 391. ν , 649. and infin. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\rho\epsilon\nu\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\nu\rho\mu\nu$, II. λ , 573. σ , 302. Od. ρ , 81.]; aor. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\eta\nu\rho\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, II. λ , 573. σ , 302. Od. ρ , 81.]; aor. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\eta\nu\rho\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, Eurip. Hel. 476. [of this aor. Homer has only the 2. pers. conjunct. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\dot{\nu}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\dot{\nu}\rho\eta$, II. 0, 17. Od. σ , 107. and 3. plur. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\dot{\nu}\rho\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, II. α , 410.]; infin. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\mu\rho\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, Eurip. Iph. T. 529. and in non-Attic writers $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\dot{\nu}\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, Hippoc. Jusjur. 3. and elsewhere.

ρίσσουσιν), from a verb, which does not occur again in Homer, ἀφορίζω; under which some of the Grammarians, contrary to all analogy, place also the acknowledged form dπούραs.

‡ See last paragraph under Αίρέω.

^{*} See both examined more at length in Buttm. Lexil. p. 144. &c. † If I am right in my conjecture (Lexil.

 ⁺ If I am right in my conjecture (Lexil. p. 145. &c.), we may add a future also in the various reading dπουρήσουσω (II χ, 489. where the common reading is dπου-

The infin. pres. $i\pi a v \rho i \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (I. ν , 733.) occurs frequently in Hippoer. The pres. $i\pi a i \rho \rho \mu a \iota$, which was supposed for some other purpose (whence the accentuation $i\pi a i \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$), does not occur; $i\pi a i \rho \omega \mu a \iota$ is conjunct. aor. The pres. act. $i\pi a v \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega$ is found only in Theogen. 115.: no pres. $i\pi a v \rho a \omega$ or $i\pi a i \rho \omega$ exists. Hesiod, ϵ , 417. has $i\pi a v \rho \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$ from $i\pi a v \rho \epsilon \omega$. 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 $\epsilon \delta \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega$, which differs from it only in the diphthong, as $\epsilon \delta \chi o \mu a \iota$ and $a \delta \chi \delta \omega$.

A^v_w, *I call out, sound aloud.* This present occurs only as a dissyllable; but the other tenses (as if formed from d^{v}_{w}) are fut. $d^{v}_{\sigma u}$, aor. $\eta^{v}_{\sigma a}$, infin. $d^{v}_{\sigma a}$, with v long. From the subst. $d^{v}_{\tau h}$, *a cry*, comes in the Epic and Tragic poets a new pres. $d^{v}_{\tau t}$, also with long v.

Aŭω, I kindle; Att. aŭω; aŭοι, Od. ε, 490. Aŭηται takes fire, Arat. 1035. (Diosc. 333.) Thence in prose

'Eναύω, *I kindle*. Herodot. 7,231. Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 22. The pass. probably takes the σ, whence ^{*}έναυσμα.—MIDD. 'Eναυσάμενος, Ælian.

This compound has, I believe, no augment; a point however not proved by the instance from Herodot. 7, 231. our oin $\pi \tilde{\nu} \rho$ où deig $\check{\epsilon} \nu a \upsilon \epsilon$.

This verb is incorrectly supposed to be the same as $a \check{v} \omega$, or $a \check{v} \omega$, Iroast, but which in the common language was $\check{v} \check{v} \omega$: see this verb. Akin to $a \check{v} \omega$ is $a \check{v} a i \langle v \omega^* \rangle$, I dry; and therefore this third $a \check{v} \omega$ must be considered as a separate verb from the two others.

'Αφάω or ἁφαω, I handle: ἀφόωντα, Il. ζ, 322.; but in the later Ionic writers ἀφάσσω, as we find the part. pres. ἀφάσσουσα, and the aor. 1. 3. pers. ἡφασε, imperat. ἄφασον, Herodot. 3, 69. A pres. ἀφασσάω, and some other forms which have not yet been examined critically, occur in Foes. Œc. Hippocr. in voc.—Compare ᾿Απαφίσκω.

'Αφύσσω, I draw off liquor, &c.: fut. ἀφύζω; aor. 1. ἤφὔσα, Od. ι, 165., poet. also ἄφυσσα; aor. midd. ἤφυσάμην, Od. η, 286. For the rule of formation see 'Αρμόττω.

'Aχθομαι, I am loaded, metaph. vexed: pass. without any act. in use; generally with fut. midd. ἀχθέσομαι, Aristoph.

* Verbs beginning with α, αυ, οι, followed by a vowel, do not take the augment; as dia, äημι, ἀηδίζομαι, αἰαίνω, οἰόω, οἰακίζω, οἰανίζομαι: but the α if short becomes long, as ^τάῖον, αὐαίνετο, οἰάκιζεν, &c.—By ἐπαφαυάνθην, (Aristoph. Ran. 1089.), we see that αὐαίνω in the Attic pronunciation had the aspirate. Nub. 865. 1432. Av. 84., but sometimes $d\chi\theta\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$; aor. 1. $\eta\chi\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ (Od. 0, 457.), whence also the pass. fut. $d\chi\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$: see Piers. ad Moer. p. 21.

ΑΧΩ, ἀχέω. See Ἀκαχίζω.

"Aw. This theme appears under four different meanings: ---

1. I blow. 3. pers. imperf. $\tilde{a}_{\epsilon\nu}$, Apollon. Rh. 1, 605. But the pres. $\tilde{a}\eta\mu\iota$ is more usual, of which 3. sing. $\tilde{a}\eta\sigma\iota$, Hes. ϵ , 514., infin. $d\ddot{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$, $d\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, part. $d\epsilon i\varsigma$, $d\epsilon \nu\tau \sigma \varsigma$; imperf. 3. sing. $\tilde{a}\eta$, Od. μ , 325. but at ϵ , 478. τ , 440. we find $\delta i \delta \epsilon \iota$. Midd. $\tilde{a}\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, $d\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$; 3. sing. imperf. $\tilde{a}\eta\tau\sigma\nu$. In the dual pres. $\tilde{a}\eta\tau\sigma\nu$ (II. ι , 5.) and the infin. pres. we find the η retained, contrary to the analogy of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$. This passive form has the active sense except at Od. ζ , 131. where it means to be blown through.

In the Etym. M. is quoted 3. pl. $\tilde{\alpha}_{\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota}$, and the explanation of its being Æolic for $\dot{\alpha}_{\epsilon\bar{\iota}\sigma\iota}$ is proved by reference to Hes. 9, 875. Much the same is said by the Schol. Il. ϵ , 526., in Heyne vol. 5. p. 712. "A $\lambda\lambda\alpha\iota$ $\tilde{\alpha}_{\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota}$ was therefore an old-established reading there (see the various readings), and $\check{\alpha}_{\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota}$ without doubt a genuine form.

2. I sleep: aor. $a_{\epsilon\sigma a}$, contr. $a_{\sigma a}$, Od. τ , 342. π , 367. [This verb is the root of $a_{\ell\omega}$, $ia_{\ell\omega}$, $a_{\omega\tau\epsilon\omega}$. Passow.]

3. I satiate. From the pres. come the following infin. act. "āµενaı (Il. ϕ , 70.), contr. from åέµεναι for ắειν; 3. pres. pass. åταί (Hesych.), and by resolution ắăται, Hes. a. 101., where it stands as a future.* Fut. ăσω, aor. ăσa, infin. ăσαι; with the midd. ăσεσθαι, ăσασθαι; although the active form also occurs in the intransitive or middle sense, I am satiated, like the above-mentioned äµεναι and āσαι, Il. o, 317. ψ , 157. &c. Verbal adj. ἀτός, and with a priv: ἅaτος, contr. āτος, insatiable. On these forms see Buttm. Lexil. p. 2.

By old grammatical tradition the conjunct. $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ or $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ (II. τ , 402.) is attached to this verb, consequently it is for $\tilde{\omega}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ or $\tilde{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$: see Etym. M. v. $\tilde{\alpha}\delta\eta\nu$, and Buttm. Lexil. p. 26.

There are no grounds for adopting the radical A Δ - as is generally done; on which, and on the relations of this verb to $d\delta \tilde{\eta}\sigma a\iota$, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 22. &c.

4. I hurt; aor. 1. ἀσα. See Ἀάω. ["]Αωρτο. See Αίρω,

* 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 $\ddot{\alpha}\tau\alpha i$ of Hesych. being taken from this passage.

Báž ω , I speak : fut. β áž ω ; and 3. sing. perf. pass. β é β akrai, Od. 9, 408.

Βαίνω, I go: fut. βήσομαι, Dor. βασεῦμαι; perf. βέδηκα (whence the syncopated forms βεδάασι, βεδασι); infin. βεδάμεν, part. βεδαώς, βεδαυῖα, contr. βεδώς, βεδῶσα, βεδώς, which forms are rare except in the poets: Homer has the Epic βεδάασι, part. βεδαώς, βεδαυῖα, infin. βεδάμεν. The aor. 2. ἔδην* is like ἔστην, therefore ἔδημεν, &c., imperat. βῆθι, conjunct. βῶ, optat. βαίην, infin. βῆναι, part. βάς, βασα, βάν. [Homer has also βάτην (ǎ) for ἐδήτην; and in 3. plur. βάν and ἔδαν for ἔδησαν.† Aor. midd. ἑδήσετο, more rarely ἐδήσατο.] Some compounds have also a passive, e. g. παραδαίνω, παραδέδαμαι, παρεδάθην. Verbal adj. βατός.

The pluperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\beta\epsilon\epsilon\delta\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ has in Homer almost always the sense of went, for which as imperf. the plainest passages are Il. ζ , 313. 495. 513. π , 751. Od. ρ , 26.; while at Od. ν , 164. it must be understood as an aorist; and the only clear instance of its pluperfect sense is in the expression $d\ddot{\iota}\delta\delta\sigma\delta\epsilon$ $\beta\epsilon\epsilon\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$, Od. γ , 410. ζ , 11. Compare Heyne ad Il. δ , 492.

In addition to the perf. pass. $\pi a\rho a \mathcal{E} \mathcal{E} a \mu a \iota$ we must mention $\pi a \rho a \mathcal{E} \mathcal{E} \mathcal{E} a \sigma \mu a \iota$ in the spurious oration of Demosth. De Fœd. Alex. p. 214. extr., and in later writers $\beta \eta \sigma \omega$, $\mathcal{E} \eta \sigma a$, in a causative sense and also in the common language; e. g. $\mathcal{E} \pi \iota \mathcal{E} \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, Lucian Dial. Mort. 6, 4.

On the unusual particip. pres. of $\beta \dot{\alpha} \omega$ we have only to say, that it occurs in anapæstic verse in Cratinus $(\pi\rho\sigma \tilde{\omega}\nu\tau\epsilon_{c})$, and in a causative sense in the Doric treaty in Thucyd. 5, 77. $(\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\tilde{\omega}\nu\tau\alpha_{c})$.

The 2. pers. imperat. of the aor. 2. was also shortened by the Attics in the compounds (as in $i\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$, $\dot{a}\nu\dot{a}\sigma\tau a$) $\kappa a\tau\dot{a}\delta a$, Aristoph. Vesp. 979. $\pi\rho\delta\delta a$, Acharn. 262.

The Epic forms (βέδαα) βεδαώς, βεδαϋία, and the 3. plur. βεδάασι are formed from the perfect by omitting the κ, as in κεκαφηώς, τετιηώς, κεχαρηώς, βεδαρηώς, τετληώς, πεπτηώς, τετμηώς, κεκμηώς : this must therefore have been a rule in the Ionic language, as it is not done on

* See note under Γιγνώσκω.

D 3

⁺ For the short α in $\beta \dot{\alpha} \nu$ and $\xi \delta \alpha \nu$ see $\Delta i \delta \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$ toward the end and note.

account of the metre: and in the cases of $\beta \mathcal{E} \delta_{\eta \kappa a}$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa a$, $\pi \mathcal{E} \phi \nu \kappa a$, the vowel is also shortened. These and other abbreviated forms of this verb ($\beta \mathcal{E} \delta \tilde{a} \mu \varepsilon \nu$, for $\beta \mathcal{E} \delta \tilde{a} a \mu \varepsilon \nu$, infin. $\beta \mathcal{E} \delta \tilde{a} \nu a \iota$ with a short for $\beta \mathcal{E} \delta a \tilde{c} \tilde{\nu} a \iota$, &c.) are seldom found except in the dialects and poets. The conjunct. $\beta \mathcal{E} \delta \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota$, part. $\beta \mathcal{E} \delta \tilde{\omega} \sigma a$, occurs in Plat. Phædr. p. 252. ($\mathcal{E} \mu \mathcal{E} \delta \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota$) 254.; the infin. $\sigma \nu \mu \mathcal{E} \mathcal{E} \delta \nu a \iota$, $\delta \pi \sigma \mathcal{E} \mathcal{E} \delta \nu a \iota$, are found in Herodot. 3, 146. 5, 86.

In the aor. 2. Homer has some forms with a instead of η short, $\beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \ell \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \nu$, $\dot{\upsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \ell \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu$ for $\dot{\upsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \ell \dot{\epsilon} \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$; with these we may compare many other words in which the Ionians changed the η into short a, as $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta^*$ for $\pi \dot{\eta} \rho a$, $\dot{a} \mu \rho_i \sigma \ell \ddot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\epsilon} \eta$, for $-\eta \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, $-\eta \sigma \dot{\epsilon} a$, and $\mu \epsilon \mu \ddot{\alpha} \kappa \upsilon \ddot{\alpha}$ from $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta \kappa a$. On the other hand $\beta \tilde{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$ in Æschyl. Suppl-206. in the iambics is one of the solitary instances of a Doricism \dagger in the Tragic language. In Theor. 15, 22. $\beta \tilde{\alpha} \mu \epsilon_{\zeta}$ for $\beta \tilde{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ is an unusual Doricism. The 1. sing. aor. 2. conjunct. $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ and $\beta \epsilon \dot{\omega}$ for $\beta \tilde{\omega}$, and 3. pers. $\beta \dot{\eta} \eta$ for $\beta \tilde{\eta}$, &c., are Ionic and Epic resolutions, like $\sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\omega}$, $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \eta \varsigma$, $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \eta \tau \sigma \nu$, &c., $\vartheta \epsilon \dot{\omega} \omega \varepsilon \dot{\omega} \omega \varepsilon c$.

Besides the fut. midd. the Epics have also the aor. midd. in the same sense, but varying in form, $i \mathcal{C} h \sigma a \tau \sigma$ and $i \mathcal{C} h \sigma \varepsilon \tau \sigma \ddagger$, imper. $i \pi \iota \mathcal{C} h \sigma \varepsilon \sigma$. 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 $i \mathcal{C} \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$, but for this I find no other authority in Homer than $d \nu a \mathcal{C} \eta \sigma \delta \mu \varepsilon \nu \sigma \iota$, Od. o, 474.

See the form Béoman, Beloman, 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 $\beta \iota \ell \dot{a} \zeta \omega$. 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 $\nu \dot{\omega} \dot{a} \nu a \ell \eta \sigma \dot{a} \mu \epsilon \nu o$, taking us into his vessel, Od. o, 475. Of other forms I know of only two instances, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota - \ell \eta \tau \sigma \nu$, Od. ψ , 52., and $\kappa a \tau a \ell a (\epsilon \nu \epsilon)$, Pind. Pyth. 8, 111. : for $\beta a (\nu \omega \pi \delta \delta a$ 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 $\beta a (\nu \omega)$. The Epic sister-form $\beta \dot{a} \sigma \kappa \omega$ has also both senses; $\beta \dot{a} \sigma \kappa' i \theta_{i}$, go; $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \ell a \sigma \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$, to bring into, II. β , 234.

The Epic language has also the form $\beta_i \ell \delta \omega$, $\beta_i \ell \delta \eta \mu$, which it uses in the sense of *I stride*, of which however we have only the pres. $\beta_i \ell \tilde{q}$ (Hymn. Merc. 225.), and the part. $\beta_i \ell \tilde{\omega} \nu$, $\beta_i \ell \tilde{\omega} \sigma a$ (II. γ , 22.

* See Heraclid. ap. Eust. Il. a, 24. p. 22,

14. Od. µ, 89. p. 478, 12. Basil.

Tragedians 'Αθάνα, ποδαγός, κυναγός, and sometimes vaós, the Doric gen. of vaῦs.

+ We always find for instance in the

‡ See έδύσετο toward the end of Δύω.

Od. λ , 539.), $\beta_{i}\epsilon_{ds}$ (II. η , 213.). [To these Passow adds $\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon_{i}\epsilon_{a\sigma\kappa\epsilon}$, Ion. imperf. Hymn. Apoll. 133.] Now if we take this as a present instead of $\beta_{a\ell\nu\omega}$, the whole verb corresponds exactly in formation with $i\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$, and both have the fut. and aor. 1. in the causative sense.

Bάλλω, I throw: fut. βαλῶ, and sometimes (but not in the early writers) βαλλήσω, Aristoph. Vesp. 222. 1482. with the aor. 1. ἐβάλλησα; the usual aorist is the aor. 2. ἔβαλον, midd. ἐβαλόμην; perf. βέβληκα, perf. pass. βέβλημαι*, Epic βεβόλημαι also; aor. 1. pass. ἐβλήθην. – MIDD.

Βαλλέειν is an Ionic resolution of βάλλειν; thus we find ὑπερβαλλέειν, συμβαλλεόμενος, Herodot.

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

From the same old stem or root too, by that change of vowel which is the most usual, come the verbal substantive $\beta \delta \lambda o_c$, and the common Epic perf. pass. $\beta \epsilon \delta \delta \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \iota$.

Βάπτω, I dip: fut. βάψω; perf. pass. βέδαμμαι; aor. 2. pass. ἐδάφην. The characteristic letter is ϕ .

 * 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 elvar. There are cases however where, for the sake of greater expression, of clearness, or of conciseness, such moods are formed. Thus διαδεδλησθε, Andocid. p. 22, 41. ἐκτέτμησθον, Plat. Rep. 7. p. 564. c. Compare Τέμνω.
 t See note under Γιγνώσκω.

[‡] The various reading $\beta\lambda\hat{\eta}o$ arises from a twofold opinion of the old Grammarians; $d\delta \lambda \eta \mu \eta \nu$, optat. $\beta \lambda \tilde{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ or $\beta \lambda \epsilon (\mu \eta \nu$; but the connexion of these passive with the corresponding active aorists, as shown in a note near the end of Γιγγάσταο, and the prevailing form of the optative σδείην, βαίην, γνοίην, are decisive in favour of $\beta \lambda \epsilon \tilde{i} o$. Compare $\pi \lambda \epsilon (\mu \eta \nu)$ under Π(μπλημ.

§ As in Ξνήσκω, Ξανοῦμαι, ἕθανον, τέθνηκα (ΘΑΝ, ΘΝΑ): in Ξρώσκω, Ξοροῦμαι, ἕθορον (ΘΟΡ, ΘΡΟ): in βλώσκω, μολοῦμαι, ἕμολον, μέμβλωκα (ΜΟΛ, ΜΛΟ).

D 4

Bápurw, I load, takes in the pass. the perf. of the otherwise non-Attic Bapéw, Belapy µa, I am loaded, Plat. Symp. 203. b., for which Homer uses intransitively the act. βεβαρηότα, βεβαρηότες*: see the article on Baivw, paragraph 6.

Bαστάζω, I bear or carry: fut. βαστάσω, &c.; but in the pass. it changes its formation, and makes the aor. 1. έξαστάγθην. Compare διστάζω, νυστάζω.

ΒΑΩ, βίζημι. See Bairw.

arbiter.

E. b-ita Bέομαι, or βείομαι, 2. pers. βέη, an Epic future, I shall live, which . U-1they there are quite as strong grounds for our explaining to be a real but irregular future (like $\pi i o \mu a \iota$ or like $\kappa i \omega$, $\kappa i \omega$), as there are for our $\partial - b \cdot \partial e_r$ calling it a conjunctive, for $\beta \epsilon \omega \mu \alpha i$, used like a future. A more important question is, whether it belongs to an old verb BEI Ω , whence β_{log} and β_{low} : or whether the passive of β_{alvw} took in more ancient usage the sense of I walk, i. e. live, in which case $\beta \epsilon i o \mu a \iota$ will correspond with the active $\beta \epsilon i \omega$ for $\beta \tilde{\omega}$. This investigation will therefore prevent the necessity of altering, as Wolf has done, the traditionary form βίομεσθα (Hymn. Apoll. 528.) to βεόμεσθα.

> BiaZoman, I force: depon. midd., from which however is not only formed with a passive meaning the aor. pass. έβιάσθην, as in many similar verbs †; 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. μ , 297. Alcæus ap. Anecd. Bekk. p. 86. For the passive use of βιάζομαι 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 -áoµaı; e.g. in Herodot. $\beta_{i\tilde{a}\sigma\theta a_{i}}$ βιάται, βιώμενος; imperat. βιω; aor. 1. έβιήσατο; and also as pass. Bindeig. Homer has Belinker actively.

Βιβάω, βίβημι. See Βαίνω.

Βιβρώσκω, *I eat.* From this synonyme of the verb $\epsilon \sigma \theta i \omega$

* See Græv. ad Lucian. Solœc. 7. Tho. M. v. Bapúveiv, where the intrans. Beed- $\rho\eta\kappa\alpha$ 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 Besappuas it

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 meaning, as βιάζω for βιάζομαι, δωρέω for δωρέσμαι, μηχανάω for μηχανάσμαι.

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, $\beta \notin \beta \rho \omega_{RA}$, $\beta \notin \beta \rho \omega_{RA}$, $\delta \notin \beta \rho \omega_{RA}$,

The future midd. $\beta \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ was used only by the later writers; see Lobeck. ad Phryn. p. 347. The future pass. $\beta \epsilon \delta \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ occurs in Od. β , 203. The Epic language had also a syncopated aor. $\dagger \ \epsilon \delta \delta \rho \omega \nu$, Hymn. Apoll. 127. From the perf. part. $\beta \epsilon \delta \rho \omega \kappa \omega \varsigma$ was formed by syncope $\beta \epsilon \delta \rho \omega \varsigma$, $\beta \epsilon \delta \rho \omega \tau \sigma \varsigma \ddagger$, Soph. Antig. 1010.

The Homeric form $\beta \epsilon \epsilon \rho \omega' \theta \omega \epsilon$, Il. δ , 35. is not a perf. but comes from a poetic pres. $\beta \epsilon \epsilon \rho \omega' \theta \omega$, I feed upon, devour, in which the stem or root BPO Ω is formed in $-\theta \omega$, like $\kappa \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega \kappa \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, and the reduplication prefixed to increase the force of the word, as in $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha i \nu \omega$ from $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$, $\tau \iota \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$ and $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \epsilon \mu \alpha i \nu \omega$ from $\tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$.

We find some forms from $\xi \ell \rho \omega \xi a$; viz. $\kappa a \tau a \ell \rho \omega \xi a \sigma a \iota$, Apollon. Rh. 2. 271., $\kappa a \tau a \ell \rho \omega \xi \epsilon \iota \epsilon$, 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 BPO Ω 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 $\kappa a \tau a \ell \rho \delta \xi a \sigma a \iota$, $\kappa a \tau a \ell \rho \delta \xi \epsilon \iota \epsilon$, in the Supplement to Schneider's Lexicon is very probable (see under BPOX-); particularly as Dionysius had undoubtedly in his mind the $\kappa a \tau a \ell \rho \delta \xi \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu$ of Od. δ , 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 $\kappa a \tau a \pi \iota \epsilon \iota \nu$.

Biów, 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. $\beta_i \omega \sigma_0 \mu \alpha_i$; aor. 1. $\hat{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\omega} \omega \sigma \alpha$ rare; aor. 2. $\hat{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\omega} \omega \eta$, optat. $\beta_i \hat{\omega} \eta \nu$ (not $-o(\eta \nu)$), conjunct. $\beta_i \tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\omega}_s, \tilde{\omega}, \&c.$,

* On the analogy of this verb with some others by metathesis of the stem or root BOP, BPO, see note under Βάλλω, and Buttm. Lexil. p. 84.

+ See note under Γιγνώσκω.

§ There is one other instance, viz. ka-

 $\tau \epsilon \epsilon \rho \omega \xi \epsilon \nu$ 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 $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon - \epsilon \rho \omega \xi \epsilon \nu$, upon a supposition that it was copied from an older narrative of the story.

|| See note under Γιγνώσκω.

ε‡ Like πίπτω, perf. πέπτωκα, part. πεπτωκώs, by syncope πεπτώs and πεπτεώs.

infin. $\beta_{i}\tilde{\omega}\nu\alpha_{i}$, part. $\beta_{i}\delta_{i}\delta_{j}$; perf. $\beta_{i}\delta_{i}\omega\nu\alpha_{i}$, and perf. pass. in the expression $\beta_{i}\delta_{i}\omega\nu\alpha_{i}\mu_{0}$.

The pres. $\beta_{i\delta\omega}$, which is very common in Lucian (see Reitz. Ind.) and others, occurs but rarely in the older writers; we do meet with $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \ d\sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \bar{\omega} \varsigma \ \beta_{i\delta} \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$, Æschin. 1, 5. p. 1. $\zeta \eta \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \ \beta_{i\delta} \bar{\upsilon} \nu$, Eurip. Fr. 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. βιώσω 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 $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. Constant of the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \tilde{\omega} \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \omega \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \omega \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for $\beta \iota \omega \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for the infin. for $\beta \iota \omega \nu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for $\delta \iota \omega \mu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for $\delta \iota \omega \mu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for $\delta \iota \omega \mu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for $\delta \iota \omega \mu a \iota$ (besides its own natural usage) for $\delta \iota$

I find but one instance of the aor. 1. in the pure Attic times, viz. in Xen. CEc. 4, 18. $\epsilon i \ \epsilon \ell \ \delta \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$, if he had lived. But in the participle this tense ($\beta \omega \ \sigma \alpha \varsigma$, Hippocr. Coac. vol. 1. p. 559.) appears to have taken the place of the cases of $\beta \iota o \ \upsilon \varsigma$, (- $\delta \nu \tau \sigma \varsigma$, &c.) which never occur: thus we find $\beta \iota o \ \upsilon \varsigma$, Plat. Phæd. p. 95. e. and oi $\delta \sigma \iota \omega \varsigma \ \beta \iota \omega \ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, p. 113. d. In the older language the aor. 1. had probably, according to the analogy of $\ \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a$, $\ \epsilon \epsilon \eta \sigma a$, &c., the causative sense of I make to live, preserve life, and, to express that meaning, a present $\beta \iota \omega \ \sigma \kappa \omega$, according to the analogy of $\mu \epsilon \theta \upsilon \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\pi \iota \pi \iota \sigma \kappa \omega$. This supposition is confirmed by the pres. $\beta \iota \omega \ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, to be brought to life, revive, Aristot. Meteor. 1. c. 14.; and the aor. 1. (though in the middle voice like $\ \epsilon \ell \ \delta \eta \sigma \alpha \tau \sigma$, $\ \delta \sigma \tau \ \eta \sigma \alpha \sigma$) does actually occur in this sense at Od. 9, 468, $\sigma \upsilon$ $\gamma \ \delta \rho \mu' \ \epsilon \ell \iota \omega \sigma \alpha \sigma$, thou hast preserved my life.

Βιόμεσθα, Hymn. Apoll. 528. Wolf has altered to $β_{\epsilon \delta \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a}$. See under Βέομαι.

The compound of this verb with ἀνά has only the aor. ἀνεβίων, ἀναβιῶναι to express the intransitive sense of *I* revive; the causative meaning, *I resuscitate*, is expressed by the aor. 1. midd. ἀνεβιωσάμην, Plat. Phæd. p. 89. b. Hence the pres. ἀναβιώσχομαι, being both passive and middle, has both senses; as passive, *I am brought to live* again, I revive, ἀναδιώσκεσθαι, -οιτο, ibid. 72. c. d.; as middle, I bring to life again, resuscitate, οί ... ἀναδιωσκόμενοι ἀν, Crito p. 48. c.

The active voice in this causative sense, ἀναθιώσκω, is found in Schol. Eurip. Alcest. init.*, and ἀνεθίωσα in Palæph. 41.

Apollon. Rh. 1, 685. has $\beta \omega \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ 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 $\sigma \iota \omega \pi \tilde{q} \nu$, and perhaps in $\pi \epsilon \pi \omega \kappa a$ also.

Βλάπτω, I hurt, harm: fut. βλάψω; aor. 1. ἔδλαψα;
fut. midd. in passive sense βλάψομαι, Thucyd. 6, 64.;
perf. pass. βέδλαμμαι†; aor. 1. pass. ἐδλάφθην, Thucyd. 4.
73. Antiph. p.61., but more generally aor. 2. pass. ἐδλάδην.
The characteristic of this verb is therefore β.

From the aor. 2. arose a new present $\beta\lambda\dot{\alpha}\omega$, of which we find only the 3. sing. $\beta\lambda\dot{\alpha}\varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in Homer.—Compare $\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\phi\omega$ for $\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\pi\tau\omega$, $\sigma\tau\varepsilon\nu\dot{\alpha}\chi\omega$ for $\sigma\tau\varepsilon\nu\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$.

Βλαστάνω, I germinate: fut. βλαστήσω; perf. ἐβλάστηκα[‡], Eur. Iph. A. 594.; aor. 2. ἔβλαστον, see note under Αἰσθάνομαι.

The aor. 1. $\xi\xi\epsilon\delta\lambda$ $\delta\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon$ occurs in Hippoer. De Alim. 1. and in the later writers, for instance Aret. 6, 3. In Æschyl. Cho. 585. we read $\beta\lambda a\sigma\tau\sigma\tilde{\nu}\sigma\iota$, which, if the reading be good in other respects, must undoubtedly be accented $\beta\lambda\lambda\sigma\sigma\tau\sigma\nu\sigma\iota$, which brings it into analogy with $a\check{\nu}\xi\omega$ and $a\check{\nu}\sigma\theta\mu\mu\iota$: compare also $\delta\alpha\rho\theta\delta\mu\omega$.

Bλέπω, *I see*: fut. β λέψω, &c. The aor. 2. pass. is irregular. § This verb is not found in Homer.

Βλίττω, I take the bees from the hive : fut. βλίσω, Ion. βλίσσω: see Άρμόττω. Of this verb I have never found

* Perhaps from Pherecycles, who is mentioned there, and from whom the story is quoted in Schol. Pind. p. 3, 96. with the expression dragioiv émolei.

† See following note under βλαστάνω.

‡ All verbs beginning with γν, and some with γλ, βλ, take in the perfect, instead of the reduplication, the syllabic augment c. Of verbs beginning with βλ, the only one which I find with the reduplication is $\beta\lambda dm^{2}m$, $\beta\epsilon\delta\lambda a\mu\mu ai$; and of those beginning with $\gamma\lambda$, $\gamma\lambda'\phi\omega$ is doubtful; for we have έξεγλυμμένοs, Plat. Rep. 10, p. 616. d. Διέγλυπται, Athen. 3. p. 93. c. Διαγεγλυμμένοs, Ælian. V. H. 3, 45.

§ Some verbs, whose radical vowel is ϵ , do not change their vowel in forming the aor. 2. pass.: thus from $\phi\lambda\epsilon'\gamma\omega$, $\beta\lambda\epsilon'\pi\omega$, $\lambda\epsilon'\gamma\omega$, we find $\epsilon\phi\lambda\epsilon'\gamma\eta\nu$, and the participles $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon$; $\sigma\nu\lambda\lambda\epsilon'\gamma\epsilon$; compare also $\lambda\epsilon'\pi\omega$, $\pi\lambda\epsilon\kappa\omega$, $\psi\epsilon'\gamma\omega$. an instance of the present with $\sigma\sigma$, probably because it was originally a pure Attic word. See Buttm. Lexil. pp. 84.189.

ΒΛ-. See Βάλλω.

Βλώσκω, *I* go. This verb comes by metathesis from the root MOA-(see Bάλλω with note, and Buttm. Lexil. pp. 84. 189.), whence the fut. μολοῦμαι; aor. ἕμολον, μολεῖν, μολών; perf. μέμ€λωκα. Of these tenses Homer uses the aor. and perf., the Tragedians the future, Æschyl. Prom. 694. Soph. Œd. C. 1742.

That $\beta\lambda\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ is the real present to those tenses we have proofs enough in the indexes of Homer, Aristophanes, and Euripides. Wherever the present $\mu\alpha\lambda\omega$ occurs it is suspicious : see Schæfer on Soph. (Ed. C. 1742.

Boaw, I cry out : Attic fut. Bonoopan.

The Ionians always contract the $o\eta$ of this verb to ω , making in the fut. $\beta\omega\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, and throw back the accent, as aor. 1. $\xi\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$. The same takes place in $vo\epsilon\omega$. For that this is the correct explanation of these verbs may be learnt from comparing them with $\beta\omega\theta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ for $\beta\sigma\eta\theta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, $\delta\gamma\delta\omega\kappa\sigma\tau\alpha$ for $\delta\gamma\delta\sigma\eta\kappa\sigma\tau\alpha$, &c. The throwing back of the accent takes place in other similar cases. In the passive voice $\beta\sigma\delta\omega$ inserts the σ in the aor. 1. of this contraction, but not in the perfect ; $\beta\epsilon\epsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$, $\epsilon\epsilon\omega\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, Herodot. 3, 39. 6, 131.

BOA-. See Βάλλω and Βούλομαι.

Bόσκω, I feed (in its active sense): fut. βοσκήσω[†], according to which the other tenses are formed. — MIDD. I feed (in its intransit. sense).

Βούλομαι, I wish: depon. pass.; with fut. midd. βουλήσομαι (see note under Βόσκω); perf. pass. βεδούλημαι; aor. 1. έδουλήθην, also Att. ήδουλήθην.‡

* We find also in Aristoph. Pac. 1154. βώσατο; and in the Etym. Μ. νένωται 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 ω into $\epsilon \omega$, as $\beta t \pi \tau \omega$ and $\beta t \pi \tau \epsilon \omega$, $\kappa t \omega$ and $\kappa v \epsilon \omega$, $\gamma a \mu \epsilon \omega$ from TAMO. Hence as often as the regular inflexion of a verb presented any difficulty, sounded badly, or caused obscurity, it was inflected as if the present had been in $\epsilon \omega$.

sounded badry, of caused observary, the inflected as if the present had been in έω. ‡ In the three verbs βούλομαι, δύναμαι, and μέλλω, the Attics very commonly increase the syllabic augm. of the imperf. and aor. by the addition of the temp. augm., and use both $\delta \delta v \kappa d \mu m p$ $\delta \delta v \kappa d \mu m p$, $\delta \delta v \kappa h m p$ and $\delta \delta$., $\delta \delta v \kappa h m p$ and $\delta \delta$., $\delta \delta v \kappa h m p$ and $\delta \delta$., $\delta \delta v \kappa h m q$ and $\delta \delta$., $\delta \delta v \kappa h m q$ and $\delta \delta$., $\delta \delta v \kappa h m q$ and $\delta \delta$., $\delta \delta v \kappa h m q$ and $\delta \delta$., $\delta \delta v \kappa h m q$ and $\delta \delta v \kappa h m q$ but occurs in the Epic and Ionic dialects ; but occurs ; but occurs in the Epic and Ionic dialects ; but occur Homer has also a perf. $\beta \epsilon \delta o v \lambda a$ in the compound $\pi \rho o \delta \epsilon \delta o v \lambda a$, **I** prefer: see note under "Ayvoµi. On the form $\beta \delta \lambda o \mu a$, $\beta \delta \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, which occurs twice in Homer, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 196.

BO-. See Boáw.

Βράζω, more commonly βράσσω, -ττω, *I boil* (in its intrans. sense), *I ferment*, *I throw up* (as the sea does), *I winnow*: fut. βράσω; aor. 1. ^{*}έβρασα. The passive has again frequently the intrans. sense.

Some wish to confine the sense of boiling and fermenting to the pres. $\beta\rho\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, but all the different meanings run too much into each other for this to hold good: $\beta\rho\dot{\alpha}\tau\tau\omega$ 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 $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}$, $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{o}$, and $\dot{\xi}\xi$.

Braxeiv, $\tilde{\epsilon}$ brax, an Epic aor. with the meaning of to rattle, to crack, to roar (as the sea or a wounded combatant is said to do).

Βρέμω and βρέμομαι, fremo, I roar (as the sea or thunder does), I resound. Used only in pres. and imperf. Βρέχω, I wet: fut. βρέξω, &c. Pass. I am wet, βρεχόμενοι πρός τὸν ὀμφαλόν, Xenoph. It has the aor. 1.

έβρέχθην, and the aor. 2. έβράχην.

Pindar has the perf. pass. $\beta \epsilon \epsilon \rho \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$, Ol. 6. 62. — The doubtful

* [I compile from that untranslated Lexicon the following :

Intrans.—to boil up, foam, ferment; $\tau v \tilde{v}$ $\pi \delta \tau ov \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho \tilde{v} s \beta \rho \delta \sigma \tau os$, Heliod. p. 193. where Jacobs conjectures $\beta \rho v \delta \sigma \sigma \tau \sigma s$. Olvos $\beta \rho \delta \delta \sigma v$, fermenting, Alex. Aphrod. Probl. p. 282. Bp $\delta \delta \sigma v \sigma \sigma s$ a turbulent spirit. It also expresses the roaring of the bear, Pollux 5, 58. Its compound is used for the rushing forth of fire, $\pi o \lambda \lambda \eta$ $\pi v \rho \delta s$ $\xi \xi \epsilon \delta \rho a \sigma \epsilon \delta \alpha \eta$, Apollod. 1, 6.

 6. Trans. — to throw up with violence (as boiling water or a tempestuous sea does), ebre Βράσσηται πάμφυρτος άφυσγετός, Oppian. Hal. 1, 779. 'Οστέα βέβρασται παρ' ήόνι, Antip. Thess. Epig. 61. 'Εβρα- σεν ές ήϊόνα, Laur. Tull. Epig. 2. Τὰ μὲν έξρασεν ἤλιθα νηδὸς πνεύματα, Ni- cand. Al. 25. Τὰ ở ἀθρόα νείθθε βράσ-σαις, ib. 137. In the same sense is used the compound & ξεβράσσυντο, of vessels cast on shore, Herodot. 7, 188. Again & arrbv & ξέβρασε, Ælian. H. A. 6, 15. Also, to throw up and shake corn in order to winnow it, Ruhnk. Tim. p. 64. Μόσχος Sηλης χύσιν βράτει, sucks by pushing and shaking the teat, Meand. Al. 359. Lycophr. 461. And in the passive, βρασσόμενος ὑπό γέλωτος, shaking with laughter, Lucian 5, p. 213. Anecd. Bekk. 1, 66. The passive voice has also the intrans. sense in Sάλασσα πνεόματι βρασσομένη, Leonid. Tar. 57. Apoll. Rhod. 2, 323. Πόθοισι βρασσόμενος, Greg. Naz. Carm. 20, 4. But the compound draβράττω has an active sense, to boil up, κρέα, Aristoph. Batr. 510. Pac. 1197. Ach. 1005. 'Ανάδρασον ὑποκαίων, Dioscor.; and so has the other compound δ φάρυγξ αίματος Βρόμβους ἐκδράσσεται, Hippocr. 531, 20.- Ερ.] perf. $\beta \ell \ell \rho \sigma \chi a$ or $\beta \ell \ell \rho \sigma \chi a$ see under B $\rho \sigma \chi a \sigma \mu a \iota$; as also the root BPOX-, below.

Bρίζω, I slumber : fut. βρίξω (never βρίσω) ; aor. 1. ἔβρίξα, Eurip. Rhes. 825., infin. βρίζαι, part. ἀπόβριξας, Od. ι, 151. μ, 7. The pres. is found in II. δ, 223. Hesychius has βρισθείς.

Βρίθω, I am heavy: fut. βρίσω; aor. 1. ἔβρīσα, infin. βρίσαι.

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

BPO-. See βιβρώσκω.

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 in, to swallow up, $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \xi \rho \delta \xi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, $d\nu \alpha \xi \rho \delta \xi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, $d\nu \alpha \xi \rho \delta \chi \epsilon \nu$ (swallowed up again), Od. δ , 222. μ , 240. λ , 586. See Bi $\xi \rho \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$; and $d\nu \alpha \delta \epsilon \ell \rho \delta \sigma \alpha$ under B $\rho \nu \chi \delta \rho \mu \alpha$. These forms are also treated of more at length in Buttm. Lexil. p. 200, &c.

Βρύκω and Βρύχω * 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 $\dot{\rho}\epsilon_{\gamma\kappa\omega}$ and $\dot{\rho}\epsilon_{\gamma\chi\omega}$. Of these two verbs no other tenses are found + except that Hesychius has $\beta\rho\tilde{\nu}\xi_{\alpha\iota}$, $\dot{\delta}\alpha\kappa\tilde{\epsilon}\nu$. [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 $\beta\rho\tilde{\nu}\kappa\omega$, $\beta\rho\tilde{\nu}\chi\omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\delta\rho\tilde{\nu}\chi\omega$, $\beta\rho\nu\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, and $\dot{\omega}\rho\acute{\nu}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$.]

Βρūχάομαι, *I roar*; depon. pass.; with fut. midd. and aor. pass. but we sometimes find also the aor. midd., Plat. Phæd. p. 117. d. Βρυχηθείς, Soph. Œd. T. 1265.

Of the more simple form the perf. $\beta \epsilon \ell \rho \bar{\nu} \chi a$ with the sense of a pres. is used by the poets: for that this tense belongs here, and not to $\beta \rho \ell \chi \omega$, *frendeo*, is proved in Buttm. Lexil. p. 200. &c. Compare the similar forms of $\mu \nu \kappa \dot{a} \rho \mu a \mu \alpha \dot{a} \rho \mu a \mu$.

A very difficult form occurs in II. ρ , 54. $\vec{a}\lambda \iota_{\mathcal{C}} \dot{a}\nu \alpha \mathcal{C} \dot{\epsilon} \mathcal{C} \rho \nu \chi \varepsilon \nu \ \vec{v} \delta \omega \rho$. 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

77. Βρῦκου στόμα, Nicand. and aor. 2. ϵ δρῦχε, Epigr. Adesp. 418.— under Βρύχω the perf. βέδρῦχε, βεδρῦχώς, pluperf. ϵ δεδρύχει. In addition to which the aor. 1. ϵ δρυξε, Eryci. Epig. 2. βρύξας, Diodor. 16.— ED.]

^{* [}According to Moeris βρύχω was the common form, βρύκω the Attic: in opposition to which see Herm. Soph. Phil. 735. — Passow.]

^{† [}Yet I find in Passow's Lexicon, under Βρύκω, άλl βρυχθείs, Phil. Thes. Epig.

treated of fully in Buttm. Lexil. p. 200., and the alternative left of considering it either a mere onomatopœia $\beta \epsilon \beta_{\rho} v_{\chi} \epsilon$, it spouts forth, or an anomalous change of vowel $d\nu \alpha \epsilon \epsilon \beta_{\rho} v_{\chi} \epsilon$ for $d\nu \alpha \epsilon \epsilon \delta_{\rho} o_{\chi} \epsilon$ (itself an old reading) from $d\nu \alpha \epsilon \delta_{\rho} \epsilon_{\chi} \epsilon_{\nu} \nu$, which also may mean to spout forth.

Βρύω, I am full, appears only in the pres. and imperf.

["Ερνος άνθεϊ βρύει, Il. ρ, 56. With gen. Soph. Œd. C. 16. But it has also a transit. sense, χάριτες ρόδα βρύουσιν, produce in plenty, Anacr. 37, 2. — Passow.]

Bυνέω, *I stop up*, makes fut. βύσω, aor. 1. ξ 6υσα with υ long; but the passive takes the σ.

The pres. $\beta i \omega$ was not used by the Attics. In Aristot. H. A. 9, 37, 3. Schneider's Codd. have $\beta \nu \nu o \tilde{\nu} \sigma i \nu$, and in Aristoph. Pac. 645. the general reading of the text $i \ell \delta ' o \nu \nu$ is now from the best sources corrected to $i \ell \delta ' \nu o \nu \nu$. Herodot. 2, 96. has $\delta i \alpha \ell \delta ' \nu \epsilon \tau \alpha$, and 4, 71. $\delta i \alpha \ell \nu - \nu \epsilon \delta \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha$. Compare $\kappa \tilde{\nu} \nu \epsilon \omega$, and $\delta \ell \nu \omega$, $\epsilon \nu \delta \tilde{\nu} \nu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma_{i}$, under $\Delta \delta \omega$.

Γ.

Γαμέω, I marry, i. e. take a wife, forms from ΓΑΜΩ a future of similar sound with the present; thus, Ion. fut. γαμέω, (II. 1, 391.) Att. fut. γαμῶ (Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 12.); aor. ἔγημα, infin. γῆμαι, part. γήμας; perf. γεγάμηκα, &c. — Pass. I am married, i. e. taken to wife (ἐγαμήθην).— MIDD. I marry, i. e. take a husband.

The fut. $\gamma \alpha \mu \eta \sigma \omega$ and aor. 1. $i \gamma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \sigma \alpha$ belong to the later writers. The older future (from $\Gamma AM\Omega$) was $\gamma \alpha \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega^*$, fut. midd. $\gamma \alpha \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha_i$, whence $\gamma \alpha \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha i$ II. i, 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. $i \gamma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \sigma \alpha$: see Schol. Ven. ad II. i, 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 $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ Partic. p. 127. The $\gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon \tilde{i} \sigma \alpha$ of Theorr. 8, 91., for the aor. 1. part. pass. $\gamma \alpha \mu \eta \theta \epsilon \tilde{i} \sigma \alpha$, is grounded on the old future $\gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \sigma \omega$.

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

* See note under $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, I bind. [But Passow gives it as his opinion that wher-

ever this form occurs there are reasons for suspecting it to be spurious.]

from an obsolete verb $\gamma \alpha \nu i \omega$, which occurs only in the perf. pass. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \alpha - \nu \bar{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \varsigma$. — Passow.] consequently it does not follow the general analogy of verbs in $\nu \nu \mu i$.*

ΓA-. See ΓΕΝ-.

Γέγωνα, a perf. 2. with the meaning of a present \dagger , *I call aloud*: infin. γεγωνέμεν (for -έναι); part. γεγωνώς; conjunct. γεγώνω (Soph. Œd. C. 213.); imperat. γέγωνε, used by the Tragedians. The 3. sing. perf. 2. γέγωνε is in Homer both pres. and aor. (see 'Aνήνοθα and note). The other tenses are inflected as from a pres. in -έω, formed from the above perf. 2., as the infin. pres. γεγωνεῖν (II. μ, 337. Eurip. Hippol. 586.), and the imperf. ἐγεγώνευν (Od. ι, 47, &c.). Hence then the 3. sing. ἐγεγώνει is to be classed with these, although it may with the same sense be the pluperf. also. The fut. γεγωνήσω is used by Euripides; the aor. γεγωνῆσαι by Æschyl. Prom. 989., and the verbal adj. γεγωνητέον by Pind. Ol. 2, 10. Even Xen. Ven. 6, 24. has the imperat. γεγωνείτω. And lastly was formed a pres. γεγωνίσκω, used by the Tragedians and also by Thucyd. 7, 76.

Γελάω, *I laugh*, with fut. midd. γελάσομαι, more rarely γελάσω, Monk Eurip. Alc. 158. Popp. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 16. Bornem. Xen. Conviv. 1. 16. The α is short in the inflexion. The pass. takes σ .

The regular aor. 1. is $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$, Poet. $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$: but as the Dorics form all verbs in $-\zeta\omega$ with a fut. in $-\zeta\omega$, we have the Dor. fut. $\gamma\epsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ and the Dor. aor. $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\zeta\alpha$.

The regular contr. part. is $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu$, plur. $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$, but in some contracted verbs the ω is resolved into ωo : which takes place only where a syllable long by position follows the ω , or it has the ι subscript, in which latter case ω is resolved into $\omega o\iota$; e.g. $\hbar \mathcal{C} \omega o \nu \tau \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$, $\hbar \mathcal{C} \omega \rho \iota \mu$, for $\hbar \mathcal{C} \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$, $\hbar \mathcal{C} \tilde{\mu} \mu \iota$ (from $- \dot{\alpha} o \nu \tau \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$, $\dot{\alpha} o \iota \mu \iota$), and for $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$ may stand according to the metre $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\omega} \omega \nu \tau \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$ or $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \omega \nu \tau \epsilon_{\mathcal{S}}$, $\partial t = 0$. 110. \pm

‡ At Od. v, 347. 390. we find however another form, $\gamma \epsilon \lambda o l \omega \nu$ for $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omega \omega$, and the part. $\gamma \epsilon \lambda o l \omega \nu \tau \epsilon s$, although in both passages the text is uncertain, from there being various readings without the diphthong. In itself it is very conceivable that, as the resolution of $\omega \omega$ is by far the most usual, and the most common mode of lengthening a syllable was by changing it into oi, like $d\lambda o law$, $\eta\gamma voi \eta\sigma ev$, so $\gamma e \lambda \delta \omega v$ became $\gamma e \lambda o law$ whenever the verse required it (Eust. ad v. 347.). But in that case we must read $\gamma e \lambda o law \tau es$ at Od. σ , 110. also, where there is no such various reading. We are led to view the word however in another light by the meaning of $\gamma e \lambda o i \eta \sigma a \sigma a$ t Hymn. Ven. 49. where the context points not to mere laughing, but rather requires laughing and joking, (γe -

^{*} There are three verbs which do not follow the general analogy of verbs in νυμι, viz. ανώω, τανύω, γάνυμαι, all three with v short.

⁺ See Buttm. Lexil. p. 202. note.

FEN-. 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. $\gamma \not\in \gamma \circ \nu a$ 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. $\gamma \epsilon l \nu o \mu \alpha i$ 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 (II. \varkappa , 71.), and to beget (Od. υ , 202. where we have $\gamma \epsilon l \nu \epsilon \alpha i$ the 2. sing. conj. aor. 1. midd. for $\gamma \epsilon l \nu \eta \alpha i$). The aor. 1. midd. $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon l \nu \alpha \alpha \eta \alpha i$, is transitive, to beget, bring forth, and belongs to both prose and poetry.

2. $\gamma'_i\gamma\nu\rho\mu\alpha_i$, old and Attic; in the common language $\gamma'_i\nu\rho\mu\alpha_i$, with *i* long; fut. $\gamma \epsilon \nu \gamma'_i\sigma \rho\mu\alpha_i$; aor. $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu\eta\nu$; perf. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta\mu\alpha_i$, or in the active form perf. 2. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho\nu\alpha_i$. 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 be, as $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu\eta\nu$ and $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho\nu\alpha$ serve at the same time for preterites of the verb $\epsilon \mu \mu l$. Not unfrequently however the perf. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \nu\alpha$ may be also taken as a present, $I \alpha m_i$; yet so that the meaning always comprehends the more exact idea of I have been, I have been born.[‡] Compare $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \alpha \alpha$.

λοίησασα εἶπεν); therefore γελοιậν from γέλοιον. And this meaning is most suited to Od. v, 390., where the suitors get ready for their banquet γελοίωντες, laughing and joking; which therefore, according to this second analogy, must be written γελοιῶντες. On the other hand at σ, 110. (γελωώντες) we want nothing more than simple laughing; and so at v, 347. instead of γελοίων we must restore the old reading γελώων for ἐγέλων. * For an account of the meaning of this form see note under "Ayvoµ.

† Instances of this use of γέγονα are, of πάντες βασιλεΐς γεγόνασι, who have all been kings, Plat. Alcib. I. 41. c. p. 124. εί άρα τις γέγονεν έραστης...ούκ, ήράσθη, ib. 55. a. p. 131.

‡ For instance, in Plat. Phæd. p. 76. c. ἀφⁱ οῦ ἄνθρωποι γεγόναμεν, since we are men, i. e. have been born men. Hence ἐξήκοντα ἕτη γέγονα, I am sixty years οἰd_i i. e. have been born sixty years. With these we may join the verb $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, which takes entirely the causative meaning to beget, as well as its more general sense to produce; while the above-mentioned aor. $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ 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 ΓEN - arise in strictness of analogy no other presents than $\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu o\mu\alpha\iota$, like $\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omega$ from TEN-, and $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu o\mu\alpha\iota$, like $\mu\epsilon\nu\omega$, $\mu\iota\mu\nu\omega$. The form $\gamma\iota\nu o\mu\alpha\iota$ might, indeed, as $\epsilon\iota$ and ι were in very ancient times almost the same, be reckoned identical with $\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu o\mu\alpha\iota$; but the analogy of $\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ shows that it arose in the course of pronunciation from $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu o\mu\alpha\iota$. That grammatical decision appears therefore to have been correct, according to which the old Epic poets admitted those two forms only, and used $\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu o\mu\alpha\iota$, on account of the established usage of $\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha \sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, in the sense of being born, $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu o\mu\alpha\iota$ in that of to become. With regard to Attic usage, the Atticists decide between $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu o\mu\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$, or $\gamma\iota\nu o\mu\alpha\iota^* \gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$, in favour of the former orthography; see Valck. ad Phcen. 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 $\gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ was a depon. pass., therefore $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \theta \eta \nu$ was used for $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \eta \nu$; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 108. and Archyt. ap. Gal. p. 674. ($\gamma \epsilon \nu a \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$); and thence it came into the common language of the later writers. But the future $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (occurring twice in Plat. Parmen. p. 141. e.) presents difficulties of another kind: see Heind.

Callimachus (in Cer. 58.) uses $\gamma \epsilon i \nu a \tau o$ in the exact sense of $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau o$, facta est. With this I join the particip. $\gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{a} \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$, which Archimedes has frequently, p. 48, 28. 35. 38. p. 127, 23. The form which Callimachus uses is therefore nothing more than an Epic lengthening of $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \tau o$, and the same kind of formation as $\epsilon i \lambda \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu$, $\epsilon \ddot{\nu} \rho a \tau o$, &c.

The aor. $\xi_{\gamma \epsilon \nu \tau o}$, $\gamma \epsilon \nu \tau o^{\dagger}$, by syncope for $\xi_{\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tau o}$, is used by Hesiod, Pindar, and other poets. Theognis, 640., has $\xi \pi \epsilon_{\gamma \epsilon \nu \tau o}$.

For $\gamma \epsilon \gamma o \nu a$ we find a poetical form $(\gamma \epsilon \gamma a a)$ plur. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma a \mu \epsilon \nu - \gamma \epsilon \gamma \dot{a} a$ -

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 μa_i ; and they belong only to the oldest period of the language, e.g.—

δέχομαι - έδεδέγμην, έδέδεξο, &c., δε-

^{* [}Гігоµан was unknown not only to Homer but also to the Tragedians. — Passow.]

sow.] + 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

σιν; infin. γεγάμεν (for -άναι); part. Ερ. γεγαώς, γεγαῶτος* (for -αότος), γεγαυΐα, Att. γεγώς, -ῶσα, -ώς. See βέβαα, &c., under Βαίνω.

With these are united three other forms: 1.) $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \ddot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$, Batrach. 143. Hom. Epigr. ult. for $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \ddot{\alpha} \ddot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$, on account of the metre, perhaps formed according to a false analogy from $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \ddot{\alpha} \sigma \iota$: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 142. — 2.) $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \gamma \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \sigma \iota$, they will be born, Hymn. Ven. 198., a future which bears the same relation to $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma a \alpha$ as $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu a \iota$ does to $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \eta \kappa a$, is used like the latter as a simple but express future, and formed without the σ like $\pi i \rho \mu a \iota$, $\ddot{\epsilon} \partial \rho \mu a \iota$, and the Epic futures in $-\dot{\nu} \omega$ for $-\dot{\nu} \sigma \omega$, viz. $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \sigma \sigma \sigma \iota$ II. λ , 454., $\tau a \nu \dot{\nu} \sigma \sigma \iota$ Od. ϕ , 174, &c. — 3.) Dor. infin. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ (for $-\dot{\epsilon} \nu a \iota$), Pind. Ol. 6, 83., which supposes the existence of the more complete perfect $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \eta \kappa a$ (as $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \kappa a$, $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \theta a a$) of which Hesychius quotes the conjunct. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \kappa \omega$.

Γέντο, he took, an old verb in Homer, of which we find only this one form. It appears to be a dialect of ἕλετο, as κέντο for κέλετο is quoted from Aleman by Eust. ad II. ι , 756, 32. Rom. (658, 29. Bas.). The γ instead of the aspirate is preserved in many glosses of Hesychius and others.

Γεύω, I cause to taste, give to taste: Midd. I taste, enjoy: Perf. pass. γέγευμαι, Eurip. Hipp. 663.: aor. 1. pass. probably with σ ; for though we find γεῦμα, we say also γευστέον, γευστικός, &c.; and some verbs have the σ in the aor. pass. although they have none in the perf., as παύω, πέπαυμαι, ἐπαύσθην; μνάω, μέμνημαι, ἐμνήσθην, &c.

In Theocrit. 14, 51. we meet with a singular form $\gamma\epsilon i\mu\epsilon\theta a$, 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 language of common life; as the similar one $i\lambda\epsilon\mu\pi\tau\sigma$, Apoll. 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.

 $\Gamma\eta\theta\epsilon\omega$, I am glad, fut. $\gamma\eta\theta\eta\sigma\omega$, &c. The perf. $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\eta\theta a$ 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).

δέχθαι — aorist syncop. (ἐδέγμην) ἐδεξο, ἔδεκτο, infin. δέχθαι, imperat. δέξο. μίγνυμι, ΜΙΓΩ — (ἐμίγμην) μίκτο. λέγομαι — ἐλέγμην, λέξο, λέκτο, λέ-

 χ θαι. πάλλω — (ℓ πάλμην) πάλτο.

δρνυμι, ΟΡΩ-- ώρμην, δρτο, infinit.

ύρθαι, particip. δρμενος, imperat. δρσο: and some others, as έγεντο, εδκτο, άλτο, έλέλικτο, ίκμενος, άρμενος.

* The Epics allowed themselves the liberty of pronouncing the accented o in the oblique cases of the part. perf. long, as $\tau \epsilon$ - $\tau \rho i \gamma \hat{\omega} \tau as$ for - $\delta \tau as$.

E 2

There is no authority for a present $\gamma \eta \theta \omega^*$; consequently none for $\gamma \eta \theta \epsilon_i$, a various reading of $\gamma \eta \theta \epsilon_i$ at Il. ξ , 140.; on the other hand we have έγήθεον in Hom., γαθεῦσι in Theocr. We see the same in ῥιγέω έρριγα, δουπέω δέδουπα, of which no pres. in -ω is in use. Yet Eustathius quotes $\gamma\eta\theta \delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma c$, which is found also in the later Epics+ who probably had some older precedent for it: this however proves nothing in favour of the active form having been used; compare axéw άχομαι, έρέω ἕρομαι, κυρέω κύρομαι.

Γηράω and γηράσχω, I grow old. fut. γηράσομαι 1: it is inflected regularly according to the first form; only the Attics have in the infin. aor. beside ynparai a syncopated form ynpavals, preferred by the Atticists.

This infin. either comes from an aor. 2. or is formed by syncope similarly to διδράσκω, έδραν, δραναι; therefore έγήραν, -as, -a, &c., ynpäva, &c. In the older language this was undoubtedly the only aorist; hence also in the Epics the part. $\gamma \eta \rho \dot{\alpha} \varsigma$ (II. ρ , 197.), $\gamma \eta \rho \dot{\alpha} \nu$ τεσσιν (Hes. ε, 188.): and certainly the 3. pers. έγήρα (II. ρ, 197.), and $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \gamma \eta \rho \alpha$ (Herodot. 6, 72.), are not imperf. but this same aorist; for in both passages the sense requires, to make it complete, that "he did grow old in it:" whilst in Herodot. 2, 146. κατεγήρασαν may quite as well be the 3. plur, of έγήραν. The long all in έγήρα and γηραναι answers to that in $\xi \delta \rho \alpha \nu$, and corresponds as in all ¶ such a orists with the vowel of the perfect. — A particip. in $\epsilon i \varsigma$, $\epsilon \nu \tau \sigma \varsigma$, consequently as coming from a sister-form in $\epsilon \omega$, is quoted in the Etym. M. from the later Ionic poetry of Xenophanes. Compare the note on $\Pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu i$.

The aor. 1. έγήρασα occurs in Æschyl. Suppl. 901. in a causative sense, to make a person grow old; while the infin. ynpáoai is used in 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

* [Passow has the form $\gamma h \theta \omega$ as a pres. not in use, from which he deduces the perf. yéynea.]

+ [The earliest writer in which it occurs

is Quintus Smyrn. — Passow.] ‡ In Simonid. 1. (Gnom. Brunck.) the active form γηραστέμεν occurs, in which the double σ at all events is false : but it is possible that the true reading there was γηρασκέμεν: Ούτε γαρ έλπίδ έχει γηρασκέμεν, ούτε Βανείσθαι.

§ See note under Γιγνώσκω.

|| It is true that the only historical evidences in favour of this quantity are the circumflex on ynpaval in correct editions (see Oud. ad Tho. M. in v.), and the a 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. ¶ Thus βέθηκα έθην, ἕκτάκα ἔκτάν ἔκτα, δέδρακα έδραν: φθάνω is the only exception, which see.

the pres. was intransitive, and vice versa: for instance, $\mu\epsilon\theta\delta\omega$, I am drunk, $\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\theta\omega$, I am full; aor. $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\epsilon}\theta\nu\sigma\alpha$, I have intoxicated, $\ddot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha$, I have filled; thus also value and $\ddot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$, $\kappa\dot{\nu}\omega$ and $\ddot{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\sigma\alpha$; and instances of the opposite kind we have in $\tau\rho\dot{\epsilon}\phi\omega$, I nourish, $\ddot{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\phi\nu$, I am well fed, fat; $\sigma\tau\nu\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, $\ddot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\nu\dot{\epsilon}\alpha$; $\dot{a}\rho\alpha\rho(\sigma\kappa\omega)$, $\ddot{\eta}\rho\sigma\alpha$; $\ddot{o}\rho\nu\nu\mu$, $\dot{\delta}\rho\sigma\alpha$, &c. — With regard to the reading of the infin. $\gamma\eta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota$ in Xen. Mem. [both Moeris and Tho. M. prefer $\gamma\eta\rho\ddot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota$, and] certainly nothing was easier than the change of this latter word to the common form, as in Herodot. 7, 114. $\gamma\dot{\eta}\rho\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ might have been easily corrupted to the present reading $\gamma\eta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\sigma\mu$. See a similar case in the aor. of $\delta\iota\delta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega$. $\Gamma'_{i}\gamma\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, $\gamma'_{i}\rho\mu\alpha\mu\iota$. See Γ EN-.

Γιγνώσκω, old and Attic, in the common language γινώσκω (compare γίγνομαι); *Iknow*: fut. γνώσομαι; aor. έγνων (plur. έγνωμεν), imperat. γνῶθι, γνώτω, &c.; optat. γνοίην, infin. γνῶναι (Epic γνώμεναι); part. γνούς*; perf. έγνωκα; perf. pass. έγνωσμαι; aor. 1. pass. έγνώσθην, infin. γνωσθήναι, part. γνωσθείς. Verbal adj. γνωστός, old form γνωτός, γνωστέος.

The ω in $\xi\gamma\nu\omega\nu$, 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 $\gamma\nu oi\eta\nu$ is become the established reading even in Homer, where however we find $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\dot{\psi}\eta\nu$ (see ' $A\lambda i\sigma\kappa o\mu\alpha\iota$). Hence $\sigma\nu\gamma\gamma\nu\dot{\psi}\eta$ 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. $\xi\gamma\nu\omega\nu$ for $\xi\gamma'\nu\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$ is (if the reading be correct) an exception : for when the syllable $-\sigma\alpha\nu$ is abbreviated to ν , the vowel preceding is always shortened ; thus $\beta\dot{\alpha}\nu$ for $\xi\delta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ is short, $\xi\delta\rho\dot{\alpha}\nu$ for $\xi\delta\rho\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu$ (see $\Delta\iota\delta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega$), $\xi\delta\dot{\nu}\nu$ for $\xi\delta\bar{\nu}\sigma\alpha\nu$. In Pind. Pyth. 9, 137. Isthm. 2, 35. $\xi\gamma\nu\omega\nu$ stands without any various reading ; but as the

* 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 ν_i and the vowel preceding it is (with the single exception of $\phi \theta d\omega \omega$) the same as that of the perfect; thus it corresponds exactly with the aor. 2. of verbs in μ_i in all its moods and its participle: thus —

σείννυμι, ΣΒΕΩ, ἔσεηκα — ἔσεην, ἔσεημεν, σεήναι, σεείην.

βαίνω, ΒΑΩ, βέβηκα — έβην, έβημεν, βήναι, βαίην, βάs. διδράσκω, δέδρāκα — ἔδρāν, ἔδρāμεν, δρûναι, δραίην, δράs.

κτείνω, ἕκτάκα — ἕκτάν, ἕκτάμεν, κτάναι, κταίην, κτάs.

γιγνώσκω, έγνωκα - έγνων, &c.

Other instances equally or even more complete may be seen under ἁλίσκομαι, βιδρώσκω, βιόω, δύω, πέτομαι, σκέλλω, γλήναι, φθάνω, and φύω; while single forms of this aorist will be found under βάλλω, γηράσκω, κλάω, οὐτάω, πλέω, πτήσσω; and some imperatives, as βήθι, δράθι, γνώθι, δῦθι; plur. βήτε, δῦτε, &c.

E 3

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 $\xi\gamma\nu\sigma\nu$ as from Pindar, without stating whether on any authority.] In Æschyl. Pers. 18. $\xi \epsilon \sigma \nu$ is by its position in the anapæstic metre long. See Lachm. de Chor. Syst. p. 28.— The occurrence of the passive aor. opt. $\sigma\nu\gamma\gamma\nu\sigma\sigma\sigma$, and of the active aor. $\sigma\nu\gamma\gamma\nu\phi\eta$, both in the same passage of Æschylus (230, 231.), and in the same active sense, is very singular.

The compound $d\nu a\gamma\iota\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ 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. $d\nu\epsilon\gamma\nu\omega\sigma a$, Herodot. 1, 68. 87. and in many other passages of this author \dagger .

Γλύφω, more rarely γ λύπτω, Eurip. Troad. 1306. On the augment of the perf. see note under Βλαστάνω.

In this verb, as in $\phi\rho\nu\nu\sigma\omega$ (Theocr.), in $\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\omega$ ($\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\omega$ (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.

Γοάω and γοάομαι, *I bewail*. Epic infin. γοήμεναι, for γο \tilde{q} ν, Il. ξ , 50.; aor. $\tilde{\epsilon}$ γοον, Il. ζ , 500. [which Passow calls an imperf.].

Γράφω, I write.—MIDD. The aor. 2. pass. ἐγράφην is formed, not regularly from the aor. 2. act., but from the imperf. ἔγραφον, as ἐτρίδην (with ι short) from ἔτριδον, φρὕγῆναι from ἔφρῦγον; in all which the rule of the aor. 2. is preserved, that the long vowel becomes short.

Beside the perf. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho a \phi a$ there was also in use $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \dot{a} \phi \eta \kappa a$ (see Archim. De Spiral. Procem. extr.) which, when occurring in the common language of the time, is censured by the Grammarians : see Phot. v.

stance, $\delta \delta \lambda \eta \mu \eta \nu$ optat. $\beta \lambda \epsilon (\mu \eta \nu - from \delta \delta \lambda \eta \nu)$: see Βάλλω.

See also οὐτάμενος, and κλῦθι with the old particip. κλύμενος.

t 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. Cc. Hippoer. in v.

^{*} With the syncopated act. aor. described in the last note may be classed a passive aor. in $\mu\eta\nu$, σ_0 , τ_0 , &c., corresponding therefore with the regular aor. 2. midd., in which however three things may be remarked; 1. 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 the mode serve as passive to the above-mentioned active aorists, for in-

ἐκτάμην, κτάσθαι, κτάμενος — from ἕκταν : see Κτείνω.

τετύχηκα, who quotes it from Theopompus, Herodian ap. Herm. p. 317. Lob. ad Phryn. p. 764.*

55

Γρηγορέω. See Έγείρω. ΓΩΝ-. See Γέγωνα.

Δ.

 ΔA -, ΔAI -. The verbs belonging to these roots have four leading senses; to divide, to give to eat, to burn, to teach.

1. $\delta a(\omega)$, *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 ΔA -, the fut. $\delta \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha_i$, the aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \delta a \sigma \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu$ with a short, both used *in prose* as well as verse, and the perf. $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta a \sigma \mu \alpha_i$ with a passive meaning, *I* am divided (II. a, 125. Herodot. 2, 84.), of which the 3. pl. on account of the sound follows again the root ΔAI -, $\delta \epsilon \delta a \dot{a} \pi \alpha_i$, Od. a, 23. The analogy \dagger of $\mu a \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha_i \alpha_i$, $\nu a \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha_i$, shows that the Lexicons have no occasion to bring forward a pres. $\Delta AZOMAI$ from which to form $\delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \rho \mu \alpha_i$, &c. This pres. is nowhere found, but another poetical one does occur, $\delta \alpha \tau \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \alpha_i$ (see it in its place), which bears the same relation to those forms as $\pi \alpha \tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho \mu \alpha_i$ does to $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \theta \alpha_i$.

3. $\delta a i \omega$, 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. $i \delta a \delta \mu \eta \nu$, whence 3. sing. conjunct. $\delta a \eta \tau a$, Hom. The perf. and pluperf. $\delta i \delta \eta a \parallel$, $i \delta \epsilon \delta \eta \epsilon \nu$, Poet.

The two passages from Demosth. c. Dionysod. pp. 1291. 1293. are quoted erroneously, as they come from the verb παρασυγγραφείν, to act contrary to agreement.

+ The verbal termination of $al\omega$ for $a\omega$ in the Epic language is not, like $\epsilon l\omega$ for $\epsilon \omega$, a mere help to the metre; for $d\omega$ is seldom used without the contraction, and the a might be long of itself: but $al\omega$, like d_{ω} and dwvou, is a mode of strengthening in the pres. the a which is short in the inflexion : beside the above-mentioned see μαίομαι, άγαίομαι, λιλαίομαι, κεραίω, κεδαίω, σκεδάννυμι, and in prose κναίω, ψαίω.

‡ This form occurs indeed only in II. ω, 63. $\Delta \alpha l \nu \nu^{2} \xi \chi \omega \nu$, where there is a various reading $\Delta \alpha l \nu \nu \sigma^{2}$: but it is one so little worthy of credit, that it is justly disregarded: compare $\xi \sigma \sigma \nu \omega$.

§ The intrans. sense, to blaze, has been given to the active voice from a misinterpretation of II. ϵ , 4. and 7. Compare II. σ , 206. 227.

|| See note under "Ayvoui.

 $\delta\epsilon\delta\eta\epsilon\nu$, 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 $\kappa a \omega$, to have been $\delta a \delta \sigma \omega$, whence $\delta\epsilon\delta a \nu$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu \sigma_{\mathcal{S}}$, burnt, in Simonid. ap. Etym. M. v. $\delta a \delta \omega$, and (by a very good emendation) in Callim. Epig. 54. (28.)

4. ΔA -, with the ideas of to teach and learn. To the former belongs the aor. 2. act., of which $\xi \delta a \varepsilon$ occurs in Theor. 24, 27. Apollon. 4. 989., and the same form with the reduplication $\delta \delta \delta a \varepsilon$ is found occasionally in the Odyssey.* The perf. has the sense of to learn, of which Homer has only the particip. $\delta \varepsilon \delta a \omega_{\mathcal{G}}$ (one who has learnt), other writers have $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta a \sigma \iota$. + To this we may add the aor. pass. $\delta \delta a \eta \nu$ (I was taught, Ilearned); from which comes, according to the note under $\lambda \kappa a \chi i \zeta \omega$, a new formation $\delta a \eta \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$, $\delta \varepsilon \delta a \eta \kappa a$ or $\delta \varepsilon \delta a \eta \mu a \iota$ (I have learnt). Another Homeric form $\delta \varepsilon \delta \delta a \sigma \theta a \iota$, to try and learn, inquire into, examine (Od. π , 316.), can only be a pres. in $\delta \sigma \mu a \iota$ formed from $\delta \delta \delta a a$ (just as from $\gamma \delta \gamma a a$ comes $\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \delta \sigma \nu \tau a \iota$, only that this occurs as a future); excepting 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 $\delta \delta \delta \delta \sigma \kappa \omega$, having its own proper inflexion: see below.

The Epic future $\delta f \omega$ ($\delta f \epsilon \iota c$, $\delta f \phi \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta f \epsilon \tau \epsilon$) belongs to this stem or root $\Delta A \Omega$, *I learn*[‡], consequently has the meaning *I shall learn*, find out, and comes undoubtedly from the future $\delta a \epsilon \omega$ by contraction of the two first vowels, as the similar Epic future $\kappa \epsilon \ell \omega$ or $\kappa \epsilon \omega$ is formed from $\kappa \epsilon \epsilon \omega \delta$: see K $\epsilon \tilde{\iota} \mu \alpha \iota$.

$\Delta \alpha i \zeta \omega$, I divide, cut in two, kill : fut. $\delta \alpha i \xi \omega$, &c.

In Eurip. Heracl. 914. stands $\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\tilde{q} \phi\lambda o\gamma i \sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu a \delta a \sigma\theta\epsilon i\varsigma$, whilst everywhere besides, even in the Tragedians, we find $\delta a \ddot{u} \chi \theta\epsilon i\varsigma$, $\delta a t \xi a\varsigma$, &c. Elmsley reads, to answer with the verse in the antistrophe, $\delta a \iota \sigma \theta\epsilon i\varsigma$, 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 $\delta a \iota \sigma \theta\epsilon i\varsigma$ from $\delta a t \zeta \omega$, as there was nothing to hinder the use of $\delta a \iota \chi \theta\epsilon i\varsigma$, like $\delta\epsilon\delta a \iota \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu o\varsigma$ in Pind. Pyth. 8, 125. (see Hermann and Boeckh on that passage). If then we read $\delta a \iota \sigma \theta\epsilon i\varsigma$, I can place it only under $\delta a i \cdot \nu \nu \mu a \iota$; 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.

* This last is generally but erroneously given to δέδαα with the other meaning. That it was the old aor. is shown by the gloss in Hesych. Δέδαον· ἔδειζαν, ἐδίδαζαν.

+ See for this formation $\beta \epsilon \delta a a$, &c., under Baivo.

‡ According to the Etym. M. v. $\delta\hat{\eta}\lambda os$, Alcæus had a pres. $\delta\epsilon\omega$, I find; which coincides with our adoption of $\delta\omega\omega$.

§ An exactly similar contraction we find in one of the declensions of nouns, viz. $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\hat{a}$, $\sigma\pi\hat{\eta}\hat{i}$, for $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\epsilon a$, $\sigma\pi\epsilon\hat{\epsilon}$.

Δαίρω. See Δέρω.

 $\Delta \dot{\alpha} \varkappa \omega$, *I bite*: from $\Delta HK\Omega$ come the fut. δήξομαι, perf. δέδηχα, &c.; aor. έδαχον*, infin. δαχεῖν. [In the passive the perf. δέδηγμαι is the tense most in use. — Passow.]

Δακρύω, I weep, has no passive: but the perf. pass. δεδάκρῦμαι takes the idea of I am weeping, I am in tears, II. π, 7., δεδάκρυνται, (the eyes or cheeks) are suffused with tears, II. v, 204. χ, 491.; part. δεδακρυμένος, weeping, in tears, Plut. Paul. Æmil. 10. See the note on Πεφυγμένος. Δαμάζω, δαμάω, δαμνάω. See Δέμω.

Δαρθάνω, I sleep: fut. δαρθήσομαι; perf. δεδάρθηκα; aor. 2. έδαρθον. See note under Αλσθάνομαι.

The Poets transpose the letters of the aorist, making ἔδραθον.

We find also in the shape of an aor. pass. $\kappa \alpha \tau a \delta a \rho \theta \delta \epsilon \nu \tau a$, Aristoph. Plut. 300., and $\kappa \alpha \tau a \delta a \rho \theta \tilde{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ (which however depends entirely on the accent), Thesm. 794. Again $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \delta \rho a \theta \epsilon \nu$ for $-\eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, 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 θ . But as they occur principally in the compound with $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha^{\dagger} \dagger$, 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 $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \delta \delta \rho \theta \eta \nu$ will then be the perfectly regular form of the aor. 2. pass.; and thus the traditionary reading $\kappa \alpha \tau a \delta \rho a \theta \tilde{\omega}$ (Od. ϵ , 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 $\kappa a\tau a \delta d\rho \theta \epsilon i \nu$, instead of $-\epsilon i \nu$, 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 τi is added. The natural idea of a person disturbed in his sleep is not, 'let me fall asleep a little,' but 'let me

as to meaning, stand pretty much on the same ground as the compounds of *kará*.

‡ 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.

In forming a new present ν is sometimes inserted before the termination; as δάκνω, aor. ξδακον: compare κάμνω, τέμνω.

[†] Little importance can be attached to quotations like ἐδάρθη and ἐδράθη in Hesychius; and ἀποδαρθέντα, quoted from a Comic writer in Lex. Seguer. p. 349., will,

sleep a little.' Καταδάρθειν may therefore very possibly be an Attic sister-form of καταδαρθάνω, like αἴσθομαι or αὕζω.

 $\Delta a \tau \epsilon o \mu a \iota$, depon., used only in pres. and imperf., while the other tenses are taken from $\Delta a \iota \omega$, No. 1., which see. Hesiod ϵ , 795. has the aor. 1. infin. of this verb without the σ , $\delta a \tau \epsilon a \sigma \theta a \iota$, like $\dot{a} \lambda \epsilon a \sigma \theta a \iota$, $\dot{a} \lambda \epsilon \omega a \sigma \theta a \iota$, from $\dot{a} \lambda \epsilon \omega a \omega$.

 $\Delta i \alpha \tau \alpha_i$, it appears, occurs only once, Od. ζ , 242. $\delta i \alpha \tau o$. But to this verb belongs also the aor. with its vowel changed $\delta o \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma \tau o$, conj. $\delta o \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha_i$ (for $-\eta \tau \alpha_i$). In that passage of the Odyssey the common reading was $\delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma o$, but the unanimous consent of Grammarians and manuscripts has now restored $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \tau o$. Both forms however indisputably belong to each other, as $\epsilon - o$ is a common change of vowel. Apollonius uses the 3. optat. act. $\delta o \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha \tau o$ personally, and writes also $\delta o i \alpha' \zeta \epsilon \iota r, -\epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$; as he, with the majority of the Grammarians, derived the Homeric verb from $\delta o \iota \eta$, 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 sentence; and $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \tau \alpha_i$, $\delta o \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma \tau o$, answer exactly to the verb $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon_i$, $\ddot{\epsilon} \delta \delta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$. See a full account of these forms in Buttm. Lexil. p. 212., &c.

Δεδίσσομαι. - ττομαι, I affright: depon. midd. [Poet. for δειδίσσομαι; but the part. aor. midd. δεδιξάμενος is found in Demosth. de Fals. Leg. 291.—Passow.]

In Homer we have $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ frequently, and in a transitive sense; but once it occurs intransitively, to be afraid, Il. β , 190. The verb comes from $\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$, $\delta\epsilon\delta\iota\alpha$, $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\alpha$. Another form is $\delta\epsilon\delta\iota\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ (see Piers. ad Moer. p. 119.), which must not however be confounded with the Homeric $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\epsilon\delta\iota\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, on which see the note to $\Delta\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\sigma\mu\iota$.

 $\Delta \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$. See $\Delta \epsilon \omega$.

Δείδω. See Δείσαι.

Δείχνυμι, and δειχνύω, *I show*: fut. δείξω; aor. 1. ἔδειξα. The Ionians spoke all the forms which came from the simple root with ϵ only; as, δέξω, ἔδεξα, ἀπεδέδεκτο, Herodot. 3, 88., ἀπεδέχθη, id. 7, 154.* That is to say, all these forms preserve their original length by position, like μέζων, κρέσσων. Compare also πείκω.

The midd. $\delta\epsilon i \kappa r v \mu \alpha \iota$ has in the Epics (II. ι , 196. Hymn. Ap. 11.) the additional meaning of to salute, welcome, drink to.+ Consequently to

* Though many passages still have $\delta\epsilon i\xi ai$, at least among the various readings, and even taken from good manuscripts, this ought not to militate against the correctness of restoring $\delta\epsilon \xi ai$ universally.

Compare Koen. Greg. Cor. in Ion. 36. Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. in $\delta \epsilon (\kappa \nu$. and $\dot{\alpha} \pi o - \delta \epsilon (\kappa \nu$.

* [In this sense Homer uses only the perf. and pluperf. - Passow.] it belongs the perf. $\delta \epsilon i \delta \epsilon \gamma \mu \alpha i$, which has the same meaning, and is used as a present: 3. plur. $\delta \epsilon i \delta \epsilon \chi \alpha r \alpha i$, 3. sing. pluperf. (as imperf.) $\delta \epsilon i \delta \epsilon \kappa \tau o$. The syllable of reduplication $\delta \epsilon i$ is found here, merely because $\delta \epsilon i$ is also the syllable of the stem or root, as in $\delta \epsilon i \sigma \alpha i$.*

 $\Delta \epsilon i \pi \nu \epsilon \omega$, -ήσω, &c. On the Att. perf. δέδει πνα, infin. δεδει πνάναι, see 'Αριστάω.

Δεῖσαι, to fear: aor. 1. ἔδεισα; fut. δείσομαι [the act. fut. δείσω is found only in Aristid. 2. p. 168. — Passow.]. Homer has the present δείδω, but only in its first person: instead of it we find the perfect (with the meaning of the present), with two forms in use, δέδοικα and δέδια, the choice of which depended on the one or the other sounding more agreeably to the ear. † Of δέδια and its pluperfect the plural takes the syncope; thus δέδιμεν, δέδιτε, for δεδίαμεν, $-\tau \varepsilon$; and pluperf. ἐδέδιμεν, ἐδέδιτε, ἐδέδισαν, for ἐδεδίειμεν, $-\tau \varepsilon$, ἐδεδίεσαν; imperat. δέδιθι.

The infin. is not formed according to this analogy, but remains $\delta \epsilon$ - $\delta \iota \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$; the Epics however form it in $-\iota \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \epsilon \iota \delta \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ (see below); compare the same formation in the pres. of $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \mu \iota$, I go. — In the indicative the unsyncopated forms, as $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$, and particularly $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$, belong 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 δ is always doubled after the augment or the preposition in composition, as $\xi \delta \delta \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon$, $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \delta \delta \epsilon \iota \sigma a \epsilon$. Now as this verb, with its compounds and derivatives, very frequently makes the preceding

* That is to say, many bring the form $\delta\epsilon/\delta\epsilon\kappa\tau\sigma$ under $\delta\epsilon\chi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, 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 $\delta\epsilon/\kappa\nu\mu\alpha\iota$, which occurs in a similar sense, nor from its sister-form $\delta\epsilon\kappa\kappa\alpha\mu\sigma\alpha\iota$; and to these again belong the synonymous presents $\delta\epsilon\imath\delta/\sigma\kappa\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\epsilon \delta/\sigma\kappa\rho\mu\alpha\iota$; whence also Apollonius 1, 558. might say $\delta\epsilon\imath\delta/\sigma\kappa\tau\sigma\pi\tau\rho I$ in the common sense of $\delta\delta\epsilon/\kappa\nu\nu\epsilon$. The original idea is indisputably the stretching out and offering of the hand, the cup, &c., with which that of pointing with the finger, or showing, corresponds very well. + The form $\delta\epsilon\delta\iotav\hat{a}$ 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 Plat. Phædr. p. 254. extr. But the form of the optative $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \epsilon i \eta$, 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 $\delta\epsilon\delta\iotaol\eta$, like $\pi\epsilon\phi\epsilon\nu\gamma ol\eta$, $\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda u\thetaol\eta$, $\epsilon\delta\eta\deltao\kappa ol\eta$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\kappa u\thetaol\eta$. But the syntax of the common reading, $\epsilon l \mu \eta \delta\epsilon\deltai\epsilon \iota$ (imperf.)... $\delta boit$ $<math>\delta \mu$...sppears to me admissible. short syllable in the cæsura of the old hexameter long (e.g. Il. λ , 10. ξ , 387.); and the δ 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 δ (dw), to supply the place of which the δ was afterwards doubled. See Dawes, Misc. Crit. pp. 165. 168. and Buttm. Lexil. pp. 355. 375.

The Epics pronounced (with the diphthong) $\delta\epsilon i \delta \delta i \kappa a$, $\delta\epsilon i \delta i a$, $\delta\epsilon i \delta i \epsilon i \delta i \mu \epsilon \nu$, the reason of which was, as in $\delta\epsilon i \delta\epsilon \kappa \tau \sigma$ under $\delta\epsilon i \kappa \nu \sigma \mu i$, that the diphthong was in the stem or root. \dagger Now as the fem. particip. of $\delta\epsilon i \delta i a$ could not be admitted into a hexameter, Apollonius Rh. (3, 753.) has, and undoubtedly not without a precedent from some older poet, $\delta\epsilon i \delta v \tilde{i} a$. \ddagger There arose also a regular present $\delta\epsilon i \delta \omega$, which however is found only in its first person. §

On the 3. pers. of the perf. $\delta\epsilon i \delta\iota\epsilon$ used as imperf. see 'Arήroθa and note. $\Delta\epsilon \delta o i \kappa \omega$ is a Doric pres. formed from the perf. in Theorr. 15, 58., like $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \omega$ in the Ionic epigram of Posidippus ap. Athen. 10. p. 417, e.

Δέδοικα is formed from the theme ΔΕΙΩ, with the change of vowel usual in the perf. 2.; and δέδια is shortened from it, as $\pi\epsilon\phi \bar{\nu}a\sigma\iota$ is from πέφῦκα, ϊδμεν from oἶδα. But that theme also was still in existence in

* The only exceptions to an immense number of instances are $\delta\pi\sigma\delta\epsilon i\sigma\pi\epsilon$, Od. β , 66. ' $a\delta\epsilon infs$, 11. n_i 117. $\delta\epsilon\delta ia\sigma in$, 11. ω_i , 663., the last of which, as being taken from ω_i is of no weight. - ready touched on in the last note but one. δ In the epigram of Antagoras, Cod. Vat. p. 379. n. 147. (in Brunck, Simonid. 62.) we ought undoubtedly to read $\delta\epsilon i\delta ar\epsilon$

 \dagger And thus it includes $\delta\epsilon \hat{\alpha}\sigma_{at}$, according to the statement here given of it. But when we consider the peculiarity of this verb, as noticed above, according to which the δ in its stem or root was originally equivalent to dw, it follows that in Homer's pronunciation the first syllable of both $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\alpha$ and $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha$ must have been also long by position. After the disappearance of the digamma the syllable $\delta\epsilon a$ discharged the same office in these forms as the double δ did in $\epsilon\delta\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon$. This is the most accurate and detailed account which I van 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 $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota v i a$, the sound of which could have been no objection to those who used $\pi \epsilon \phi v v i a$. The form $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota a \sigma \iota v$ in II. ω , 663, has been al-

§ In the epigram of Antagoras, Cod. Vat. p. 379. n. 147. (in Brunck. Simonid. 62.) we ought undoubtedly to read deldire instead of δείδετε. Compare the various readings δειδίμεν, δειδέμεν, Od. 1, 274. As the verse can in every instance dispense with the form $\delta\epsilon\delta\omega$, the poets appear to have been swayed in their preference of that or deldia by merely metrical reasons. Compare Il. r, 39. with \$\$, 536 .- On delda 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 δείδια. And it is equally clear from the above-mentioned δειδυία (as a substitute for which δείδουσα must have been at once apparent), and from $\delta \epsilon \delta (a \sigma w$ in so old a poet as the author of II. ω must at all events have been, and who would therefore certainly have used Seidovos, 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. $\delta i\epsilon$ ($\dot{\epsilon} \delta i\epsilon$), e. g. II. λ , 556. ρ , 666.*

This Epic $\delta i\omega$ contained also the idea of to fly, run, $\delta i\omega r$ II. χ , 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 $\delta i\omega \mu a_i$, δc . (II. μ , 276. η , 197.) But there must have been also an active transitive $\delta i \eta \mu \iota \uparrow$, pretty nearly corresponding in meaning with this, from which two Homeric forms come: 1. $i \nu \delta i \omega \sigma a_i$, they urged (the dogs) on, II. σ , 584. 2. $\delta i \nu \tau a_i$, pass. or midd. with a neuter sense, they run, II. ψ , 475. Hence the infin. $\delta i \omega \sigma a_i$ may belong to both forms and both meanings, as in II. μ , 276. and 304.

In Æschyl. Pers. 697, 698. (in both which verses the present reading is $\delta \epsilon \omega \mu a_i$, a theme formed without any authority,) the old editions and the majority of the manuscripts have $\delta \epsilon \omega \mu a_i$, contrary to the metre. But three manuscripts, according to Hermann, give $\delta \omega \mu a_i$; which must therefore be the true reading concealed under the above corruption; and what in Homer is expressed by $\delta \omega$ is thus represented in Æschylus by $\delta \omega \mu a_i$, which with $\delta \epsilon \delta a$ has in its favour the analogy of $\kappa \eta \delta \omega \mu a_i$, $\epsilon \lambda \pi \omega \mu a_i \epsilon \omega \lambda \pi a_i$, and the like.

ΔΕΚ-. See Δείκνυμι and Δέχομαι.

~ Δέμω, I build, and midd. δέμομαι: aor. 1. ἕδειμα; midd. ἐδειμάμην; perf. 1. δέδμηκα[‡], perf. 2. δέδομα, perf. pass. δέδμημαι.

The pres. and imperf. are rare even in the poets. The pres. is found only in the part. $\delta \epsilon \mu \rho \nu \tau a$, Hymn. Merc. 188.; the imperf. $\delta \epsilon \mu \rho \nu$ in Od. ψ , 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 $\delta \epsilon \ell \mu \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$, II. η , 337. is the conjunct. aor. 1. act. shortened from $\delta \epsilon \ell \mu \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$.

Of the sister-form § $\delta_{0\mu\epsilon\omega}$ we find principally the aor. and perf., but their usage is also limited; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 587. sqq. The common language used $\partial_{i\kappa}\delta_{0\mu}\delta_{i\kappa}$, e. g. $\dot{\omega}\kappa_{0}\delta_{0\mu}\eta\sigma\epsilon$ $\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\chi_{0c}$, and the like.

* 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. $\delta\epsilon_{i\ell}\mu\epsilon_{\nu}$, where however Hermann has adopted (I see no reason why) Tyrwhit's correction $\delta\epsilon_{i}\delta\epsilon_{\mu}\epsilon_{\nu}$. See the preceding note.

+ The pretended verb $\delta(\eta\mu\mu)$, said to have the same meaning as $\delta(\mu\nu\omega)$, to water, and which is so described in Schneider's Lexicon, is erroneous. All the forms of that kind belong to $\delta(\eta\mu\mu)$: see Riemer's Lex. and Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 27. [Passow places the different forms $\delta(\epsilon)$, $\delta(\epsilon)$, &c., under $\delta(\eta\mu\mu)$, which he says is contracted from $\delta(\eta\eta\mu)$.

‡ It may be doubted whether this perf. be formed by metathesis like βέθληκα (see Bάλλω and note), or by a mere syncope: on the former hypothesis it will run thus, δέμω (ΔΕΜ, ΔΜΕ) δέδμηκα; by the latter, like νέμω νενέμηκα, δέμω (δεδέμηκα) δέδμηκα.

§ Many dissyllabic barytone verbs, which have ϵ in the syllable of the stem or root, make eister-forms by changing the ϵ to a, and taking the termination $\epsilon \omega$; as, $\phi \epsilon \rho \omega \phi o_{\epsilon}$ $\rho \epsilon \omega$, $\tau \rho \epsilon \mu \omega$ $\tau \rho a \mu \epsilon \omega$, $\phi \epsilon \delta c \mu a \mu$, $\delta c c$. The same stem or radical word $\Delta \epsilon \mu \omega$ has also the meaning of to tame in the following forms; perf. $\delta i \delta \mu \eta \kappa a$; perf. pass. $\delta i \delta \mu \eta \mu a$; aor. 1. pass. $i \delta \mu \eta \theta \eta \nu$, part. $\delta \mu \eta \theta \epsilon i \varsigma$; aor. 2. $i \delta \delta \mu \eta \nu^*$, part. $\delta \check{a} \mu \epsilon i \varsigma$. Besides these was formed the present in the following manner: 1. $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \zeta \omega$ and $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \omega$. 2. by the insertion of the syllable νa , $\delta \acute{a} \mu \nu \eta \mu$ and $\delta a \mu \nu \acute{a} \omega$. † Of these $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \zeta \omega$ has become the usual form in prose as well as verse, and is inflected regularly through all its tenses like the derivative verbs in $\acute{a} \zeta \omega$: $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \zeta \omega$, as a present, is the Epic sister-form of $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \zeta \omega$ (like $\dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \acute{a} \omega$ for $\dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \acute{a} \zeta \omega$), Il. a, 61.; but its forms are at the same time the Ionic and Attic future of $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \zeta \omega$; e. g. $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \varphi$, Il. χ , 271. $\delta a \mu \acute{o} \omega \sigma \iota \nu$, Il. ζ , 368. ‡ MIDD. $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$, $\delta a \mu \acute{a} \sigma \sigma \theta a$, Eurip. Hom. &c. $\delta \acute{a} \mu \nu a \sigma a \mu$. Hom. Hes.

Δέρκομαι, or perf. with the meaning of the pres. δέδορκα, (see Buttm. Lexil. p. 202. note,) *I see, look.* Aor. by transposition ἕδρăκον, which act. form is used particularly by the Epics; the other poets use the two aorists belonging to the deponent δέρκομαι, viz. ἐδέρχθην, Soph. Aj. 425. and ἐδράκην, Pind. On the short a in ἕδρακον see Πέρθω.

There are no grounds for a pres. act. $\delta \epsilon \rho \kappa \omega$. The perf. $\delta \epsilon \delta \delta \rho \kappa \alpha$ has in Pindar (Ol. 1, 153. &c.) a pass. or intrans. meaning also, $\phi \epsilon \gamma \gamma \sigma c$, $\phi \delta \sigma c \delta \delta \delta \rho \kappa \epsilon$, is seen, shines.

 $\Delta \epsilon \rho \omega$, Iskin, I beat, is inflected regularly according to the rules of verbs whose characteristic letter is one of the four liquids, λ , μ , ν , ρ . Thus it has no fut. 1. but a fut. 2. $\delta \epsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$; its aor. 1. is not formed in $\sigma \alpha$, but in α , as $\xi \delta \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha$; its perfect 1. is (with the change of ϵ to α , like $\pi \epsilon i \rho \omega$, $\pi \epsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \alpha \rho \varkappa \alpha$,) $\delta \epsilon \delta \alpha \rho \varkappa \alpha$ and its perf. 2. $\delta \epsilon \delta \delta \rho \rho \omega$. In the pass. it has a fut. 2. $\delta \alpha \rho \gamma \sigma \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, and an aor. 2. $\epsilon \delta \delta \delta \rho \eta \nu$.

An Attic sister-form of the present is $\delta a i \rho \omega$, [whence the infin. aor. $\delta \tilde{\eta} \rho a_i$,] Aristoph. Nub. 442. Av. 365. See Heind. ad Plat. Euthyd. 35. Passow mentions also a later Ionic pres. $\delta \epsilon i \rho \omega$, as probably formed from the aor. $\xi \delta \epsilon i \rho a$. Verbal adj. $\delta a \rho \tau \delta \varsigma$, Ep. $\delta \rho a \tau \delta \varsigma$.

* Beside these two synonymous aorists there has been quoted a synoop, aor. $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\mu\eta\tau\sigma$; the only authority for which is Antim. Fragm. 19. ap. Pausan. 8. p. 651. ; where however the reading γ' $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\mu\eta\theta'$ is false. The manuscripts have δ' $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\mu\eta\theta'$ contrary to the context. But Schellenberg saw that the true reading is, 'Os $\betaa \tau \delta\tau'$ 'Aδράστφ τριτάτφ δέδμηθ' ὑπ' ἀνακτι.

† Like περνάω πέρνημι from περάω; and with the change of ε into ι, κιρνάω κίρνημι from κεράω (κεράννυμι), πίλνημι, πίτνημι, and σκίδνημι, from πελάω, ΠΕΤΑΩ, ΣΚΕΔΑΩ. These derivatives occur mostly in the dialects and poets.

[‡] Thus we have as futures τελέει, Il. 3, 415. τελέî, Plat. Protag. p. 311. b. καλέî, Xen. Symp. 1, 15. καλέισθε, Demosth. Lept. 5. κορέειs, Il. ν, 831. These futures in έω $-\omega$, and άω $-\omega$, with a similarly sounding present, are not very numerous. Compare ελαύνω and περάω.

§ The aor. 1. also did however exist; see $\delta \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon i s$ in Lex. Seguer. 2. p. 89, 5. $\Delta \epsilon \delta \omega$, *I wet*, is inflected regularly. The Epic $\delta \epsilon \delta \omega \mu a\iota$ see under $\Delta \delta \omega$, *I am wanting*.

Δέχομαι, Ionic (but not Epic) δέπομαι, I receive; depon. midd.: fut. δέξομαι, also δεδέξομαι, Il.; aor. 1. έδεξάμην. — Pass. perf. δέδεγμαι; pluperf. έδεδέγμην; aor. έδέχθην, part. δεχθείς (in a pass. sense), taken.

The perf. $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$ has in the Epics another peculiar sense of a present, I wait, e. g. $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma\epsiloni\sigma\delta\kappa\epsilon\nu\epsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$, II. κ , 62. Also, I receive, particularly of one who stands to receive an attack, or waits for game; e. g. $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma\epsilon\nu\pi\rho\sigma\delta\kappa\eta\sigma\iota\nu$, II. δ , 107. Imperat. $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\xi\sigma$, II. ϵ , 228. ν , 377., to which belongs with a similar active sense the fut. $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\xi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, II. ϵ , 238. But $\delta\epsilon\ell\delta\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$, I welcome, similar as that idea may seem to be to the above meaning, belongs to $\delta\epsilon\epsilon\kappa\nu\nu\mu\iota$, as we have shown under that verb.

The syncop. aor. ($\dot{\epsilon}\delta\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\mu\eta\nu$) $\ddot{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\kappa\tau o$, $\delta\dot{\epsilon}\chi\theta\alpha\iota$, imperat. $\delta\dot{\epsilon}\xi o$, 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 έδεξάμην; compare Il. 0, 88. with a, 596. It happens however that the 1. sing. $\delta\delta\epsilon\gamma\mu\eta\nu$ does not occur in this meaning but only with that of an imperf., I was waiting for, expecting (e.g. Od. 4, 513.), and in the same way the particip. δέγμενος, ποτιδέγμενος has only the sense of waiting, expecting (e.g. Il. ι , 191. η , 415.), that is to say, the sense of the perf. $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$ as 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 ΓEN -. But since at Il. μ , 147. $\delta \epsilon \chi a \tau a \iota$, which is not a historical form, is used in speaking of the waiting for an attack, consequently in the exact meaning of δεδέχαται, it is clear that the perf. δέδεγμαι in this its peculiar sense (as a present), which sense the present δέχομαι 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 $\delta \epsilon_{\chi 0 \mu \alpha \iota}$ in the old Epic writers a twofold usage : viz. --

δέχομαι, I receive ; sync. aor. (ἐδέγμην) ἕδεκτο, &c., received.

δέδεγμαι or δέγμαι (whence δέχαται) I wait for, expect; plupe f. (with the force of an imperf.), έδεδέγμην or έδέγμην, part. δεδεγμένος or δέγμενος.

From the form $\delta \epsilon \kappa \rho \mu a \iota$ would come (see the 2d note under $\Delta \epsilon \mu \omega +)$)

* See Teva.

+ That is to say, according to the analogy laid down in that note, from δέκομαι might be formed δοκέομαι, from which would come regularly δεδοκημένοs.

also the Epic perf. $\delta\epsilon\delta c \kappa \eta \mu \epsilon \nu o c$, II. o, 730. Hes. a, 214. in the sense of the above-mentioned $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu o c$. We find in Apollon. Lex. $\delta\epsilon\delta c \kappa \eta \mu \epsilon \nu o c$. $\epsilon \kappa \delta\epsilon \chi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o c$, $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$: which is therefore to be distinguished from the Attic $\delta\epsilon\delta\delta\kappa\eta\mu a \iota$ under $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \omega$.

Δέω, I bind: fut. δήσω; aor. 1. ἔδησα; perf. δέδεκα*; perf. pass. δέδεμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐδέθην.—ΜIDD. The fut. 3. (or paulo-post fut.) δεδήσομαι generally supplies in Attic writers the place of the non-Attic fut. 1. pass. δεθήσομαι, 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 ει: thus we have τρεῖ, πνεῖν, but τρέομεν, πνέουσι, &c.: δέω, I find, is however an exception; for we find τὸ δοῦν, τῷ δοῦντι, Plat. Cratyl. (δ) ἀναδῶν, Aristoph. Plut. 589. διαδοῦμαι, &c.; in which respect it differs from δέω, I am in want of, which makes τὸ δέον, δέομαι, and even sometimes δέεται.

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 δ to θ , for the future 3. is used in some other verbs in the same way: see particularly $\Pi_{i\pi\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega}$.

Instead of $\delta \epsilon \omega$ the older Ionic and Attic language had a present of a more distinct and intelligible sound, $\delta \delta \eta \mu \iota$; e. g. imperf. $\delta \delta \eta$, Il. λ , 105.; $\delta \delta \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu$, Od. μ , 54. according to the reading of Aristarchus; $\delta \delta \epsilon \omega \tau \omega \nu$, Xenoph. Anab. 5, 8, 24. as taken from the most credible sources. See Porson ad Schol. Od. *l. c.*

 $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, I am in want of, I fail: fut. δεήσω; aor. ἐδέησα, for which Homer has once δησεν, Il. σ, 100. This verb is generally impersonal; δεĩ, it is wanting, it is necessary, (il faut), conjunct. δέη (contr. δη̃), optat. δέοι, infin. δεῖν, part. δέον, Att. δεῖν; imperf. ἔδει; fut. δεήσει; aor. 1. ἐδέησε. Pass. δέομαι (as depon. I am in want of), δέη or δέει, δεῖται, &c.; fut. midd. δεήσομαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐδεήθην. This voice is never impersonal.

* This verb, like $alv\epsilon\omega$, $al\rho\epsilon\omega$, $\pi\sigma\theta\epsilon\omega$, and many others, inflects some of its tenses regularly with η , e.g. its future and

aor. 1., but others with ϵ , viz. its perfects and aor. passive.

This verb, with respect to its contraction, differs from the preceding merely in the forms which in $\delta\epsilon i\nu$, to bind, are contracted to $\omega\nu$.* But the contraction also to $\epsilon\iota$, 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) $\tau \sigma \sigma o \dot{\upsilon} \tau \sigma \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon c_{\sigma}$, Isocr. Busir. 5. p. 222.; and Xenophon uses $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau a\iota$, $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a\iota$, perhaps always, as it is still preserved in many passages. †

The conjunctive of the impersonal is frequently found in verse as a monosyllable, because according to some $\delta \epsilon_{\eta}$, 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 $\delta \epsilon_{\overline{i}}$ 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 $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, to be in want of, and $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$; that is to say, for $\delta \epsilon o \nu$ (which is otherwise never contracted) $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, and for $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, the same in sound as their infinitives, and which they

* Compare the preceding verb, particularly toward the end of the first paragraph.

† Δέεσθαι, Mem. 1, 6, 10. Anab. 7, 7, 31.; δέεται, Anab. 7, 4, 8.; δέεται and προσδέεται three times in Mem. 3, 6, 13. 14.; ¿déero, 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 προσδέεται. 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 Attics, having been foisted into this one writer by copyists or grammarians. In addi-tion to this we have the gloss of the An-tiatucist in Bekker, p. 94. 'Edéero àvrl τοῦ ἐδεῖτο, which merely proves the great probability of what was most probable before. The only usage of later writers and Grammarians (see Schæfer ad Greg.

p. 431.) at a time when certainly every one pronounced $\delta\epsilon\hat{\sigma}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, 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 $\pi\lambda\epsilon\hat{\nu}\nu$, 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.

‡ 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 $\dot{\rho}/\eta\tau\rho\rho e_{3}$, that is to say the later ones, as using the common form. If now we compare $\delta\eta\lambda\delta\epsilon_i$. $\delta\eta\lambda\delta_i$, we have an analogy for $\delta\epsilon\eta$ $\delta\epsilon\epsilon_i$. The passages quoted by Reisig from Aristophanes Plut. 216. Ran. 265., where the reading in many, and those the best manuscripts, is $\kappa \delta \nu \delta\epsilon_i$. "and even if it must be," give the above-mentioned preceµt great weight. Still this usage, if I have stated it correctly, cannot be the same as a similar one in $\kappa\epsilon \delta\mu a$, $s\mu h$ $\delta id\kappa\epsilon \mu a does not arise from contraction.$ 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. $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ and $\pi\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$. But there are no instances 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 elliptically or used as substantives.*

Homer has this verb with the stem or root ΔEY - instead of ΔE very frequently as a passive $\delta \varepsilon i \circ \mu \alpha \iota$, $\delta \delta \varepsilon i \varepsilon \tau \sigma$, $\delta \varepsilon v \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, and once as active $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \varepsilon i \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$, Od. ι , 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 $\delta \varepsilon \eta \theta \eta \tau \alpha \iota$. In the midst of this great unanimity of meaning in the root ΔEY -, we find two passages which are very striking: 1. II. ι , 337. which has the impersonal $\delta \varepsilon \tau$, whereas in all the other passages $\chi \rho \eta$ is used in a similar sense; 2. Od. σ , 100. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \varepsilon \iota \delta$ $\delta' \varepsilon \delta \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ in the sense of the above-mentioned $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \varepsilon \dot{\nu} \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$, where the common form $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ therefore is shortened in a way which we meet with nowhere else. \uparrow

* In the first place, it is very remarkable that the Lexicons of Atticists and rhetoricians which have come down to us, and which do not overlook the comparative $\pi\lambda\epsilon\hat{i}\nu$ for $\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}o\nu$, have not the two forms in question : beside which, some of the manuscripts, even that of Gregory, mention only $\pi\lambda\epsilon\hat{i}\nu$, and have not the addition of δείν αντί του δέον: while δοκείν 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 $\pi\lambda\epsilon\hat{\nu}$ for $\pi\lambda\epsilono\nu$, in order to understand Seiv and Sokeiv in certain phrases as participles. Whence under the word $\Delta \hat{\epsilon w}$ in the Etym. M. we find after that explanation the fol-lowing, $\eta \, \dot{\alpha} \pi \partial \tau \sigma \tilde{\sigma} \, \delta \epsilon i \nu$, $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$. The gloss itself may be compared with those on $\Delta \epsilon \tilde{\nu} \, \dot{\varphi} \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\Delta \epsilon \tilde{\nu} \dot{\nu}$ in Hesychius. And how suitable the article is to the infinitive τό δείν, τό δέον, in the latter Lexicographer, is clear. Under these circumstances the example from Lysias c. Alcib. 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 deî, while deîv as well as déov 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 *bokeiv*, I have no doubt that it depends entirely on a comparison of the expression έμοι δοκείν with έκείνω δοκούν : but this 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, $\epsilon\mu ol$ $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \epsilon i \nu$ (see Herm. ad Vig." not. 204.). We have now therefore to consider the contraction as stripped of all analogy; for Contraction as supped of all analogy; for $\pi\lambda \hat{\epsilon}\hat{\nu}\nu$, if that be the only instance, is sufficiently explained as shortened from $\pi\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\hat{i}\nu\nu$, which in a phrase of daily occurrence like $\pi\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\epsilon}\nu\nu$ \hbar $\mu\dot{\nu}\rho_{10\ell}$, is very conceivable. But in $\pi\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\hat{i}\nu\nu$ the pure sound of the stem or root is ϵ_i , which in the form δέον or δοκέον is unheard of even in the Ionic dialect. Further, the name KAE- $\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\eta s$, which the Grammarians introduce also in the comparison, is compounded not of KAEO- but of KAEEL, from KAEOS, as ορείνομοs from δροs; and, not to omit any thing bearing on the question, the name Nelhews is not from Neohews, but a dialect from the old name NnAevs, the head of the family of that old colonist.

+ If criticism were not bound to consider as sacred whatsoever the old rhapsodists and critics have handed down as the text of those primæval monuments of ΔΗΚ-. See Δάκνω.

 $\Delta \eta \omega$. See $\Delta A - 4$.

Διαιτάω, 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 έδιαίτησα, sometimes διήτησα, and has even the double augment $\varkappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \delta i \eta' \tau \eta \sigma \alpha$. Compare the following.

Διāκονέω (and διāκονέομαι depon. midd.), I serve. Like the preceding verb its irregularity consists in the augment: thus έδιακόνησα and διηκόνησα, δεδιακόνηκα and δεδιηκόνηκα.

On the derivation of this word, which is indisputably not compounded of $\delta\iota a$, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 231.

Διδάσκω, I teach, loses the σ in the formation; thus fut. διδάξω; aor. 1. ἐδίδαξα; perf. δεδίδαχα; perf. pass. infin. δεδιδάχθαι, Il. λ , 831. &c. — MIDD.

It comes from $\Delta A\Omega$, and is exactly like $d\lambda i\sigma \kappa \omega$, 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. ϵ , 64. Hymn. Cer. 144.

Δίδημι. See Δέω, I bind.

Διδράσχω, I run away, generally occurs in composition with ἀπό, ἐξ, or διά: fut. δράσομαι; perf. δέδραχα; all with α long; hence Ion. διδρήσχω, δρήσομαι, &c. — Aor. 2. ἕδρᾶν, -āς, -ā, -āμεν, -āτε, ἕδρᾶσαν and ἕδρᾶν; conjunct. δρῶ, -ặς, -ä, &c.; optat. δραίην; imperat. δρᾶθι; infin. δρᾶναι; part. δράς, δράντος (not δρᾶντος); Ion. ἕδρην, -ῆναι, &c.: but δραίην, δράς retain the α, according to the analogy of ἕστην.

antiquity, it would be easy to alter the one passage to $\chi\rho\eta$, and the other to $\ell\mu\epsilon\hat{v}$ δ' $\ell\delta\epsilon'\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$. If however the Homeric formation $\delta\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\omega$ be compared with the common $\delta\epsilon\eta\sigma\omega$, 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 $\epsilon\nu$, as in $\epsilon'\delta\alpha\delta\epsilon\nu$; while in others it was entirely omitted, as in $\delta\epsilon\eta\sigma\omega$, $\delta\alpha\delta\epsilon\nu$. Hence also we may find it easier to explain how $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \delta a$, & c., remained longer than others in a state of resolution; and, to bring $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_i$ within the same analogy, we may adduce the formation $\epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \omega \sigma a$. But the steps by which we advance here are not so sure as in $\epsilon \delta a \epsilon \omega$ and $\kappa a \omega \delta \epsilon a$: we will therefore content ourselves with merely pointing out the probability.

F 2

The form $d\pi o \delta i \delta \rho \dot{a} \nu a \iota$ in Thucyd. 4, 46., which would come from $\delta i \delta \rho \eta \mu \iota$, Bekker has now amended (from the reading of several manuscripts) to $d\pi o \delta \rho \tilde{a} \nu a \iota$; but in Dio Chrysost. to. 1. p. 52. we read $d\nu \dot{a} \gamma \kappa \eta \mu \iota \sigma \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, $a \dot{\nu} \tau \delta \nu \kappa a \iota \dot{a} \pi o \delta \iota \delta \rho \tilde{a} \nu a \iota^* \Im \epsilon \iota \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$, which might very well have been grounded on such a precedent as the above passage of Thucydides.

The aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\rho\tilde{a}\sigma a$, which is the regular aorist of $\delta\rho\dot{a}\omega$, *I* do, was also that of $\delta\iota\delta\rho\dot{a}\sigma\kappa\omega$ 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.+

The formation of the aor. 2. in $\bar{\alpha}\nu$, &c., detailed above not only arises completely from the analogy laid down in the note under $\Gamma_{i}\gamma\nu\dot{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$, 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{a} is evident from the Ionicism $\check{\epsilon}\delta\rho\eta\nu$, and from the following conclusion of an anapæstic verse of Aristoph. in Herodian (Piers. p. 465.), $\delta\epsilon\bar{\nu}|\rho\rho\,\delta'\,\dot{a}\nu\,ob\kappa|$ $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon\delta\rho a|\mu\epsilon\nu$: with which we may join the unquestionable amendment of Reiske in Eurip. Herael. 14. $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\delta\rho a\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\delta\rho_{a\mu}\rho\nu$. Compare $\Gamma\eta\rho\tilde{a}\nu\alpha$. But that the *a* in the 3. plur. $\check{\epsilon}\delta\rhoa\nu$ should be short, is only according to the general rule of the aor. 2. of verbs in $\mu\mu$, 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 $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon\delta\rhoa\sigma a\nu$.

Δίδωμι, I give: fut. δώσω; aor. 1. ἕδωκα§; perf. δέδωκα; aor. 2. ἕδων; perf. pass. δέδομαι; aor. midd. έδόμην.

Homer has in the pres. 2. and 3. sing. $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\tilde{c}$, $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\tilde{i}$, as formed from $\delta\iota\delta\delta\omega$, II. ι , 164. 519., which forms occur also in Herodot. and Hippocr. But $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\sigma\theta a$, or rather $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\sigma\theta a$, is found only in Homer, e. g. II. τ , 270. The following forms are also Homeric only; the imperat. pres. $\delta\iota\delta\omega\theta\iota$ (Od. γ , 380.), the infin. pres. $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\tilde{v}ra\iota$ (II. ω , 425.), the fut. $\delta\iota\delta\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\gamma$, $\delta\iota$ -

* The circumflex need not excite our suspicion against this form; not only because we find it so often erroneously placed over the termination in $d\nu\alpha_i$, but because the radical long α in this verb might certainly produce a present in $\bar{\alpha}\mu_i$, $\bar{\alpha}\nu\alpha_i$.

† Thus it is easy to conceive that $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma$ $\delta\rho d\sigma \alpha s$ and $-d\sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha$, wherever they are now met with in Attic writers, are corruptions of $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\delta\rho \dot{\alpha}s$ and $-\hat{\alpha}\sigma \alpha$. See Bekker on Andoc. Myst. 125. Lys. c. Andoc. 28. and compare *Pypdas*.

‡ Thus the Dorics and Epics use έθεν, έσταν, έδον, έδυν, for έθεσαν, έστησαν, &c. The same takes place in other anomalous aorists, as $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, $\beta\dot{\alpha}\nu$, for $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\epsilon\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, Hom.

 \S This irregular aorist in -κα 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 -κα, except the participle of the middle, which however with its indieative belongs to the Ion. and Dor. dialects. Except this indic. and particip. the other moods of the middle are never met with. In Attice prose we find, of the middle, the aor. 2. only. δώσομεν (Od. v, 358. ω, 314.), and the aor. 2. δύσκον for "έδων (Hom.).* - The imperat. pres. δίδοι, as from δίδοιμι, is an unusual Doricism for δίδου, in Pind. Ol. 1, 136. The infin. pres. διδων + (Theocr. 29, 9.) is also Doric. Instead of ¿δίδοσαν, the Dorics and Epics used ἕδιδον, δίδον, Hymn. Cer. 328. 437. On the unusual accentuation of the conjunct. pass. δίδωται and the opt. pass. απόδοιντο, which look like Atticisms (Fischer quotes some instances from Ionic writers), see the second paragraph under $\Delta i \nu \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$.

The form $\delta \delta \theta_i$, and $\Im \epsilon \tau_i$ from $\tau i \theta \eta \mu_i$, are never used. The former was once the reading in Nicand. Th. 562., but is now rejected by the discovery of better manuscripts. $\Delta \tilde{\varphi} \sigma \iota$ is 3. sing. of the conjunct. for $\delta \tilde{\psi}$, as $i \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \sigma \iota$ is for $i \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta}$. As the conjunctive arises from contraction, it is again resolved by the Ionics; thus for didu, du, duc, &c., they use $\delta\iota\delta\omega\omega$, $\delta\omega\omega$, $\delta\omega\eta\varsigma$, $\delta\omega\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\delta\omega\eta\tau\epsilon$, &c.: and in this resolved form the Epics shorten the vowel, thus δώομεν for δώωμεν, &c.

 $\Delta i \zeta \eta \mu \alpha i$, I seek, an Ionic depon. midd. according to the formation in μ , but retaining the η in the passive : thus $\delta(\zeta \eta \mu \alpha)$, $\delta(\zeta \eta \tau \sigma)$, $\delta(\zeta \eta \tau \tau \sigma)$, δίζησθαι, διζήμενος, Herodot.; δίζηαι, Od. λ, 100.; ην δίζη, Callim. Epig. 11. The shortened forms δίζεαι (Theorr. 25, 37.) and δίζεο (in a hexameter in Etym. M. v. agelyaíveiv) are perfectly regular. But the forms of the proper theme in -ouart are also frequently found. In Herodotus however those in -εται, -ετο, -εσθαι, are now, according to the manuscripts, universally changed into those with η : and in Callim. Epig. 17., where hitherto has stood difortai, Jacobs has adopted from the Vatican manuscript (vii, 459.) $\delta l \zeta \eta \nu \tau \alpha l$, so that the other formation in general, at least in the older writers, may be doubted. § Fut. διζήσομαι, Od. π, 239.; aor. 1. έδιζησάμην έμεωυτόν, Heraclit. ap. Plut. adv. Colot. 20. p. 1118.

The verb $\delta l \zeta \omega$, which occurs in II. π , 713. and in an oracle in Herodot. 1, 65. with the meaning of to doubt, is supposed to be the same stem or family as δίζημαι. Compare Ἐξέδισεν preserved in Suidas from some lost writer.

 $\Delta_{i\kappa\epsilon\ell\nu}$, infin. to $\ell\delta_{i\kappa}$, *I threw*; a defective poet. a orist [found in the lyric and tragic poets, with no other tenses except the aor. 1. έδιξε in Simmias Br. Anal. 1, 208. In Lycophr. 531. is πήδημα λαιψηρον δικών.]

occurrence of Silouar. But ¿Silero in Moschus 2, 28. stands undisputed, as it does in the following fragment, perhaps of Callimachus, in Suid. v. άγκοs ; ποσσl δ' ἀνελθείν Αγκος ές ύψικάρηνον εδίζετο: not to mention (see Ind. Gesn.) the Orphic poems.

^{*} On this iterative see δύσκεν toward the end of $\Delta \psi \omega$.

t See Mus. Ant. Stud. 1. p. 242. sqq.
 t In Brunck's Anal. 3, 216. is διζομένη.

[§] In Apollon. 1, 1208. the reading δί-ζετο κρηναίης has been preferred perhaps a little too hastily, on account of the rare

Διστάζω, *I doubt* (like βαστάζω and νυστάζω), seems to partake of the two formations of verbs in $-\zeta\omega$; its future is διστάσω, and though I know of no examples of the formation in $-\xi\omega$, $-\gamma\mu\alpha_i$, &c., yet the verbal substantive is δισταγμός, and still we find δίστασις.

Διψάω, I thirst; fut. διψήσω; infin. διψην never διψάν. Δίω. See Δείσαι.

Διώχω, *I pursue*, has the fut. διώξω in Xen. Cyr. 6, 3, 13. Anab. 1, 4, 8. and Demosth. p. 989.; but the general Attic fut. is διώξομαι, Aristoph. Equ. 368. Elmsl. Ach. 278. Plat. Theæt. p. 168. a. On ἐδιώχαθον, διωχάθειν, from διωχάθω, see 'Αμύνω and note.

ΔΜΕ-. See Δέμω Δοάσσατο, δόαται. See Δέαται.

 Δ οχέω, *I seem*, appear; also *I think*: it forms its tenses from $\Delta OK\Omega$, as fut. δόξω, aor. 1. ἔδοξα; but takes its perf. from the passive δέδογμαι, *I have seemed*.

The regular formation $\delta\sigma\kappa\eta\sigma\omega$, aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\delta\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha$, belongs to the poets. Thus $\delta\epsilon\delta\delta\kappa\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ in Pind. Nem. 5, 36. Eurip. Med. 761. Aristoph. Vesp. 726. (also Herodot. 7, 16, 3.) must be distinguished from the Epic $\delta\epsilon\delta\delta\kappa\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_0$ under $\Delta\epsilon\chi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$.

For a full account of the supposed neut. part. $\delta o \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$ for $\delta o \kappa \delta \tilde{\upsilon} \nu$, see $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, *I* am in want of, with note.

Δουπέω, I sound heavily, I fall: fut. δουπήσω; perf. δέδουπα; aor. 1. έδούπησα and (II. λ, 45.) έγδούπησα from a stem or root ΓΔΟΥΠ-, which appears to bear the same relation to δουπέω as κτυπέω does to τύπτω.*

 Δ ράσσω, Att. δράττω, *I seize*, grasp; but the middle is more usual in the same sense.

Hence the 2. pers. perf. pass. δέδραζαι is used in Eurip. Tro. 745. as a middle. [So also δεδραγμένος, Il. v, 393. Soph. Antig. 235. — Passow.]

* I suppose for instance that $\gamma \delta o u \pi$ and $\kappa \tau v \pi$ - are essentially the same onomatopocia for the sound proceeding from a heavy body, whether striking or struck; and hence that $\delta o u \pi \epsilon i \nu$ came to signify the falling of such a body, $\tau i \pi \tau \epsilon i \nu$ the beating it. Beside δέδρāμαι we find δέδρασμαι; see Thucyd. 3, 54. Hence the verbal adj. δραστός, δραστέος.

[Δρώοιμι is an Epic form produced from the optat. pres. act. $\delta \rho \tilde{\varphi} \mu \iota$ (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 πράττω, Aristot. Poet. 3, 6.— Passow.]

 $\Delta \rho \epsilon \pi \omega$, *I pluck*, is inflected regularly; thus fut. δρέψω, &c. The midd. is frequent : [αίμα δρέψασθαι is an unusual expression in Æschyl. Sept. 720. Verbal adj. δρεπτός. — Passow.]

In Pind. Pyth. 4, 234. $\delta\rho a\pi\omega' v$ 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. $\Delta\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\omega$ is less common than $\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\omega$; we find it in Moschus 2, 69. The middle $\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ is of more frequent occurrence; $\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\rho\mu\epsilon'\nu\alpha\nu$, Anal. 1. p. 241. No. 81. Compare $\Gamma\lambda\dot{\nu}\phi\omega$.

 $\Delta \rho i \pi \tau \omega$, I tear the flesh, scratch, is inflected regularly: fut. δρύψω; perf. δέδρῦφα; perf. pass. δέδρυμμαι; aor. 1. midd. δρυψάμενος, Od. β, 153.

That $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\phi\sigma\iota$ in II. ω , 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 $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\phi\omega$; 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.*

Δύναμαι, *I can*, forms the pres. and imperf. like ίσταμαι; depon. with fut. midd. δυνήσομαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐδυνήθην†, ήδυνήθην, or ἐδυνάσθην, which last form (more Ionic than the others) never takes the augment; aor. 1. midd. ἐδυνησάμην, Hom.; perf. δεδύνημαι. Verbal adj. δυνατός, possible.

In the passive of all verbs in μ 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 $\tau i\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha$, $i\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\alpha$, $\delta i\delta\rho\mu\alpha$ may

† On the double augment see βούλομαι and note.

^{*} Thus βλάδεται in Hom. for βλάπτω, λίτομαι in the Hom. Hymns for λίσσομαι, στενάχω Epic for στενάζω.

be seen under their respective verbs: in the present case we have as proparoxytons, the optat. $\delta'\nu\nu\alpha\iota\tau\sigma$ and the conjunct. $\delta'\nu\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ (Ion.), $\delta'\nu\eta\alpha\iota$, $\delta'\nu\eta\tau\alpha\iota^*$, which have undoubtedly been introduced into Homer from the common language.

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

Of the three forms of the aor. 1. pass. $i \delta v \nu \dot{a} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ 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 $\dot{\eta}\delta v \nu \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu$, $\dot{\eta}\delta v \nu \dot{\eta}\theta \eta \nu$; 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. $\delta v \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \tau o$.

 $\Delta \omega \omega$. 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 $i\sigma\tau\eta\mu$, and $\phi\omega$, and the analogies laid down in sect. 113. of my Grammar.[‡] The pres. act. $\delta\omega\omega$, $\varkappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\omega\omega$, &c., has the causative meaning to envelope in, to sink anything, and retains it in the fut. and aor. 1. act. $\delta\omega\sigma\omega$, $\xi\delta\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha$. Pass. $\xi\delta\bar{\upsilon}\eta\nu$ with υ short. § The MIDD. $\delta\omega\omega\mu\alpha$, $\delta\omega\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$, $\xi\delta\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\dot{\mu}\eta\nu$ 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

• Notwithstanding $\delta l \nu a \mu a \iota$ as a proparoxyton is the only form in use, according to which we find $\delta \ell \nu \eta a \iota$ (II. ζ , 229.) accented in the same way, yet the Ionians admit the resolution and write $\delta \nu \nu \epsilon \omega \mu a \iota$; e.g. in Herodot. 4, 97. Compare $\epsilon \pi t - \sigma \tau a \mu a \iota$.

+ [Yet Passow says that $\delta \omega r_{\eta}$ is in good writers conjunctive only, though it does occur in Eurip. Hec. 257., and that the Att. and Dor. is $\delta \omega r_{q}$, Schaef. Soph. Phil. 798.]

‡ [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. — Ep.]

§ Like έλύθην, ἐτύθην, and the perf. pass. λέλὕμαι, although from λόω, δύω, δύω, fut. -ύσω, &c., all with v long. See Δέω, I bind, with note; also Teíνω. 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. δέδυκα and the aor. 2. έδυν. * In addition to the above comes a new active form durw, which properly speaking is synonymous with the middle δύομαι, as έδυν is with the midd. έδυσάμην; yet so that in 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 $\delta \delta v v$, like $\delta \phi v v$, retains the v long through all the persons ($\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\bar{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, &c.); but the 3. plur. $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\bar{\upsilon}\nu$, shortened by the Epic and Doric writers for $\delta \delta v \sigma a v$, has the v short according to the regular analogy. See έδραν, &c., under Διδράσκω with note. Of the conjunctive and optative moods we must however make particular mention. To form a conjunct. according to the analogy of $\xi \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, $\sigma \tau \tilde{\omega}$, is not possible, but it may follow that of the resolved form $\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega$ or $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \omega$, $\sigma \tau \eta \eta \varsigma$: and thus we find a conj. δύω, δύης, δύη, from έδυν, not only in Homer (e. g. Il. ρ, 186. ι, 604. λ, 194.), but even in Attic prose, ἐπειδαν ὁ ήλιος δύη, Plato Cratyl. 64. p. 413. b.; which forms therefore must not be derived from the present $\delta i \omega$, nor must we attribute to this latter an immediate sense. Of the optat $\delta i \eta \nu \dagger (\bar{\nu} \text{ for } \nu)$ I can produce but one example, viz. $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\tilde{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\pm$ for $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\nu(\eta\mu\epsilon\nu)$ (like $\sigma\tau\alpha(\eta\nu-\sigma\tau\alpha\tilde{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu)$ in II. π , 99. But according to Bekker's observation, the construction in Od. 1, 377. σ , 348. v, 286. requires the optative, and consequently in those passages instead of $\delta i \eta$ we must write $\delta i \eta$.

The Epic δύσκεν, Il. 9, 271. is the 3. sing. aor. 2. act. for έδυ, and formed according to the regular analogy of iteratives, like στάσκον, δύσκον, &c., consequently it means, he drew back each time.

The Epic sister-forms of the aor. 1. midd. έδύσετο §, imperat. δύσεο (like έβήσετο, imperat. βήσεο), 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 σ of the aor. 1., of which

crept into it from common analogy, and that the true reading in the Epic poets is always ¿6ήσετο, ¿δύσετο. At the same time it is possible that usage might have attached a distinct meaning to each form, and that Homer might have said in every instance δύσετο δμιλον, δύσετο ήέλιος, &c., but δύσατο τεύχεα, χιτώνα, &c.

^{*} For an account of this aorist see note under Γιγνώσκω; and for its meaning see note under Tevxw.

Compare φύην, p. 261.
 \$ See Buttm. Lexil. p. 425. and note.
 \$ Amidst the uncertainty which prevails in Homer's text between ἐδύσατο and -ετο, it is very probable that the form in -avo

the most complete instance is the well-known aor. $\xi \pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \nu$, $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$, &c. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 226. note. The Epic participle $\delta \nu \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma c$, used in the sense of a present in Od. a, 24. Hes. ϵ , 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 coming from the common expression $\delta \nu \sigma \epsilon \tau \sigma \delta' \eta \epsilon \lambda \omega c$.

Later writers form $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu \omega$ an aor. 1., at least in the participle, $\dot{\eta} \lambda \dot{\iota} \nu \nu$ $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu \alpha \nu \tau \sigma c$, $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \nu \nu$ $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu \alpha \nu \tau \sigma$, Æl. V. H. 4, 1, 1. Paus. 2, 11. Herodotus inflects the form $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu \omega$, as he does many other barytones*, as if it were a pres. in $-\epsilon \omega$; thus 3, 98. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \nu \sigma$, they put on.

E.

'Εάφθη. See Άπτω.

'Eá ω , *I permit*, &c. : fut. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\sigma\omega$; but in the augment it changes the ϵ not into η , but into $\epsilon_i \dagger$, e. g. imperf. $\epsilon_i^{\prime}\omega\nu$; aor. 1. $\epsilon_i^{\prime}\bar{a}\sigma\alpha$, &c.

The Ionics leave out the augment; thus imperf. $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ for $\tilde{\epsilon}\iota\omega\nu$, [$\tilde{\epsilon}a\sigma a$ for $\epsilon\iotaa\sigma a$, Hom. who has also a pres. $\epsilon\iotaa\omega$, $\epsilon\iota\omega$, 10, 55. The fut. midd. $\epsilon\iotaa\sigma \mu a\iota$ is used in a passive sense, Thucyd. 1, 142. — Passow.]

Έγγυάω, I give as a pledge; MIDD. I pledge myself. This verb is inflected regularly, but is uncertain in its augment: thus we have in general use the imperf. $\eta\gamma\gamma$ ύων, and the aor. 1. $\eta\gamma\gamma$ ύησα, yet the perf. is equally common as $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\gamma$ ύηκα; and again we find without any augment at all $\epsilon\gamma\gamma$ υήσατο, $\epsilon\gamma\gamma$ υηκώς[‡], &c.

'Eγείρω, I waken (any one): fut. ἐγερῶ; aor. 1. ἤγειρα; perf. with Attic redupl. ἐγήγερκα; perf. pass. ἐγήγερμαι. MIDD. I waken (myself); to which we must add the syncopated aor. ἠγρόμην.

* Thus we find συμβαλλεόμενος, ὑπερβαλλέειν, ἐββίπτεον, πιεζεύμενος, Herodot.

† The following verbs do the same : ἔχω, ἕρπω and ἑρπύζω, ἕλκω, ἐθίζω, ἐλίσσω, ἑστιάω, ἕπω and ἕπομαι, ἐργάζομαι.

‡ See Reisk. Ind. in Isæum. It is remarkable too that the aor. 1. ἐνεγγύησα, ἐνεγγυησάμην occurs frequently : see Budæus, p. 76, 77. Stephan. Thesaur. and Lucian. Lexic. v. $\ell \nu \epsilon \gamma \nu q \nu q \nu$. Budæus explains this to be merely the augment; which is singular, as analogy would require $\ell \nu \epsilon \gamma \delta \eta \sigma a$. Others place it as without the augment under $\ell \nu \epsilon \gamma \nu q \nu q \nu$. I consider it to be an anomaly in the augmentation; and that daily pronunciation, deceived by ear and sense, strayed from $\ell \nu \epsilon \gamma \nu \eta \sigma a$ into the double compound $\ell \nu \epsilon \gamma - \gamma \nu \eta \sigma a$.

This agrist has been mistaken by the Grammarians, at least the later ones, who, as we see in Thom. Mag., supposed a present έγρομαι. Such a one however is never met with, and the remaining forms are in every instance plainly aorists, e. g. $\xi \gamma \rho \epsilon \tau \sigma \delta' \xi \xi \tau \nu \sigma \upsilon$, Il. β , 41. $\kappa a \nu \xi \gamma \rho \eta$ μεσημβρινός, ούδείς σ' ἀποκλείσει, 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 $\epsilon \gamma \rho \epsilon$ - $\sigma\theta \alpha i$, and ascribe $\xi \gamma \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha i$ 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. v, 124. Apollon. Rh. 4, 1352. Lucian Dial. Mar. 14, 2.), more than usual circumspection is necessary. In a similar case under άγείρω, where ἀγέροντο, ἀγερέσθαι 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 $\xi \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ under "I $\zeta \omega$. Compare also $\Pi \epsilon \phi \nu \omega \nu$.

The perf. 2. έγρήγορα,

whose anomalous reduplication was probably caused by the sound of $\eta \gamma \rho \delta \mu \eta \nu$, " $\gamma \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, belongs, like that a rist, to the immediate meaning, and expresses the being in a certain state or situation, *I am watching*.* The pluperf. $\varepsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \delta \rho \varepsilon \iota \nu$ 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 $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\eta\gamma o\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, and in the writers of the N. T. $\gamma\rho\eta\gamma o\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega$. But we find as early as Homer (Od. ν , 6.) a participle $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\eta\gamma o\rho\dot{\omega}\nu$, as if from an indicative in $\tilde{\omega}$, \tilde{q}_c , \tilde{q}_c , \dot{q}_c .

In Homer we have further, in the place of the 2. plur. $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \delta \rho a \tau \epsilon$, a form more convenient for the metre with a passive termination, $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \rho \rho \theta \epsilon \pm 3$; and to this we may join the corresponding infinitive $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta$ -

^{*} See note under "Αγνυμι.

[†] The participle ἐγρηγοροῦσα in Hippocr. de Insomn. 1. is therefore defensible,

although we find just before as a present, $\epsilon\gamma\rho\eta\gamma$ op $\epsilon\nu$.

t In the same way from ἀνώγετε, ἀνω-

 $\gamma \delta \rho \theta \alpha \iota$. We find also in the same poet a very peculiar deviation in the active form of the 3. plur. (likewise with the θ), $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \delta \rho \theta \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$.*

"Εδω. See Έσθίω.

Εδούμαι. See "Ιζω.

"Εζομαι. See "Ιζω.

Ἐθέλω and Ͽέλω, I wish, am willing : fut. ἐθελήσω and ℑελήσω; but aor. 1. ήθέλησα; imperf. ήθελου; and perf. ήθέληκα in good prose writers; τεθέληκα is an Alexandrine perf.; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 332.

[These two verbs are the same in meaning, and differ only in form : $\Im \ell \lambda \omega$ is not found in any Epic poet before the Alexandrine æra, $\ell \theta \ell \lambda \omega$ 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 ϵl $\Im \ell \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 7. Hence the Attics naturally preferred the imperf. $\eta \theta \epsilon \lambda o \nu$ and the aor. 1. $\eta \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma a$, in which the augment comes regularly from $\ell \theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$; consequently these forms are not to be compared with $\eta \delta o v \lambda \eta \theta \eta \nu$, $\eta \delta v v \eta \theta \eta \nu$, $\eta \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu$. On the difference of meaning between $\beta o v \lambda \eta \mu a$ and $\ell \theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$ see Buttm. Lexil. p. 194. &c. — Passow.]

'E θ (ω , *I accustom*, is regularly inflected; e.g. fut. $\partial \theta$ ($\sigma \omega$, Att. - $i\omega$, Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 53.; but it takes \in for its augment, like $\partial \omega$, which see with its note. Compare also the following.

"E $\vartheta\omega$. From this old present (of which we now find no remains in the Epic writers except the participle $\xi \vartheta\omega\nu$, being accustomed to) comes the very common perfect $\varepsilon \omega \varthetaa$, I am accustomed to. The other tenses are furnished by the passive of $\xi \vartheta \zeta \omega$, of which the perf. pass. $\varepsilon \vartheta \vartheta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ is nearly the same as $\varepsilon \omega \vartheta \alpha$.

γέτω, came ἄνωχθε, ἀνώχθω; and this seems the most natural way of accounting for the Epic πέποσθε (see πάσχω), viz. πέπονθα, πεπόνθατε, πέποσθε. See under "Ανωγα.

* Ανωγα.
* These forms do indeed appear in their external relations like a series of anomalies; but I think I can point out a general regularity running through the whole. The transition of ἐγρηγορατε to the passive form ἐγρήγορθε was justified by the neuter meaning of ἐγρήγορα, which suited

the perf. pass. quite as well as the perf. active, just as in $d\nu \epsilon \varphi \gamma a$ and $d\nu \epsilon \varphi \gamma \mu a$: but this passive might, according to the analogy of $d\omega \rho ro$ ($\delta \rho \rho ro$), retain the o; and thus $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \rho \rho \rho a$, $-\rho \rho \theta \epsilon$, $-\delta \rho \theta a$ are regular. That the active form $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \delta \rho \theta a \sigma i$ arose again from this $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \rho \rho \theta \sigma$, might have been only an appearance, but devoid of truth. As from $d\gamma \epsilon i \rho \omega$ came $d\gamma \epsilon \rho \epsilon \theta \omega$, so from $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon i \rho \omega$ might come $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \rho \epsilon \theta \omega$, and $\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \omega$; of which latter theme the regular perf. 2. would be $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma o \rho \theta a$.

The perf. $\epsilon i \omega \theta a^*$ is a lengthening of the stem or radical form, exactly as we see from $\epsilon i \delta \omega$, $\eta \delta \epsilon i \nu$, $\eta \delta \eta$, the lengthened form $\eta \epsilon i \delta \eta$. The object in the formation of this perfect was to preserve both the augment and the change of vowel; it was therefore properly $\epsilon'' o \theta a$: hence arose, by transposing the quantities, the Ionic $\xi \omega \theta a$ in Herodotus, and thence again came the common $\epsilon i \omega \theta a$. The Doric writers had another formation, similar to the perf. 1. but with the change of vowel, $\xi \theta \omega \kappa \alpha$. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 138. 'E $\omega\theta\varepsilon\varepsilon$ (like $\partial\pi\omega\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon$) 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 ϵ ; but as we find also in Herodot. Ever, everysee, and Exples, it appears to me most probable that the Ionics, accustomed to insert their & not according to well-known analogies, but from a dark and uncertain feeling, lengthened the historic forms $\eta \psi \epsilon$, $\epsilon i \chi \epsilon$, $\tilde{\omega} \phi \lambda \epsilon$, as well as these two perfects, contrary to true analogy. Compare "E $\psi\omega$.

Eidow, idow, video, an obsolete verb, whose place has been supplied by $b\rho a\omega$: 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. \uparrow

1. to see: the only tense which retains this meaning is the aor. 2. $\epsilon i \delta \delta \nu$, and Epic without the augment $i \delta \delta \nu$; infin. $i \delta \epsilon i \nu$, Ep. $i \delta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$; conjunct. $i \delta \omega$, Epic $i \delta \omega \mu i$; part. $i \delta \omega \nu i$: all these forms are Homeric. The aor. 2. midd. has the same meaning, $\epsilon i \delta \delta \mu \eta \nu$, in Hom., more frequently without the augment $i \delta \delta \mu \eta \nu$; infin. $i \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha i$; conjunct. $i \delta \omega \mu \alpha i$; imperat. $i \delta \delta \nu$. See also 'Opáw.

2. to know: olda[‡], I know, to which we may add the part. $\epsilon i \delta \omega_{\varsigma}$; infin. $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon' \nu a_i$, Ep. 'idµ $\epsilon \nu a_i$ and 'idµ $\epsilon \nu$; imperat. 'io θ_i ; conjunct. $\epsilon i \delta \tilde{\omega}$, Ep. $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \omega$ also; optat. $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon i \eta \nu$; pluperf. $\tilde{\eta} \delta \epsilon i \nu$; fut. $\epsilon i \sigma o \mu a_i$, but less frequently and mostly Epic $\epsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \omega$. The aor. and perf. are supplied from $\gamma_{i\gamma}\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$.

Of the regular persons of olda, the 2. sing. and the three persons of the plur. $olda\mu\epsilon\nu$, $oldar\epsilon$, $olda\sigma\iota$, occur but seldom, and, with regard to Attic usage, are disapproved of by the Atticists, while their places

* See note on ἀλήοχα under 'Αγω, and Buttm. Lexil. p. 136. &c.

+ Those who attributed to $\epsilon t \delta \omega$ as a present the two meanings of to see and to know were guilty of an inaccuracy: $\epsilon t \delta \omega$ meant I see, I see into it; the perf. $o t \delta a$, I have seen into it, and consequently I know.

.

‡ Properly the perf. 2. of $e^{i\delta\omega}$ with the augment thrown aside (like $e^{i\omega\omega}$, $e^{i\omega\kappa\alpha}$, Ion. $o^{i\kappa\alpha}$), 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 $e^{i\omega\kappa\alpha}$ see last note but one under Elkew. are supplied by syncopated forms: we will therefore first give the pure Attic usage of this verb in olda and its pluperf. $\ddot{\eta} \partial \epsilon \iota \nu$.

	ATTI	C USAGE	de la							
PRES. S. olda	D		Ρ. ίσμεν							
οἶσθα	ĩc	τον	ίστε							
			ίσασι(ν).							
Imperat. ἴσθι, ἴστω, &c.	Conj.	Optat.	Infin.	Part.						
ίσθι, ίστω, &c.	είδῶ	είδείην	ειδέναι	είδώς,-υῖα,-ός.						
IMPERF. S. joeiv. A	tt. ἤδη,		•							
ήδεις, more generally ήδεισθα; Att. ήδης, more gen. ήδησθα,										
ήδει; Att.	hor and	ήδη,								
D										
ήδειτον or	ήστον,									
<i>ήδειτην</i> —										
Ρ. ήδειμεν —										
ήδειτε —										
<i>ἤδεσαν</i> —	ησαν.*									

FUT. εἰσομαι, less frequently εἰδησω. †
AOR. (εἰδησα), εἰδῆσαι. ‡
Verbal adj. (neut.) ἰστέον.

In both the Ion. and Dor. dialect we find the regular $\delta i \delta a_{\zeta}$, Od. a, 337.; in the Att. sometimes $\delta i \sigma \theta a_{\zeta}$, Cratin. AB. 3. p. 1295. Piers. Moer. p. 283. Br. Aristoph. Fr. 143. Meineke Menandr. p. 122. The Ion. and Dor. use $i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $i \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \delta$; and the Epics for $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon' \nu a_i$ have $i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu a_i$ and $i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$ as shortened from $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon' \mu \epsilon \nu a_i$. They have the same shortening of the radical vowel in the conjunct. $i \delta \epsilon \omega$ (II. ξ , 235. where however others read $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \omega$ as a dissyllable) for $\epsilon i \delta \omega$, and in the fem. part. $i \delta \nu i a$ for $\epsilon i \delta \nu i a$. We find also $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, 2. pl. conjunct. for $\epsilon i \delta \eta \tau \epsilon$, Od. ι , 17., $\epsilon i \delta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\epsilon i \delta \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, II. a, 363. For $\mu \delta \epsilon \nu$ the Epics have a lengthened form, by which the separation of the augment from the radical syllable is made more distinct (compare $\mu \epsilon \nu \nu$ under $E i \mu \mu$, I go), and of which we find 2. pers. $\mu \epsilon i \delta \epsilon i \delta \eta \epsilon$; 3. pers. $\eta \epsilon i \delta \epsilon \eta$, $\eta \epsilon i \delta \eta$, II. χ , 280. Od. ι , 206. Apoll. Rh. 2, 822., and Herodotus (1, 45.) has with the termination short $\eta \epsilon \iota \delta \epsilon$ for $\mu \delta \epsilon \iota$. To these we must add a form as quoted in this verb only,

* On these syncopated forms of the dual and plural see Piers, ad Moer. p. 174.

+ Isocr. ad Demonic. 4. συνειδήσεις ; 5. είδήσεις ; more frequently in the Ionic dialect.

‡ Hippoer. De Dec. Orn. 3. De Vict. Acut. 46. Aristot. Eth. 8, 3. Theophr. Procem. extr. § The Ion. $i\delta\mu\epsilon\nu$ did not come from $i\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$; general analogy requires just the converse : $i\delta\mu\epsilon\nu$ and the infin. $i\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$ belong evidently to $\epsilon i\delta\omega$, and not to $i\sigma\eta\mu$. See last note but one under $\epsilon i\kappa\omega$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega\kappa\alpha$.

|| This shortened termination is certainly remarkable in a dialect which in other cases adds vowels without reason or *μ*δειν for *μ*δεσαν, Apollon. Rh. 2, 65. and lengthened to *μ*είδειν, ib. 4, 1700. On the other hand Homer has (II. σ, 405. Od. δ, 772.) the 3. pl. *μσαν*, in sound the same as the 3. plur. imperf. of $\epsilon l\mu i$; and it is to be explained in the same way, for it bears the same relation to the syncopated form *μσαν* for *μ*δεσαν, as *μσαν* from $\epsilon l\mu i$ does to *μσαν*, *μσαν*. Lastly Homer uses both futures, less frequently however είδμσω, II. a, 546. The Epic infin. είδησέμεν, Od. ζ, 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 είδέναι. So in particular, ώς εἰδῆς, $i\nu$ εἰδῆτε, in many combinations, where there is danger of our being influenced by custom to alter it to "idng, "idnre, e.g. in Demosth. Mid. 23. (p. 539. Rsk.) "I will lay it before you, iv' είδητε, ότι καί τούτων την μεγίστην όφείλων δουναι δίκην φανήσεται:" and again at 24. (p. 541. init.): see other examples in Sturz. Lex. Xenoph. under eideen 6. To the above we may add also the verbal adj. $i\sigma\tau\epsilon o\nu$, which is never used properly of seeing, though there are cases where we cannot translate it otherwise; see Heind. ad Plat. Theæt. 141. In the same way the Homeric conjunct. είδομεν, which always stands for είδωμεν (as at Il. v, 327. Od. ζ, 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 είδήσω according to the context might express the physical idea of seeing, Od. 4, 257., belongs, like all the other cases, to $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \nu \alpha i$; "thou wilt there know the most illustrious of the Phæacians." The later poets were the first, from misunderstanding perhaps the Homeric language, to use είδω in the exact sense of to see; είδομες, as a present, Theorr. 2, 25., or they formed from the aorist ideir a new future, apá y' idnow avrár, ib. 3, 37.

But there is one part of the verb which really belongs to $\varepsilon i \delta \omega$, video, viz. the Epic middle $\varepsilon i \delta o \mu a \iota$, $\varepsilon i \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, used exactly as the Latin verbs appareo and videor, as at II. ϑ , 555. a, 228. μ , 103.; and by a particular deviation it is joined with a dative in the sense of to be like to, $\varepsilon i \delta \dot{o} \mu \varepsilon v \sigma c$ 'Aκάμαντι, II. ε , 462. $\varepsilon i \sigma \sigma \tau \sigma v i$ Πριάμοιο, β, 791.

As $\epsilon i \delta \omega$ had originally the digamma, which we see in *videre* and the frequent hiatus in Homer before $\epsilon \bar{l} \delta o_c$, $l \delta \epsilon \bar{l} \nu$, $\epsilon l \delta \epsilon \nu a_i$, &c., it had also the syllabic augment. This is the true explanation of the aor. $\epsilon \bar{l} \delta o \nu$, $l \delta \epsilon \bar{l} \nu$, in the common language; thus $\epsilon \bar{l} \delta \omega$, $\bar{\ell}$ --*i dov*, $l \delta \epsilon \bar{l} \nu$, like $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega$,

analogy. It is easy enough to conjecture that Herodot. wrote $\eta \epsilon i \delta \epsilon \epsilon$; but the various reading $\eta \delta \epsilon \epsilon$, from which this must be deduced, is very doubtful. The best manuscripts have $\check{\eta} \epsilon_i \delta \epsilon_i$, the others $\epsilon_i \delta \epsilon_i$.

έλιπον, λιπεῖν: and (after the total disappearance of the digamma) by contraction εἶδον. This $\epsilon\iota$ is therefore different from that in the pres. είδω, where it was added to strengthen the radical syllable $i\delta$ - as in $\lambda\epsilon i \pi \omega$ from $\lambda\iota\pi$ -. Hence in the Epic language the aor. εἰσάμην occurs with that augment ἐεισάμην. But Homer has also the particip. ἐεισάμενος, Il. β, 22., and Pindar (Nem. 10, 28.) ἐειδόμενος, for which it is necessary to suppose a theme ἐείδω, as such an ε is found in many verbs which had the digamma according to the analogy of ἐθέλω.*

Eixá $\zeta \omega$, *I conjecture*, is regular, except in sometimes taking the augment, contrary to the analogy of verbs in ϵ_i ; thus $\epsilon i \varkappa \alpha \sigma \alpha$, $\epsilon i \varkappa \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha i$, Att. $\check{\eta} \varkappa \alpha \sigma \alpha$, $\check{\eta} \varkappa \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha i$. See Moer. 182. and compare Ruhnk. ad Tim. v. $\epsilon i \varkappa \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega v$. In Plato it is found thus augmented in good manuscripts. See the following.

Eⁱx ω , I yield, is regular, and like other verbs in ε_i does not take the augment : thus imperf. ε_i ix ω ; aor. 1. ε_i iz α , where the place of the augment is supplied by the accent. The same is still visible in many compounds ; thus $d\pi\varepsilon_i\rho\gamma\varepsilon_i$ can only be the imperat. of $d\pi\varepsilon_i\rho\gamma\omega$, the imperfect is $d\pi\varepsilon_i\rho\gamma\varepsilon_i$. 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 to omit it entirely, writing iz ε_i , $\varepsilon\phi_i z_{\varepsilon_i}$, $\delta\pi\delta\varepsilon_i$ in Wolf's Homer, though he reads in every instance iz ε_v and $\varepsilon\phi_i z_{\varepsilon_i}$. See Etym. M. v. $\varkappa\alpha\beta\eta\sigma\tau_0$.

Homer has the fut. midd. Il. a, 294. Od. μ , 117.; for at Il. δ , 62. $\frac{\delta}{\pi\sigma\varepsilon(\xi_0\mu\varepsilon_V)}$ 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. ult. On ε ikabov see $\frac{\partial}{\partial}\mu$ under $\frac{\partial}{\partial}\mu$ vw.

Eixo. We never find the present of this verb in the sense of to be like to, to appear, but the perf. 2. žouza + with the force of a present is used in its stead; pluperf. žouza+.

* Thus ἐέλδομαι, ἐέλπομαι, ἐέργω,ἐἴσκω.

and in Homer (II. v, 102.) once, 3. pl. $\dot{\epsilon}oix\epsilon\sigma\alpha v$; perf. infin. $\dot{\epsilon}oix\epsilon\nu\alpha i$, part. $\dot{\epsilon}oix\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $-oi\alpha$, $-\delta\varsigma$, beside which Homer has once $\epsilon\dot{i}oixoi\alpha i$, II. σ , 418. The Attics preferred a sisterform of this part. $\epsilon\dot{i}x\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ (like $\dot{\epsilon}oi\delta\alpha$, $\dot{\epsilon}oi\delta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $\epsilon\dot{i}\delta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$), particularly in its neuter $\epsilon\dot{i}x\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, although $\dot{\epsilon}oix\delta\varsigma$ still remained always a good form. Homer has once $\epsilon\dot{i}x\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, II. ϕ , 254. and very frequently the fem. $\epsilon\dot{i}xvi\alpha$: the Ionics, but not Homer, always use $\deltaix\alpha$, $\deltaix\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $\deltaix\delta\varsigma$. Fut. $\epsilon\dot{i}\xi\omega$ (Aristoph. Nub. 1001.).

The same abbreviation which we find in $\epsilon i \kappa \omega'_{\mathcal{L}}$ takes place on account of the metre in other forms of this perfect; as $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon \nu^*$, he is like (Aristoph. Av. 1298.), $\pi \rho o \pi \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ (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 $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon$ (II. σ , 520.) is imperf., and the only instance of the pres. or imperf. of $\epsilon i \kappa \omega$.

Of the syncopated forms of this perfect we find $\xi_{0i\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu}$ for $\xi_{0i\kappa\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu}$ in Soph. and Eurip., $\xi_{i\kappa\tau\sigma\nu}$ 3. dual for $\xi_{0i\kappa\alpha\tau\sigma\nu}$, Od. δ , 27., and $\xi_{i\kappa\tau\eta\nu}$ 3. dual pluperf. for $\xi_{\omega\kappa\epsilon i\tau\eta\nu}$, 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. $\eta_{i\kappa\tau\sigma}$, and without the augm. $\xi_{i\kappa\tau\sigma}$, II. ψ , 107. \ddagger . The perf. $\xi_{i\gamma\mu\alpha\iota}$ is found in composition in the post-Homeric poets, but with an irregular augment: thus $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\eta_{i\xi\alpha\iota}$ Eurip. Alc. 1066., $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\eta_{i\kappa\tau\alpha\iota}$ Hesych.§.

radical vowel ϵ , and the ϵ at the beginning is the syllabic augment instead of the reduplication, like $\epsilon a \gamma a$ and some others; thus $\epsilon t \kappa \omega \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa a$, $\epsilon \gamma \gamma \omega \epsilon \delta \rho \kappa a$, like $\delta \epsilon \rho \kappa \omega$ $\delta \epsilon \delta \delta \rho \kappa a$. Again in the three pluperfects ϵo -would by the temp. augm. be ηo -, which again by Attic and Ionic analogy would become $\epsilon \omega -$, as $\chi \rho \delta \phi \mu \alpha i$, Ion. $\chi \rho \epsilon \omega \mu \alpha i$, $\gamma \eta \delta s$, Att. $\nu \epsilon \delta s$, and many others. ***** [Whether the perf. $\epsilon t \kappa \alpha$ be a good

* [Whether the perf. εἶκα be a good Atticism or not, has been doubted; see Piers. ad Moer. p. 148. or Brunck Aristoph, Nub. 185.—Passow.]

+ Compare the same thing in εγρήγορα - εγρηγόρθαι.

‡ In order to understand clearly the augment of the pluperf. in these forms έφκει and ήϊκτο, we must recollect that this is not the way of writing them which existed in Homer's time. E'/ $\kappa\omega$ is one of those verbs which had originally the digamma; the perfect therefore with the reduplication was FE-FOIKA, consequently $\epsilon\omega/\kappa\epsilon_i$ was in his language FE-FOI-KEI, and $\epsilon\omega/\kappa\tau_0$ $\eta/\omega/\kappa\tau_0$ were FEFIKTO EFEFIKTO; which forms, if substituted for the others, suit the verse in every instance, by merely throwing aside occasionally a separable ν , as in II. ψ , 107.

§ These forms appear to have arisen out of the old Epic $\#\kappa\tau_0$ by analogies imperfectly understood. For if it were wished to form at once from $e^{i\kappa\omega}$, without going through the perfect $\delta_{0i\kappa\alpha_i}$ a perf. pass. $\#\mu\mu_i$, in order to resolve it into $\#^*\mu_i$, in order to resolve it

G

Lastly we have a complete deviation from the 3. plur. of the perf. in the Attic form $\epsilon i \xi \alpha \sigma \iota$, 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 $i\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota$, 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 σ sometimes appears and sometimes disappears between the stem of the verb and the termination, so the 3. plur. $-\alpha \tau \tau\iota$, $-\alpha\sigma\iota$ had a more complete ending $-\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\iota$, $-\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$, of which these two forms are chance remains.†

To this stem or root belong also $i\sigma\kappa\omega$, $i\delta\sigma\kappa\omega$, which see in their places.

Eἰλύω, I envelope: fut. εἰλῦσω; perf. pass. εἰλῦμαι; aor. 1. part. εἰλυσθείς, Hom. Post-Hom. εἰλῦσα, Com. ap. Athen. 7. p. 293. d.

regulates such cases would be destroyed without sufficient reason. Whilst a language 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 latergrammarian-poets.

* If we compare the different forms arising out of the two perfects tours and otoa, we shall find a very close analogy between them. From elko, elbo, came $ξ_{0iκa}$, $ξ_{0iδa}$; of the former a shortened form olka is found in the Ionic dialect, of the latter olda was in common use: the one has a part. elkás, the other elbás. Of *toura* the pluperf. (with the augm. after the analogy of $top \tau d\zeta \omega$, $top \tau d\zeta v$) was $top \tau d\zeta v$; but there existed also the regular pluperf. with merely the ou shortened, as is clear from the 3. pluperf. pass. *ἤ*ικτο (without the augm. *ἕικτο*), which must come from a perf. čiyµaı, pluperf. ήτγμην. In the same way from ϵοιδα
came the pluperf. (ήτδειν) ήδειν. By
syncope from ϵοικα were formed ϵοιγμεν and therny; from olda-(old-oba) olova, ίδμεν, ίσμεν, ίστε; and in the pluperf. from ήδειν-ήσμεν, ήστε, ήσαν. From this hoar (for ho-oar) comes therefore the Homeric loav (for 18-0av) by the mere omission of the augment: so that it is not necessary to suppose for this single word that Homer was acquainted with longu, of which there is no other instance. And lastly,

čoικα - (oi into i, čtκ-σασιν) είξασιν,

olda - (oi into i, id-oaoiv) loaoiv :

both Attic forms instead of the regular $\delta o (\kappa a \sigma v \nu, \sigma \delta \delta a \sigma v \nu)$, and both terminating in $\sigma v \nu$, according to a mutual analogy, in which they differ from all other perfects. Whereas if this 3. plur. came from $\delta \sigma \eta \mu$, why is it not accented like $\delta \sigma \tau \tilde{a} \sigma \tau$, and lengthened in the Ion. dialect like $\delta \sigma \tau \dot{e} - a \sigma \tau$?

+ The great difference between the terminations of the principal and of the historic tenses " is this, that by the augment e and the consequent throwing back of the accent toward the beginning of the word, the terminations of the latter were shortened; e.g. τύπτ-οντι (Dor. for -ουσι), έτυπτ-ov; and consequently from the historic ending our we may conclude that there was in the principal tenses the ending -σαντι (-σασι). In this remark I agree exactly 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 m; namely, that in the most ancient mode of inflexion the 3. plur. of the pres. and imperf. ended thus, $\tau \iota \theta \dot{\epsilon} \cdot \sigma a \nu \tau \iota$, $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \dot{\iota} \theta \epsilon \cdot \sigma a \nu$. The σ in the former dropped out, leaving τιθέαντι τιθέασι, which were shortened to τιθείσι τιθέντι.

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.]

Eilliopai, I drag myself along, crawl along, Soph. The pass. $i \lambda v \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} v a \iota$, used in Homer with the single ϵ , is distinct from the above, and means, 1.) to compress or draw oneself up together, II. ω , 510. Od. ι , 433. 2.) to be thrust or pushed, II. ψ , 393. The old Homeric language seems to have made a distinction between the forms beginning with ϵi and those with $\dot{\epsilon}$, 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.

Είλω, είλλω or είλλω, ίλλω, and εἰλέω or εἰλέω, I press together, shut in, envelope, roll up: all the remaining forms, which occur in the common language, come exclusively from the form in έω; as, εἰλήσω, εἰλημαι, εἰληθείς.

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. $\epsilon i\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu$ and the part. pass. $\epsilon i\lambda\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$, the rest of the formation comes from the simple stem or root $E\Lambda-$; as, the 3. pl. aor. 1. $\epsilon\lambda\sigma\alpha\nu$, the infin. $\epsilon\lambda\sigma\alpha\iota$, and (according to the analogy mentioned above in $\epsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma^*$) $\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\sigma\alpha\iota$; also the part. $\epsilon\dot{\lambda}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ with the meaning of to strike, on which, and on the relation which this verb bears to $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\dot{\nu}\nu\omega$, $\eta\lambda\alpha\sigma\alpha$, see art. 44. in Buttm. Lexil. Perf. pass. $\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\mu\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$.

To this verb and to the same simple stem or root belong, according to all analogy, the aor. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \nu$ and the 3. pl. without augm. $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \nu$ (Il. χ , 12.), infin. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \nu \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$, part. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \ell \epsilon$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \nu$. Compare $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$, $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \nu$, and $\kappa \epsilon \ell \rho \omega$, $\ddot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \rho \sigma \alpha$, $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \nu$. Here also the aspirate is uncertain, and the editions and passages vary between the lenis and $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \nu$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \nu \alpha \iota^+$, &c.

The imperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\lambda\epsilon\iota$ in Pind. Pyth. 4, 414. (according to Boeckh's undisputed emendation) and the pluperf. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\lambda\eta\tau\sigma$ in Apollon. 3,

+ Some of the Grammarians, principally the more modern, class these forms by themselves under a theme AΛHMI, which they join partly with $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \omega \mu \alpha$, partly with $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \alpha$, conferti, &c., but genuine grammatical tradition agrees with our statement. See Buttm. Lexilogus.

G 2

^{*} See the conclusion of Elow.

471. are sister-forms of $\epsilon i\lambda \epsilon_{\iota}$ and $\epsilon i\epsilon \lambda \tau_{o}$ with the meaning of to press upon, disturb, which bear the same relation to $E\Lambda\Omega$, $\epsilon i\lambda\omega$, as $\tau \rho o \mu \epsilon \omega$ does to $\tau \rho \epsilon \mu \omega$, $\epsilon \kappa \tau \delta \tau \eta \kappa a$ to $\kappa \tau \epsilon \ell \tau \omega$, 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, $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, as it was once written, or $\pi\rho\sigma\nu\sigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, as we find it in authorities on which we can depend. This latter pronunciation arose from the digamma which was originally between the σ and ϵ . There occur but two examples of it with the form of the present, viz. $\pi\rho\sigma\nu\sigma\epsilon\lambda\sigma\tilde{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu$, Aristoph. Ran. 730., and $\pi\rho\sigma\nu\sigma\epsilon\lambda\sigma\tilde{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_c$, Æschyl. Prom. 435. For a full account of it see Buttm. Lexil. p. 494.

Είμαρται. See Μείρομαι.

Ei μ i, *I* am, a defective verb in μ i, from a radical form E Ω . Beside the pres. and an imperf. $\tilde{\eta}\nu$, it has only a fut. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\rho\mu\alpha$, Poet. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$; the other tenses are supplied by $\gamma i \gamma \nu \rho \mu \alpha i$; verbal adj. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau \epsilon \rho \nu$. From the middle comes the 2. sing. imperat. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma$, Epic and also Dor. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\sigma$; and the 1. sing. imperf. $\check{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$, 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 $\check{\epsilon}i\alpha\tau\sigma$ for $\check{\eta}\nu\tau\sigma$, Od. ν , 106., where however others read $\epsilon'i\alpha\tau\sigma$.

The 1. pers. sing. $i\mu\mu$ was Dor. for $\epsilon i\mu$: the 2. sing. pres. ϵi_{σ} is only Ionic (Hom. and Herodot.), from which by leaving out the σ came the common ϵi : $i\sigma\sigma i$ is Dor. and Ion., nor is it quite unknown to Attic poetry, Eur. Hel. 1246. The 3. pers. $i\nu\tau i$ is Dor. for both $i\sigma\tau i$ and $\epsilon i\sigma i$. The 1. plur. $\epsilon i\mu\epsilon\nu$ is Ion. as $\epsilon i\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ is Dor. for $i\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$, from which comes the unusual poetical form $i\mu\epsilon\nu$, Brunck. Soph. El. 21. The 3. plur. $\epsilon i\sigma\epsilon\nu$ is Epic for $\epsilon i\sigma\epsilon\nu$: the Dorics have also $\epsilon o\nu\tau\epsilon$.

In the Ionic dialect the part. the conj. and the optat. are formed from the theme E Ω , by which the part. has the same irregular accent as the part. $i\omega\nu$ from $\epsilon i\mu$, thus

Optat. čoum: conj. čw: part. čών.

This participle has in some Doric writers a particular feminine $\epsilon a \sigma \sigma a$. The conj. is sometimes in the Epics strengthened by the diphthong ϵ_i , as $\epsilon i \omega$, $\epsilon i \eta \varsigma$, $\epsilon i \eta$ (from which it is often confused with the optative), II. ϵ_i , 245. σ , 88. Od. o, 448. ρ , 586.; $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon i \omega$, II. ψ , 47.‡. In the optative the

* These two forms (ἐόλει, &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 Phryn. p. 152. Schæf. ad Long. p. 423. ‡ Compare Herm. de Legg. quibusd. subül. Serm. Hom. 1. p. 16. Matth. Gr. Gramm. p. 415. Schæf. Hes. Op. 538. 567. p. 238. Gnom. Gr. abridged forms $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \tau \epsilon$, are more rare than the others; $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu$ is found however in Plat. Rep. 8. p. 558. d., and has been restored by Bekker in some other passages: $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \tau \epsilon$ occurs in Od. ϕ , 195., and the dual $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \tau \eta \nu$ is found, according to Bekker, in several passages of Plato.

The 3. sing. of the imperat. $\eta\tau\omega$ for $\xi\sigma\tau\omega$ is found frequently in the N. T., e. g. 1 Cor. xvi. 22., and once in Plat. Rep. 2. p. 361. c. which is the more striking as he so frequently uses $\xi\sigma\tau\omega$. The 3. plur. has also an unusual sister-form (corresponding with the gen. plur. particip.) $\delta\nu\tau\omega\nu$, Plat. Leg. 9. p. 879. b. Ionic and Dor. $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\nu\tau\omega\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\tau\omega$.

In the infin. we find in the old Ionic $\xi \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\xi \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$, $\xi \mu \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\xi \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$; the last is the most common in Homer. The Dorics use $\tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$ or $\tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \varsigma$, both which are at the same time 1. pl. imperf. — also $\epsilon l \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\epsilon l \mu \epsilon \varsigma$, differing from 1. pl. pres. indic. only in the accent.

The imperfect has numerous sister-forms : e.g. from the radical form EΩ the 1. sing. $\check{e}_{0\nu}$ for $\bar{\eta}_{\nu}$, Il. ψ , 643., but none of the other persons : έσκον, -ες, -ε, in Hom. is a mere imperf. as Il. η, 158., but in Herodot. a real iterative like the other forms in $-\sigma \kappa o \nu$: and lastly the true Ionic form according to the formation in μ_i , ϵ_a , ϵ_{ac} , and 2. plur. $\epsilon_{a\tau\epsilon}$; or lengthened $\tilde{\eta}_{\alpha}$, 3. sing. $\tilde{\eta}_{\epsilon\nu}^*$, Il. μ , 371. : $\tilde{\epsilon}\eta\nu$ occurs as 1. sing. in Il. λ , 762. only, where it is most probably false for $\ell o\nu$; but as 3. sing. it is more common, and found in Ionic prose; Homer has also sometimes $\eta \eta \nu$, and in 2. sing. $\epsilon \eta \sigma \theta a$ for $\eta \sigma \theta a$: the 3. plur. $\epsilon \sigma a \nu$ for $\eta \sigma a \nu$ occurs both in the older and later Ionic, as well as in the Doric dialect. In Hes. ϵ , 825. and 9, 321. $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ also appears to stand for $\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu$, but it is there rather a peculiarity of syntax. \dagger From the Ionic ϵa arose the old Attic 1. sing. $\frac{1}{\eta}$ for $\frac{1}{\eta}\nu$, which with regard to the extent of its usage requires still further critical examination.[†] For the 3. sing. $\frac{3}{4}\nu$ the Dorics have by a particular anomaly $\tilde{\eta}_{S}$. Poetical fut. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ for έσομαι, &c.; and from the Dor. έσοῦμαι comes έσσεῖται, Il. β, 393. v, 317.

All the persons of the pres. indic. are enclitical except the 2. sing. $\epsilon \overline{i}$, which always retains the accent; perhaps also $\epsilon \overline{i}_{c}$, used enclitically by Wolf in Od. δ , 611.

 $Eli_{\mu\iota}$, *I* go. The forms of this verb lead us to a root ' $I\Omega$, with its radical vowel ι occasionally lengthened to $\epsilon\iota$; and connected with which are many irregularities both of form and meaning. Only the following moods and tenses are in use:

‡ See Fisch. 2. p. 498, 499. Heind. ad Plat. Protag. 5. In which it is particularly remarkable that Chœrobosc. (MS. ap. Bekk. fol. 242. v. and 348. v.) proves from Aristoph. Plut. 29. and Menander, the usage of the 1. sing. $\tilde{\eta}_{\nu}$.

^{*} This form has always the ν , 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.

PART.	iw, &c. iévau iwv, iovau, ióy	(always with the accent	on the last syllable like	the part. aor. 2. in other	verbs).				
INFIN.	iévaı.								
CONJ.	iw, &c.					 	 		
OPTAT. CONJ. INFIN.	ioupu, &c.	OT	ioinv, &c.						
IMPERAT.	"00, "two	trov, irwv,	ίτε, ίτωσαν, οΓ	ióvrwv.†					
	Pres. S. $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \mu \iota$, $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \varsigma$ (generally * $\epsilon \bar{\iota}$), $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \sigma \iota(\nu)$,				1111. 1. μευν, 1.01. ηια, Δ.11. ηα, ητιρειτ. 5. ητιν ητα, Δ.11. ηα,			(The dual follows the analogy of the	

The Midd. (with the meaning of to hasten) is likewise used in pres. and imperf. ispan, itpny, and (like ispan from inμι) makes the imperat. icooS, &cc. Verbal adj. irós, iréos, or irnrós, irnréos.

* Homer has also $e_i\sigma\sigma\alpha_n$ II. r_i 450. + Instead of travaw Æschyl. Eumen. 32. has $trav_i$ the same as the dual, a circumstance which otherwise occurs only in the passive formation. Compare in $Ei\mu (-\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega v)$, and Elmsley on Markland's Iphig. T. 1480.

Plat. Tim. p. 26. c.d. Euthyphr. p. 4. d. according to the present corrected text.

§ See this form in a verse in Lucian. Alex. 29, where the text incor-

rectly has Tero. || The longer form is merely a lengthening of the shorter one by a repetition of the reduplication, like *Ervynos*. In the simple For verb the above verbals cannot well occur except in the neuter, iréov, irnτέον. Perhaps the only instance of iros is έξιτόν έστι, Hes. 3. 732. Thros see the compounds (elournros, avefirnros) in the lexicons. [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 $i\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, $i\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, &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 place of some tenses of $\xi_{\rho\chi o\mu a\iota}$ which are not much in use.

Homer has an infin. $i\mu\epsilon\nu$, and sometimes $i\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, for $i\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$: but $\epsilon i\nu\alpha\iota$ for $i\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ is doubtful, as $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon$ i $\nu\alpha\iota$ in Hes. ϵ , 351. may come from $\epsilon i\mu\ell$, Iam.[†] The 3. sing. opt. $\epsilon i\eta$ for ioi occurs in II. ω , 139. Od. ξ , 496. The conj. $\epsilon i\omega$ for i' ω is quoted from the Doric writer Sophron in the Etym. M. p. 121, 29. and 423, 23. Homer has contracted the Ionic imperf. $\eta i\alpha$, 3. sing. $\eta i\epsilon\nu$, $\eta i\epsilon$, to $\eta\epsilon$, II. and in 1. plur. to $\eta o\mu\epsilon\nu$, Od. : beside which we find the 3. plur. $\eta i\sigma\alpha\nu$, which, the 3. sing. $i\epsilon\nu$, $i\epsilon$, the 3. dual $i\tau\eta\nu$, and the 3. plur. $\eta i\sigma\alpha\nu$, which, though imperfects, have also the force of aorists. Lastly we find in the Epic poets a fut. midd. $\epsilon i\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$; and from the aor. midd. $\epsilon i\sigma \alpha \mu\eta\nu$ a 3. sing. $\epsilon i\sigma\alpha\tau\sigma$, $\epsilon i\epsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\sigma$, and a 3. dual $\epsilon i\epsilon\sigma\sigma\sigma\eta\nu$, II. o, 415. 544.[‡] A peculiar form, the 3. plur. pres. $I\sigma\iota$ for $i\alpha\sigma\iota$, is found in Theogn. 716.

Einteiv, to say, an aorist: indic. $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon v$; imperat. $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \S$, compound $\pi \rho \delta \epsilon i \pi \epsilon$, &c. Besides these the forms of the aor. 1. $\epsilon i \pi \alpha$ were also in use; in the Attic language the most common were $\epsilon i \pi \alpha \varsigma$, $\epsilon i \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon$, $\epsilon i \pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$, but these were constantly exchanged for the forms with the ϵ , so that after all the speaker appears to have been generally guided by his ear. The most unusual are the 1. sing. $\epsilon i \pi \alpha \parallel$, which is rather

* See these exceptions in Herm. de Æschyl. Danaïd. p. 8. § On the accentuation of this imperat. see the second note under $E_{p\chi o\mu as}$. It is used also for $\epsilon \pi e \tau \epsilon$, like $\delta \gamma \epsilon$, particularly by Aristoph, see Elmsl, Ach. 328. Reisig Conj. p. 35. Demosth. Phil. 1. p. 43, 7. Cherson. p. 108, 13.

Cherson, p. 108, 13, || Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 8. $ob\tau' \epsilon l\pi a \ ob\tau' \epsilon \pi o logar distribution di distributica distribution di distributica di distributi$

[†] Two other passages quoted also in confirmation of it (Herodotus 5, 108. Æschyl. Suppl. 300.), may be classed with that of Hesiod.

[†] I deduce διαειμένος (Apollon. Rhod. 2, 372.) rather from εἶμι, ἴεμαι, than from διῆμμ. A perfect είμαι from that verb is not more surprising than είσατο, καταείσατο, according to which it is formed.

Ionic, and the 2. sing. imperat. $\epsilon i \pi \sigma \nu$, which, with the optative*, is perhaps the rarest of all. The part. $\epsilon' \pi \alpha \varsigma$, $-\alpha \sigma \alpha$, $-\alpha \nu$ is peculiarly Ionic. The MIDD., which however occurs only in the compound $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon_{i}\pi\epsilon_{i}\nu$ (to refuse, to despair of) in the same sense as the active, has always the form of the aor. 1. $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon_{i}\pi\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha_{i}$. Fut. $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon_{\rho\rho}\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha_{i}$, Posidipp. Epigr. 2.

The 2. sing. imperat. $\epsilon i \pi o \nu$ has been accented always in the grammars and generally in the text of different writers thus, $\epsilon i \pi \delta \nu$; 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 EIIQ, with the augm. $\epsilon \iota$; but then it is very unnatural for this augment to continue through all the moods, while it is never visible in $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \pi \omega$ (see below). We certainly recognise the root EII- in the subst. $\epsilon \pi \sigma \varsigma$; but there is nothing to prevent the same root having been changed to EIII-. †

According to this the verb has in common language no augment: originally it had the digamma, and hence in the Epics the syll. augm. $\tilde{\epsilon}\epsilon_{\ell\pi\sigma\nu\nu}$. For the same reason the compounds have the hiatus, $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\epsilon\epsilon_{\ell}\pi\epsilon_{\ell}\nu$: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 130. note.

With this aorist $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu$ usage has joined, so as to form but one verb, the Ion. fut. $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$, Att. $\epsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$, from the pres. $\epsilon i \rho \omega$, which in the sense of *I* say is Epic ; also the perf. $\epsilon i \rho \eta \varkappa \alpha$, perf. pass. $\epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \alpha i$; and lastly the aor. pass. $\epsilon \rho \rho \eta \nu$, pronounced also $\epsilon \rho \rho \mu \alpha i$; and lastly the aor. pass. $\epsilon \rho \rho \eta \nu$, pronounced also $\epsilon \rho \rho \mu \alpha i$; but probably by those only who were not Attics. ‡ Verbal adj. $\epsilon \eta \tau \delta c$, $\epsilon \eta \tau \epsilon \delta c$. The fut. 3. (paulo-post fut.) $\epsilon i \rho \eta \delta \sigma \delta \mu \alpha i$, from $\epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \alpha i$, is used as a simple fut. pass. instead of $\epsilon \eta \delta \eta \delta \sigma \delta \mu \alpha i$, which is found but seldom in Attic writers (Isocr. Philipp. init.).

The pres. $\epsilon'_{i\rho\omega}$ occurs in Od. λ , 137. : and thence undoubtedly comes

* In Plat. Soph. p. 240. d. είπαιμεν has been restored from the best manuscripts. So has also είπαιεν in Demosth, c. Nicostr. p. 1254. This opt. is more frequent in Aristotle. There is also an instance of είπειε.

 \dagger See Buttm. Lexil. p. 131. The occurrence of $\xi \pi o \omega \sigma t$ (e. g. in Nicand. Ther. 738.) shows only the usage of a late grammarian-poet. [‡] This form is found written in various ways in the manuscript copies of the older writers: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 447. Bekker ad Æschin. 2, 34. 124. But the best manuscripts have it not unfrequently in its regular shape; see Plat. Gorg. 36. Theæt. 65.

§ This fut. appears to have been used only in its participle. Thuc. 8, 66. Plat. Phædr. 9. the fut. $i\rho\tilde{\omega}$. But the aor. pass. $i\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\eta\eta\nu$ points to a theme 'PEQ, to which we may refer the perf. $\epsilon''_{i\rho\eta\kappa\alpha}$ also, on account of the syllable $\epsilon\iota$ which stands instead of the reduplication.* The Ionians and the common prose language had also $\epsilon i\rho\dot{\eta}\theta\eta\nu$ or $\epsilon i\rho\dot{\epsilon}\theta\eta\nu$ (see Schweigh. Lex. Herod. in $\dot{\rho}\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$), in the same way as from $\epsilon''\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\iota\epsilon\dot{\lambda}\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$ crept into the non-Attic aorists $\epsilon i\lambda\dot{\eta}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, $\dot{\delta}\iota\epsilon\iota\dot{\lambda}\xi\eta\eta\nu$.†

By some $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$ 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 $\epsilon \rho \omega \mu \alpha$, which see.[‡] Yet Hesiod (9, 38.) has a verb $\epsilon i \rho \omega$ produced to $\epsilon \omega$, in which $\epsilon i \rho \epsilon \delta \sigma \alpha \iota$ is the fixed traditionary reading, though the metre would admit $\epsilon i \rho \omega \sigma \alpha \iota$ quite as well.

Φημi was used as the present of this verb, but with certain limitations, which will be seen under it: in the compounds however we find sometimes ἀγορεύειν (which properly means to harangue), e.g. ἀπαγορεύω, I forbid, ἀπεῖπον, I forbade; and sometimes λέγω, e.g. ἀντιλέγω, ἀντεῖπον.§

The expression with $\kappa \alpha \kappa \tilde{\omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$, to speak ill of, was treated in this respect as a compound; for instead of $\epsilon \tilde{l} \pi \epsilon \ \mu \epsilon \ \kappa \alpha \kappa \tilde{\omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$, the present was $\dot{a} \gamma o \rho \epsilon \dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon \ \kappa \alpha \kappa \tilde{\omega}_{\mathcal{S}}$.

The Epics have also an imperat. $\xi \sigma \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, which is a sister-form with σ inserted, as in $\lambda \delta \sigma \kappa \omega$ from $\lambda \alpha \kappa \epsilon \tilde{i} \nu$, $i \sigma \kappa \omega$ from $\epsilon \tilde{i} \kappa \omega$.

The poetical verb $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\epsilon}\pi\omega$, or $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\nu\dot{\epsilon}\pi\omega$, is shown in Buttm. Lexil. pp. 123. 131. to be no compound, but a strengthened form of the root or stem of $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \tilde{\iota}\nu$ (EMII- $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\epsilon}\pi\omega$, like AAK- AAEK-, OPF- $\partial\rho\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$). The imperf. (according to form) is $\check{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu$, $\check{\epsilon}\nu\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu$: the aor. $\check{\epsilon}\nu\iota\sigma\pi\sigma\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\iota}\sigma\pi\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\iota}\sigma\pi\sigma\iota\mu$; imperat. $\check{\epsilon}\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon$; fut. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\iota}\psi\omega$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\iota\sigma\pi\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$. Here the aorist as compared with the present is, by its long syllable, at variance with general analogy, but still not without example; see

* This syllable ϵ_i 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

είληφα from ΛΗΒΩ. See Λαμβάνω. είληφα from ΛΗΧΩ. See Λαγχάνω. είλοχα, είλεγμαι from λέγω.

+ We may indeed, as many do, form είρηκα from είρω, or even from the fut. ερέω, as a new theme by means of the augm. ε; but by the method which I have followed above, the perf. pass., the aor. pass., and the verbals ρημα, ρητόs, all agree together; and the grand analogy of the language is in favour of this plan. [‡] Struve has pointed out two passages in Hippocrates, viz. 8 $\gamma \delta \rho$ tr... $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$, I say, in Præcept. p. 64., and $\tilde{m} \epsilon \omega \nu$, they 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 presents sprung from the future, as $\mu a \chi \epsilon \omega$ - $\mu a i$; and $\tilde{m} \epsilon \omega$ is then a proof that the augm. $\epsilon \iota$ cannot be used in the way noticed in the preceding note.

§ Not that $\dot{a}\pi\eta\gamma\dot{o}\rho\epsilon\nu\sigma a$, $\dot{a}\nu\tau\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}a$, could not be used, but the compounds of $\epsilon\dot{l}\pi\sigma\nu$ were far more common.

είμαρται from μείρομαι.

έσπόμην under "Επομαι. The circumflex over ἐνισπεῖν* shows too that 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 ἐνίψω the σ is dropped, as in the fut. of διδάσκω and ἀλύσκω.† From this future was formed again another present ἐνίπτω in Pind. Pyth. 4, 358., which however must be distinguished from the Homeric ἐνίπτω, to revile, which see hereafter.

The preterites $\xi\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu$ and $\xi\nu\iota\sigma\pi\sigma\nu$ are always found without the augment, and where the metre would have required $\eta\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu$, there $\xi\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu$ was introduced. The double ν in $\ell\nu\epsilon\pi\omega$ is besides frequent in the Tragedians; but $\xi\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu$ seems not to occur, generally speaking, in their writings. We have supposed this preterite to be, in form, an *imperfect*, like $\xi\phi\eta\nu$ under $\Phi\eta\mui$: but in usage both are aorists, and the former is used in narration promiscuously with $\epsilon\hbar\sigma\nu$ and $\xi\nu\iota\sigma\pi\sigma\nu$: compare $\eta\delta\sigma$ under $A\delta\delta\omega$. Hence then we may explain the use of this form in the Hymn to Pan, 29., where $\xi\nu\epsilon\pi\sigma\nu$, answering to the preceding $\delta\mu\nu\epsilon\delta\sigma\iota$, stands for $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\sigma\sigma\iota$. 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 $\xi\kappa\lambda\nu\sigma\nu$, II. a, 218.

The Grammarians deduce from $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon i\nu$ a twofold imperative, $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon$ and $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon g$. If this latter be genuine, we must suppose $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon i\nu$ to be a compound \ddagger , perhaps of $i\nu i$ and $\sigma\pi\epsilon i\nu$, which would then correspond in form with $\sigma\pi\epsilon i\nu$ from $i\pi\omega$, and of which the imperat. would be $\sigma\pi\epsilon g$, as from $\sigma\chi\epsilon i\nu$, $\sigma\chi\epsilon g$. See the Etym. M. v. $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon\nu$, Schol. Od. ξ , 185. Some manuscripts have also $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon g$ or $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon g$ (for the accent is uncertain) wherever the word stands at the end of the verse; on the other hand at Od. δ , 642. in the middle of the verse $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon$ could be the only reading. I would observe however that the aor. $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\nu$ as a compound is contrary to analogy, for in that case it ought to be $i\nu\epsilon\sigma\pi\sigma\nu$, like $i\pi\epsilon\sigma\chi\circ\nu$; and further, that in the two passages of the Iliad, λ , 186. ξ , 470., where the Cod. Ven. has in the text $i\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon c$, the scholium does not mention this reading, but has in the lemma (as far as

* See Od. γ . 93. Eurip. Suppl. 435. In Hes. 5. 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 $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \psi \omega$.

‡ The above observation is grounded on

this circumstance, that we find in the common dialects merely such monosyllabic imperatives as $\partial \xi_s$, $\delta \delta s$, ξ_s , $\sigma \chi \xi_s$, $\phi p \xi_s$, with their compounds. To prove *Evara*s to be no compound by comparing it with $\zeta a \tau \xi_s$, $\partial \gamma \xi_s$, 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. the lemmata of Villoison are to be depended on) $\ell \nu \iota \sigma \pi \epsilon$. I would not therefore recommend the adoption of this form with a view to strengthen the last syllable of the hexameter.

Elpyw, I shut out, Elpyvou, I shut in, are distinguished from each other in their tenses merely by the breathing ; thus, $\epsilon i \rho \xi \omega$, $\epsilon i \rho \xi \alpha$: $\epsilon i \rho \xi \omega$, $\epsilon i \rho \xi \alpha$. This verb, according to the analogy of verbs beginning with *e*, does not take the augment, which is supplied by the accent: see $E'_{\varkappa\omega}$, I yield. For είργαθον see 'Αμύνω, αμύναθον.

The Ionic form of this verb is $\xi_{\rho\gamma\omega}$, $\xi_{\rho\xi\alpha}$, &c.*; which in the oldest language, as we shall see below, had the digamma, and consequently corresponded exactly with the same stem or root under $\delta \epsilon \zeta \omega$. 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. ξ , 411. was to shut in, rac $\mu \epsilon \nu$ (the swine) άρα ἕρξαν κατὰ ήθεα. Originally therefore the meaning of the verb 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 of Herodotus the distinction is observed, e. g. 3, 136. τούς Πέρσας έρξε ώς κατασκόπους έόντας, and no doubt from old tradition : whence the same writer has ἑρκτή for the Att. εἰρκτή, a prison. In the Attic and 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.+ Nor is ἀπείργειν (with the exception of $\ddot{a}\phi\epsilon\rho\kappa\tau\sigma_{0}$ in the last note) ever found with a ϕ ; on the contrary, the compound with $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha}$, the most usual in the sense

* It is singular to find this form in Thucyd. 5, 11. where $\pi \epsilon \rho i \epsilon \rho \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ is the reading of all the known manuscripts except one which has a; for in all the

except one which has e; for in all the other passages of this writer we find the diphthong. We may however compare with it &φερκτos in Æschyl. Choeph. 444. + This is also proved in various in-stances 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 eloyw without exception (see

Bekker on Thuc. 1, 35.): the reason of which was, that other grammarians as-cribed $\epsilon_{l}^{\nu}\rho_{\nu}\omega$ without distinction to the Attics, but $\epsilon_{l}^{\nu}\rho_{\nu}\omega$ to the *kouvoîs* (see Etym. M. 377, 48.), as is indeed the case in many other words. And certainly $\check{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\rho$ κτοs, shut out, quoted in the last note from Æschylus, 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 ϑ ; while in Thucyd. 1, 76., where $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon i \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ has the general sense of to constrain, heep down by force, the τ stands without a various reading. Further, that the sense of shutting in is expressed by the pres. $\epsilon i \rho \gamma \nu \nu \mu$, is evident from the grammarian above mentioned, who observes that " $\epsilon i \rho \gamma \nu$ in the present is not used;" for $\epsilon i \rho \gamma \omega$ is a very common present.

As to the digamma, the same conclusion results from the Epic augment in *ἕεργον*, *ἐέργνν*, and again from the Epic sister-form (with its superfluous ϵ in the present) $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega$, in the same language, from which is contracted the common $\epsilon'_{i\rho\gamma\omega}$.* The digamma is therefore very easily to be discerned in Od. ξ , 411. Tag $\mu \epsilon \nu$ apa $\epsilon \rho | \xi a g \dots$, and in the Epic compound ἀποέργει. The Homeric perf. pass. ἔεργμαι, 3. plur. pluperf. έέρχατο 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 reduplication is inadmissible, because in Od. ĸ, 241. it is preceded by a consonant, in Il. ϵ , 89. by a shortened diphthong. These two passages belong however to the numerous instances where the digamma has disappeared from our Homer. The forms Epxara, Epxaro, are much more striking, particularly in Od. 4, 221. K, 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 $\tau\epsilon i \chi a \tau a \iota$ were put for τετεύχαται) is never the case. Hence in the history of the digamma, and its gradual disappearance, this verb would be a remarkable feature. The form $\xi_{\rho\gamma}a\tau a\iota$ supposes the theme $\xi_{\rho\gamma}\omega$ to have the common lenis, 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.

Εἰρύω. See Ἐρύω.

Είρω. See Είπεῖν.

Eipw, I string in a row: aor. 1. $\epsilon \tilde{l} \rho a$ (Herodot. 3, 87. $\tilde{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon l \rho a \varsigma$, exserens) and $\tilde{\epsilon} \rho \sigma a$ (Hippocr. de Morb. 2, 33. $\delta \iota \tilde{\epsilon} \rho \sigma a \varsigma$). Perf. pass. in the Epic poets $\tilde{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \mu a \iota$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \mu \tilde{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \varsigma$; in Herodot. 4, 190. $\tilde{\epsilon} \rho \mu \tilde{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \varsigma$. In the former the digamma is not obliterated; for in the only two passages where the pluperf. $\tilde{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \tau \sigma$, and the perf. $\tilde{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \mu \tilde{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \sigma$ cocur (Od. o, 460. σ , 296.), it is

* Once in the text of our Homer we find $\epsilon l \rho \gamma \omega$ (II. ψ , 72.), $T \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \mu \epsilon \epsilon l \rho \gamma o \nu \sigma_i$, but it is indisputably a false reading : for as $\epsilon l \rho \gamma \omega$ is contracted from $\epsilon \ell \rho \gamma \omega$, it cannot have had the digamma, which the hiatus before the verb shows to have been in the verse ; for $\epsilon \ell \rho \gamma \omega$, i.e. $E^{+} EP \Gamma \Omega$, has

it not before the first ϵ ; compare II. β , 825. $\epsilon \nu \tau \delta s \epsilon \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota$. Bentley's emendation of this passage is, therefore, certainly correct, μ , $\epsilon \epsilon \rho \gamma o \nu \sigma \iota$.

† The augment is occasionally omitted in syllables naturally long, as $\epsilon \nu \tau \nu \epsilon$, $\epsilon \lambda \kappa \epsilon$, $\epsilon \lambda \pi \epsilon \tau o$, $\delta \rho \chi \epsilon$, $\delta \pi \tau \epsilon \tau o$. preceded by the separable ν . 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 $i \nu \epsilon_{\nu} \rho_{\mu} \epsilon_{\nu} \sigma_{\sigma} \pi i \delta a_{\alpha} \sigma_{\sigma}$, consequently with the augm. ϵ_{i} ; although it may be taken for the unchanged diphthong of the present, as in the verbal subst. $\epsilon_{i} \rho_{\mu} \delta \sigma_{\sigma}$, on the aspirate of which see Buttm. Lexil. p. 300. For $\dot{a}\pi \delta \epsilon_{\rho\sigma} \epsilon$ see "Epsa.

Είσα. See ΈΩ, 2.
Ἐίσκω. See «Ισκω.
Είωθα. See «Εθω.
ἘΛ-. See Αἰρέω.
ἘΛ-. See Είλω.

Ἐλαύνω, I drive: fut. ἐλάσω with a short, Ep. ἐλάσσω; aor. 1. ἤλασα, Poet. ἐλασα, ἐλασσα; perf. ἐλήλακα, perf. pass. ἐλήλαμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἠλάθην: verbal adj. ἐλατός. In non-Attic writers the passive takes a σ , as ἐλήλασμαι, ήλάσθην, ἠλαστός. The forms ἐλῶ, ἐλᾶς, ἐλᾶ, &c., infin. ἐλᾶν, are in the Attic prose a future, according to the analogy of verbs whose futures end in -ἄσω or -έσω, and which form a new Attic future by rejecting the σ and contracting the remaining termination, thus ἐλάσω, ἐλάω, ἐλῶ. See also last note under Δέμω. — MIDD.

The forms in $-\tilde{\omega}$, $-\tilde{q}c$, &c., occur also as presents from the simple theme $i\lambda \dot{a}\omega$. In prose however there is only one example, the imperat. $\dot{a}\pi i\lambda a$, Xenoph. Cyr. 8, 3, 32. In poetry there are several; $i\lambda\omega\nu$, Il. ω , 696., $i\lambda \dot{a}\mu\nu$, Od. o, 50., $i\lambda\tilde{a}$, Pind. Nem. 3, 129., $i\kappa\pi\sigma\delta\omega\nu$ $i\lambda a$, Eurip. Herc. 819.

In Od. η , 86. is a 3. plur. pluperf pass. $i\lambda\eta\lambda i\delta\alpha\tau o$, for which Wolf writes $i\rho\eta\rho i\delta\alpha\tau o$, 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 $i\lambda\alpha i\nu\omega$, as the expression is much the same as we find in v. 113. in II. σ , 564. and Od. ζ , 9. But the reading $i\lambda\eta\lambda i\delta\alpha\tau o$ is likewise found in very few manuscripts, while by far the majority has $i\lambda\eta\lambda i\delta\alpha\tau o$, and some $i\lambda\eta\lambda i\alpha\tau o$. This last has been adopted by Alter; and when we consider that it is the regular Ionic form, according to the analogy of $\pi\epsilon\pi\tau\tau i$ for $-\alpha\nu\tau\alpha i$, 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 $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{c}$, $\sigma\nu\nu\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{c}$, Arat. 176, like $\dot{\alpha}\kappa\eta\chi\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{c}$ (II. σ , 29.),

ἀκαχήμενος, and ἀλαλήμενος. See Herodian in Etym. M. v. ἀκαχήμενος and Thom. Mag. v. ἐληλάμενος. In Apollon. 2, 231. the modern editors have altered this accent, because it was not supported by a scholium, like the passage in Aratus. See note under ᾿Ακαχίζω.

^{*}E $\lambda\delta_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$ and $\ell\ell\lambda\delta_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$, *I desire*: a defective depon. used only in pres. and imperf. It is found once in a passive sense, Il. π , 494. Both forms are exclusively poetical.

Ἐλέγχω, I refute: fut. ξω; perf. with redupl. ἐλήλεγχα; perf. pass. ἐλήλεγμαι.

'Ελελίζω, I turn round, tremble : fut. $i\lambda\epsilon\lambda i\xi\omega$; aor. 1. $i\lambda\epsilon\lambda i\chi a$, aor. 1. pass. $i\lambda\epsilon\lambda i\chi\theta\eta\nu$, midd. $i\lambda\epsilon\lambda i\xi a\mu\epsilon\nu o g$, &c. 'Ελέλικτο (II. λ , 39.) is a syncopated aorist. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 287.

ΕΛΕΥΘ-, ΕΛΘ-. See "Ερχομαι.

'Ελίσσω, -ττω, I wind: augm. $\epsilon\iota$; perf. pass. ϵ ίλιγμαι and ϵ λήλιγμαι. In this last perf. three things are to be observed: 1.) that the simple augm. ϵ ίλιγμαι was also in use; 2.) that the augm. ϵ ι does not take place with the reduplication; 3.) that the syllable of reduplication does not admit of the aspirate. \ddagger

⁶Ελχω, I draw: fut, ξλξω; aor. 1. εἶλξα. It borrows also from a theme ΈΛΚΥΩ, which is not used in the pres. or imperf., and even in the fut. ξλξω is preferred: see Piers. ad Moer. p. 134. But in the aor. εῖλχὕσα, ἑλχύσαιis far more common than εἶλξα, and in the passive εῖλχυσμαι, εἰλχύσθην are the only forms in use.—MIDD.

The regular imperf. $\epsilon \tilde{\lambda} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ is never found in Hom. nor in Ionic prose, but always $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa \epsilon \nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa \epsilon \tau o$. The particular inflexion $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa \eta \sigma \omega$, $\eta \lambda \kappa \eta \sigma a$ (with η as augment), $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa \eta \theta \epsilon \ell c$, has in Homer the stronger meaning of to drag along.

"E $\lambda \pi \omega$, I encourage to hope: Od. β , 91. γ , 380. But it is generally used in the midd. $\check{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, I hope; perf. $\check{\epsilon}o\lambda\pi\alpha$ with the force of the pres.; pluperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\lambda\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$ with the force of an imperfect: see $\check{\epsilon}o\iota\kappa\alpha$ and note under $\Xi'\kappa\omega$; also the second note under "Ayvvµι, and a note in Buttm. Lexil. p. 202. The Epic forms are $\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\lambda\pi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\lambda\pi\sigma\mu\eta\nu$: see "E $\lambda\delta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ and note.

in prose : see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 30.

‡ In stating these rules we must however remember the rarity of this form, and that I know only some instances of it quoted by Maittaire from Pausanias.

^{*} Like ἐέλπομαι, ἐέργω, ἐειδόμενος, ἐἴσκω, which in the older language had the digamma.

⁺ It is however to be observed that this diphthong is found also in the present, and even, though not frequently,

'Ελύω. See Είλύω,

'Eμέω, *I vomit*, has ε in the inflexion and σ in the passive : it takes also the Attic reduplication.

[Æschylus has the fut. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\nu\sigma\mu\alpha$ in the sense of to vomit, while Xenoph. (Anab. 4, 8, 20.) has the imperf. act. in the same intrans. sense.]

'Εμνήμυκε. See 'Ημύω.

'Eναίρω, I kill: fut. ἐνἄρῶ; aor. 2. ἤναρον, Eurip.: infin. ἐναρεῖν. — MIDD. with aor. 1. ἐνηράμην, Hom. [This verb is not a compound: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 119.]

Ἐναύω. See Aὕω.

ΕΝΕΓΚ-, ΕΝΕΙΚ-. See Φέρω.

Ένέπω. See Είπεῖν.

'Ενήνοθα, 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 a sorist: thus $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\nu\eta\nu\sigma\theta\epsilon$, κατενήνοθε, it lies or it lay thereon. As a theme we must suppose ENOΩ, ENEOΩ: see this more fully explained in Buttm. Lexil. p. 110. &c.

Ένθειν, ήνθον. See "Ερχομαι.

[']Ενίπτω, I reproach, has in Homer two forms of the aor. 2., viz. 1.) ἐνένīπον, for which two false readings ἐνένιπτον and (II. ψ, 473.) ἐνένισπον have crept into the printed text of Homer, as I have shown in Buttm. Lexil. p. 123. &c. This form is the reduplicated aor. 2. with the radical vowel long, which we know from the subst. ἐνīπή was long in the root also. 2.) The 3. sing. $\eta ν i π \ddot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon$, formed by a peculiar reduplication in the middle of the word, like $\eta ρ i κ a κ c ν$, infin. ἐρυκακέειν, from ἐρύκω.

Homer has another sister-form $\ell \nu \ell \sigma \sigma \omega$, which bears the same relation to $\ell \nu (\pi \tau \omega \ as \ \pi \ell \sigma \sigma \omega \ to \ \pi \ell \pi \tau \omega$. 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 reproach; they must therefore be distinguished from $\ell \nu \ell \pi \omega$, $\ell \nu \iota \sigma \pi \sigma \nu$, and the Pindaric $\ell \nu \ell \pi \tau \omega$ (see under $E\nu \ell \pi \omega$); while the long ι above mentioned 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.

"Εννῦμι, or ἑννύω, I put on, clothe, forms its tenses from a theme 'ΕΩ; thus fut. ἕσω, Ep. ἕσσω; aor. 1. ἕσσα, infin. ἕσαι; fut. midd. ἕσομαι; aor. 1. midd. ἑσσάμην; perf. pass. εἶμαι, εἶσαι, εἶται, &c., whence 3. pl. pluperf. εἶατο (Il. σ, 596.), comp. ἐπιεῖμαι, ἐπιειμένος. From the pass. $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\eta\nu$ (which never occurs in its simple form in the first person), come the 2. and 3. sing. of the pluperf. $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\sigma$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\sigma$, and the compound $\eta\mu\phi\epsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, &c. The forms with the syllabic augment (which takes the aspirate), $\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$ (II. κ , 23., Od. ξ , 519.) and $\tilde{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\tau\sigma$ (II. μ , 464.), are Epic only.

The Ionics have another form $\tilde{\epsilon i} \nu \nu \mu i$; for $\tilde{\epsilon \pi \epsilon i} \nu \nu \sigma \theta a i$ in Herodotus proves that the ϵ_i in the Homeric $\tilde{\epsilon i} \nu \nu o \nu$ (II. ψ , 135.) is not the augment. The temp. augm. is found neither in the imperf. nor the aorist: the perf. only has the augment ϵ_i . 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$ is never used in prose, but principally the compound $\dot{a}\mu\phi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$, which make its fut. $\dot{a}\mu\phi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$, Att. $\dot{a}\mu\phi\iota\tilde{\omega}$; fut. midd. $\dot{a}\mu\phi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$; and takes the augment in the preposition, $\dot{\eta}\mu\phi\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha$, infin. $\dot{a}\mu\phi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$, pass. $\dot{\eta}\mu\phi\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\eta}\mu\phi\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\eta}\mu\phi\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$, &c., infin. $\dot{\eta}\mu\phi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. Nor do the other compounds generally reject the vowel of the preposition before the ϵ , as $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

Ἐόλει, ἐόλημαι. See under Είλω.

'Εορτάζω, I celebrate, solemnize : fut. ἑορτάσω; it takes the augm. in the second syllable ἑώρταζον, according to the analogy οθέοικα, ἐφκειν. See Είλω and note.

'Επαΐω, Herodot. 3, 29. See 'Αΐω. 'Επαυρεῖν, &c. See ΑΥΡ-.

 $E_{\pi \epsilon i \gamma \omega}$, *I press*; pass. *I hasten*. For proof that this verb is no compound, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 118.

Έπίσταμαι, I understand, depon. pass. with fut. midd.; imperf. ηπιστάμην: fut. ἐπιστήσομαι; aor. ηπιστηθην; verbal adj. ἐπιστητός. In the optat. the accent sometimes follows the regular conjugation of barytone verbs, e.g. ίσταιο, ίσταιτο, ίσταισθε, ίσταιντο; but the conj. is always ίστῶμαι, συνιστῆται, &c.* See Δύναμαι with note, and Ἱστημι.

This verb is distinguished from $i\phi(\sigma\tau a\mu a)$, the proper compound of $i\sigma\tau a\mu a$, by the π , by the augment, and by the aorist retaining the η of the formation before the θ .

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

* Yet the Ionic conj. is ἐπιστέωμαι, Herodot. 3, 134.

97

1081.) Gaisf. See Buttm. on Soph. Phil. 798. The usual form in the imperf. is $\eta \pi i \sigma \tau \omega$ and in the imperat. $i \pi i \sigma \tau \omega$, e. g. Xen. Mem. 3, 4, 9. Cyr. 3, 2, 16. See Moer. 163. 182. Homer has the imperf. without the augm. ἐπίστατο. The pres. and imperf. are conjugated like ἴσταμαι. 'ΕΠΩ, ένέπω. See Είπεῖν. mar handler off

"E $\pi \omega$, I am employed or busy about anything : imperf. είπον, Poet. without augm. έπον; fut. έψω; aor. έσπον, infin. σπείν, part. σπών; compound ἐπέσπον, ἐπισπείν, μετασπών. The augment is ει, as περιείπεν, Xen. Mem. 2, 9, 5. This verb in its simple form is found only in Il. ζ, 321.*, but its compounds are used both in verse and in prose, περιέπω, διέπω, &c.

These aorists seldom occur except in poetry : though Ionic prose has frequently περιέσπε, Herod. 1. 73., περισπείν, ib. 115., and the passive of the same compound περιεφθηναι, 5, 1. 6, 15., and περιέψεσθαι for περιεφθήσεσθαι, 2, 115. 7, 119.

Midd, Eropan, I follow: imperf. sinounv, and Poet. without augm. infount; fut. Edouar, infin. Edeobar. The aorist has this peculiarity that the augment is aspirated, έσπόμην, comp. έφεσπόμην (έσπου Plat. Polit. p. 280. b., έφέσπετο Eurip. Hipp. 1307.) †, and as a proof that it is merely the augm. it disappears in the other moods : infin. σπέσθαι, imperat. σποῦ, ἐπίσπου Plat. Theæt. p. 169. a., επίσπεσθε Plat. Crit. p. 107. b. &c. The Ion. imperat. 2. pers. is onéo, Ep. oneño, Il. x, 285.

If έσπον σπέσθαι and έσχον σχειν be compared with έπλε έπλετο and $\epsilon \pi \tau \delta \mu \eta \nu \pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha_i$, we see at once that the former arise from the same syncope as the latter. That is to say, the aspirate in $\xi \pi \omega$ and 'EX Ω ($\tilde{\epsilon}\xi\omega$) passed (as it does in so many other words) into a σ , which immediately attached itself to the consonants following, therefore έ-σπον, έ-σχον. This statement does not however militate against the insertion of a σ according to another analogy in the root 'EII, and thus $\delta\sigma\pi\delta\mu\eta\nu$, $\delta\sigma\pi\delta\sigma\theta\alpha$, $\delta\sigma\pi\omega\mu\alpha$, $\delta\sigma\pi\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$, became anomalous aorists.

* [Yet Homer has frequently $\pi\epsilon\rho \tau\epsilon \dot{\nu}\chi\epsilon$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \nu \sigma \nu \nu$, e. g. in Il. o, 555. $\delta \mu \phi'$ Όδυσηα $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \nu$, Il. λ , 483. and many other similar expressions, which Buttmann, it would seem, considered as compounds. - ED.]

+ A singular form is ἐπέσποντο in Pind. Pyth. 4, 237. which can hardly be joined with the Pindaric forms in the note following. In and the off of a poister of a

From these, and not from the $i\sigma\pi\delta\mu\eta\nu$ belonging to the former analogy, came the indicative which passed into the common language, while the other moods $i\sigma\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, &c., remained in the usage of the Epics (II. ϵ , 423. Od. μ , 349. II. μ , 395., &c.). But from the very circumstance of $i\sigma\pi\delta\mu\eta\nu$ being an aorist, the pres. $i\sigma\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ which is a various reading for $i\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ at Od. δ , 826. ought not to be allowed to displace the present old and unobjectionable reading of the text.*

'Εράω, *I love*, is used only in the pres. and imperf.; having a regular passive ἐρῶμαι, ἐρᾶσθαι, ἐρώμενος. But the sister-form ἔραμαι, like ἴσταμαι, is a deponent synonymous with the active, and in the pres. solely poetical. The aor. pass. however, ἡράσθην, fut. ἐρασθήσομαι, with an active sense, is used in prose; part. ἐρασθήσείς.

The Epic language has instead of $\eta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\eta\nu$ the midd. $\eta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$, whence $\eta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau\sigma$, Hom. $\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau\sigma$, Hes. and Pind. The perf. $\eta\rho\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, Parthen. The 2. pers. pres. Epic with double σ , $\epsilon\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$ occurs in Theocr. 1, 78. The Dor. conj. $\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ for $\epsilon\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ is accented according to the analogy of barytone verbs, Pind. P. 4, 164. compare $\epsilon\pi(\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\delta\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$. Lastly $\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\theta\epsilon$ in an act. sense, II. π , 208. is probably a false reading.⁺

'Eράω is used only in its compounds, and with the regular aor. 1. ἐξερᾶσαι, κατερᾶσαι, to pour or shoot out, συνερᾶσαι[‡], to pour or throw together.

'Εργάζομαι, I labour, work, depon. midd. : fut. έργά-

* See the note in Buttm. Schol. Od. ad h.l. Bekker in his critique on Wolf's Homer has ventured a conjecture that all those Epic moods, $\delta \sigma \pi \delta \sigma \theta a$, &c., have crept into Homer's poems by false readings, because in every instance the verse would admit $\delta \delta \sigma \pi o \mu \delta \nu o o$, $\delta \mu a \sigma \pi \delta \sigma \theta a$, &c., and that 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 $\delta \pi \sigma \pi \delta \sigma \theta a$, $\mu \epsilon \pi a \sigma \pi \delta \mu \epsilon o s$, 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 (O.8, 123. 9, 15. Isth. 4, 40.) as they are in the Alexandrine poets, 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.

† That is to say, the depon. $\xi pa\sigma\theta \epsilon$ is no more capable of resolution than $\overline{1}\sigma\tau a$ - $\sigma\theta \epsilon$, $\delta \dot{u}\nu a\sigma\theta \epsilon$, &c.; and $\epsilon p \hat{a}\sigma\theta \epsilon$ can be only passive. The reading must therefore necessarily be $\overline{\epsilon}ns \ \tau \sigma \pi \rho i\nu \ \gamma' \ \epsilon \rho d\sigma a\sigma\theta \epsilon$. [Passow however seems to think it may be defended by supposing a theme $\epsilon \rho d\sigma a$ - $\mu a \omega$ from which will come $\epsilon \rho \tilde{a} \pi a \omega$, Sappho Fr. 59. Theor. 2, 149.]

‡ Isocr. Phil. p. 110. b., as restored by Bekker. Aristot. de Gen. Animal. 3, 1. extr. σομαι; perf. εἰργασμαι, Ion. ἐργασμαι. The augm. is ει. [The Ion. and Att. generally use the perf. pass. εἰργασμαι in the act. sense of the aor. midd. εἰργασάμην, Valck. Phœn. 1069. Lob. Soph. Aj. 21., but this tense is also found as a true passive, e.g. τὰ ἐργασμένα, Herodot. 7, 53. compare Plat. Charm. p. 173. c. Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 9. Conviv. 5, 4. Œcon. 19, 8., &c. And even the indic. of this perf. is found in a passive sense, at least in its compound ἀπείργασται, Plat. Legg. 4. p.710. d. The fut. pass. ἐργασθήσομαι is seldom found with a really passive meaning which it has in Sophoc. Tr. 1218., Isocr. Epist. 6. — Passow.]

"Εργω. See Είργω.

²ΕΡΓΩ and ἕρδω. See 'Ρέζω.

Έρεείνω. See "Ερομαι.

'Ερέθω, *I excite*, *irritate*, is used only in pres. and imperf., but we find in Mosch. 3, 85. the aor. with augm. $i p_{\ell} \theta \sigma \nu$. Its derivative $i \rho_{\ell} \theta \ell \zeta \omega$ is more used.

Έρείδω, I support by placing one thing against another: fut. ἐρείσω, &c. It has the Att. redupl.; thus perf. act. ἐρήρειχα, perf. pass. ἐρήρεισμαι; of this latter Homer has the 3. plur. ἐρηρέδαται for ἐρηρεισμένοι εἰσί, Il. ψ, 284. 329. Od. η, 86. 95.; for which Apollon. Rh. uses ἐρήρεινται. Homer has the augm. only in ήρήρειστο, but Hes. a. 362. has ήρείσατο.—MIDD. I support myself; ἐρείδομενος, ἐρεισάμενος, &c. Hom.

'Ερείκω, I tear, break: imperf. ήρεικου; aor. 1. ήρειξα. Midd. I tear my clothes in pieces. Pass. I am torn or broken; perf. ἐρήριγμαι, Hippocr.

To the intransitive sense of the pass. (e. g. Il. ν , 441.) belongs the Epic aor. 2. act. $\eta_{\rho i \kappa o \nu}$, Il. ρ , 295.* Compare the last paragraph of $\Gamma \eta_{\rho \dot{\alpha} \omega}$.

Έρείπω, I overthrow : fut. έρείψω; aor. 2. ἤρἴπον; aor. 1. pass. ἤρείφθην; perf. 2. with Att. reduplication ἐρήρἴπα; perf. pass. ἐρήριμ-

* 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. Ætol, in Piers, ad Moer. p. 194. whose admirable emendation of the whole fragment was not understood by his neglecting in this verse to change καλόν into κακόν; διὰ μὲν κακόν ήρικεν οδσον.

н 2

μάι, and Ep. pluperf. 3. sing. ἐρέριπτο for ἠρήριπτο, Il. ξ, 15., but we find in Herodian Hist. 8, 2. κατερήρειπτο.

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. $\eta \rho \pi \sigma \nu$, and the perf. $\epsilon \rho \eta \rho \pi \sigma \sigma$ (see note under $T \epsilon i \chi \omega$), 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. $\epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \iota$, not $\epsilon \rho \iota \pi \delta \nu \tau \iota$, is the true reading.

The Epic midd. $\dot{a} \nu \eta \rho \epsilon_i \psi \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu$ belongs unquestionably to this verb, although in this compound its sense is somewhat different: Homer has frequently $\dot{a}\nu\eta\rho\epsilon i\psi a\nu\tau_0$, they have torn away, carried off, Il. v, 234. Od. δ , 727. &c. and Hesiod, ϑ , 990. has $\dot{a}\nu\epsilon\rho\epsilon i\psi a\mu\epsilon\nu\eta$, having carried off.+

'Ερέπτομαι, I feed, graze, eat, occurs only in the pres. and imperf. Later writers use ἐρέπτω for ἐρέφω like γλύπτω for γλύφω, δρέπτω for δρέφω, &c.; compare γλύφω. This form was long regarded with suspicion in Pind. P. 4, 240. but has been satisfactorily defended by Boeckh.

Ἐρέσσω, ττω, I row: fut. ἐρέσω; aor. 1. ἤρεσα, Poet. ἤρεσσα and ἔρεσσα, Il. 1, 361. Od. λ, 78. The compound διήρεσα occurs in Od. μ , 444. ξ , 351. From ἐρέτης and ἐρετμός we may conclude that its characteristic letter was τ.

'Ερεύγω. See 'Ερυγγάνω.

Έρεύθω, I make red: fut. ἐρεύσω; aor. 1. infin. ἐρεῦσαι. Also ἐρυθαίνω, whence ἐρυθαίνετο, he became red: purely Homeric forms. The subst. ἐρύθημα comes from the formation in -ήσω, which belonged to ἐρυθαίνω as it did to ἀλιταίνω, in which the termination -αίνω is a mere extension of the original present, according to the analogy mentioned

* Of this aorist $\eta \rho m \sigma \nu$, 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 $\eta \rho e m \sigma \nu$ 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 $\eta \rho e u \sigma n$, as he has $e \rho e u \sigma n$.

+ There are no grounds for the theme $\frac{\partial v_{FF}(\pi \pi w)}{\partial v}$ in the lexicons; nor must we be misled by the usage of this word in some later writers ($\frac{\partial v_{FF}}{\partial v}$) ($\frac{\partial v_{FF}}{\partial v}$).

in note under $Ai\sigma\theta \dot{a}\nu o\mu a\iota$. On the other hand in the later form $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\nu\theta a(\nu\omega)$, $-a(\nu\omega)$ is a derivative termination from $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\nu\theta\rho \delta c$, as $\lambda\epsilon\nu\kappa a(\nu\omega)$ is from $\lambda\epsilon\nu\kappa\delta c$ with the regular flexion $\lambda\epsilon\nu\kappa\tilde{a}\nu a\iota$, &c. And the Alexandrine poets treated $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\nu\theta a(\nu\omega)$ in the same way, e.g. $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\nu}\theta\eta\nu\epsilon$, Apollon. Rh. 1, 791. Compare $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta a(\nu\omega)$.

Ἐρέφω, I cover, crown: fut. ἐρέψω; aor. 1. ἔρεψα. MIDD. Eur. Bacch. 323. Aristoph. Vesp. 1294. See also Ἐρέπτω.

Έρέχθω, I torment, torture; used only in pres. and imperf. Έρέω. See Eiπεῖν and Έρομαι.

²Eρίζω, *I contend, dispute*: fut. ἐρίσω, Epic ἐρίσσω, Dor. ἐρίζω, &c. This verb has in the Epics a middle synonymous with the active, II. ε, 172. Od. δ, 80. Hes. 9, 534., to which belongs the perf. pass. with Att. reduplication ἐρήρισμαι*; while ἐριδήσασθαι, II. ψ, 792. probably does not belong to this verb, but comes from the pres. ἐριδαίνω, according to the analogy laid down in note under Αἰσθάνομαι: only that ἐριδήσασθαι in the passage above mentioned has the second syllable long; whence it has been written with double δ.†

^{*}EPOMAI, I ask: fut. $\epsilon \rho \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha i$; aor. $\eta \rho \delta \mu \eta \nu$, imper. $\epsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\nu}$ (not $\epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \rho \alpha i$), Ep. $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma \rho \alpha i$, opt. $\epsilon \rho \sigma \delta \mu \eta \nu$, conj. $\epsilon \rho \sigma \mu \alpha i$, infin. $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha i$ (not $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha i$), part. $\epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \rho c$. [This aor. is in common Attic use in all its moods, and the fut. is occasionally found in the best writers, Plat. Lys. p. 207. c. 211. d. Apol. p. 29. e. Xen. Hell. 4, 5, 6. but of the infin. pres. $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha i$ 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 $\epsilon \rho \omega \tau \alpha \omega$.—Passow.] Ionic prose has on the other hand a present $\epsilon \ell \rho \sigma \mu \alpha i$, of which

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, Aùràs γàp πάντων βασιλεύs και κοίρανός έστιν, 'Αθανάτων τέ ol ούτις έρηρισται κράτος ἕλλος.

+ This way of writing it Wolf has very

properly rejected : and thence we must conclude that the Greeks expressed this lengthening of the vowel, not by merely making it long (as from ℓ_{DS} ℓ_{DS} , 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 Grammurians, according to the Scholium in Heyne, had another reading $\ell_D \ell_D^{ch} \sigma \sigma \theta a.$ Compare the double way of writing $d \delta \eta \lambda os$ and $d \ell \eta \lambda os$ in Buttm. Lexil. p. 53. &cc.

н 3

the imperf. $\epsilon i \rho \delta \mu \eta \nu$ with its other moods $\epsilon i \rho \omega \mu \alpha i$, $\epsilon i \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha i$, &c., are, like the above, used as a rists : fut. $\epsilon i \rho \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha i$.

We often meet with the accentuation Eperodau, which is considered as a present ; but as we nowhere find an indicative "popul, "peral, &c., this is not conceivable. Now, as the manuscripts frequently give us the aoristic accentuation έρέσθαι, ἐπερέσθαι, 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. "έρομαι. Compare ήγρόμην in $\epsilon_{\gamma\epsilon(\rho\omega)}$ This supposition was very much supported by the actual existence of the Ionic pres. $\epsilon'_{i\rho\rho\mu\alpha\iota}$, which was considered to be a mere Ion. production of the common "ερομαι. But if we examine carefully all that is quoted on the subject and the analogy of the language, there can be no doubt of the Ion. είρομαι being the true theme, and έρέσθαι the regular aor. from it (compare ayepéobae), which thus takes its natural augment hobuny. Now when we explain the Ion. elocto, &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 stand very commonly in the imperfect, as έκέλευε, ήρώτα, ἕννεπε, and thence also "toy. In Homer too we find Elpopai, Elperdai, Elpopai, &c., frequently enough; but sometimes we also meet with ἐρώμεθα, ἕροιτο, ἕρειο (for ἕρεο), ἕρεσθαι. Of the accentuation ἐρέσθαι being used in 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 ε and those with ε_i to be in the Epic language the same, and therefore leave the accentuation of Eperdau untouched. Again at Il. a, 513. ø, 508. we must remain in doubt between the reading of είρετο and ήρετο; 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 έρωταν.

Later writers, mistaking the aoristic meaning of $\epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o c$, have used $\epsilon \rho \eta \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o c$, Paus. 4, 12.⁺ The fut. in the Ion. form $\epsilon i \rho \eta \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ was liable to be confounded with the passive fut. $\epsilon i \rho \eta \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ under $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$; whence perhaps $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \eta \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ was preferred.

[•] That the Greek Grammarians supposed $\epsilon \rho e \sigma \theta a$ to be falsely accented is clear from the Etym. M. v. $\epsilon I \rho \omega$ and $\Delta \epsilon - \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, however faulty these articles may be in other respects.

⁺ In that passage however Bekker proposes instead of έρησαμένοις δε έχρησεν to read χρησαμένοις.

The Ionic insertion of the ϵ in $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a_i$, $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \nu \tau \sigma$, &c., is found in Homer, and in $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \epsilon \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma c_s$, Herodot. 3, 64., where those manuscripts which give $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma c_s$ are not deserving of attention. The Epic language had also in this formation the active $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$, II. η , 128. Od. ϕ , 31. λ , 229. which must not be confounded with the future $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$ from $\epsilon \epsilon \rho \omega$, $\epsilon \tilde{\ell} \pi \sigma \nu$: $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \delta \nu \omega$ is 1. plur. conj. pres. for $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, II. a, 62. A lengthened present in the same language is $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \delta \nu \omega$. Compare $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \delta \nu \omega$.

[°]E $\rho\pi\omega$, *I creep along*, go along: fut. [°]E $\rho\psi\omega$, &c. The augm. is ϵ_i . 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 tragedians, Brunck. Eurip. Hipp. 561. Metaph. in Eurip. Cycl. 422.—Passow.]

"Ερρω, I go forth or away: fut. ἐρρήσω; aor. 1. ήρρησα; perf. ήρρηχα.

^{*}Ερσαι is an old aorist, of which we find in Hom. the compound $\dot{a}\pi \dot{\phi}$ ερσε, $\dot{a}\pi o \dot{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \eta$, $\dot{a}\pi o \dot{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon$, with the sense of to wash away, sweep away. II. ζ, 348. ϕ , 283. 329. The present for this may be either $\ddot{\epsilon} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \omega$ with a causative meaning, or ΕΡΔΩ; see Buttm. Lexil. p. 156. &c.

'Ερυγγάνω, I eruct: fut. ερεύξομαι *; aor. ήρυγον.

The more simple theme $i\rho\epsilon i\gamma\omega$ does not occur in an active form; on the contrary Homer, Herodotus, and the non-Attic writers of a later period have $i\rho\epsilon i\gamma o\mu\alpha$, from which the latter formed $\eta\rho\epsilon\nu\xi\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$. Homer has, like the Attics, $\eta\rho\nu\gamma\sigma\nu$. The meaning of this verb has modifications 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.

'Ερυθαίνω. See 'Ερεύθω.

'Ερύχω, I hold back from: fut. ἐρύξω; aor. 1. ἤρυξα, Æschyl. Sept. 1075. Ep. ἔρυξα, Il. γ, 113.

The Epics have also a peculiar aor. 2. with the reduplication in the middle of the word, ήρύκἄκον, Il. ε, 321. Infin. ἐρυκακέειν, Hom. Compare ήνίπαπεν under Ἐνίπτω.

² Epúw and $\epsilon i \rho i \omega$, *I draw*, a verb used only by the Ionics and Epics, has v short in the inflexion. ² Epúw has the fut. $\epsilon \rho i \sigma \omega$, Ep. $\epsilon \rho i \sigma \sigma \omega$, but also $\epsilon \rho i \omega$, II. λ , 454.; perf. pass. $\epsilon i \rho v \mu \alpha \iota$. The Poet. and Ion. $\epsilon i \rho i \omega$

D

and it is by mere chance that I have not been able to find any instance of its actual occurrence.

^{*} I have inserted this fut. without besitation as it is the necessary result of the analogies laid down in my grammar,

forms $\epsilon i \rho i \sigma \omega$, &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 ϵ , viz. $\dot{\rho} i \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$.* This verb is also used in Attic prose, and has in Attic poetry the v always long in the inflexion, $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta v$. But in the Epic poets it is short even there, as $\dot{\rho} v \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta v$, 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 $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma a r o$, $\dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma a \tau o$, even where the syllable is required to be long. \uparrow

In the passive form of this verb it is sometimes difficult, particularly amidst the difference of meanings, to distinguish the tenses correctly. The perf. pass. has necessarily by virtue of the reduplication, even if it be formed from $\epsilon \rho i \omega$, the syllable ϵ_i as augment. To this tense belong, with some degree of certainty according to the sense, the forms $\epsilon i \rho \nu \nu \tau a_i$ or $\epsilon i \rho i \omega \pi a_i$, pluperf. $\epsilon i \rho \nu \nu \tau o_i$, $\epsilon i \rho i \omega \tau o_i$, 11. ξ , 75. σ , 69. o, 654. of the ships which have been or were drawn up on land. In the passage of Od. χ , 90. it may be doubted whether $\epsilon i \rho \bar{\nu} \tau o$ be pluperf. or syncop. 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 σ , but with the ν long. §

In the sense of to save, watch over, we frequently find EpvoBai, Epvo,

* Not that I mean by this expression, "without the ϵ_i " 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 ϵ was added afterwards as in $\Im \epsilon \lambda \omega$, $\epsilon \theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$.

† Because $\delta v \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ 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 buodμην to be an Epic shortening of the syl-lable. Again in $\epsilon \rho i \sigma \sigma \sigma \theta a \iota$ the earlier editors made a distinction between ¿puoaσθαι, ερύσσασθαι, to draw, and ερυσασθαι, 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 buodunv 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

is proved by the verbals $\xi \rho \bar{\nu} \mu \alpha$, $\xi \rho \bar{\nu} \sigma \ell$. $\pi \tau \sigma \lambda \iota s$, &c., having the meaning of to protect, while $\rho \bar{\nu} \tau \prime \rho$, $\rho \bar{\nu} \mu \omega s$, &c., have the meaning of to draw. That the Epic language belongs to that period is in itself probable; the above-mentioned $\rho \bar{\nu} \sigma d \mu \eta \nu$ gives it critical certainty.

provedue; the above-mendoned portanty gives it critical certainty. \ddagger The passage runs thus, 'Auplirous' δ'' 'Oburfies' écleare rubaliants', El Ados δ'' 'Oburfies' écleare rubaliants', El Ados of écleue Supday. Here écleare appears to stand in exactly the same situation as at Od. χ , 79. épléorare páryawor $\delta\xi\delta$. But we may understand the times of the action thus, "he rushed on Ulysses with the sword which he had drawn," and then écleare is the pluperf. of the same middle of which elpéoraro $\delta\xi$ fips. $\delta\xi\delta$, as indeed he has done at δ , 530. If this argument be not conclusive, it will at least show that this is a solitary instance of the syncop, aor. écoro as a middle with transitive sense for elpéoraro, whereas all other instances of those syncop, aorists have a completely passive meaning.

§ Of $\epsilon l \rho \nu \sigma \mu \alpha u$, $\epsilon l \rho \nu \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, as required by the grand analogy of verbs which shorten

eipuro, &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 the duration of the action. Thus είρῦτο, ἔρῦτο, 2. pers. ἔρῦσο are plainly imperf., Il. ω , 499. δ , 138. ν , 555. χ , 507. in all which instances the sense is thou didst protect, he protected, exactly corresponding with the undoubted imperf. in Il. ζ, 403. olos γαρ έρύετο "Ιλιον "Εκτωρ. In the same way είρυντο, ρύατο are used of protecting bolts, walls, guards, Il. μ , 454. σ , 515. Od. ρ , 201.: and a similar meaning of duration is always found in the infin. είρυσθαι, έρυσθαι, ρύσθαι, e. g. Od. γ, 268. 4, 194. Il. o, 141. It is clear therefore that all these forms belong to the syncope of the pres. and imperf. - εἰρύετο εἴρυτο, ἐρύεσθαι ἔρυσθαι. Nay, the indicative itself is used, not only by Apollon. 2, 1208. Epural, he watches over, but by Homer also, in as much as the 3. plur. εἰρύαται in the passages of Il. α , 239. Od. π , 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 suit better than that of the imperf., as $\epsilon\rho\nu\tau\sigma$, Il. ϵ , 23. and 538. $\epsilon\rho\rho\tau\sigma\sigma$ (lyric), Soph. (Ed. 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 $\gamma \epsilon \nu o \mu a \iota$ and in Buttm. Lexil. p. 305. that in the Epic language the future of $\epsilon \rho \delta \omega$ becomes $\epsilon \rho \delta \omega$ again. We must consider in the same light the middle $\epsilon \rho \delta \epsilon \sigma \partial a \iota$, II. ξ , 422. ι , 248. υ , 195.; for Homer when speaking 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. σ , 174. χ , 351. where in a similar combination and meaning we find as in other cases the aor. $\epsilon \rho \delta \sigma \sigma \partial a \iota$.

There are still two other Hesiodic forms to be mentioned: 1.) ϵ , 816. infin. $\epsilon_i \rho \dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ with ν short, for $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota \nu$, to draw; therefore exactly analogous to the formation in $\mu \iota$, like $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ for $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$. 2.) 9,

* Some similar futures of verbs in $-\epsilon\omega$ and $-\alpha\omega$ will be found in the last note under $\Delta \ell \mu \omega$, with which these Epic futures in - $\delta \omega$ correspond exactly; thus $\ell \rho \omega \omega$, fut. $\ell \rho \delta \sigma \omega$, and dropping the σ , $\ell \rho \delta \omega - \ell \rho \delta \sigma \sigma \omega$, II. λ , 454. $\tau \alpha \nu \delta \sigma \omega \sigma \omega$, Od. ϕ , 174. Compare also $\sigma \delta \omega$ unde $\Xi \delta \zeta \omega$.

the vowel in the inflexion, I find no instance. Only in very late writers ἐρρίσθην is quoted from ρύεσθαι, to save. See Stephan. Thesaur.

304. *Epuro* likewise with v short, and with a passive sense, was watched, guarded.

^{*}Ερχομαι, I go, borrows from ΕΛΕΥΘΩ its fut. ἐλεύσομαι, its aor. Ep. ήλυθον, Att. ηλθον* (from which all the other moods are formed, imperat. ἐλθέ†, inf. ἐλθεῖν, part. ἐλθών), its perf. ἐλήλῦθα; and verbal adj. ἐλευστέος (μετελευστέος).

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

The Dor. ³/₄νθον, ⁱνθεῖν, for ³/₄λθον, ⁱλθεῖν, is analogous to βέντιστος, φίντατος, for βέλτιστος, φίλτατος.

It has been mentioned under $\epsilon \tilde{i}\mu i$, I go, that in usage it is connected with this verb. That is to say, instead of the collateral moods of the pres. of $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\chi o\mu\alpha i$ those of $\epsilon \tilde{i}\mu i$ are generally used; instead of the imperf. $\eta\rho\chi o\mu\eta\nu$ the imperf. $\eta\tilde{\epsilon}i\nu$ or $\eta\tilde{\alpha}$; and instead of the fut. $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon o\sigma o\mu\alpha i$ the indicat. pres. $\epsilon \tilde{i}\mu i$: 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. $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\chi o\mu\alpha i$, imper. $\tilde{i}\theta_i$, conj. $\tilde{i}\omega$, opt. $\tilde{i}o\mu\mu$, infin. $\tilde{i}\epsilon\nu\alpha i$, part. $\tilde{i}\omega\nu$. Imperf. $\eta\tilde{\epsilon}i\nu$ or $\eta\tilde{\alpha}$; perf. and pluperf. $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\upsilon\theta\alpha$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\upsilon\theta\epsilon i\nu$; aor. $\eta\lambda\theta\sigma\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\epsilon$, &c.; fut. $\epsilon\tilde{i}\mu i$, of which the other moods will be found under that verb.

* This distinction of $\hbar \lambda u \theta o \nu$ and $\hbar \lambda \theta o \nu$ 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 accentuation; thus, $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon$, $\delta \lambda \theta \epsilon$, $\epsilon b \rho \epsilon$ in the common, and $\lambda \alpha \delta \epsilon$, $i \delta \epsilon$ in the Attic language.

‡ In this word the first production only . is pure Epic, as in εμνήμυκε. The ov is It is evident that the forms of $\epsilon l\mu$ were preferred on account of their slightness (particularly in their numerous compounds) to the corresponding heavy-sounding forms of $\epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu$, in addition to which there was the ambiguity of $\eta\rho\chi\phi\mu\eta\nu$. 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 $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\dot{\eta}\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\sigma$, Aristoph. Thesm. 504. $\eta\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\sigma$, Arat. 102, 118. $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\dot{\nu}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ Soph. CEd. 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 $i\lambda \partial i v$ have a decided preference for the meaning come, so that $\tilde{\eta}\lambda \partial i v$ for instance very seldom occurs in the sense of going, going away^{*}; and those of i u are as seldom found in the sense of come[†]. But $i \rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \partial a v$ 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.[‡]

'Eσθημένος, clad, clothed, a defective part. perf., properly Ionic, occur-

* Instances of this meaning are the following; $\mu h \notin \lambda \partial p_S$, do not go (away), Soph. Phil. 1182. $\epsilon l \notin \lambda \partial o t \tau is$, Xen. Anab. 7, 8, 9, although this may be interpreted as a coming to the distant place: $\sigma \nu \mu \theta o \nu$. $\lambda \epsilon \delta t \epsilon \lambda \partial \delta \nu \tau t$ els $\Delta \epsilon \lambda \phi o \lambda s$ auxour $\hat{w} \sigma a t$, 3, 1, 5. that is lévau els Δ ., kal $\epsilon \lambda \partial \delta \nu \tau a$ $\delta \nu a co \nu \delta \sigma a$,

+ They principally occur only where the immediate context expresses a coming, as dorow ire, or obk fire eis $\tau f \mu \delta \epsilon$ $\tau h \mu$ $\chi d \rho a \nu$, Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 6. or in an antithesis as lorres kal dardores.

‡ 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, venio. In Greek $\xi \rho \chi er \theta a is both, as the$ particular relation come is announced by $the context. The Aorist <math>\frac{1}{3} \lambda \theta o \nu$, as expressing the moment when the action is completed, 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 ; els: means he will go, and for he will come the Greek language has recourse to the verb how, I come (i.e. I am arrived, I am there); therefore \$\$\xie \eta, he will come. In the compounds these distinctions generally disappear, because the point or place of arrival is expressed by the preposition ; $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a in all its tenses gives the$ mposepχeroda in all his tenses gives the idea of coming to us; its contrary $d\pi i\rho_{\chi}$ χeroda never has that sense: $d\pi i \eta \lambda \partial o\nu$ expresses a point of time quite as well as $\eta \lambda \partial o\nu$, 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.

ring in Herodot. 6, 112., but found also, and with the augm. $\eta\sigma\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_{0}$, in Eurip. Hel. 1555. We meet with $\eta\sigma\theta\eta\tau\sigma$ 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.

Ἐσθίω, I eat, has from the old ἔδω a fut. ἔδομαι or ἐδοῦμαι, and less frequently ἐδέσω; perf. 2. ἐδήδοκα; perf. pass. ἐδήδεσμαι; aor. pass. ἠδέσθην; verbal adj. ἐδεστός, ἐδεστέον, Plat. Crito, p. 47. b. Aor. act. ἔφαγον, infin. Φαγεῖν.

The poets had also a shorter form $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \omega$, whence $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \theta o v \sigma \iota$, II. ω , 415., $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \omega \nu$, 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 $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \omega$ was also frequently used by the Epics and even by Hippocrates De Vet. Med. 9. $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \pi i \nu \omega \nu$. The infin. of this verb is by the Epics syncopated $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha i$; and from an old perf. act. $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \eta \delta a$ they have the particip. $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \eta \delta \omega c$; they use also an imperf. $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \sigma \kappa \sigma \nu$. The perf. 2. (with its change of vowel ϵ to o) was $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \eta \delta \sigma \kappa a$, which change was by the Epics transferred to the perf. pass., consequently instead of the usual $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \eta \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha i$ they have $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \eta \delta \sigma \sigma \alpha i$, Od. χ , 56. See Buttm. Lexil. pp. 137–140.

From ΦΑΓΩ, which is not in use, the LXX frequently formed a fut. $\phi \dot{\alpha} \gamma o \mu \alpha \iota$, 2. pers. $\phi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$, analogous to $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta o \mu \alpha \iota$.*

"Εσπετε, έσπον, έσπόμην. See Είπεῖν and "Επω.

'E $\sigma\tau\iota$ a, I receive as a guest, entertain at my table. The augm. is $\epsilon\iota$. [Pass. with fut. midd. (Plato de Repub. 1. p. 345. c.), I am a guest, feast upon (anything, $\tau\iota\nu\iota$), Lycophr. 1411. Casaub. Athen. 7. 1. – Passow.]

Εύαδε. See 'Ανδάνω.

Εύδω, καθεύδω, I sleep : fut. εὐδήσω, καθευδήσω; imperf. with augm. εὖδον, καθεῦδον, but also ηὖδον, καθηῦδον, and ἐκάθευδον. Generally the compound is more used in prose than the simple.

The forms with nu are more properly Attic ; nudev, Plat. Symp. p.

* 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 $\phi d\gamma over in$ the paraphrast of Dionys. de Aucupio (Schneid. Oppian. p. 179.), and $\phi a \gamma \epsilon o i s$ in the false Phocylides, 145. 203. b. καθηῦδον, p. 217. e. 219. c.: καθεῦδον is found in Aristoph. Eccl. 479. Av. 495.: ἐκάθευδον is used by Xenoph. and most good writers.

Εύρίσκω, I find: fut. εύρήσω; perf. εὕρηκα; aor. 2. εῦρον, imperat. εὑρέ*, infin. εὑρεῖν; aor. 2. midd. εὑρόμην; perf. pass. εὕρημαι; aor. 1. pass. εὑρέθην; verb. adj. εὑρετός. In verbs beginning with ευ the augm. ηυ is generally rather Attic: but in this verb ηὕρισκον, ηὑρέθην are seldom found even in the Attics; the common way of writing them is εὕρισκον, εὖρον, εὑρέθην, and the perf. is always εῦρηκα.— MIDD.

Non-Attic writers, as the Alexandrine and others of a later period, form the aor. 2. midd. as an aor. 1., $\epsilon i\rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ for $\epsilon i\rho \dot{\sigma} \mu \eta \nu$: see the last paragraph under $ai\rho \epsilon \omega$. Wolf. Lept. p. 216., Jacob. Anth. Poet. p. 880., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 139.

Εύχομαι, I pray, depon. midd.: fut. εύξομαι; aor. 1. ηὐξάμην. The augment follows the general analogy of verbs beginning with ευ; compare εὐρίσχω.

The 3. sing. syncop. aor. εὖκτο for ηὖζατο occurs in an Epic fragment in Schol. Soph. Œd. C. 1375. The pluperf. ηὖγμην is in Soph. Tr. 610.

Εύω, I singe, roast: fut. εύσω, Ion. εὐω †; aor. 1. εὐσα, Hom. In prose generally ἀφεύω, ἀφεῦσα, and ἡφευμένος, Æschyl. ap. Athen. 9. p. 375. e.

In the dialects we find also $\dot{a}\phi a\dot{v}\omega$. In Aristophanes the reading is uncertain, but the better authorities are in favour of $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\dot{v}\epsilon\iota\nu$. So we have $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\tilde{v}\sigma a$ in Simon. Fr. 136. and $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\dot{v}\sigma a_{12}$ in Nicand. ap. Athen. 2. p. 61. a. The pronunciation with the lenis $\epsilon\ddot{v}\omega$ and $a\ddot{v}\omega$ is known from single forms and derivations, among which are $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\eta\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ (Hesych.) in the sense of I dry up, $a\dot{v}a\dot{v}\omega$, I dry, &c. But the forms which belong here must not be confounded with $a\dot{v}\omega$, I kindle (see that verb), as the radical idea is essentially different.

^{*}Eχθω, I hate, used only in pres. and by the poets ‡; hence ἀπεχθάνομαι, I am hateful; fut. ἀπεχθήσομαι. The

^{*} For the accentuation of this imperat. see the second note under "Ερχομαι.

⁺ See the last note under 'E $\rho \dot{\upsilon} \omega$.

^{‡ [}The active voice is found in Æschyl.

Fr. 296. Soph. Aj. 459. Phil. 510. Eurip. Med. 118. Androm. 212. but the pass. $\xi \chi \theta o \mu a \iota$ is more common. — Passow.]

aor. $\eta \chi \theta \delta \mu \eta \nu$ is Poet., but $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \chi \theta \delta \mu \eta \nu$ is more generally used. Perf. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \chi \theta \eta \mu \alpha \mu$, *I dm hated*. We find also a perf. $\eta' \chi \theta \eta \mu \alpha \mu$, part. $\eta' \chi \theta \eta \mu \alpha \nu$ in Lycophr. 827.

Some have wished to reject the above relation, which has always been supposed by grammarians to exist between the forms of this middle verb, and they adopt, beside $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon\chi\theta\dot{a}\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, a present, answering to the active, $\xi_{\chi}\theta_{0\mu\alpha_{\ell}}$, $d\pi \epsilon_{\chi}\theta_{0\mu\alpha_{\ell}}$, of which $\eta_{\chi}\theta_{0\mu\eta\nu}$, $d\pi\eta_{\chi}\theta_{0\mu\eta\nu}$ would be imperfect. Now the true relation of which we are in search must be grounded on the usage of the older writers. And first then $a\pi\eta\chi\theta\delta\mu\eta\nu$, when standing in immediate connexion with the present, cannot be an imperfect; it can only be an aorist. Thus in Od. ξ , 366. olda $\delta \tau' \eta \chi \theta \epsilon \tau o$ $\pi \tilde{a} \sigma \iota \Im \epsilon \sigma \tilde{\iota} \sigma \iota v$, "that he has been hated," consequently "is hated:" the same of απήχθετο, Il. 1, 300.: again, θαυμάζω ότι, εί μέν τινι ύμων απηχθόμην, μέμνητε....εί δέ τῷ ἐπεκούρησα, &c. Xen. Anab. 5, 8, 25. In the same way the conj. is plainly an aorist in Il. δ, 53. Τὰς διαπέρσαι, ὅταν τοι ἀπέχθωνται περὶ κηρί. " destroy them, as soon as they have become hateful to thee." Compare also the following passages in Plato's Apologia: and first the present, p. 24. "I tell you everything without concealment, καίτοι οίδα σχεδόν ότι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀπεχθάνομαι, that I make 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, έντεῦθεν οὖν τούτω τε ἀπηγθόμην καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν παρόντων; and immediately afterwards και ένταῦθα κάκείνω και άλλοις πολλοῖς \dot{a} πηχθόμην. μετά ταῦτ' οὖν ήδη ἐφεξῆς ἦα, αἰσθανόμενος μέν...ὅτι ἀπηχθα- $\nu \delta \mu \eta \nu$, where the relative meaning of the imperfect and a orist is most evident. In Demosth. Olynth. 3, p. 34. "I say it not, $i\nu' a\pi i \chi \theta \omega \mu a i$ τισιν ὑμῶν," it evidently refers to the immediate consequences of the sentence; and just afterwards in a general sense, " for I am not so silly, ώστε απεχθάνεσθαι βούλεσθαι μηδέν ωφελειν νομίζων." But the passages where $\eta_{\chi}\theta_{\epsilon\tau o}$, $a\pi\eta_{\chi}\theta_{\epsilon\tau o}$ have been translated as imperfects, was hated, may very well be understood, like other aorists, in the sense of the pluperf. had made himself hateful, had been hated, as Il. 7, 454. Eurip. Hipp. 1402. Compare particularly Il. ζ, 200. Notwithstanding this however we see the infin. $\dot{a}\pi \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a_{\mu}$, not only in every instance as a proparoxytone, but we find expressly in Lex. Seg. 6, p. 423. 25. the gloss Άπέχθεσθαι· λέγουσι δέ ποτε και άπεχθάνεσθαι. Nor do I feel sufficient confidence to recommend the aoristic accentuation for II. ϕ , 83. Eurip. Med. 290. Thucyd. 1, 136. Plat. Rep. 1, p. 343. e. Lys. c. 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.* Notwithstanding what has been said, we need not be surprised at finding the indic. pres. $d\pi \epsilon_{\chi} \theta_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$ in Eurip. Hipp. 1260. (compare $a'_{i\sigma} \theta_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$); for it is ascertained to be a false reading for $i\pi \dot{\alpha}\chi\theta_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$: and the usage of Theocritus ($\dot{a}\pi \epsilon_{\chi} \theta \epsilon \tau a_i$, 7, 45.) is not of sufficient authority.

"Eyw[†], I have, hold: fut. $\xi \varepsilon$ with the aspirate; imperf. είχου \ddagger ; aor. (as from ΣΧΩ), ξσχου, imperat. σχές (comp. παράσχες), optat. σχοίην, conj. σχῶ, σχῆς, &c. (comp. παράσχω, παράσχης, &c.), infin. σχείν, part. σχών. Pass. and midd. "xouas; imperf. eixouny; fut. midd. "Eouas; aor. midd. ἐσχόμην § (παράσχου, παρασχέσθαι). From the aor. σχείν comes a new fut. act. σχήσω ||, and fut. midd. σχήσομαι, whence perf. act. έσχηκα, perf. pass. έσχημαι, aor. pass. έσχέθην, verbal adj. έκτός and σχετός.

From the aor. Egyov comes also a new pres. Toyw, which with its future $\sigma_{\chi \eta \sigma \omega}$ is principally used when the more definite ideas of to hold firm, stop, seize on (which are contained in the less expressive "xeiv), require force and elevation. The aor. žoyov 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 supposed to be transitory, as seized, held on, &c. In its compounds $\xi_{\chi\omega}$ has generally one of these more definite senses, whence also the aor. πάρεσχον &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 between their respective meanings, we still find cases of the aor. midd. used instead of the passive; the most common are oxiolat in the

* Bekker has never yet found it in any manuscript. The quotation of the above-mentioned verse of Eurip. in Plutarch with απεχθείσθαι contains a trace of it; see Elmsley, who has written it $d\pi \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$.

† [Theognis has for the 2. sing. ξχεισθα, 1316. like σχήσεισθα below.— Passow.] ‡ [Homer has the imperf. also without

the augm. Exov. - Passow.]

§ [This aor. sometimes loses the augm. in Hom. in its 3. sing. σχέτο, Il. η, 248. φ, 345. We find also its imperat. σχοῦ, infin. σχέσθαι, part. σχόμενος. - Passow.]

|| [We find a rare form of the 2. sing. fut. σχήσεισθα, Francke Hymn. Cer. 366. like έχεισθα mentioned above. — Passow.]

sense of *to be seized*, *held*, Od., ἕσχοντο Herodot. 1, 31., κατέσχετο Od. γ, 284. Eurip. Hipp. 27., κατασχόμενος Pind. Pyth. 1, 16. Plat. Phædr. p. 244., συσχόμενος Plat. Theæt. p. 165. b.

The way in which $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\sigma\nu$ comes from $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ may be seen by comparing it with $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\sigma\nu$ from $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\omega$. In $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\omega$ the ι supplies the place of a reduplication, as we see fully exemplified in $\mu\ell\mu\nu\omega$, $\gamma\ell\gamma\nu\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, &c., where $\mu\nu$, $\gamma\nu$ are the syncopated stem of those verbs as $\sigma\chi$ is of the one before us. This ι would have the aspirate, as in $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$; but here again, as in $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ itself, it passed on account of the χ into the lenis, a change more frequent in the older times of the language : compare $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma$ from $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\sigma$, vestis ; $d\theta\rho\delta\sigma$; and $d\theta\rho\delta\sigma$; $d\theta\ell\rho\omega$, Att. $d\theta\ell\rho\omega$.

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, $\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\sigma\chi\epsilon$; see Porson ad Eur. Hec. 836. Orest. 1330. Plat. Protag. p. 348. a.

The language of poetry has from a theme $\Sigma X E \Theta \Omega$ the forms $\ddot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \epsilon \theta o \nu$, $\sigma \chi \epsilon \theta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$, $\sigma \chi \dot{\epsilon} \theta \omega \nu$, on which see $\dot{a} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \omega$.

On είχεε, Herodot. 1, 118., for είχε, see έψεε under έψω, and compare έώθεε under έθω.-From the part. perf. συνοχωκότε, Il. β, 218., we may conclude that there was an old Epic part. ὄχωκα, of which the following seems to be a satisfactory explanation. The simple perfect of $\xi_{\chi\omega}$, with the usual change of vowel, would be $\delta_{\chi\alpha}$ (compare the subst. $\partial_{\chi} \dot{\eta}$; which reduplicated becomes, according to the common analogy, öκωχα. But since of two aspirates the second may be changed, it is very possible that this became oxwa, particularly as such a change made the derivation from $\xi_{\chi\omega}$ more sensible to the ear. And it is clear from the Hesychian gloss συνοκώχοτε, 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. $\partial \kappa \omega \chi \eta$, as all similar verbal substantives ($\partial \pi \omega \pi \eta$, $\partial \delta \omega \delta \eta$, $\delta \delta \omega \delta \eta$, $\delta \gamma \omega \gamma \eta$, $\delta \kappa \omega \kappa \eta$) are connected with really reduplicated forms of their respective verbs. Compare also the exactly similar formation of o'xwka under o'xw.

In the passage of II. μ , 340. the reading $\pi \tilde{a}\sigma \alpha i \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\omega} \chi \alpha \tau \sigma$ (i. e. $\pi \dot{\upsilon} \lambda \alpha \iota$) with the explanation "were shut" has very much in its favour, both from the sense and construction as well as from the antithesis at 9, 58, $\pi \tilde{a} \sigma \alpha \iota \dot{\sigma} \dot{\omega} \dot{\tau} \gamma \nu \nu \tau \sigma \pi \dot{\upsilon} \lambda \alpha \iota$. If with Wolf we adopt it, the only way of analogous explanation is this : ' $O\chi\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $a \ bolt$, has its meaning from the verb $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\omega$; and the supposition that $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\chi\omega \tau\dot{\alpha}\varsigma \pi\dot{\upsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ meant to hold together, shut, is grounded on analogy, like $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu \tau\dot{\alpha} \dot{\omega}\tau\alpha, \tau\dot{\eta}\nu$ $\gamma\lambda\tilde{\omega}\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$, &c. But as we have shown above that $\ddot{\upsilon}\kappa\omega\chi\alpha$ was the perf. act., so is $\dot{\omega}\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$ formed as correctly as $\tilde{\eta}\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$ with $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\eta}\sigma\chi\alpha$, and with the change of vowel continuing into the passive like $\check{a}\omega\rho\tau o$. According to this $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\omega\chi a\tau o$ is the Ion. 3. plur. of the pluperf. pass. from $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\chi\omega$.*

The following compounds of $\xi_{\chi\omega}$ have other peculiarities :

άν έχω. When ἀνέχεσθαι in the midd. has the sense of to bear, its imperf. and aor. have a double augm., ἠνειχόμην, ἠνεσχόμην (ἀνασχέσθαι).

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

ἀμπέχω, I envelope: imperf. ἀμπεῖχον; fut. ἀμφέξω; aor. ἡμπισχον, ἀμπισχεῖν. MIDD. ἀμπέχομαι or ἀμπισχνοῦμαι, I have round me, have on me; fut. ἀμφέξομαι; aor. ἡμπισχόμην.

Here too we find the double augment. In Aristoph. Thesm. 165. indeed, where $\eta \mu \pi \epsilon \sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma$ stands, the aor. is embarrassing, and probably the true reading was $\eta \mu \pi \epsilon i \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma$, 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 $i\sigma\chi\omega$ and $\xi\chi\omega$, is not only admissible, but actually does occur (see Elmsl. ad Eurip. Med. 277.). Still however $\eta\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\circ\nu$, which appears so frequently in the common language, is not the imperfect of it, as $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu$ alone would suffice to inform us. But instead of this another pres. $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\omega$ has been supposed, and supported not only by the gloss $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\circ\dot{\mu}\epsilon\nu\circ\nu$ in Hesychius, but also by the similar various reading in Aristoph. Av. 1090. That a form $i\sigma\chi\epsilon\omega$, $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\circ\bar{\nu}\mu$ should have existed in the Attic dialect, and that $\dot{a}\mu\pi\prime\sigma\chi\omega$ and $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\circ\bar{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$ should have become completely confounded together, is most improbable. But in the passage of Aristophanes there is an old reading $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\nu\circ\bar{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$: it is therefore evident that $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\circ\bar{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$, from a mere misunderstanding of the aor. $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu$, crept not only into some of the manuscripts of Aristo-

* The reading ἐπψχατο, from a supposed pres. ἐποίγνυμι, is quite untenable; for as the simple οἰγνύμαι means to open, this compound of it eannot mean to shut.

Derived from $\sigma \chi_{\alpha\mu\alpha}$ it might be in itself defensible, but in the passage in question it gives no idea recommended by its combining easily with the context.

phanes, but into Hesychius also, where the gloss $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ occurs just before.* Now that $\ddot{\eta}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\dot{a}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, is really an aorist, we learn from the passages of Aristoph. and the following glosses of Hesych. $A\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon a\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$. 'H $\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\tau\sigma$ (l. $\ddot{\eta}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon$), $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\sigma\chi\epsilon$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\epsilona\lambda\epsilon\nu$. 'H $\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\tau\sigma$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\delta\dot{\nu}\sigmaa\tau\sigma$, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\delta\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\epsilon\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon\tau\sigma$ (l. $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\epsilon\dot{a}\lambda\epsilon\tau\sigma$). And therefore it is clear that this form is not resolvable into $\ddot{\eta}\mu\pi-\iota\sigma\chi\circ\nu$, $\dot{a}\mu\pi-\iota\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$; because instead of $\ddot{a}\mu\pi-\epsilon\sigma\chi\circ\nu$ the augm. passed over to the preposition, $\ddot{\eta}\mu\pi\iota-\sigma\chi\circ\nu$.

ύπισχνέομαι, I promise, Ion. (Hom. and Herod.) ὑπίσχομαι: fut. ὑποσχήσομαι; aor. ὑπεσχόμην, imperat. ὑπόσχου†; perf. ὑπέσχημαι.

[°]Eψω, I cook: fut. ἑψήσω, &c. Verbal adj. ἑΦθός, or ἑψητός, ἑψητέος. A remarkable form of the aor. is συνηψας in the comic writer Timocles ap. Athen. 9. p. 407. e.

We find in Herodotus (1, 48. 1, 118. 8, 26.) a resolution of $\epsilon\epsilon$ for ϵ in the 3. sing. imperfect of three verbs, $\tilde{\epsilon}\psi\epsilon\epsilon$, $\dot{\epsilon}v\epsilon'\chi\epsilon\epsilon$, $\check{\omega}\phi\lambda\epsilon\epsilon$, from $\tilde{\epsilon}\psi\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}v\dot{\epsilon}\chi\omega$, and $\bar{\omega}\phi\lambda\sigma\nu$, which reciprocally confirm each other.[‡] Some suppose a pres. $\dot{\epsilon}\psi\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ from which they may be formed, but except in $\dot{\epsilon}\psi\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$, $\dot{\phi}\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$, there are no traces whatever of such a theme, unless we imagine something in $\dot{\epsilon}\psi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}v$, Hippocr. de Steril. 17. which to me seems to mean nothing of the kind; and in an aor. 2. (as we shall see $\ddot{\omega}\phi\lambda\sigma\nu$ is) a form in $\epsilon\sigma\nu$ would be quite remote from all analogy. Compare the perf. $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\theta\epsilon\epsilon$ under "E $\theta\omega$.

The formation of the verbal adj. $\xi\phi\theta\delta\varsigma$ dates from a time when the double letters ξ and ψ were not yet introduced into the Attic writing; consequently the root of $\xi\psi\omega$ was then $E\Phi\Sigma$ -: when to this root the termination $\tau\sigma\varsigma$ was added, the σ necessarily dropped out, as three consonants could not stand together, leaving $\xi\phi-\tau\delta\varsigma$, which, by a change of the second consonant to make the root somewhat more visible, became $\xi\phi\theta\delta\varsigma$.

'EQ, 'EQ, 'IQ. The first 'EQ has three leading senses, which form so many verbs: 1. *I send*; 2. *I seat*; 3. *I clothe*. The second 'EQ is

• The critic must not be misled by finding the reading $\partial_{\mu}\pi_{\alpha}\sigma_{\chi}\phi_{\mu}\mu_{\sigma\sigma}\sigma$ in Aristoph. 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 $\partial_{\mu}\pi_{\sigma}\sigma_{\chi}\sigma_{\theta}\mu_{\alpha}$, and which is verified by such pure analogy, 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. + An imperat. pass. $\delta \pi o \sigma \chi \ell \partial \eta \tau \iota$ has been hitherto the reading in Plat. Pheedr. p. 235. d., but there are only weak grounds for it in the manuscripts. See Bekker.

t 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 suspect that $\frac{\partial \pi \epsilon \hat{\chi} \epsilon \tau}{\tau \epsilon}$ in Herodot, 1, 153. where $\tau \epsilon$ is injurious to the context, is a corruption of $\frac{\partial \pi \epsilon \hat{\chi} \epsilon \epsilon}{\tau \epsilon}$. the root of $\epsilon i \mu i$, *I* am. The third, 'I Ω is the root of $\epsilon i \mu i$, *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 Ω .

1. In µ I, I send, throw.

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

ACTIVE.

- Pres. [†]ημι, [†]ης, [†]ησι, 3. pl. (*iέāσι*) *iãσι* or *iεĩσι*. Imper. [†]*ει*. Opt. *iείην*. Conj. *iῶ*. Infin. *iέναι*. † Part. *iείς*.
- Imperf. ΐην and (from 'IEΩ) ΐουν. Comp. ἀφίουν or ἡφίουν; 3. pl. ἡφίεσαν.

Fut. now.

Perf. $\epsilon i \kappa a \pm$ (like $\tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \kappa a$). Pluperf. $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon \iota v$.

Aor. 1. ήκα, Ion. ἕηκα.

Aor. 2. $\tilde{\eta}\nu$, &c. (not used in sing. but its place supplied by aor. 1.), pl. $\tilde{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma a\nu$, generally with augm. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\tau\epsilon$, $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma a\nu$ ($\kappa a\theta$ - $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu$, $d\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\tau\epsilon$, $d\phi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma a\nu$ §). Imper. $\tilde{\epsilon}_{c}$. Opt. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\eta\nu$; pl. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\tau\epsilon$, $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\epsilon\nu$ for $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$, &c. Conj. $\tilde{\omega}$. Infin. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$. Part. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}_{c}$. The compounds follow the simple, e. g. $d\phi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$, $d\phi\tilde{\omega}$, $d\phi\epsilon_{c}$, &c. Opt. pl. $d\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $d\nu\epsilon(\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$, &c.

PASS. and MIDD. (compare $T(\theta\eta\mu\iota.)$)

Pres. lepai.

Aor. 1. pass. $\tilde{\epsilon}\theta\eta\nu$, generally with the augm. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\theta\eta\nu$ ($\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\ell\theta\eta\nu$, part. $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\theta\epsilon\ell\varsigma$, &c.; $\dot{\eta}\phi\epsilon\ell\theta\eta$, Plut. Sylla 28.).

* It may however be shortened in Att. poetry; see Lex. Seg. 6. p. 471, 10. Dobr. ad Aristóph. Plut. 75.

† [Instead of ίέναι Homer has ίέμεναι, Hesiod ίέμεν: and in the imperf. Homer has ίεν 3. plur. for ίεσαν, Π. μ, 33.— Passow.]

 \ddagger For ἕωκα, ἀφέωκα, and the pass. ἀφέωνται in N. T. see the note on ἀγήοχα under ἅγω. I will mention here a trace of the same form in Herodot. 2, 165. where the text has ἀνέονται ἐs τὸ μά $\chi_{i\mu\sigma\nu}$, but the sense requires a perfect àveirrat, they are given to, devoted to, vacant. What therefore was a mere conjecture of Stephanus, $\dot{a}\nu\ell\omega rrat$, 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. $\epsilon\phi\epsilon\hat{u}rro$, &c., the accent is not thrown back to the beginning of the word, because the ϵ_i arises from the augment.

I 2

Perf. είμαι (as μεθείμαι, μεθείσθαι, μεθείσθω), &c. Διαειμένος, Apoll. Rh. 2, 372. belongs to the middle of είμι, ίεμαι.

Aor. 1. midd. $\eta \kappa \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, which in the indicative is used even in prose*; The other moods do not occur.

Aor. 2. midd. ἕμην, generally with the augm. εἴμην, εἶσο, εἶτο (ἀφεῖτο, ἐφεῖντο).† Imper. οὖ (ἀφοῦ, προοῦ, πρόεσθε, &c.). Opt. εἴμην, εἶο, εἶτο, &c. Conj. ὦμαι. Infin. ἕσθαι (προέσθαι). Part. ἕμενος (ἀφέμενος).

Verbal adj. έτός, έτέος (ἄφετος, &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 $i\epsilon_{\ell\epsilon_{\ell}}$, $i\epsilon_{\ell}$ (contracted like $\dot{\epsilon}\tau i\theta\epsilon_{\ell\epsilon_{\ell}}$), and in the 1. sing. was formed, at least in the Ion. and Att. dialect, an anomalous form in $-\epsilon_{\ell\nu}$, as $\pi\rho o i\epsilon_{\ell\nu}$, Od. ι , 88. κ , 100. μ , 9. (Wolf's ed.); $\eta\phi i\epsilon_{\ell\nu}$, Plat. Euthyd. p. 293. a. Libanius 1, p. 793.; $\dot{\alpha}\nu i\epsilon_{\ell\nu}$, 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 $\pi\rho\delta\omega\mu\alpha$, $\pi\rho\delta\eta\tau\alpha$, $\pi\rho\delta\sigma\sigma\theta\varepsilon$, &c., see the second paragraph of $\Delta\delta\nu\alpha\mu\alpha$. We find in the active voice of this verb corresponding forms, but only in the present, e. g. $\dot{\alpha}\phi\delta\sigma\tau\varepsilon$, Plat. Apol. p. 29. d.; $\dot{\alpha}\phi\eta$, Xen. Cyr. 8, 1, 2. (6.); but the genuineness of these two is doubtful.[‡] The other dialectic forms of both moods correspond exactly with those of $\tau\ell\theta\eta\mu\mu$, as $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\dot{\omega}$, for conj. $\dot{a}\phi\omega$; $\ddot{\eta}\sigma\iota$ for 3. sing. conj. $\ddot{\eta}$, &c.

From the ι of the pres. $i\epsilon \nu a \iota$ arose a new theme, Ω , of which we find many forms, but always in the Ion. dialect, as $\dot{a}\nu i \epsilon \iota$ for $\dot{a}\nu i \eta \sigma \iota$, Herodot. 3, 109. $\xi \dot{\nu} \nu \iota \sigma \nu$ frequently for $\xi \nu \nu i \epsilon \sigma a \nu$; Il. a, 273. $\xi \dot{\nu} \nu \iota \epsilon$, imperat. Theogn. 1240. Bekk. $\mu \epsilon \tau i \epsilon \tau \sigma$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \tau i \epsilon \tau \sigma$ for $\mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon i \epsilon \sigma$, Herodot. 1, 12. and the augm. perf. $\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \tau \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \varsigma$ frequently used for $\mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \varsigma$: see also 3. pres. $\mu \epsilon \tau i \epsilon \iota$ in Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. 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 $d\nu d$, which according to meaning can only belong here, and which have this pecu-

§ For instance $d\nu\iota\epsilon\hat{\imath}$ is from 'IEO, but $d\nu\iota\epsilon\iota$ pres. of 'IO. Compare II. a, 326. with 336., β , 752. with γ , 118. where προτει is sometimes pres. sometimes imperfect. See Brunck on Sophoel. Cfd. T. 628. and Heyne on II. ζ, 523. The imperfect. For the imperfect of the second state of the subscriptions when compared with the Homeric ξυνίει, Od. a, 271. and elsewhere; while the 3. plur. ξώνιον is rendered doubtful by the various reading ξώνιεν for ξυνίεσαν (see Heyne on II. a, 273.). We have quoted these points to show the great uncertainty of the readings, not to recommend a uniformity, which is impossible if we pay any regard to manuscripts.

^{*} Examples may be found in Fisch. ad Well. 2. p. 484. where we must restore $\pi \rho o \eta \kappa a \sigma \theta \epsilon$.

⁺ Xenoph. Hier. 7, 11. Eurip. Suppl. 1199.

[‡] Yet we find in the Attics instances of the regular form, as $\pi a \rho i \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ Plat. Phæd. p. 90., $\dot{a} \phi i \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ Xen. Hell. 2, 4, 10. (16.), $\dot{a} \rho \iota \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ ib. 6, 4, 2. and 3., still with the various reading $a \phi i \sigma \epsilon \nu$ in both passages.

117

liarity, that they take ϵ instead of η in the future, and have the regular formation of the aor. 1. in σa instead of κa , as $d\nu \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \iota$, $d\nu \epsilon \sigma a \nu$, $d\nu \epsilon \sigma a \iota \mu \iota$, II. ξ , 209. ϕ , 537. Od. σ , 265. But this form appears to be used only where the preposition gives the idea of *again*, *back*: compare II. β , 276. ξ , 362. where $d\nu \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$, $d\nu \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$ have merely the sense of to stimulate.

2. Eloa, I seated, placed; huan, I sit.

 $E^{7}\sigma a$ is a defective verb, of which the following forms are found with the meaning of to seat or place.

Αοr. έἶσα, ας, εν, &c. Imper. εἶσον. Infin. ἕσαι, ἕσσαι (ἐφέσσαι). Part. ἕσας, είσας. — Μιρρ. εἰσάμην. Imper. ἕσαι, ἕσσαι (ἔφεσσαι).

Part. έσάμενος (έφεσσάμενος, Od. π , 442.), είσάμενος:

some of which are liable to be confounded with similar forms of ἕννυμι. Fut. midd. ἕσομαι, ἕσσομαι (ἐφέσσομαι).

Perf. pass. Juan, &c., which see below.

Of these forms $\epsilon i\sigma \dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ 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 $i\partial\rho\dot{\omega}\omega$ (which is complete in all its moods and tenses), and by $\kappa\alpha\theta i \zeta\omega$, a word of still more general occurrence. The indisputable connexion of this verb with $i\zeta\omega$ and $\xi\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ has induced many grammarians to place the above forms under $\xi\zeta\omega$, the pres. act. of which however is nowhere found. But in that case the augm. $\epsilon\iota$, which does not occur in $\xi\zeta \phi\eta\eta\nu$, would form in Attic prose a deviation for which there are no grounds. Now as $\tilde{\eta}\mu\alpha\iota$ seems to presuppose a radical form 'E Ω , it is more natural to leave all the above forms in this their simplest formation, distinguish them from $\xi\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, (which we shall see presently to be a word in very limited use), and class this latter as a form belonging to $i\zeta\omega$, $i\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.*

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

 at II. ϕ , 506. But a much more evident comparison is furnished by Od. π , 443. $\xi\mu\dot{\epsilon}\dots$. Όδυσσεύς Πολλάκι γυύνασιν οἶσιν έφεσσάμενος. The meaning of έφέσσεσθαι therefore in the above passage of the Iliad is "he will never seat," consequently it must not be separated from ἕσασθαι, ἕσαι. είσάμενος not only in Herodot. 1, 66. but also in Plut. Thes. c. 17. and many other passages. In Thucyd. 3, 58. ἑσσάμενος is scarcely genuine, and the various reading ἑσάμενος is undoubtedly the true reading. Lastly we find in Od. ξ, 295. ἐέσσατο with the syllabic augment*, like ἕειπε, ἐείλεον, ἐελμένος, ἐερμένος, &c.

In Athen. 4, p. 142. is quoted from Phylarchus, a prose writer of the time of the Ptolemies, a fut. ε i $\sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$, 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 N. T. $\kappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ and $\kappa \alpha \theta h \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$.

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

Pres. 14a1+, 10a1, 10rai, &c., 3. pl. 11rai.

Imperf. ήμην, ήσο, ήστο, &c., 3. pl. ήντο. Imperat. ήσο, ήσθω, &c. Infin. ήσθαι. Part. ήμενος.

In prose however the compound $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ with the same meaning is much more used, which takes no σ in the 3. sing. except when in the imperf. it has no augm., as —

κάθημαι, 3. sing. κάθηται.

έκαθήμην or καθήμην, 3. sing. έκάθητο or καθήστο.

Imper. κάθησο. Opt. καθοίμην, 3. sing. κάθοιτο. ‡ Conj. κάθωμαι, -η, -ηται. Infin. καθήσθαι. § Part. καθήμενος.

The defective tenses are supplied by $\tilde{\epsilon}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ or $\tilde{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ with their compound.

Instead of the 2. sing. in $-\sigma \alpha \iota$ and $-\sigma \sigma$ we find also the shortened forms of the compounds, viz. pres. $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta$ for $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \iota$ and imperat. $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \sigma \nu$ for $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \sigma \sigma$, which however are not so good Attic as the others.

Instead of $\tilde{\eta}\nu\tau \alpha$, $\tilde{\eta}\nu\tau \alpha$, the Ion. have $\tilde{\epsilon}\alpha\tau\alpha$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\alpha\tau\alpha$ (the ending of the Ion. perf. pass.), and the Epics $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\alpha\tau\alpha$. In the compound the Ion. use, according to their general analogy, $\kappa\dot{\alpha}\tau\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{\epsilon}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, for $\kappa\alpha\theta$ -.

The same form $\tilde{\eta}\mu\alpha\iota$ is also the true perf. of $\epsilon l\sigma a$, as used in the sense of $l\delta\rho\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ of inanimate objects, e. g. Herodot. 9, 57., Callim. Fr. 122.: these passages, with the Ion. 3. pl. $\epsilon l\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, Lucian De Dea Syr. 31. prove decidedly that the reading of Od. v, 106. is $\epsilon l\alpha\tau\sigma$ with

* This writing $\epsilon \ell \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma$, with the lenis, to distinguish it from $\epsilon \ell \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma$ the aor. of $\ell \nu \nu \nu \mu \mu$, is an arbitrary proceeding of the Grammarians, and scarcely correct, as the syllabic augment takes the aspirate before aspirated vowels, as in $\epsilon \delta \rho \omega \nu$, $\ell \eta \kappa \alpha$.

† This form may be considered either as a perf. pass. (1 have been seated, or I have seated myself, consequently I sit), or as a separate formation in μ_s, like δf. $\zeta\eta\mu\alpha\iota$: the former appears to me the more probable. Compare $K\epsilon\widehat{\iota}\mu\alpha\iota$. \ddagger The accentuation of the opt. and conj.

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 of the accent in $\kappa d\theta \eta \mu a u$, $\kappa a \theta \eta \sigma \theta a u$, but compare the same appearance with the observations made on it under $K \epsilon \hat{\eta} \mu a$. 119

the aspirate, not (as it is sometimes written) $\epsilon i \alpha \tau o$ the midd. of $\epsilon i \mu i$. See also " $I \zeta \omega$.

3. ἕννυμι, to put on, which see in its place. Ἐῶμεν or ἕωμεν. See ^{*}Aω, 3.

Z.

Zάω, I live, is contracted in η, like διψάω, πεινάω, χράω; it is used by old writers principally in the pres. and imperf., as βιώω is in the remaining tenses : thus pres. ζῶ, ζῆς, ζῆ; imperat. ζῆ (Herm. Soph. Ant. 1154.), or ζῆθι; opt. ζώην; infin. ζῆν. Imperf. ἔζων, ἔζης, ἔζη, &c.

The forms with the η , particularly the imperf. $\xi\zeta\eta\varsigma$, $\xi\zeta\eta$, soon drew the usage aside to the formation in μ , so that $\xi\zeta\eta\nu$ as well as $\xi\zeta\omega\nu$ was used in the imperf., and $\zeta\eta\vartheta$ 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 $\xi\zeta\eta\varsigma$, $\xi\zeta\eta$. He quotes however $\xi\zeta\omega\nu$ 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 $\xi\zeta\omega\nu$.* Hence it is remarkable that the same Herodian (Fr. 43.), immediately after having pronounced the above opinion, rejects $\zeta\eta\vartheta$, which is necessarily connected with $\xi\zeta\eta\nu$. This imperat. occurs in the LXX, and sometimes in the Anthologia \dagger ; but $\zeta\eta$ 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 $\zeta'_{1\sigma\epsilon\nu}$ (Aristoph. Plut. 263.), $\zeta'_{1\sigma\sigma\nu\sigma\iota}$ (Plat. Rep. 5.

* 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 lb. p. 410, 49. &c. and Tho. M. v. $\xi(\omega \nu)$, and to defend $\xi(\eta \nu$, 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 $\xi(\omega \nu, which sounds so dif$ $ferently from <math>\xi(\eta, nay the contrary is the$ more probable. See Fischer, 1. p. 125.In Demosth. Timoer. 702, 2. we certainly $find <math>\xi(\eta \nu$ without any known various reading. All things considered I very much doubt whether Herodian ever gave it as his opinion that $\xi(\eta\nu$ was used for $\xi(\omega\nu$. 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 $\xi(\omega\nu$ is by no means rejected, and nothing more is stated than that $\xi(\eta\nu$, which belongs to $\xi\zeta\eta\nu$, $\xi\zeta\eta$, 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 (ZHOI) are said, by a play on the letters, to bid us enjoy life.

I 4

p. 465. d.), $\zeta'_{\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota}$ (ib. 9. p. 591. c.), and $\zeta'_{\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota}$ (which is the common form in use among the later writers) in Dem. c. Aristog. I. p. 794, 19. In these last we find also the aor. 1. $\xi'_{\zeta\eta\sigma\alpha}$ and the perf. $\xi'_{\zeta\eta\kappa\alpha}$.

The Ion. and Dor. formed this verb with the vowel ω , and that not merely as a lengthening of the theme in $\zeta \omega \omega$, $\zeta \omega \omega \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \omega \omega \tau$, but throughout the persons, thus $\zeta \omega \epsilon \iota \varsigma$, $\zeta \omega \epsilon \iota \tau$, $\zeta \omega \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, $\zeta \omega \omega \sigma \iota \tau$, and also shortened to $\zeta \delta \epsilon \iota \tau$, see Simonid. Gaisford. 231, 17. Herodot. 7, 46. Theodorid. Epig. 8, 7. Hence also a future tense, $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \omega \sigma \epsilon$, which is now restored from the manuscripts to the text of Herodot. 1, 120.*

Zέω, I seeth, boil, retains the ε in the inflexion. From the examples given by Stephens it appears that ζέω, generally speaking at least, has an intransitive, and ζέννυμι a transitive sense; the other tenses have both meanings in common. The pass. takes σ , e. g. $d\pi \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \sigma u \epsilon \nu \sigma \varsigma$, $d\pi \sigma \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon i \varsigma$.

Ζεύγνυμι, I join : fut. ζεύξω, &c. ; aor. 2. pass. εζύγην.

Ζώννυμι, I gird: fut. ζώσω, &c.; perf. pass. έζωσμαι. — MIDD. ζώννυμαι, &c.

According to Suidas (v. $\sigma\epsilon\sigma\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$) the older Attics had no σ in the perfect. This he proves by the authority of Thucyd. 1, 6. $\delta\iota\epsilon\zeta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, where however all the Codd. have $\delta\iota\epsilon\zeta\omega\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$. Compare $\Sigma\omega\zeta\omega$. Z $\omega\omega$. See Z $\omega\omega$.

H.

'Ηβάω, I am in the bloom and vigour of manhood, pubeo; ήβάσκω, I am coming to manhood, pubesco. The aor ήβησα, 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 $\dot{\omega}\omega$ has the sense of to become, $\dot{\omega}v\eta \tilde{\xi}\tilde{\omega}v$ to become young again.

When the ω is followed by a syllable naturally long it is lengthened by the Epics to ω_0 , and when it has the ι subscript it becomes $\omega_{0\iota}$; thus $\eta \mathcal{E} \omega_{0} \tau \tau \varepsilon_{0}$, $\eta \mathcal{E} \omega_{0} \tau \tau \varepsilon_{0}$, $\eta \mathcal{E} \omega_{0} \iota \iota$ for $\eta \mathcal{E} \tilde{\varphi} \iota \iota$.

'Ηγέομαι, Ilead; Iconsider as such: depon. midd. [The

* This formation may be supposed to arise from the mere lengthening of $\zeta \omega \omega$, $\zeta \omega$, making $\zeta \omega \omega$; but when I compare $\beta \omega \sigma e \sigma \theta e$ (see Bi $\omega \omega$) and $\beta \epsilon_{0\mu} \omega$ with $\zeta \omega \epsilon_{\mu\nu}$ and $\zeta \overline{\eta} \nu$, and the well-known forms έπεζάρει for ἐπεβάρει, ζέρεθρον for βέρεθρον, it seems to point out to me a radical identity in the verbs ζ $\hat{\eta}\nu$ and βιώναι, which accounts for their being so mixed up together in usage. act. $\eta\gamma\epsilon\omega$ is found only in its compounds, as $\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\gamma\epsilon\omega$, Schæf. Mel. p. 114., but it is better to derive these from the adj. $\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\gamma\eta\varsigma$, &c.; I doubt therefore whether $\eta\gamma\epsilon\omega$ was ever really in use. — Passow.

The Ion. and Dor. use, principally in the sense of to consider in a certain light, the perf. $\eta \gamma \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ instead of the pres.; it is common for instance in Herodotus, see Schweigh. Lex. Herod. v. $\eta \gamma \epsilon \sigma \partial \alpha \iota$; Fragm. Pythag. Gale p. 711. ($\delta \gamma \eta \nu \tau \alpha \iota$); whence it came into the language of poetry, e. g. $\mu \epsilon \gamma' \eta \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \delta \delta \epsilon$, Eurip. Phœ. 553. In prose it does not appear frequent until the later writers.* In the sense of to precede $\ddot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ is found in Pind. Pyth. 4, 442. In a passive sense $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$ is the same as $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \nu \rho \mu \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon$, that which is usual, Orac. ap. Demosth. adv. Macart. p. 1072, 25. In two of the passages of Herodot. there is a remarkable various reading $\ddot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ (see Schweigh. ib. v. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$); and it is very possible that this form had the Ion. short α for η with a different breathing.

^eHδω, Idelight: but little used in the active. Pass. I am delighted: fut. ήσθήσομαι; aor. 1. ήσθην. Compare 'Ανδάνω. Homer has once the midd. ήσατο for ήσθη, Od. 4, 353.

'Hθέω, I strain, filter : fut. in general use ήθήσω, &c. But Galen quotes from Hippocrates ήσας from H $\Theta\Omega$.

^eH_{κω}, *I come*, *am arrived* (see Ίκνέομαι), has (in the older writers) only the present, the imperfect $\tilde{\eta}$ κον, and the future $\tilde{\eta}$ ξω.

The form διήξα belongs to διάττω; but later writers have also from ήκω not only the aor. 1. ήξα but a perf. ήκα. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 743, 744.

^{*}Ημαι. See ΈΩ, 2.

'Ημί, ην. See Φημί.

[']H $\mu\nu\omega$, *I sink*: fut. $\eta\mu\nu\sigma\omega$, &c. The regular perf. of this verb was $\eta\mu\nu\kappa\alpha$; to this was prefixed the reduplic, with the shortened ε 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

* 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. 374. d. $(\eta\gamma\eta\sigma\alpha)$ for $\eta\gamma\epsilon_i$,), and in Clitophon 407. c. $(\eta\gamma\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon)$. 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 $\dot{a}\pi\dot{a}$. $\lambda a\mu\nu o_{\mathcal{G}}$ from $\pi a\lambda a\mu\dot{\eta}$, $\nu\dot{\omega}\nu u\mu\nu o_{\mathcal{G}}$ for $\nu\dot{\omega}\nu u\mu o_{\mathcal{G}}$; thus was formed an Epic perf. $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\nu\dot{\eta}\mu\upsilon\kappa a$, and its comp. $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\mu\nu\dot{\eta}\mu\upsilon\kappa a$, II. χ , 491.

'Ησσάομαι, ήττάομαι, I am inferior, am overcome, used in the pure language only in the passive form. Fut. ήσσηθήσομαι, occasionally ήττήσομαι, Lyc. c. Ergocl. 9., pro Polycr. 32. Verbal adj. ήττητέον.

The Ion. formed from $-\delta\omega$ a pass. $\delta\sigma\sigma\delta\delta\mu a\iota$, $\delta\sigma\sigma\delta\delta\mu a\iota$, $\delta\sigma\sigma\delta\delta\mu\eta\nu$, &c., Herodot. The later writers thought they might also form an active (to overcome), which Diodorus has occasionally (see Schæfer on Aristoph. Plut. p. 525.). The only passage in which it occurs in any of the older writers (Isæus 11, 31. p. 86, S.) has been corrected by the Breslau manuscript from $\tau \partial \nu \ \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \ \eta \tau \tau \tilde{q} \nu$, $\tau \partial \nu \ \partial \dot{\epsilon} \ \nu \iota \kappa \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a\iota$ to $\eta \tau \tau \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a\iota$... $\nu \iota \kappa \tilde{q} \nu$.*

Θ.

Θάλλω, I germinate: fut. Ααλῶ, also Ααλλήσομαι; perf. 2. τέθηλα, Dor. τέθαλα.

Hom. has not the pres. $\Im \delta \lambda \omega$, but in its stead uses $\Im \eta \lambda \varepsilon$; the Epic formation therefore is, $\Im \eta \lambda \varepsilon \omega$, $\cdot \eta \sigma \omega$ (II. a, 236.), &c.; perf. $\tau \varepsilon \theta \eta \lambda a$, part. $\tau \varepsilon \theta a \lambda \upsilon a$; with a rare aor. 2. $\Im \delta \lambda \varepsilon$, Hymn. Pan. 33. The form $\Im a \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \omega$, wherever it occurs, is only a corruption of the Doric $\Im \delta \lambda \varepsilon \omega$. The later Epics, as Quint. Sm. 11, 96., have $\Im \delta \lambda \varepsilon \omega$. The pass. $\tau \varepsilon \theta \eta \lambda \eta \mu \varepsilon \nu \sigma \sigma$ in Hippocr. Insomn. 5. is remarkable.

ΘΑΝ-. See Θνήσκω.

Θάπτω, *I bury*: fut. \Im άψω; perf. τέτἄφα; aor. 2. pass. ἐτάφην (but Herodotus has the aor. 1. ἐθάφθην); perf. pass. τεθάμμαι, τεθάφθαι. The root of this verb was therefore

* The conclusion that because we have $\eta \tau \tau \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a$, we must necessarily have $\eta \tau \tau \tilde{a} \nu$ is false: $\eta \tau \tau \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a$, is a neuter idea, $\eta \tau \tau \omega \nu$ $\epsilon \mu \tau \iota \nu o s$, whence it can be joined only with the gen. $\eta \tau \tau \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a t$ roos. The passive form, as in many other verbs, took this meaning, $\eta \tau \tau \eta \theta \eta \nu$ like $\ell \phi o \delta \eta \eta \nu$, $\epsilon \pi \lambda d \gamma \chi \theta \eta \nu$, &c., and might therefore have an active voice in a causative sense, but not necessarily. The common reading in Isaeus condemns itself. If the orator had wished merely to contrast the active and passive, he must have snid $\tau \delta \nu$ $u \ell \nu \nu \kappa \tilde{a} \sigma \theta u \tau \delta \nu \delta \epsilon \nu \kappa \tilde{a} \nu$, and it would have been a most unnatural mode of speaking to have brought in the verb $\eta \tau \tau \eta \tau$; even if it had been in use. The neuter ideas "to get the better, to win," are here contrasted with "to be worsted, to lose," and it was therefore necessary to say $\tau \partial \nu \mu \partial \nu$ $\eta \tau \pi \hat{a} \sigma \partial a$, $\tau \partial \nu \delta \hat{c} \nu u \eta \nu$, exactly as had been said a little before $\partial \nu \eta \hat{e} t \hat{e} \rho a \nu u \hat{q} \mu \tau \hat{e} \nu a \hat{a}$ it kal $\tau \eta \hat{\eta} \eta \tau \tau \eta$ - $\theta \hat{e} \sigma y$: where $\nu u \hat{q} \mu$ is taken in a judicial sense and stands absolutely, not having the opponent following it in the accusative case, as when it means to conquer any one in battle. $\Theta A \Phi$, as we see one or both of the aspirated letters in all the above forms. See below $\Theta A \Phi$.

Thus we have $\tau\epsilon\theta\dot{\alpha}\phi\theta\omega$ in Lucian Dial. Mar. 9, 1. $\tau\epsilon\theta\dot{\alpha}\phi\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ in Herodot. 6, 103. Compare $T\rho\dot{\epsilon}\phi\omega$, with note.

 $\Theta A \Phi$ -. Perf. used as a pres. $\tau i \theta \eta \pi a$, *I am astonished*, where the second aspirated letter of the root is changed into the *tenuis*; on the contrary in the aor. $\xi \tau a \phi o \nu$ the first undergoes that change.* Compare $\Theta a \pi \tau \omega$.

 $\Theta A\Omega$, 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. $\Im_{\eta\sigma\alpha\iota}$, and that only from Hesychius. Of the latter Hom. has the infin. pres. $\Im_{\eta\sigma\alpha\iota}^+$ with the collateral meaning of to milk (Od. δ , 89.), and the aor. 1. midd. $i\partial_{\eta\sigma\alpha\iota}$, he sucked (II. ω , 58.). [So $i\partial_{\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma}$, Callim. Jov. 48., and $\Im_{\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nuo\varsigma}$, Hymn. Cer. 236. But in Hymn. Apoll. 123. $\Im_{\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\sigma}$ has the causative sense she gave suck to.—Passow.]

See another Sáoµaı in the following Θεάοµαι.

Osáopas, I look at attentively, consider. Depon. Midd.

The following different formations from this stem or root have been preserved in the dialects:

1.) $\Im d \circ \mu a \iota$ in the following Doric forms; $\Im d' \mu \epsilon \theta a \ddagger$, Sophron ap. Apollon. de Pron. p. 359. a. Imperat. $\Im d \epsilon \circ$, Nossidis Epigr. 8., Anytes Epigr. 10. $\Im a \sigma \theta \epsilon$, the Megarean in Aristoph. Ach. 770. Fut. and aor. $\Im a \sigma \circ \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$, Theocr. 15, 23. $\Im d \circ a \sigma \theta a \iota$, 2, 72. $\Im a \sigma a \iota$ (imperat.) 1, 149. And the Epic $\Im \eta \sigma a \iota a \tau \circ$, Od. σ , 191.

2.) βαέομαι Doric, Pind. Pyth. 8, 64. βηέομαι Ion. whence έθηεῖτο, έθηεῦντο, βηεύμενοι, αοτ. έθηήσατο, &c., Hom. Herodot.

3.) Seáoµaı 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 $\Im a \circ \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ appears to be the oldest, whence $\Im a \tilde{\nu} \mu \alpha$; and the second merely the common lengthening of it, $\Im a \cdot \delta \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, Ion. $\Im a \cdot \delta \rho \mu \alpha \iota$. From the oldest form arose the simple verbal subst., properly $\Im a \alpha$, but soon changed into $\Im \delta \epsilon \alpha$, like $\mu \nu \delta \alpha$ into $\mu \nu \delta \alpha$; and hence first came the form $\Im \epsilon \delta \alpha \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, which

* A perfect $\tau \ell \theta a \phi a$ with a causative meaning, I astonish, in Schweighæuser's Athen. 6. p. 258. c. is suspected, because the manuscript has (contrary to the metre it is true) $\tau \ell \theta a \iota \phi \epsilon$. Now the aor. p. $\ell \theta \ell \mu \beta \eta$ in Hesych. supposes a theme, $S \ell \mu \beta \omega$; perhaps therefore it ought to be $\eta \tau \sigma \vartheta$ fiou 'Typotrys $\mu \epsilon \sigma ov \tau \ell \theta a \mu \phi \epsilon$, . instead of $\mu \epsilon \tau \sigma \vartheta \sigma \sigma \vartheta$. † This verb is contracted in η instead of α . See $Z \dot{\alpha} \omega$.

‡ This is more of an Æolic than a Doric contraction : here the o is swallowed up by the a preceding it, which consequently becomes long ; thus the part. $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tilde{a} \nu$ for $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tilde{a} \nu$, $\phi \nu \sigma \tilde{a} \nu \tau \epsilon$ for $\phi \nu \sigma d o \nu \tau \epsilon$, $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tilde{a} \sigma a$ for $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \tilde{a} \sigma \sigma$, &c. does not occur in Homer. In Herodotus we find indeed both forms, e. g. $\Im\eta\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\Im\epsilon\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (Ion. for $\Im\epsilon\dot{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$), but this uncertainty would seem to arise more from traditionary corruptions of the text. He has also constantly recurring as various readings $\dot{\epsilon}\theta\eta\epsilon\tau\sigma$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\theta\eta\eta\tau\sigma$, of which the latter is perhaps according to the analogy of some verbs in $\dot{\alpha}\omega$ contracted by the Epics in η instead of α , as $\dot{\rho}\eta\alpha\iota$ 2. sing. pres. and $\dot{\rho}\eta\tau\sigma$ 3. sing. imperf. of $\dot{\rho}\rho\omega\omega$, $\dot{\rho}\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\tau\eta\nu$ dual of $\dot{\rho}\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}$: verbal adj. $\Im\alpha\eta\tau\dot{\sigma}\varsigma$, $\Im\eta\eta\tau\dot{\sigma}\varsigma$, $\Im\epsilon\sigma\sigma\dot{\sigma}\varsigma$. Compare Z $\dot{\alpha}\omega$ and $\Theta\Lambda\Omega$.

 $\Theta_{\epsilon i \nu \omega}$, I beat. This pres. is constantly used by the Epic poets and Tragedians in both the act. and pass. voice. Beside this the Attic poets have a form géveiv, Gévev, imper. Géve, conj. Géve, frequent 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. $\Im \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tilde{\epsilon} \epsilon$. Hence our latest critics have shown that those forms are aorists, (excepting occasionally that the fut. 9evw, 9evwv, ought to be restored,) and therefore that the infin. and part. must undoubtedly be accented Seveiv, Seváv.* All those passages certainly express a momentary beating, Seiver on the contrary (e. g. Seiveral, Æschyl. Pers. 301. "έθεινον, ib. 416. "έθεινε, Eurip. Herc. 949. Θεινόμενος, Hom.) continued blows, or the proper imperfect. Of the indic. of this aor. $\ell \theta \epsilon \nu o \nu$ no instance has yet been found. The Epic language has the aor. 1. žoeiva, part. Seivaç, Il. v, 481. Hence we can point to έθεινε as evidently an imperf. at II. π, 339., and as an aor. at ϕ , 491. The perfects and the aor. pass. are wanting.

Θέλω. See Ἐθέλω.

 $\Theta'_{epopular}$, I warm myself: used in prose in the present and imperfect only.

Homer has, beside the above, a fut. $\Im \epsilon \rho \sigma \rho \mu a \iota$ and an aor. pass. ($\epsilon \partial \epsilon \rho \eta \nu$) conj. $\Im \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$. The act. $\Im \epsilon \rho \omega$, *I warm*, stands in the lexicons without any good authority.

Quite as defective is the derivative form of which we find in Homer only $\Im \epsilon \rho \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ and $\Im \epsilon \rho \mu \epsilon \tau o$. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 546. note.

Θέσσασθαι, to beseech; a defective aor. of which we find only \Im έσσαντο (Pind. N. 5, 18.), and part. \Im εσσάμενος, Hes. Fr. 23.: see Schæf. Schol. Par. Apollon. Rh. 1, 824. The verbal adj. would be \Im εστός, from which come ἀπόθεστος and πολύθεστος, Hom.

* Blomfield on Æschyl, Sept. 378. (he has made some mistakes) and Elmsley on Eurip. Heracl. 272. We must not be surprised at the ϵ in an aor. 2. any more than in $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \mu o \nu$: it was necessary on account of $\epsilon \theta a \nu o \nu$.

Θέω, I run: fut. midd. 9εύσομαι* Hom., or 9ευσοῦμαι Dor. The other tenses are defective. Compare Τρέγω.

For the imperf. $\xi \theta \epsilon o \nu$ Hom. has $\Im \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \kappa o \nu$. We find also an act. fut. $\Im \epsilon \nu \sigma \omega$ in Lycophr. 119. There are some forms from $\Im \epsilon \omega$, the root of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$, which we must take care not to confound with those of $\Im \epsilon \omega$, *I* run: e. g. $\pi \rho o \theta \epsilon \delta o \nu \sigma \iota$ (II. a, 291.), the Ion. optat. $\Im \epsilon \sigma \iota \sigma \tau$ for the aor. 2. midd. $\Im \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \tau \sigma$, and $\pi \sigma \tau i \theta \epsilon \iota$ for $\pi \sigma \tau i \theta \epsilon \varsigma$, Theorem. 14, 45.

Θηέομαι. See Θεάομαι.

Θηλέω. See Θάλλω.

 $ΘH\Pi$ -. See ΘAΦ-.

Θησθαι. See ΘΑΩ.

Θιγγάνω, I touch : fut. βίξομαι †; aor. 2. έθιγον. See note under Αἰσθάνομαι.

Beside $\Im_{i\gamma\gamma\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega}$ a pres. $\Im_{i\gamma\omega}$ is generally adopted, of which $\mathring{e}\theta_{i\gamma\sigma\nu}$ would be at the same time imperf. and aor., and $\Im_{i\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu}$ would be different from $\Im_{i\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu}$ (compare $\kappa\lambda\dot{\upsilon}\omega$). But there are not sufficient proofs of the indic. $\Im_{i\gamma\omega}$ or of $\mathring{e}\theta_{i\gamma\sigma\nu}$ as a decided imperfect. The accentuation of $\Im_{i\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu}$ $\Im_{i\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu}$, and $\Im_{i\gamma\omega\nu}$ $\Im_{i\gamma\dot{\omega}\nu}$, is indeed generally confounded in the manuscripts; but when for instance we read in Hesychius, $\Theta_{i\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu}$. $\psi_{a\bar{\nu}\sigma\alpha\iota}$, $\mathring{a}\psi_{a\sigma}\theta_{a\iota}$, $\mathring{a}\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta_{a\iota}$, we see how little dependence is to be placed on these accents. If we were to accent in every passage of our text $\Im_{i\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu}$, $\Im_{i\gamma\dot{\omega}\nu}$, as aorists, we should not find the sense disturbed in any one instance. \ddagger

Θλάω, *I contuse*, *bruise*, *crush*: fut. βλάσω, &c. It has a short in the inflexion, and in the pass. takes the σ.

The part. perf. pass. is $\tau \epsilon \theta \lambda a \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$, Theocr. 22, 45.; as in the Doric dialect all verbs ending in $\zeta \omega$ and some in $\dot{\alpha} \omega$, which have a short in

† In Eurip. Heracl. 652. the reading of the text was $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\theta(\xi\epsilon\iotas, but it is now$ $amended from the manuscripts to -<math>\epsilon\iota$. [Passow has a fut. act. $\Im(\xi\omega, but without$ $example or remark, further than that <math>\Im_{\iota-\xi}o\mu a\iota$ is more general.]

the second sec

look at the passages, we shall see a plain difference between these aorists and the sense of $\mu\epsiloni\lambda i\sigma\sigma\epsilon ro$ in the former and $\delta\pi\alpha\phi\delta\nu$ in the latter, which express a duration of the thought; nay in the passage of $\mathcal{E}schylus$ we shall find them contrasted, ${}^{2}\pi\alpha\phi\delta\nu$ $\delta\tau\alpha\rho\delta\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon_i\rho k \kappa a 3 \delta r\gamma\delta\nu$ $\mu\delta$ - $\nu\sigma\nu$. [There are a few other instances in the Tragedians, but none to be depended on; e. g. in Soph. Phil. 9. the Ald. ed. has $m\rho\sigma\sigma\theta r\gamma\epsilon\nu$. compare also $\mathcal{A}schyl.$ Agam. 1049. Soph. Aj. 1410. Elmsl. and Herm. Ced. C. 470. 'Schaft, Eurip. Or. p. 12. Greg. Cor. p. 990. Monk Eurip. Alc. 1136. Elmsl. Eurip. Bacch. 304. Wunderl. Obs. Critt. p. 151. — Passow.]

Six verbs in έω take ευ in the fut. or in some derivative, viz. Σέω, νέω, πλέω, πνέω, βέω, χέω; thus πλεύσομαι, ἕπνευσα, χεῦμα, δεc. And two in aίω take aυ, viz. καίω, κλαίω (Att. κάω, κλάω), fut, καύσω, κλαύσομαι.

the inflexion, change to the other formation with the ξ ; as $\kappa_0 \mu i \zeta_\omega$, Dor. fut. $\kappa_0 \mu i \xi_\omega \cdot \gamma \epsilon \lambda a \omega$, $\epsilon' \gamma \epsilon \lambda a \sigma a$, Dor. $\epsilon' \gamma \epsilon \lambda a \xi a$, &c.

Θλί6ω, I press, squeeze: fut. βλίψω; aor. 2. pass. έθλί6ην (like τρί6ω).

In Homer we find the fut. midd. $\Im i \psi \epsilon \tau \alpha i$, Od. ρ , 221. The pass. part. pres. $\Im i \delta i \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma c$ is in Dioscor. Epig. 37., and the part. perf. pass. $\tau \epsilon \partial \lambda \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$ in Leon. Tar. Epig. 70.

Θνήσκω, I die: fut. Θανοῦμαι; aor. 2. ἔθανον; perf. τέθνηκα: compare βέβληκα and note under Βάλλω. Of this perf. the following syncopated forms are in common use: τέθνᾶμεν, τέθνᾶτε, τεθνᾶσι, and 3. plur. pluperf. ἐτέθνᾶσαν; imp. τέθνᾶθι, opt. τεθναίην, infin. τεθνάναι, part. τεθνεώς, gen. -ῶτος, fem. τεθνεῶσα, neut. τεθνεώς, but in Herodot. 1, 112. τεθνεός, which is perhaps preferable. From τέθνηκα arose also an Attic fut. τεθνήξω or τεθνήξομαι (like ἑστήξω or ἑστήξομαι), 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. Θνητός.

That the α in the infin. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota$ was short in the common language is evident from Aristoph. Ran. 1012: but we find in Æschyl. Agam. 550. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\alpha\nu\alpha\iota$ which was perhaps a contraction of $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\alpha\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$. The Epics have also $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu$, and Homer $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$. The Ion. and Hom. language has a perf. part. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $-\tilde{\omega}\tau\dot{\sigma}\varsigma$ (comp. $\beta\epsilon\delta\alpha\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ under Bairw, and $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ under "I $\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$), for which Homer has sometimes $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\sigma}\tau\varsigma$, and once $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}\tau\iota$, as a trisyllable, Od. τ , 331. For $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\tau\varsigma$ there is also a frequent various reading $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\iota\dot{\omega}\tau\varsigma$, and for $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\sigma}\tau\varsigma$ sometimes $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\iota\dot{\sigma}\tau\varsigma$. To preserve Homeric uniformity Heyne wrote all the above with $\epsilon\iota$, whilst Wolf for the same purpose preferred η : 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; $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\tau$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\sigma}\tau\varsigma$ and $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\varsigma$.

In usage this verb is so mixed up with its compound $\dot{\alpha}\pi o\theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \omega$, that the simple forms $\xi \theta a \nu o \nu$, $\vartheta a \nu \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, $\vartheta a \nu o \tilde{\upsilon} \mu a \iota$ are entirely poetical, while on the contrary the perf. $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa a$ with its derivative forms scarcely ever occurs compounded with $\dot{\alpha}\pi \delta$. Moreover of the perfect we find hardly any but syncopated forms: the part. $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \omega_{\varepsilon}$ is indeed interchanged with $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon \omega_c$, yet so that of the latter the masculine only occurs in prose. The usage of prose is therefore the following:

Ανήσκω and ἀποθνήσκω· ἀπέθανον, ἀποθανεῖν, &c.; ἀποθανοῦμαι· τέθνηκα, ἐτεθνήκειν· τέθναμεν, τεθνάναι, &c.; τεθνηκώς and τεθνεώς, τεθνηκοῖα, τεθνηκός.

The part. $\Im a \nu \omega \nu$, of $\Im a \nu \omega \nu \tau \epsilon c$, is however common in prose as an adj. in the sense of *dead*.

The infin. perf. $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota$ is used generally in its natural meaning : but not unfrequently it stands also for the aor. $\Im \alpha \nu \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, e. g. in Plat. Crito (at the beginning), $\eta \tau \dot{\sigma} \pi \lambda \tilde{\iota} \tilde{\iota} \nu \dot{\alpha} \dot{\sigma} \tilde{\iota} \kappa \tau \alpha \iota \dot{\sigma} \dot{\delta} \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\rho} \kappa \sigma \mu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota \mu \epsilon$; and such is its meaning in the familiar hyperbolical expression $\pi \sigma \lambda \lambda \dot{\kappa} \iota_{\mathcal{S}}$, $\mu \nu \rho \iota \dot{\alpha} \kappa \iota_{\mathcal{S}} \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota$: whence it is clear that in some other passges we must not force it to mean to be dead, as Plat. Crito 14. $\epsilon \dot{\iota}$ $\dot{\delta} \epsilon \iota_{\ell} \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota \sigma \epsilon$. 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. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\omega$ or $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\rho\mu\alpha$, 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 $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ($\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\epsilon\iota$) "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 v. and the passages in Brunck ad Aristoph. Ach. 590., Fisch. ad Well. 3. p. 106.*

The compound with $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha}$ 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 $\kappa \alpha \tau \theta \alpha \nu \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, $\kappa \alpha \tau \theta \alpha \nu \dot{\omega} \nu$, &c.; hence in the Attic poets, who do not willingly omit the augment, the indic. $(\kappa \dot{\alpha} \tau \theta \alpha \nu \epsilon)$ seldom occurs (Æsch. Agam. 1553.), while the other moods are frequent in Euripides and others.

Θορέω, θόρνυμαι. See Θρώσκω.

Θράσσω. See Ταράσσω.

Θραύώ, I break in pieces. The passive takes σ . The old perf. pass. τέθραυμαι has been restored by Bekker to Plat. Legg. 6. p. 757. e. (425, 7.).

* An unwillingness to recognize the idea of a perfect in $\tau e\theta \nu \hat{\eta} \xi o \mu a$ arises partly from the custom of our language, particularly from such expressions as $\beta i \omega \sigma \epsilon rat \hat{\eta}$ $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \hbar \xi \epsilon \tau a_i$, where we always contrast to live with to die, whereas the true contrast is between to live and to be dead.

Θρύπτω, I break in pieces: fut. Αρύψω; aor. 2. pass. ετρύφην Compare Θάπτω and Τρέφω 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 $\mu\alpha\lambda\alpha\varkappa\alpha\beta\rho\delta\sigma\tau$ are $\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, Xenoph. — Passow.]

Θρώσκω, I leap: fut. Δοροῦμαι, Ion. Δορέομαι; aor. 2. έθορον, conj. Δορῶ, infin. Δορεῖν. See βέβληκα and note under Βάλλω.

The pres. $\Im o \rho \epsilon \omega$, which is in all the lexicons, is searcely to be found even in the later writers; and where we do find it, $a \pi \sigma \theta o \rho \sigma \tilde{\nu} \tau \epsilon_{\varsigma}$ is a false reading for $a \pi \sigma \theta o \rho \delta \nu \tau \epsilon_{\varsigma}$ or something similar: see Stephan. Thesaurus.* That $\Im \rho \tilde{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$ and $\Im \delta \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ are connected in usage was allowed by the old Grammarians: see Eustath.ad II. β , 702. p. 246, 47. Basil. où $\gamma a \rho \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \pi \epsilon \nu \epsilon \kappa \theta o \rho \delta \nu \tau a a \lambda \lambda' \epsilon \tau \iota a \pi \sigma \theta \rho \omega \sigma \kappa \sigma \nu \tau a$. Compare also Herodot. 6, 134., where the aorists $\tilde{\upsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta o \rho \delta \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$, $\tilde{\upsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta o \rho \delta \nu \tau a$, are used of leaping over a wall, and then follows the present: $\kappa a \tau a \theta \rho \omega \sigma \kappa \sigma \nu \tau a$ $\delta \epsilon (by leaping down) \tau \delta \nu \mu \eta \rho \delta \nu \sigma \pi a \sigma \theta \eta \nu a$.

Among the forms of this verb we may with safety class the perf. $\tau \epsilon \theta \circ \rho \alpha$, 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. ' $\Omega_{\mathcal{G}}$ $\epsilon i \tau \epsilon \kappa \lambda \delta r \iotao_{\mathcal{G}} \tau \epsilon \theta \circ \rho v i \eta_{\mathcal{G}} \sigma \phi \circ r \delta v \lambda i \omega r \epsilon \xi$, "as if either the spine were dislocated...." instead of $\vartheta \circ v \rho i \eta_{\mathcal{G}} \dots \epsilon \xi$.

In the collateral sense of copulating (see $\Im \rho \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$ and $\Im o \rho \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$ in Hesych.) the depon. $\Im \delta \rho \nu \nu \mu \alpha \iota$ is more common.

ΘΥΦ-. See Τύφω.

Θύω, Isacrifice: fut. $\Im \overline{\upsilon}' \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ἔθῦσα; perf. τέθῦκα†, Chœrobosc. p. 1286., Draco pp. 45, 26. and 87, 25.; aor. 1. pass. ἐτῦ'θην, part. τυθείς. — Midd.

 $\Theta'\omega$, and a sister-form $\vartheta'\nu\omega$, have also the sense of *I rage*; and with this meaning we find a syncop. part. aor. midd. $\vartheta'\mu\nu\omega_{0}$ in Pratinas ap. Athen. 14. p. 617. d. according to the reading as now corrected.

I.

'Ιάομαι, I heal, depon. midd.: fut. ίάσομαι, lon. and Ep.

* Even in Quint. Sm. 1, 542. Sopei should be amended to the far more suitable poetical aor. Sόρεν. † On this perf. compare $\Delta \epsilon \omega$ with note, and $\Delta \delta \omega$ with second note. in j and j

'Ιδρόω, I sweat; fut. ἰδρώσω, &c. This verb, like its contrary ριγόω, is contracted irregularly in ω and ω , instead of ov and oi; thus ἰδρῶσα, Il. δ, 27., ἰδρώην, ἰδρῶσι, ἰδρῶντες, Hippocr. This however seems to hold good of the Ionic dialect only, as in Xen. Hell. 4. 5, 7. the best editions now read ἰδροῦντι, not ἰδρῶντι.

Ίδρύω, I place, build: fut. ίδρύσω, &c. - MIDD.

The aor. 1. pass. $i\delta\rho\dot{v}\theta\eta\nu$, regular with v long, is recommended as exclusively the Attic form; on the other hand $i\delta\rho\dot{v}\nu\theta\eta\nu^*$ (which supposes a theme in $-\dot{v}\nu\omega$, 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.

[']Ιζω, more generally $\varkappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \omega$, 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.[†] (Hom. and Herodot. 8, 52. 71.); but of $\varkappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \omega$ we find a fut. $\varkappa \alpha \theta i \tilde{\omega}$, an aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \varkappa \dot{\alpha} \theta i \sigma \alpha$, and perf. $\varkappa \epsilon \varkappa \dot{\alpha} \theta i \varkappa \alpha$. The Middle has the sense of to sit, and its future is generally $\varkappa \alpha \theta i \zeta' j \sigma \circ \mu \alpha i$.

With regard to the accentuation of this verb, we know that the vowels ι and v when short can be augmented only by being made long, as $i_{\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\omega}$, aor. $i_{\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma\alpha}$; but where they are already long by position, the augment can be marked only by the difference of pronunciation and accent; thus in $i\zeta\omega$ the imperat. pres. is $i\zeta\epsilon$, the imperf. is $i\zeta\epsilon$; though from errors of transcription this rule is very frequently broken in the manuscripts, and consequently in the text of all writers. The

* Instances occur where there is no ν in the pres. of a verb, and yet it is found in the aor. 1. pass., as $i\delta\rho i\nu \theta\eta \nu$, $d\mu\pi\nu i\nu \theta\eta$ under ' $i\delta\rho i\omega$ and $\Pi\nu i\omega$. In such cases it is not necessary to suppose an actual theme in $-i\nu\omega$. Compare $i\theta i\nu \tau a\tau a$ for $i\theta i\tau a\tau a$. See also $Tei\nu\omega$. + [Passow has also a fut. $i\xi h\sigma \omega$, Att. $i\hat{\omega}$; and in the compound he has fut. $\kappa \alpha$ - $\theta \iota \xi h \sigma \omega$, Dor. $\kappa \alpha \theta \iota \xi \omega$, Att. $\kappa \alpha \theta \iota \tilde{\omega}$; aor. 1. $\epsilon \kappa \alpha \theta \iota \sigma \alpha$, also $\kappa \alpha \theta \iota \sigma \alpha$, Thuc. 6, 66. 7, 82. Aristoph. Ran. 911. The Epic part. $\kappa \alpha$ - $\theta \iota \sigma \sigma \alpha s$ is used by Homer.] older Attics augmented $\kappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \omega$ in the middle also, $\kappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \varepsilon$, $\kappa \alpha \theta i \sigma \varepsilon \nu$.* 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. ζάνω, καθιζάνω.

With this verb is intimately connected the verb $\xi \zeta \in \sigma \theta \alpha_i$, $\varkappa \alpha \theta \xi \zeta \in \sigma \theta \alpha_i$, which never occurs in the older writers except in the aorist $\xi \zeta \delta \mu \eta \nu$, $\xi \varkappa \alpha \theta \in \zeta \delta \mu \eta \nu$, I sat, I have sat down, $\varkappa \alpha \theta \in \zeta \delta \mu \in \nu \circ \varsigma$, &c., and of which the fut. 2. is $\varkappa \alpha \theta \in \delta \delta \delta \mu \mu \alpha_i \dagger$ (like $\mu \alpha \chi \delta \delta \mu \alpha_i$ and $\pi \delta \delta \delta \delta \mu \alpha_i$). The defective tenses are supplied by $\xi \delta \sigma \alpha$, $\delta \zeta \omega$, and $\delta \delta \rho \delta \omega$, with the comp. $\varkappa \alpha \theta \in \delta \sigma \alpha$, &c.

The general supposition is, that there are two synonymous verbal forms ίζεσθαι and ἕζεσθαι. In that case $\dot{\epsilon}$ ζόμην must be an imperf. as well as $i\zeta \delta \mu \eta \nu$; whereas we can prove, not from the Homeric language, which is in this respect uncertain, but from Attic prose, that it is invariably a pure aorist. Plat. Meno. 26. p. 89. και δή και νῦν εἰς καλὸν ήμῖν παρεκαθέζετο, $\tilde{\phi}$ μεταδώμεν τῆς ζητήσεως: in this construction the imperf. 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.) καὶ αὐτός ποτε καθεζόμενος συχνόν χρόνον κατέμαθον άναστας μόγις, not "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 έζετο in the poets, and ἐκαθέζετο in all writers, are regularly used in the narrative of the momentary action of sitting down, as is also καθέ-Zwuai, &c. : those passages, therefore, where the context does not necessarily show this, must be understood in the same sense. And thus the few instances where the pres. καθέζομαι is found become very suspicious.t

γ [Diogen, Lacit, inic also a luc, κατέ δήσομα. — Passow.] ‡ In Lucian Solœc. 11. τό γε μην καθέξεσθαι τοῦ καθίξειν διενήνοχεν. Here is a various reading καθίζεσθαι. Now when we find further on, τδ δὲ καθίζω τοῦ καθέζο μαι ἄρά τοι δοκεί μικρῷ των διαφέρεω; εἴπερ τό μὲν ἕτερον δρῶμεν (we do that to another), τὸ καθίζευν λέγω, τὸ δὲ μόνους ἡμᾶs αὐτοὐs, τὸ καθέζεσθαι, - we must undoubtedly read here also $\kappa a\theta i \langle \omega \rho a u$ and $\kappa a\theta i \langle \varepsilon \sigma \partial a u$: for it is clear that the point in discussion is the difference between the midd. and nct. voices, in the same way as $\kappa a \tau a \delta o u \lambda o \tilde{v} \sigma \theta a u$ and $\kappa a \tau a \delta o u \lambda o \tilde{v} \sigma \theta a$ and $\kappa a \tau a \delta o u \lambda o \tilde{v} \sigma \theta a$ and $\kappa a \tau a \delta o u \lambda o \tilde{v} \sigma \theta a$. But in the direction given by Thom. M. (p. 489.) $\lambda \epsilon \gamma e \ o \tilde{v} \ \kappa a \theta \epsilon (\delta \mu a u, \kappa a \theta \epsilon (\delta \mu a u, \kappa a \theta \epsilon (\delta \mu a u, \kappa a \theta \epsilon) \lambda \epsilon \gamma e \ o \tilde{v} \ \kappa a \theta \epsilon)$ number of just afterwards. But in the direction given by Thom. M. (p. 489.) $\lambda \epsilon \gamma e \ o \tilde{v} \ \kappa a \theta \epsilon \delta (\delta \mu a u, \kappa a \theta \epsilon) \lambda \epsilon \gamma e \ o \tilde{v} \ \kappa a \theta \epsilon) \lambda \epsilon \gamma e \ o \tilde{v} \ \kappa a \theta \epsilon \rangle (\delta \mu a u, \kappa a \theta \epsilon) \lambda \epsilon \gamma e \ o \tilde{v} \ \kappa a \theta \epsilon \rangle (\delta \mu a u, \kappa a \theta \epsilon) \lambda \epsilon \gamma e \ o \tilde{v} \ \kappa a \theta \epsilon \rangle$ where $\kappa a \eta \epsilon \ \delta \mu a u = 0$ and $\kappa a \mu = 0$

^{* [}Wolf always accents the imperf. κd - $\theta \iota \zeta o \nu$, not $\kappa a \theta \iota \zeta o \nu$, and his is indisputably the more correct way if we suppose the original form to be $\delta \kappa d \theta \iota \zeta o \nu$: but Buttmann does not allow this to hold good in all cases. — Passow.]

all cases. — Passow.] + [Diogen. Laert. has also a fut. καθεδήσομαι. — Passow.]

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 $\epsilon i\sigma a$ and $\tilde{\eta}\mu a\iota$, whose immediate connexion with $i\zeta\omega$ and $i\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$ is shown in the note below : thus, $\kappa a\theta i\zeta\omega$, I seat, place, $\epsilon\kappa a\theta i\sigma a$, $\kappa a\theta i\omega$. MIDD. $\kappa a\theta i\zeta o\mu a\iota$, I seat myself, sit, fut. $\kappa a\theta \epsilon \delta \delta \tilde{\mu} a\iota$ and $\kappa a\theta i\zeta\eta \sigma o\mu a\iota$, aor. $\epsilon\kappa a\theta \epsilon \zeta \delta \mu \eta \nu$. In the more remote meaning of the middle voice, I seat or place (for myself), cause to be placed, are used $\epsilon i\sigma \delta \mu \eta \nu$ and $\kappa a\theta \epsilon i\sigma \delta \mu \eta \nu$, whence $\epsilon \gamma \kappa a\theta \epsilon i\sigma a\tau o$, Eurip. Hipp. 31.: perf. $\kappa a\theta \eta \mu a\iota$, properly I have seated myself, whence pres. I sit. Nor must we forget to mention with the above the usage of $\kappa a\theta i\zeta\omega$, I seat or 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 $\kappa o\epsilon \mu \delta r \nu \mu \iota$.

The meaning of *I* seat or place myself may also be understood passively; and so arose $(\breve{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu)$ $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\theta\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$, forms which are frequent in the later writers but banished from the pure language.*

On the Homeric $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ see note on $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\sigma\alpha$ 2. under 'EQ.

"Inμι, I send. See under ΈΩ 1.

'Ιθύω, I go straight on : fut. ίθύσω ; aor. 1. ίθυσα, &c., to which be-

seated ourselves, consequently $\delta\kappaa\theta\epsilon\zeta \delta\mu\epsilon\thetaa$. Again in Phoen. 73. and Helen. 1587. $\kappaa\theta\delta \xi \epsilon^{-1}$ is $\delta\kappaa\theta\delta \xi \epsilon^{-1} co.$ Whether in a later period a usage was formed from this, according to which $\kappaa\theta\delta \zeta \rho\muaa$, as a present, was the same as $\kappa d\theta\eta\mu aa$, 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, $\kappaa\theta\delta \xi \rho \sigma rau$; 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 $\kappaa\theta \xi \rho \sigma rau$; so fn o assistance, the context requiring $\kappa d\theta \eta \nu rau$. However the language of this dialogue, in which we find δs for $\delta \sigma \theta a$, $\pi \epsilon \rho i \epsilon \sigma raus$ $(see <math>\delta \sigma \tau \eta \mu i$), p. 570. d., and $\delta \mu \delta \tilde{\pi}$, p. 366. 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 'E $\Delta\Omega$, as proved by $\delta\delta\delta\mu\alpha_i$, ' $\delta\delta\sigma_s$ and sedeo. Now as $\delta\sigma\pi\delta\mu\eta\nu$ and $\delta\sigma\chi\delta\mu\eta\nu$ come from $\delta\pi\omega$ and 'EX Ω , so $\delta\sigma\delta\delta\mu\eta\nu$ comes from 'E $\Delta\Omega$: and here even better than in $\delta\sigma\pi\epsilon \sigma\theta\alpha we can see the augment which in$ the common language had become equally $fixed throughout all the moods, <math>\delta\sigma\delta\mu\mu\alpha_i$,

к 2

έζωμαι, έζόμενος. To the above we may add the pres. Toow, Ifw, exactly like Toxw to έσχον. In καθίζω, καθέζετο this origin naturally enough ceased to be heard any longer, and then were formed ekátura, καθιώ : καθέζετο 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 $\kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha$ than in that of other aorists, which we have seen mistaken in a similar manner. But it is now clear also that $\epsilon I \sigma a$ and $\Re \mu a i$, whose connexion with $\xi \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ we acknowledged (see p. 117.), and yet separated them from it on practical grounds, do not come from 'EΩ, but from this same 'EAQ; that is to say $\bar{\eta}\mu\alpha\iota$ was softened down from house, of which latter there are still remains in hora and in eloa, eloáµny, both formed with that oldest of augments er, 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 reading προσκαθιζήσει there proposed for Æschin. c. Ctes. p. 77, 33. has been now adopted by Bekker from evident traces in the Codd. The conj. έσθῶ in Soph. Œd. C. 195. was indeed still more improbable : see Brunck and Reisig. longs also in Homer and others $i \pi \iota \theta \upsilon \omega$, with the ι long. But $i \theta \upsilon \nu \omega$ is Ionic and Epic for $i \vartheta \theta \upsilon \nu \omega$, *I* direct or guide straight forward : aor. 1. $i \theta \upsilon \nu a$: also in the midd. $i \theta \upsilon \nu \varepsilon \tau \sigma$ in the act. sense, Od. χ , 8.

Ίχνέομαι, more generally ἀφιχνέομαι. I come, depon. midd.: fut. ἕξομαι; aor. ἰχόμην; perf. ἶγμαι, ἀφῖγμαι, ἀφῖγβαι.

The Ion. 3. plur. perf. pass. $\dot{a}\pi i\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha i$ in Herodotus is remarkable as the only known instance of the *tenuis* in the stem being retained. But $i\kappa \tau \alpha$ in Hes. 9, 481. is a syncopated aorist: and to this belongs also $i\kappa \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha c$ in Soph. Phil. 494. : see note in Buttm. edit.

The Epic language has the pres. and imperf. of the active, $i\kappa\omega$, $i\kappa\omega$, $i\kappa\omega$, with the aor. $i\xi\sigma\nu$; on which last, as a mixture of the aor. 1. and 2., see $i\delta i\sigma\epsilon\tau\sigma$, p. 73., and olor under $\Phi\epsilon\rho\omega$.

In the pres. $i\kappa\omega$ the ι is long throughout, while in the aor. $i\kappa\omega\mu\eta\nu$ it is, according to the root, short, but becomes long by the augment; consequently in $i\kappa\omega\mu\eta\nu$, $\dot{a}\phi\bar{\iota}\kappa\omega\mu\eta\nu$ it is long; in $i\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $i\kappa\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, &c., short: and accordingly in the Epic language the indicative $i\kappa\omega\mu\eta\nu$, from the augment being moveable, is both long and short. The form $i\kappa\nu\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ (Eurip. Or. 670. 679. &c.) has the ι short. Another poetical present is $i\kappa\dot{a}\nu\omega$, with ι short and a long.

The pres. $i\kappa\nu\sigma\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$ occurs in its simple form in particular senses only; in Hom. to go through, travel from one place to another, Od. 1, 128. ω , 338.: in the Attics, to go to as a suppliant ($i\kappa\epsilon\tau\eta_c$), implore, and to be suitable to. The true pres. as to meaning is in the Epic language $i\kappa\omega$ and $i\kappa\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$, in the Tragic principally $i\kappa\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$, in prose $\dot{\alpha}\phi\iota\kappa\nu\sigma\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$. The aor. $i\xi\sigma\nu$ is solely Epic; but $i\kappa\phi\mu\eta\nu$ and $i\xi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ are common to all the poets.

To these we may add $\eta \kappa \omega$, 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 $i\kappa\omega$; whence, as Eustathius (ad II. a, p. 82, 33.) expressly informs us, the Grammarians agreed that $i\kappa\omega$ was the only form used in Homer, and $\eta\kappa\omega$ the only one in succeeding writers. But the more critical way of understanding it is that $i\kappa\omega$ and $\eta\kappa\omega$ are properly but one word in different dialects, like $\sigma\kappa i\pi\omega\nu$ and $\sigma\kappa \eta \pi\omega\nu$.* The older poets (for this

* That is to say, that in this verb the short syllable of the stem or root, as seen in the aorist $(i\kappa\epsilon\hat{w})$ $i\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\omega$, instead of being strengthened in the present by changing it

to ϵ_i , as in $\pi\epsilon i\theta\omega$ $\pi_i\theta\epsilon i\nu$, passed over into \overline{i} or η ; making therefore ' $i\kappa\omega$ or $\eta\kappa\omega$ instead of $\epsilon i\kappa\omega$.

relates principally to them, including Pindar; see Boeckh ad Pind. Ol. 4, 11.) had the dialectic form $i\kappa\omega$, which, like our *come*, was used of being already arrived at a place, e. g. in II. σ , 406.; but the language of the succeeding period, i. e. the Ionic and Attic prose with Attic poetry, in which $i\!/\kappa\omega$ had become established, limited the usage of the latter verb to that particular meaning, while the lengthened forms $i\kappa\acute{a}\nu\omega$, $\dot{a}\phi\imath\kappa\nu\sigma\widetilde{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$, retained the more general sense of to come to, arrive at a place. In the future also the difference is pretty much the same: $i\!/i\!\xi\omega$, 'I shall come (to you) and be with you;' $\dot{a}\phi\!/i\!\xi\circ\mu\alpha\iota$, 'I shall set out from hence and come to you.'

Ίλάσκομαι, I appease, midd.: fut. ἰλάσομαι (Ep. ἰλάσσομαι, Dor. ἰλάξομαι); aor. 1. ἰλασάμην with a short.

The Epics have also $i\lambda \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu a\iota$ (II. β , 550.) and $i\lambda \alpha \rho a\iota$ (Hom. Hymn. 20. Orph. Arg. 942.); while Æschylus has $i\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \rho \mu a\iota$, Suppl. 123. 134. The ι 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. $\lambda\eta\theta\iota$ (Od. γ , 380. π , 184. $\lambda\ddot{\alpha}\theta\iota$, Theorr. 15, 143.) from $\lambda\eta\mu\iota$, and a conj. and opt. from $\lambda\eta\kappa\omega$.*

'Ιμάσσω[†], *I whip*: fut. iμάσω (ă); aor. 1. iμασα. On the formation of this fut. see 'Αρμόττω.

'Ιμάω, I draw up (a rope or water): fut. iμήσω, &c. The Att. infin. pres. is iμην: compare ζάω, βάω. — MIDD.

[']Ιμείρω and ⁱμείρομαι I desire, wish for. The aor. opt. midd. is iμείραιτο (Il. ξ , 163.), and the aor. 1. pass. iμέρθη (Herodot. 7, 44.). The ι is always long.

"Ιπταμαι. See Πέτομαι.

"Ισημι, I know. [Of this verb we find only the Dor. pres. ⁱσāμι in Pind. and Theocr., the 2. sing. ⁱσης, 3. sing. ⁱσāτι, and 1. plur. ⁱσăμεν, Pind. N. 7, 21., and the part. ⁱσας, Pind. 3, 52. The forms which only appear to belong to this verb, such as ⁱσμεν, ⁱδμεν, ⁱσασι, ⁱσθι, ⁱσαν, will be found under Εⁱδω.— Passow.]

^{*}Ισκω. ^{*}Ισκεν, he spoke, is a defective imperf. (Od. χ , 31.), differing essentially from ⁱσκω or είσκω, I make or think like (which occurs only

* We must compare these imperatives with στηθι, ἕστηκα, &c., and suppose that the pres. and aor. 1. took the causative sense to make gracious; of which ἰλάσμαι, ἰλασάμην, would then be the middle, I make gracious to me, appease. be doubted, for $i\mu\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega$ (II. o, 17.) may be the conj. aor., as it is in Hesychius; nor do I know other authority for the pres. than $i\mu\alpha\sigma\sigma\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma_i$ in Archiæ Epig. 22. which was perhaps first made from the passage of Homer.

 \dagger The characteristic $\sigma\sigma$ of this verb may

in the pres. and imperf., Il. λ , 798. ϵ , 181. Od. δ , 279. ν , 313.), and arising from the insertion of the σ in IK- the root of $\epsilon^{i}\kappa\omega$, like $\lambda\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega$ from $\lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\tilde{i}\nu$, $\tau\iota\tau\dot{\nu}\sigma\kappa\omega$ from $\tau\epsilon\dot{\nu}\chi\omega$, &c. With respect to $\dot{\epsilon}$ - $i\sigma\kappa\omega$ see note on "E $\lambda\delta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\delta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$.

Ίστημι: imperf. ⁷στην; fut. στήσω; aor. 1. ^{*}στησα; perf. ^{*}στηκα; pluperf. ^{*}στήκειν, Att. εἰστήκειν. The aor. 2. indic. ^{*}στην is seldom used before the time of Polybius: its other moods are found in Homer. Pass. ⁷στάμαι; imperf. [†]στάμην: fut. σταθήσομαι; aor. 1. ^{*}στάθην (ǎ); perf. ^{*}σταμαι; pluperf. ^{*}εστάμην. Fut. midd. στήσομαι; aor. 1. ^{*}εστησάμην; fut. 3. (paulo-post) ^{*}εστήξω old Att., and ^{*}εστήξομαι later, Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 597., like τεθνήξω, τεθνήξομαι, from 9νήσκω. Verbal adj. στάτός, στατέος.

The 2. and 3. sing. of the indic. pres. in $-\tilde{a}_{c}$ and $-\tilde{a}$ are found only in the later writers. The 3. plur. iorãoi is the Attic form, ioréaoi the Ionic, iorávri the Doric. In the optat. is an abridged form of the dual and plural by dropping the η , and in the 3. plur. changing $-\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ into $-\epsilon v$, thus returning to the regular optat. of the barytone verbs; as dual, iσταίτον, iσταίτην, plur. iσταίμεν, iσταίτε, iσταίεν: the same is found in the optat. of the aor. 2. as $\sigma \tau a \tilde{i} \tau \epsilon$ for $\sigma \tau a l \eta \tau \epsilon$; 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. $i\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon$ (Od. τ , 574.) with a sister-form in $-\omega\nu$, -ac, -a, peculiar to the Ionic dialect and the later writers : Homer has also an aor. 2. στάσκον. In the aor. 2. imperat. instead of στηθι we have in the compounds $\pi a \rho \dot{a} \sigma \tau a$, $\dot{a} \pi \dot{o} \sigma \tau a^*$, as from a theme $\Sigma TA\Omega$. In the infin. pres. are istáper, istáperal, with a short, for istáral, but in the aor. 2. the long vowel remains, as $\sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha_i$, Od. ϵ , 414. Il. ρ , 167. In the middle the fut. and aor. 1. are Homeric; the latter is also in common use: but an aor. 2. $i\sigma \tau \alpha \mu \eta \nu$ is nowhere found in any of its moods or tenses. In the passive the Ion. 3. plur. is iortearal for ioravre.

In the conjunct. we find in the later writers the 2. and 3. sing. $i\sigma\tau\tilde{q}c$, - \tilde{q} , instead of $i\sigma\tau\tilde{\eta}c$, - $\tilde{\eta}$, in which case they belong to the inferior form $i\sigma\tau\dot{a}\omega$. The Epics for the 3. sing. $i\sigma\tau\tilde{\eta}$ have $i\sigma\tau\tilde{\eta}\sigma\iota$. And as the conj. is a contracted form the Ionics resolve it, using for $i\sigma\tau\tilde{\omega}$ and $\sigma\tau\tilde{\omega}$, - $\tilde{\eta}c$, &c., $i\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$, $i\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$, &c., $\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$, $\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, &c. This resolution again the

* The length of the α is sufficiently evident from two passages in Menand. ap. Suid. v. $\partial \pi \delta \sigma \tau \alpha$. We see in Lex. Seguer. p. 81. that some Atticists considered this form inferior to the other.

Epics vary to suit the metre, using $\sigma\tau\epsilon i\omega$, $\sigma\tau \eta \eta_c$, $\sigma\tau \eta \eta_r$, $\sigma\tau \eta \eta \tau \sigma \nu$, &c., and $\sigma\tau\epsilon io\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $\sigma\tau\epsilon i\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\sigma\tau \eta\epsilon\tau\sigma\nu$ for $\sigma\tau \eta\eta\tau\sigma\nu$: 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 $\delta \nu \mu \mu \alpha$): thus we find in all writers $"\sigma\tau \alpha \iota o$, " $\sigma\tau \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma_{\epsilon}$," $\sigma\tau \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma_{\epsilon}$, " $\sigma\tau \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma_{\epsilon}$, " $\sigma\tau \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma_{\epsilon}$," $\sigma\tau \eta \tau \alpha$, &c. See $\Delta \nu \mu \alpha \iota$ and 'E $\pi i \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$.

The tenses of this verb, like those of $\delta \omega \omega$, $\phi \omega \omega$, 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 pres. and imperf. $i\sigma\tau\eta\mu$, $i\sigma\tau\eta\nu$; fut. $\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\omega$; aor. 1. $i\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha$: whence therefore the whole of the passive voice has the sense of to be placed; and a middle ($i\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\alpha$, $\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\alpha$, $i\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$), 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 $i\sigma\tau\eta\mu\mu$ and $i\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\mu$ 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 $T_{\varepsilon}i\chi\omega$, p. 238.), we have the meaning of the

aor. 2. ἔστην, constiti as aorist, I placed myself, stopped; perf. ἔστηκα, 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. ἐστήχειν or εἰστήχειν the imperf. of the same.*

To suit this present meaning of the perfect was formed

and στήκοντες, Alex. Aphrod. Probl. 1, 49. And again another pres. έστήκω, Posidippi Epigr. 15.

^{*} In the later and corrupted state of the language a pres. was formed from ἕστηκα, viz. στήκω, whence στήκετε, 1 Cor. 16, 13.

also a proper future $\delta \sigma \tau \eta \xi \omega$ or $\delta \sigma \tau \eta \xi \delta \mu \alpha i$, *I shall stand*, which, though a passive form, is not to be regarded as properly such (for in meaning it corresponds with the active), but as a fut. midd. with an active sense, like $\Im \alpha \nu \delta \tilde{\mu} \alpha i$, $\lambda \eta' \psi \delta \mu \alpha i$, &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 compound (e. g. $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\xi\epsilon\iota$, Xen. Anab. 2, 4, 5.) we may observe the same change which occurs in $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\omega$ to the future meaning belonging to the pres. in $-a\mu a\iota$.

Of all the syncopated forms of this perfect the infin. ἐστάναι * is most used, and ἐστηκέναι perhaps not at all. Of the others are found principally ἕσταμεν, -ατε†, -ᾶσιν· ἕστασαν· ἑστώς, -ῶσα, gen. -ῶτος.

In this abridged form the pluperf. has never its proper augment ϵ_i , but remains $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$: hence the two first persons, as being similar to the perfect, seldom occur in prose.[‡] Beside these syncopated forms the complete forms of $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha$ are also in general use: $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\eta\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\tilde{\alpha}\theta\iota$ are perhaps exclusively poetical: while of the conj. are found only those persons which have an ω , e. g. $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\tilde{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$, Plat. Gorg. 52. p. 468. b. $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\sigma\tau\tilde{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu$, Eurip. Bacch. 319.

Instead of the regular perf. part. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $-\nu\bar{\iota}a$, $-\delta\varsigma$, gen. $-\delta\tau\sigma\varsigma$, is used a syncopated form $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\omega\sigma a$, $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ (of the last we shall speak hereafter), gen. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\ddot{\omega}\tau\sigma\varsigma$. There is also an Ionic form $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $-\omega\sigma a$, $-\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, gen. $-\bar{\omega}\tau\sigma\varsigma$, like $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, &c. (see under $\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\sigma\kappa\omega$); and Homer has frequently a gen. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\ddot{\alpha}\dot{\sigma}\tau\varsigma$, an accus. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\ddot{\alpha}\dot{\sigma}\tau_a$, and a nom. plur. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\dot{\sigma}\epsilon\varsigma$, as from $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\dot{\omega}\varsigma$; while another form $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, from $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ by dropping the κ (like $\tau\epsilon\tau\lambda\eta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ and others; see under $Bai\nu\omega$), is found in Hes. ϑ , 519., and a gen. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, with a fem. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\ddot{\nu}ia$ in Apollon. Rhod. Again, like $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\kappa\sigma$ for $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, we have a singular form in Hom. $\ddot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\tau\epsilon$ || for $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$ or $\ddot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon$, Il. ∂ , 243. 246. We find

* For which Homer has έστάμεν and έστάμεναι.

† For which Homer has also εστητε, Il. δ, 243. 246.

‡ In Andoc. 2, 8. καθέστατε is pluperf., and at 1, 112. παρέσταμεν according to Bekker is the same. [Homer has ἕστάτον as dual of both perf. and pluperf.; and ἑστάτην, plur. ἕστάμεν, ἕστάτε, ἕστάσαν as pluperfects. — Passow.]

§ We'may gather from different parts of Buttmann's Grammar the following formation : the regular part. was $\delta\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\omega_s$, whence by dropping the κ came $\delta\sigma\tau\eta\omega_s$: the Ionics changed the η into short a (see under Bairw), whence $\delta\sigma\taud\omega_s$; while again in $\delta\sigma\tau\eta\omega_s$ the length of the η passed on into the following vowel, making $\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon \omega$, though the origin of this change was not visible in the nom. as it is in the gen. $\delta\sigma\tau\eta\delta\sigma\sigmas \delta\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\tau\sigmas$, like $\mu\epsilon\tau\eta\sigma\rho\sigmas \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\omega\rho\sigmas$. — Ed.]

|| This reading, according to the correct criticism of the grammarian in the schoalso for the syncopated 3. plur. $\delta \sigma \tau \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ the Ion. resolved form $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon \alpha \sigma \iota$ in Herodot. 1, 200. 3, 62.; and without doubt the 2. pl. $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon \alpha \tau \epsilon$, $\pi \rho \sigma \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \alpha \tau \epsilon$, in Herodot. 5, 49., is genuine, notwithstanding the various reading $\pi \rho \sigma \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \epsilon$ has crept in from the common language.

If we follow analogy the neut. part. of $\delta \sigma \tau \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$, contracted from $\delta \sigma \tau \alpha \delta_{\mathcal{L}}$, 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 $\delta \sigma \tau \delta_{\mathcal{L}}$. Hence it is very probable that in this case the language of the Attics followed apparent analogy, and formed from $\delta \sigma \tau \omega_{\mathcal{L}}$ the neuter $\delta \sigma \tau \delta_{\mathcal{L}}$. Still the gen. and other cases are $\delta \sigma \tau \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \phi_{\mathcal{L}}$, &c.*

There is also a perf. for the transitive meaning $\varepsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \kappa a I$ have placed, which belongs however to a later æra. † 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, and instead of $\varepsilon v \lambda \delta \lambda \varepsilon \chi \alpha \varsigma$ saying $\varepsilon v \lambda \delta \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \delta \sigma \omega$, because $\lambda \delta \lambda \varepsilon \chi \alpha$ was not in common use.

In Homer we find coraoav (for the accent and breathing must be determined by criticism) in both a transitive and intransitive sense: the plainest instance is in Il. μ , 55. and 56. where it has the two meanings in two succeeding verses. In the description there given of the ditch round the Grecian camp we read, κρημνολ...Εστασαν ἀμφοτέρωθεν, ύπερθεν δέ σκολόπεσσιν 'Οξέσιν ήρήρει, τούς εστασαν υίες 'Αχαιών. Here the first is beyond a doubt Eστασαν: 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 $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ in a transitive sense, as II. β , 525. Od. γ , 182. σ , 306., in all which it is evidently an aorist; whereas the pluperf. (which necessarily is and remains *έστασαν*, if we deduce it in a transitive sense from the perfect have placed) cannot stand in these passages, particularly in Od. σ , 306., without the greatest violence. But

lium, has been admitted by Wolf into the text instead of $\ell\sigma\tau\eta\tau\epsilon$, 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 έστός, as does Hermann in Soph. Œd. T. 632. Compare Dind. Aristoph. Equ. 567. The other reading is defended in Alb. Hesych. 1, p. 503. † In Polyb. 10, 20. stands έφεστάκει

† In Polyb. 10, 20. stands ἐφεστάκει according to which therefore, if we find in the same writer ἐφέστηκε 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 $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ be an aorist, it must be a shortened form of $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$: 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, $\epsilon\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\epsilon$ for $\epsilon\pi\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon^*$ (see $\Pi(\mu\pi\rho\eta\mu\iota)$).

Έπίσταμαι see in its alphabetical place.

^{*}Ισχω. See ^{*}Εχω. ΙΩ. See Εἶμι.

K.

ΚΑΔ-, κέκασμαι, κέκαδμαι. See Καίνυμαι. Κεκαδεΐν, -ήσειν. See Κήδω and Χάζω.

Kăθαίρω, I cleanse: fut. κăθăρῶ; aor. 1. ἐκάθηρα (later ἐκαθāρα also), infin. καθᾶραι, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 25. — MIDD. This verb is no compound; see Buttm. Lexil. p. 119.

Καθέζομαι. See Ίζω. Καθεύδω. See Εΰδω.

Κάθημαι. See Hμαι.

Καθίζω. See «Ιζω.

Kaívvµaı, I am distinguished, excel: defective depon. without fut. or aor., and occurring only in pres. and imperf. There is however a synonymous perf. κέκασµaı, Dor. κέκαδµaı; pluperf. ἐκεκάσµην. That these forms are correctly classed under one verb both sense and construction plainly show. For as in Od. γ , 282. we read ἐκαίνυτο φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων Νῆα κυξερνῆσαι, so at β, 158. we find ὀµηλικίην ἐκέκαστο "Ορνιθας γνῶναι: and as at β, 219. Olog δή με Φιλοκτήτης ἀπεκαίνυτο τόξψ, so at II. ξ, 124. δς ἡλικίην ἐκέκαστο "Εγχεί. But κέκασµαι occurs without an accusative; therefore, as a necessary result of the above comparison, it stands absolutely in the sense of to excel or be distinguished in anything, as κεκάσθαι ἰπποσύνη, μύθοισι, ἀλκῆ · κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασµένε, &c. For these expressions a present κάζω has been supposed with the meaning of to equip, adorn; but the above comparison shows that καίννµαι might have been used in that absolute sense quite as well

* An opposite case is found in Callim. L. P. 83. $\delta\sigma\tau d\theta\eta$ with a long; if it is not a false reading for $\delta\sigma\tau d\kappa\eta$ ($\delta\sigma\tau \eta\kappa\epsilon_i$); 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. μ , 55, 56. Passow differs in one point only from Buttmann: he reads with him the 3. plur, aor. 1. $\delta\sigma\tau\delta\sigma\sigma\sigma$ for $\delta\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\sigma\omega$ in II. β , 525. Od. γ , 182. and σ , 306., but he also reads it in *both* lines 55. and 56. of II. μ ., whereas Buttmann reads in the former of the two the pluperf. $\delta\sigma\tau\sigma\sigma\sigma\omega$ with the force of an imperfect.] as $\kappa i \kappa a \sigma \mu a \iota$, 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 $\kappa a i r \nu \mu a \iota$ with $\kappa i \kappa a \sigma \mu a \iota$, to which and to the Doric $\kappa i \kappa a \delta \mu a \iota$ it bears exactly the same relation as $\dot{\rho} a i \nu \omega^*$ does to $\dot{\rho} \dot{a} \sigma \sigma a \tau \epsilon$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{a} \delta a \tau a \iota$. 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 $i \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \phi a \nu \tau \iota \phi a \dot{\delta} \mu \rho \nu \kappa \kappa \kappa a \delta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu c \varsigma$; for the shoulder was not adorned 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 $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \tau \sigma i \varsigma$, $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \sigma i \varsigma$, together with the dative of the thing; and sometimes (as in Od. τ , 82. δ , 725. II. ω , 546. \pm) this dative stood alone.

Kaivo, I kill: fut. κάνῶ; aor. 2. ἔκάνον, infin. κάνεῖν. The perf. is wanting. In the passive the pres. and imperf. only are in use.

This verb is a sister-form of $\kappa\tau\epsilon\ell\nu\omega$, $\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu$, to which it bears the same relation as $\pi\tau\delta\lambda\iota\varsigma$ to $\pi\delta\lambda\iota\varsigma$, or $\chi\theta\alpha\mu\alpha\lambda\delta\varsigma$ to $\chi\alpha\mu\alpha\ell$. [It is very common both in the Poets and Tragedians, and found also in the best Attic writers.—Passow.]

Kaíw, I burn (transit.), Att. $\varkappa \acute{a}\omega$ with a long and without contraction: imperf. $\breve{\epsilon}\varkappa \alpha i o \nu$, Att. $\breve{\epsilon}\varkappa \ddot{\alpha} o \nu$; fut. $\varkappa a \acute{v} \sigma \omega$ (compare $\Theta \acute{\epsilon} \omega$); aor. 1. pass. $\acute{\epsilon}\varkappa a \acute{v} \theta \eta \nu$. Verbal adj. $\varkappa a \upsilon \sigma \tau \acute{v} \varsigma$, $\varkappa a \upsilon \sigma \tau \acute{\epsilon} \varsigma \varsigma$.

In the passive voice the aor. 1. is the only tense in use by the Attics; see Thom. M. v. $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \theta \eta$. Beside Homer and Herodotus none but the later writers have the aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \eta \nu$ ($\check{\alpha}$).

The Epics have also an aor. 1. act. (without σ in the termination) $\xi \in \eta a$; many forms of which fluctuate between η and ε_{ℓ} , while a third

* For the terminations $-\nu\omega$ and $-\nu\nu\mu$ are essentially the same; as in $\tau l \nu \omega \tau l \nu - \nu \nu \mu$, κτείνω κτίννυμι.

t The above account does not agree with the usage of Eurip. in Elect. 616., where the walls of the town $\Phi poopais \ \kappa \epsilon \kappa a \sigma \pi a \delta \epsilon \xi tais \ \tau \epsilon \ \delta o p v \phi \delta p \omega r$. Here $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \sigma \pi a$ evidently means are furnished, equipped, 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, $\xi_{\chi} \epsilon \alpha$ (Ep. $\xi_{\chi} \epsilon \omega \alpha$) from $\chi' \alpha$, $\epsilon l \pi \alpha$ from $\epsilon l \pi \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$, $\tilde{\eta} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \alpha$ from $\kappa a \omega$ and $\epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu \alpha$ from $\sigma \epsilon \delta \omega$. As these aorists go over into the middle voice also ($\epsilon \chi \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \eta \alpha$, $\epsilon \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \delta \sigma \sigma \omega$, $\delta \alpha \epsilon \delta \alpha \tau \delta \alpha$, $\delta \alpha \epsilon \delta \sigma \delta \omega$, may be considered as belonging to the same.

^{+ [}Passow supposes it to be probably from κaiwa, κreiwa, consequently from a radical form KENΩ in the sense of to overpower, conquer.]

with ϵ has been retained by the Tragedians only, e. g. $\kappa \epsilon a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ Æschyl. Agam. 858., érréartes Eurip. Rhes. 97.; but this last can scarcely be considered in any other light than as derived like the others from the old Epic language. The forms $\xi \kappa \eta \alpha$, $\xi \kappa \eta \varepsilon$, and the optat. 3 sing. $\kappa \eta \alpha \iota$ plur. $\kappa \eta \alpha_{i\epsilon\nu}$ have no various reading with the ϵ_i , as all the others have: e.g. infin. aor. κείαι and κήαι, Od. o, 97: imperat. κείον and κήον, Od. φ, 176: conj. κείομεν and κήσμεν, Il. η, 333. and 337.: indic. midd. 3. plur. κείαντο and κήαντο, Il. 1, 88., and the same in the participles κείαντες, Od. 1, 231. ν, 26., κειάμενος, Il. 1, 234. Od. π, 2. ψ, 51. If we compare with this the exactly similar appearance in the Epic conjunctives of the form in $\mu \iota$, — those for instance from $\xi \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, $\xi \theta \eta \nu^*$, — it is evident that when the η before the other vowel had been shortened in the old language into ε , it was again lengthened by the Epics into ε_i , like $\beta \epsilon i \omega$, $\sigma \tau \epsilon i o \mu \epsilon v$, &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 κείαντο, κείομεν, κεΐαι, &c., in all those passages being the genuine one, i. e. having the oldest tradition in its favour. + Compare a similar case of the text fluctuating between $\tau \in \theta \nu \in \tilde{\omega} \tau \circ \varsigma$ and $\tau \in \theta \nu n \tilde{\omega} \tau \circ \varsigma$.

Some have also supposed a present $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ and $\kappa \dot{\eta} \omega$, on account of $\kappa a \tau \alpha \kappa \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\mu} \epsilon \nu$ (var. reading $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \eta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$), Il. η , 408. and $\ddot{\epsilon} \kappa \eta \sigma \nu$, Od. ι , 553. To place this $\kappa \dot{\eta} \omega$ as an Ionicism by the side of the Attic $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \omega$ cannot be satisfactory, as $\kappa \alpha \dot{\omega}$ is the Ionicism like $\kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$; nor is it easy to perceive what grounds there are for those forms, when we have $\kappa \alpha \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$, Il. ξ , 397. and $\check{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \omega \sigma$, Od. χ , 336. As therefore in the one passage $\check{\epsilon} \kappa \eta \sigma \nu$ has been already expelled from the text by the reading of the manuscripts $\check{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \nu$, so in the other $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha i \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$ 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 $\kappa \dot{a}\omega$ and $\xi \kappa \eta a$ are written in many editions, new as well as old, rests entirely on a false opinion, is evident without further investigation. See Piers. ad Moer. p. 231.

Καλέω, I call: fut. καλέσω, fut. midd. καλέσομαι (Ep. and Poet. καλέσσω, καλέσσομαι, Attic καλῶ‡, καλοῦμαι);

As στείω for στέω, στήης for στέης;
 again στείομεν for στέωμεν στήετον for στήητον, &c. See Βαίνω and Ίστημι.
 the form with ει is found once in

The form with ϵ_i is found once in Sophoel. El. 759. $\kappa\epsilon i a v \tau \epsilon_s$ with the various reading $\kappa h a v \tau \epsilon_s$, the alteration of which to $\kappa \epsilon a v \tau \epsilon_s$. I cannot approve of. See Aristoph. Fr. 1133. and compare Piers. ad Moer. p. 321.

‡ The fut. $\kappa \alpha \lambda \acute{e} \sigma \omega$, or, as the Attics spoke it, $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$, is indisputably the fut. of the simple stem or root $KA\Lambda \Omega$, and the common pres. $\kappa \alpha \lambda \acute{e} \omega$ arose out of that fut. as the Ionic pres. $\mu \alpha \chi \acute{e} \mu \alpha \iota$ came from

aor. 1. ἐκάλεσα (Poet. καλέσσα); midd. ἐκαλεσάμην (Poet. καλεσσάμην); perf. κέκληκα; perf. pass. κέκλημαι (I am called, named), opt. κεκλήμην, κέκληο, &c.; aor. 1. pass. ἐκλήθην; fut. pass. κληθήσομαι; fut. 3. (paulo-post) κεκλήσομαι, I shall be called, named. Ion. and Hom. imperf. καλέεσκον.

From this verb came also by metathesis an Ionic sister-form $\kappa\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$, used by Homer in pres. and imperf. only; see note under $K\epsilon\lambda o\mu\alpha\iota$. On $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon o$ or $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon o$ see $K\lambda\epsilon\omega$. This verb is the old Latin calo, calare.

Κάμνω, I am weary: fut. καμοῦμαι; aor. 2. ἐκαμον*, infin. καμεῖν; aor. 2. midd. ἐκαμόμην; perf. by metathesis κέκμηκα: on which see βέδληκα under Βάλλω, and κέκληκα under Καλέω, with the note underneath.

Sophoeles (Trach., 1215.) has the 2. sing. fut. $\kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$. In the Epic part. perf. the κ is dropped as in $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \phi \eta \omega \varsigma$, $\tau \epsilon \tau \lambda \eta \omega \varsigma$ and others; thus $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \omega \varsigma$, gen. $-\delta \tau \sigma \varsigma$ and $-\tilde{\omega} \tau \sigma \varsigma \dagger$, as in Hom. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \tilde{\omega} \tau \iota$, $-\tilde{\omega} \tau a$, and in accus. plur. $-\delta \tau \alpha \varsigma$: see under Baiv ω and "I $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$; also $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \alpha \omega \varsigma$ under $\Gamma \epsilon i \nu \rho \mu \alpha \iota$. The Epics have also very frequently the aor. 2. act. and midd. with the reduplication, which then remains in all the moods; thus $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \alpha \theta \sigma \nu$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \alpha \theta \omega \nu$; $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \delta \lambda \nu \theta \iota$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \theta \delta \iota \tau \sigma$, &c., and in the verb before us Homer has the conj. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \delta \mu \mu \sigma \iota$, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \delta \mu \mu \sigma \iota$.

Κάμπτω, *I bend*: fut. κάμψω, &c. In the perf. pass. when the 1. pers. has $\mu\mu$, one is naturally dropped, as κέκαμμαι, κέκαμψαι, &c.

Kαταπροίζεσθαι Ion. (Archil. ap. Etym. M. v. προίκτης), καταπροίζεσθαι Att. (Aristoph. frequently); a defective verb found only in the fut.[±],

μαχέσομαι-οῦμαι. From ΚΑΛΩ was formed κέκληκα by metathesis like τέτμηκα from τέμνω, κέκμηκα from κάμνω : see also βέβληκα, under Βάλλω. Instances of this fut. may be seen in καλεῖ, Xen. Symp. 1, 15. καλεῖσθε, Demosth. Lept. 5. παρακαλοῦντας, Xen. Hell. 6, 3, 2. See this formation also under Δέμω. Of the fut. καλέσω the only instances which we find in the older writers are in Æschin. c. Timarch. p. 10. and Lycurg. c. Leoer. p. 150. ἐπικαλέσεται. In Aristoph. Plut. 963. Brunck has mistaken the aorist for the future.

* See έδακον under Δάκνω, έταμον under Τέμνω.

+ I cannot think there are any grounds for $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \partial r as$ in Thucyd. 3, 59. however supported it may be by the manuscripts against the various reading $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \kappa \delta r as$. It can hardly have been introduced by the antiquated meaning (the dead) or by the solemn tone of the oration, as $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \mu \eta \kappa \delta r \epsilon s$ is used even by Euripides in the same sense.

[‡] Thus οὐ καταπροίξεσθαι ἔφη, Herodot. 3, 36. καταπροίξεσαι, ib. 3, 156. Archil. Fr. 23. Aristoph. Nub. 1240. Vesp. 1396. καπροίζονται, Herodot. 5, 105. Aristoph. Vesp. 1366. Thesm. 566. Equ. 435. and in such expressions as où $\kappa a \tau a \pi \rho o i \xi \epsilon \iota$, 'thou shalt not have done it for nothing' (i. e. not without being punished for it). A deviation to the aor. $\kappa a \tau a \pi \rho o i \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota$ is very possible, but it occurs only in Themist. Or. 14. init.* In the Etym. M. we find also a verb $\pi \rho o i \sigma \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$, *I beg*, quoted from Archilochus, from which comes $\pi \rho o i \kappa \tau \eta s$ in Homer: but the etymological connexion of the two is not clear.†

Καυάξαις. See Άγrυμι.

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

KAΦ-; whence perf. part. $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\breve{\alpha}\phi\eta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, - $\dot{\sigma}\tau\sigma\varsigma$, breathing short and with difficulty, Il. ϵ , 698. Od. ϵ , 468. Of this root or stem we find no other trace except that Hesychius has $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\eta\phi\epsilon$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\kappa\epsilon$: probably with the sense of *expirare*. [This perf. seems to be formed from an obsolete theme $\kappa\alpha\phi\epsilon\omega$, akin to $\kappa\dot{\alpha}\pi\tau\omega$ and $\kappa\alpha\pi\dot{\omega}\omega$.—Passow.]

Κεῖμαι, *I lie*, belongs to the stem or root ΚΕΙΩ or ΚΕΩ, and has only a pres., imperf., and fut. Pres. κεῖμαι, κεῖσαι[‡], κεῖται, &c., 3. plur. κεῖνται: imperat. κεῖσο, κείσθω, &c.; optat. κεοίμην; conj. κέωμαι §, κέη, &c.; infin. κεῖσθαι; part. κείμενος. Imperf. ἐκείμην, ἕκεισο, ἕκειτο, &c. Fut. κείσομαι. Comp. κατάκειμαι, κατάκεισαι, &c.: but the infin. retains the accent on the syllable of the stem or root, κατακεῖσθαι. So also ἑπίκειμαι, &c.

The forms of the optative and conjunctive, as well as the accent of the compound infinitive, might possibly recommend KE Ω as the radical form of $\kappa\epsilon \tilde{\iota}\mu\alpha\iota$: but the whole formation of the verb, together with the derivatives $\kappa o \epsilon \eta$, $\kappa o \epsilon \mu \tilde{\mu} v$, makes it far more probable that the $\epsilon \iota$ is the radical syllable and the forms with the ϵ shortened from it. K $\epsilon \tilde{\iota}\mu\alpha\iota$, itself might certainly be considered as a syncopated form (like $\delta \tilde{\iota}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\rho \tilde{\upsilon}\sigma \theta \alpha\iota$), 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*-

* Brunck thought indeed that he had found in the Argument of the Antigone of Sophocles an aor. pass. $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \rho o \sigma \vartheta \rho \nu \alpha$ in a different form and meaning; but it is a mere error of transcription for $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \rho \eta - \sigma \vartheta \eta \nu \alpha$.

† That is to say, $\pi pol\xi$ had the general sense of a gift, as originally dos had in Latin; thence $\pi polka$, like $\delta \omega pean$, without pay or reward, gratis. The verb from which this word is derived meant therefore to make a present of; and thus $\kappa a \tau a \pi pol\xi \epsilon_i$ 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. 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 have recourse to the idea of stretching out the hand as belonging to both actions.

‡ Homer always uses κείσαι, κείσο, but we find in the Hymn. Merc. 254. as 2. sing. κατάκειαι.

sing. $\kappa \alpha \tau d\kappa \epsilon_{1\alpha i}$. § Whether $\kappa \epsilon \omega \mu \alpha i$ was a genuine Attic form may be doubted. In an inscription in the Corp. Inscript. I. n. 102. p. 10. stands $\kappa \epsilon \ell \omega \nu \tau \alpha i$. self down, consequently I lie,) with the redupl. dropped, by which the accent in the compound $\kappa a \tau \dot{a} \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu a \iota$, $\kappa a \tau a \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is accounted for in the most natural way, like $\kappa \dot{a} \theta \eta \mu a \iota$, $\kappa a \theta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$. From the shortening of $\epsilon \iota$ to ϵ arose naturally the change to the form in $- \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, whence in Homer $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a \iota$, in Herodot. 1, 178. $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau a \iota$, and in Hippocr. de A. A. L. 9, p. 333. $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$.

Instead of the 3. sing. $\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\imath}\tau\alpha\iota$ Herodotus has $\kappa\epsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, and later writers $\kappa\epsilon\alpha\tau\alpha\iota^*$: instead of the 3. plur. $\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\imath}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ Homer has $\kappa\epsilon\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, and very frequently (according to Ionic analogy) $\kappa\epsilon\iota\check{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota$ and $\kappa\epsilon\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, the latter of which is found only in Homer and the later Ionics. In the 3. plur. imperf. Homer and the Ionics for $\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\tau\sigma$ have $\kappa\epsilon\iota\check{\alpha}\tau\sigma$ and $\kappa\epsilon\check{\alpha}\tau\sigma$, with an iterative $\kappa\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\sigma$. Od. ϕ , 41. In the infin. pres. we find in Hippocr. $\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\imath}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ for $\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\imath}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

In II. τ , 32. Od. β , 102. Wolf has altered according to the Venet. manuscript the old reading of the text $\kappa\epsilon i\tau a\iota$ (which as an indicat. would be certainly incorrect) to a conjunct. $\kappa \eta \tau a\iota$. But this was unnecessary, as by an old usage $\kappa\epsilon i\mu a\iota$, $\kappa\epsilon i\tau a\iota$ served for both conjunct. and indicat. Thus in Plat. Phædo p. 84. e. $\mu \eta$ διάκειμαι is conjunct., and in p. 93. a. stands $\epsilon\xi \quad \delta\nu \quad \delta\nu \quad \sigma\nu\gamma\kappa\epsilon\eta \tau a\iota$ with a various reading in the Ed. Bas. 2. $\sigma\nu\gamma\kappa\epsilon i\tau a\iota$, which ought however to be accented $\sigma\nu\gamma\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau a\iota$: on the other hand, Bekker in Isocr. π . $\lambda\nu\tau\iota\delta$. 278. has corrected from a good codex $\delta\pi\omega_{c} \quad \delta\nu \dots \delta\iota a\kappa\epsilon i\sigma\theta a\iota$ to $\delta\iota \kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon$, but he supposes the true reading to be $\delta\iota a\kappa\epsilon \eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$. Compare a similar case in $\delta\epsilon\eta$, $\delta\epsilon i$, under $\Delta\epsilon\omega$.[†]

Homer has also an infin. $\kappa\epsilon\iota\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, and part. $\kappa\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu$, $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ (from KEIΩ), as future, Il. ξ , 340. Od. η , 342.; which undoubtedly come from the fut. $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\omega$ contracted to $\kappa\epsilon\dot{\omega}$ and again shortened to $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\omega$. That this form should pass into a desiderative was very natural, Od. 9, 315. Compare a similar future in $\delta\dot{\eta}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\delta\dot{\eta}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\delta\dot{\eta}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, from a fut. $\delta\alpha\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ and a root $\Delta\Lambda\Omega$.

Kείρω, I shear: fut. κερῶ; perf. pass. κέκαρμαι; aor. 2. pass. ἐκάρην.—Midd.

The Epic language forms the fut. $\kappa\epsilon\rho\sigma\omega$, aor. 1. $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\rho\sigma\alpha$. Pindar (Pyth. 4, 146.) has the aor. 1. pass. $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\rho\eta\nu$.

Kelw. See $\delta h \omega$, p. 56.; also Kalw and Kelpan.

* $\kappa \epsilon \alpha \pi \alpha \iota$ is properly the Ion. 3. plur. shortened from $\kappa \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \pi \alpha \iota$, 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.

+ See Herm. ad Vig. not. 526. and De Metr. 1. p. 86. where the very analogous form kéerau for kéŋrau, like $\phi \theta$ /erau, iµeíperau, &cc., is preferred for Homer: and it certainly appears to be an old reading; for at 11. τ , 32. the small Schol. have the gloss Kéerau åvrl $\tau o \tilde{v}$ keîrau, which should be åvrl $\tau o \tilde{v}$ kéŋrau. Kελαδέω, *I sound*, roar, is regular; but the Epic language has the participle as from a barytone verb, $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \nu$, $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \sigma \tau a$: although it is used only as an adjective. [Passow has also $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega$, which he calls the original form of $\kappa \epsilon \lambda a \delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, and from which he derives the above participle.]

Κέλλω, I run in, land: fut. κέλσω; aor. 1. ἕκελσα.

Kέλομαι, I command, exactly synonymous with κελείω: fut. κελήσομαι; aor. 1. κελησάμην, Pind. O. 13, 113. The Homeric aor. ἐκεκλόμην, ἐκέκλετο, κεκλόμενος, is most naturally considered as the aor. 2. of this verb with syncope and reduplication (according to the analogy mentioned under Κάμνω), and with the augm. like ἐπέφραδον: it has also exactly the same meaning at II. π, 657. κέκλετο δ' äλλους φευγέμεναι, 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.*

"Εκλεο see under Κλέω.

Kεντέω, I prick, is regular. But Homer (II. ψ , 337.) has the aor. 1. infin. κένσαι from the stem KENT- which shows itself in κοντός, a pole. The verbals κεστός, pricked, and κέντωρ, κέντρον, are explained by the omission of ν before σ in the one case, and of σ between ν and τ in the others. +

Κεράννυμι, I mix, also χιρνάω[‡], χιρνημι: fut. χεράσω, Att. χερῶ; aor. 1. ἐχέρἄσα, aor. 1. midd. ἐχερἄσάμην. The other forms are affected by syncope or rather by the metathesis (which we may see exemplified in βέβληχα under Βάλλω), joined with a contraction into ā: thus perf. χέχρāχα; perf. pass. χέχρāμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἔχρāθην: aor. 1. midd. ἐχρāσάμην; but there is also an aor. 1. pass. ἐχεράσθην.

In the perfect pass, is found also $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \rho a \sigma \mu a \iota$, but only in a later period, to which belongs also Anacr. 29, 13. On the other hand, Homer uses

† If we examine this more closely we shall certainly find that the adopting a stem KENT- to unite the above-mentioned forms is the most suitable plan; better for instance than KENΩ, which does not explain $\kappa\epsilon\sigma\tau\delta s$ satisfactorily, and than KEΩ through which we cannot immediately get to $\kappa\epsilon\tau\omega\rho$, &c. We must not however try to unite the ideas to prick, whence $\kappa\epsilon\tau\tau\epsilon w$, — to cleave, whence $\kappa\epsilon d\zeta \omega$, — and to beat, whence in all languages comes the idea of to kill, $\kappa\tau\epsilon l\omega\omega$, $\kappa a l\omega\omega$; nay we must rather endeavour to keep them separate.

* Kepavvous and its sister-form Ke-

^{*} It is generally acknowledged that $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\omega$, of which $\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\hat{w}$ is properly the inf. aor. and $\kappa\alpha\lambda\hat{\omega}$ the fut. (compare $\kappa\alpha\pi\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\hat{\omega}$), is the one original verbal stem, which afterwards branched off according to difference of meaning into three verbs, $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\alpha$, $\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega$, and $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\omega$.

the shortened form in the infin. aor. 1. act. $\epsilon \pi \kappa \kappa \rho \eta \sigma a\iota$, Od. η , 164. For the Ionians have the η in $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho \eta \mu a\iota$, $\kappa \rho \eta \theta \epsilon \epsilon c$, &c. (KEPA, KPEA, KPH), but in the Attic and common language the η is changed on account of the ρ into \bar{a} in this and other similar cases.

The simple form $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$ is used by the poets: Homer has $\kappa \epsilon \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha c$, $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{\alpha} \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$, $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \sigma$. Comicus ap. Athen. 2. p. 48. a. $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \rho a$. Otherwise $\kappa \epsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$ is the Att. future: see Hesych.

[In the fut. and aor. Homer doubles the σ of the regular form, making $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$.—Passow.]

The Homeric conj. $\kappa\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, Il. δ , 260. is not to be traced back to a theme KEP Ω , but more analogically to $\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$, like $\delta\nu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ conj. of $\delta\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$: compare also $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$, conj. $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, under Κρεμάννυμι.

Lastly at II. ι , 203. the text had until very lately the imperat. $\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon$, but now has from better sources $\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\epsilon$: see under $\Delta\alpha\iota\omega$.

Κερδαίνω, I gain, is regular in the Attic language, and in the aor. takes the α like χοιλάναι, λευχάναι, and others: thus fut. χερδάνῶ; aor. 1. infin. χερδάναι. But the Ionics and many of the later writers form χερδήσομαι, ἐχέρδησα.

This Ionic formation is undoubtedly the older, and $-ai\nu\omega$ was originally nothing more than one mode of lengthening the present, as in $a\lambda_{i\tau}ai\nu\omega$ and similar verbs, so that the simple KEP $\Delta\Omega$, $-\eta\sigma\omega$ is the original stem, and $\tau \delta$ $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta \sigma c$ the verbal subst., as the analogy which it brings with it confirms. But in a very early period some imagined that $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta ai\nu\omega$ sounded like a derivation from $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta \sigma c$, like $\lambda \epsilon \nu \kappa ai\nu\omega$ from $\lambda \epsilon \nu \kappa \delta c$, &c., and they accordingly inflected all the tenses in the termination $-ai\nu\omega$. Herodotus has both inflexions; the older $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta \eta \sigma a \nu$ 4, 152., the other $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta a \nu \epsilon \sigma \rho \delta \eta \sigma a \nu$ 4, 152., the other $\kappa \epsilon \rho \delta a \nu \epsilon \sigma \rho \delta \eta \sigma a$ 4.

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

Κεύθω, I envelope, hide: fut. κεύσω; perf. (synonymous with pres.) κέκευθα; pluperf. (synon. with imperf.) ἐκεκεύθειν, Od. ι, 348.; aor. 2.

ραννύω are formed like other verbs in μι (see 'Αγω, ἄγνυμι) by changing the ω of the barytone form into -vυμι or $-v'ω_n$, only that when ω is preceded by a vowel, the ν is doubled, thus κεράω, κεραννύμι. Again κιρνάω, κίρνημι are formed from κεράω by changing -άω into -νάω, -νημι, and in some verbs changing the ϵ of the root into ι ; thus κεράω, κιρνάω, κίρνημι : compare Δέμω, and Πίλνημι from πελάω. čκῦθον and 3. sing. without the augm. κύθε, Od. γ, 16., aor. 2. conj. with the Ep. redupl. κεκύθω, Od. ζ, 303. Homer has also the aor. 1. conj. in the compound ἐπικεύσης, Od. o, 263. Of the passive we find only the pres. and imperf. Sophocles repeatedly [and Æschylus once] use the active κεύθω, and κέκευθα, as intrans., I am hidden.*

Kέω. See Kεĩμαι and Kαίω; also $\Delta \dot{\eta} \omega$ under ΔA -.

Kήδομαι, 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, $\kappa \eta \delta \omega$, *I fill with care*, fut. $\kappa \eta \delta \eta \sigma \omega$, II. ω , 240.; afterwards a perf. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \eta \delta a$, Tyrt. 3, 28. synonymous with the pres. $\kappa \eta \delta \rho \mu a \iota$.

The middle with a short vowel in the inflected syllable is found in Æschyl. Sept. 138. in the imperat. $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$: and the derivative verb $\dot{\alpha}\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \omega$ has the same inflexion in Il. ξ , 427. $\dot{\alpha}\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$ as now corrected from $\dot{\alpha}\kappa \eta \delta \eta \sigma$ ': see Heyne.

In Il. 9, 353. we find $\kappa\epsilon\kappa a\delta\eta\sigma o\mu\epsilon\theta a$, which some commentators, looking only at its exterior, have classed with $\kappa\epsilon\kappa a\delta or$, $\kappa\epsilon\kappa a\delta \eta \sigma \omega$ (see $X\dot{a}\zeta o\mu a\iota$); but the sense when critically examined is opposed to that derivation \dagger , and in favour of the old one from $\kappa\eta\delta o\mu a\iota$. And since the perf. $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\eta\delta a$ 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 rhythm; and which takes place in the *a*, because, as we see from the Doric $\kappa\dot{a}\delta o\mu a\iota$ (Pind.), *a* is properly the vowel of the root: in this case therefore it is the Ionic \check{a} , as $\pi\dot{a}\rho\eta$ for $\pi\dot{\eta}\rho a$, $\dot{a}\mu\phi\iota\sigma\delta\ddot{a}\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ for $-\eta\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, &c. See also $\dot{a}\rho\ddot{a}\rho\nu\bar{\imath}a$ under 'A $\rho a\rho\dot{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$. \ddagger

Κίδνημι. See Σκεδάννυμι. ΚΙΚ-. See Κιχάνω. Κικλήσκω. See Καλέω.

Kivéw, I move, is regular.

[See Sophoel. Aj. 634. El. 868. Œd.
 T. 968. Ant. 911., Æschyl. Sept. 590.
 Ed.]

 \dagger In order to explain it in that way we must first understand $\chi \alpha \zeta \epsilon \sigma \partial \alpha i$ ruos (which in its common acceptation means to give way to any one) in the sense of to cease from pursuing anyone; and then suppose that the two goddesses blame themselves with a certain severity of expression, because, when their friends are pursued by the enemy, they do not assist them against the pursuit of the other gods; or we must take it without the interrogation (see Heyne), and understand $ob\kappa \epsilon r_1 \chi d \xi \sigma \theta a l \tau u v os$ in the sense of not deserting, and this said by those who, after having long deserted their friends, at last assist them.

‡ I adopt this mode that I may not take $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \delta o \nu$ twice, once from $\chi d \zeta \omega$ and once from $\kappa \eta \delta \omega$, but that I may ground my argument on two actually existing forms, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \delta o \nu$ for $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \delta \eta \sigma \omega$ from $\chi d \zeta \omega$, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \eta \delta a$ for $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \delta \eta \sigma o \mu a$ from $\kappa \eta \delta \omega$. In the passive it has an Epic sister-form $\kappa i \nu \nu \mu a \iota$, with ι long like the active. This form must not be classed with $\kappa i \omega$ (which will be found below), for that verb never gives the idea of continuous motion as $\kappa i \nu \nu \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$ most plainly does at Il. ξ , 173., where it is used of oil moved about or shaken : and in other places where $\kappa i \nu \nu \mu a \iota$ 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 Il. δ , 281. 332. 427. with Od. κ , 556. I consider it therefore more correct to give it a root for itself, KIN-, quatio.*

Κίρνυμι. See Κεράννυμι.

Kıyávw and Kıyávoµaı, I obtain, hit: fut. Kıynooµaı; aor. 2. čKıyov, $\kappa_{i_X\omega}$, &c. These are the only tenses found in the Attic poets; but the Epic language has (beside a new aor. midd. ἐκιχησάμην, -σατο) a very common preterite, which according to form is an imperf. of $KIXE\Omega$, KIXHMI, without however this pres. ind. having been ever actually in use. Hence come έκίχεις (Od. ω, 283.), 2. sing. imperf. for έκίχης, like έτίθουν, έτίθεις, with the plur. έκίχημεν and dual έκιχήτην, for έκίχεμεν $-\chi\epsilon\tau\eta\nu$; to which we must add the moods of the present, as the opt, $\kappa_{i\gamma\epsilon i\eta\nu}$, conj. ($\kappa_{i\gamma}\tilde{\omega}$) $\kappa_{i\gamma\epsilon i\omega}$, infin. $\kappa_{i\gamma}\tilde{\eta}\nu\alpha_{i\gamma}$ part. $\kappa_{i\gamma\epsilon i\varsigma}$, and the midd. $\kappa_{i\chi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\sigma}$; in which formation in μ_i therefore the η is retained quite as far as it is in $\dot{a}\eta \nu a\iota$ and $\delta i \zeta \eta \mu a\iota$. We find then (including the imperf. έκίχανον) 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 circumstance, that the Epics have not the other moods of either Kixárw or *Ekiyov*, but only those above quoted; consequently beyond the indicative they have no distinction between present and aorist. The earliest occurrence of the conj. $\kappa i \chi \omega$, $\kappa i \chi \eta \varsigma$, &c., is in the Tragedians (Soph. Aj. 657. Eurip. Suppl. 1069.).

In all the above forms the Epics have the ι short: and $\check{\epsilon}\kappa\iota\chi\sigma\nu$ has this quantity in all the poets.[†] But in $\kappa\iota\chi\acute{a}\nu\omega$ both the principal syllables are different in the Epic and Attic poets, the former having the ι short and the a long, the latter the ι long and the a short. Now as Hesychius and other Glossographers have the glosses $\kappa\iota\chi\chi\acute{a}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$,

* Grammatical analogy also is in favour of it. For while $\kappa \nu \nu \epsilon \omega$, from KY- $\epsilon \kappa \nu \sigma a$, retains the ν short, $\kappa \nu \epsilon \omega$ has the ι long: in the same way $\kappa l \nu \nu \mu a \iota$ is remote from the analogy of $\zeta \omega \nu \nu \mu \mu$, $\zeta \epsilon \nu \nu \nu \mu$, because it is written almost invariably with a single ν , and therefore (with $\gamma \delta \nu \nu \mu a \iota$, $\lambda \delta \zeta \mu a \iota$,

[&]amp;c.) comes under the analogy of those verbs which affix merely -uµaa to the stem or root.

[†] It was impossible therefore that Simonides could say $\xi \kappa i \chi \epsilon$, a reading which Brunck (in Gnomicis) in Sim. Fr. 7. preferred to $\xi \phi i \kappa \epsilon$.

 $\epsilon \kappa i \gamma \chi \alpha \nu \epsilon$, 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.*

The analogy of $\epsilon \tau \nu \chi \alpha \nu \tau \nu \gamma \chi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, or that of $i \kappa \delta \mu \eta \nu i \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ (with ι short), has been the cause of the general supposition that the stem of the verb is in $\epsilon \kappa \iota \chi \alpha \nu$. Everything appears to me to lead to a form $\kappa \iota \chi \eta \mu \iota$ ($\kappa \iota$ being a reduplication), with $\kappa \iota \chi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ as a sister-form, which in the present prevailed over the former. "E $\kappa \iota \chi \sigma \nu$ arose from $\epsilon \kappa \iota \chi \eta \nu$ by a shortening of the syllable, just as $\xi \dot{\nu} \nu \iota \sigma \nu$ did from $\xi \nu \nu \iota \eta \nu$; and metrical causes confused the one with the other. According to this supposition the true stem or root is XE- or XA- (compare the note on $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$, $\pi \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \eta \nu$), from which came $\kappa \iota \chi \bar{\alpha} \nu \omega$, like $\phi \theta \bar{\alpha} \nu \omega$ from $\Phi \Theta A$ -.

There is a Doric aor. 1. $\xi \kappa_i \xi a$, moved away, pushed away, which Schneider in his Lexicon deduces from $\kappa i \chi \omega$. There is certainly nothing to hinder this new aorist being formed from $\xi \kappa_i \chi o \nu$; but the grounds which I have laid down in Schol. Od. λ , 579. make me think it more eligible to give it a stem or root of its own KIK Ω : and this last supposition is confirmed by a fragment of Simonides, although as it now stands unintelligible, $\xi \pi \iota \kappa i \kappa o \delta \rho o \mu \epsilon \sigma \iota$, Chærobosc. ap. Bekk. p. 1185. and Herodian in Bandini Bibl. Laur. Med. (Græca) p. 146. See Blomf. ad Callim. pag. ult. †

Κίχρημι. See Χράω.

 $K_{i\omega}$, I go; used only in pres. and imperf.; indeed the indic. pres. seldom or never \ddagger occurs ($\kappa_{i\epsilon\iota_c}$, Æschyl. Ch. 676); the other moods of the present however, as the optat. $\kappa_{io\iota\mu\iota}$, part. $\kappa_{i\omega\nu}$, &c., together with the imperf., are in frequent use in Homer and the other poets. The part. pres. $\kappa_{i\omega\nu}$ 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 Ω , $\epsilon_{I\mu\iota}$, I go.

To be satisfied that *"knov* is an imperf. we have only to look at Il.

* See Monk and Matthäe on Eurip. Hipp. 1434. (1442.). Hitherto however this reading has not been introduced into any passage of the Tragedians from manuscripts, 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 peculiarities from all writers. Now that Photius and Suidas expressly quote $\kappa c\gamma \chi dvew$ from Solon ; that Eustathius (on Od. p. 209, 32.) cites not merely $\kappa c\gamma \chi dve but$ also $l\gamma \chi dvw$, and that as "more analogical"—these two things appear to me much ore against than in favour of the introduction of it. The above supposition that κ_{I-} is a syllable of reduplication, agrees both with the fluctuation of the quantity (as the Epics had both $\pi i \phi \alpha i \sigma \kappa \omega$ and $\pi i - \phi \alpha i \sigma \kappa \omega$) and with the form $\kappa_{I} \gamma \chi d \omega \omega$, which has its analogy in $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu$. That $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$ and $\kappa i \chi d \omega \omega$ were preferred to $\pi i \pi \lambda \eta \mu$ and $\kappa i \chi d \omega \omega$ (the two latter being also in use), corresponds with other euphonic observances.

† [Passow mentions (from κίκω) a rare poet. aor. ἕκϊκον, infin. κικεῖν, and a Dor. aor. 1. ἕκιξα, midd. ἐκιξάμην.]

‡ [Passow says that the indic. pres. is not used at all.] β , 588. ζ , 399.; and that $\kappa i \omega \nu$ is not an aor. we may be convinced by such passages as $a_{\rho\chi\epsilon} \lambda_{\epsilon\chi\sigma\sigma\delta\epsilon} \kappa_{\iota\omega\nu}$, Il. γ , 447., see also π , 263. ω , 328.: while in such as κλισίηνδε κιών... θέτο, κ, 148., we must remember the usage of the participles iwr, aywr, φέρων, stated in the construction of participles in the syntax; according to which therefore that sentence is to be construed in the same way as ἕστησε φέρων, Od. a, 127.

149

On μετεκίαθον see ἀμύναθον under ᾿Αμύνω and ἐδιώκαθον under Διώκω. The verb κίνυμαι see above under Κινέω.

Κλάζω, I sound, scream, &c. : fut. \varkappa λάγξω*; aor. 1. έκλαγξα; perf. κέκλαγγα synonymous with the present; whence the fut. κεκλάγξω and κεκλάγξομαι.

See κεκλαγγυΐαι, Xenoph. Ven. 3, 9. 6, 23. Conj. κεκλάγγω and fut. κεκλάγξομαι, Aristoph. Vesp. 929. 930. Both futures are quoted by Suidas. There are other presents formed from some tense of $\kappa \lambda \dot{a} \zeta \omega$; for instance κλαγγέω whence κλαγγεῦντι, Theocr. Epigr. 6., and κλαγyávw, which however is doubtful +; see Schneid. ad Xen. Ven. 4, 5.

In the Epic language this verb is also inflected with one γ . In the oldest poets however this is found only in the perf. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha$, used as a present, of which the part. masc. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \eta \gamma \omega_{\varsigma}$ changes in its oblique cases to κεκλήγοντος, as though formed from a new present κεκλήγω (Hom.), This is cl like έρρίγοντι in Hes. a, 228. : see πεφρίκοντας under Φρίσσω. An aor. 2. mmy- 1 έκλαγον is found in Hymn. Pan. 14. and Eurip. Iph. A. 1062. in the an herfor chorus. But the aor. 1. ἕκλαξα‡ belongs merely to the Doric inflexion tree and of κλείω. [The regular aor. 1. ἕκλαγξα is used in a transit. sense in Ja by the Pind. Pyth. 4, 40. Compare Æschyl. Sept. 388. Agam. 48. The audrian presents κλάγω or κλάγγω never occur.-Passow.]

Kλaíw, I weep, Att. ×λάω with a long and without contraction : fut. xλαύσομαι § (xλαυσοῦμαι, Aristoph. Pac. The fut. κλαιήσω, κλαήσω is 1081.); aor. 1. έκλαυσα. less frequent. Verbal adj. xλαυστός and xλαυτός, xλαυ- $\sigma \tau \epsilon_{0S}$. - 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.

Ven. 6, 23. He has also Khayyalvw.] ‡ This aor. was formerly quoted from Archiæ Epigr. 28., but the true reading ἀποκλάγξασα is now adopted by Jacobs.

hanin

§ On the formation of this future see Θέω.

^{*} Some verbs in (have yy for their characteristic, as for instance $\kappa \lambda \dot{a} \zeta \omega$, $\pi \lambda \dot{a}$ ζω, σαλπίζω.

^{+ [}Passow however makes no mention of Khayyavw being a suspected form, and quotes it from Æschyl. Eum. 126. and Xen.

čκλαεν standing in the text of Theocr. 14, 32., but occurring nowhere else, has been altered by Hermann to čκλαι; 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.

Κλάω, I break: fut. κλάσω (with a short); aor. 1. εκλασα; aor. 1. pass. ἐκλάσθην; perf. pass. κέκλασμαι. Thus the a is short in the inflexion; and the passive takes σ.

In Anacr. Fr. 16. we find a syncopated aor. 2. part. ἀποκλάς as from ἀπόκλημι, on which see ἕγνων, &c., under Γιγνώσκω.

Kλείω, I shut, is regular: thus fut. κλείσω,&c. But the perf. pass. is both κέκλεισμαι and κέκλειμαι; while the aor.
1. pass. is ἐκλείσθην only.

The Ionians pronounced this verb $\kappa \lambda \eta \tilde{\iota} \omega$, and formed it $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \eta \tilde{\iota} \sigma \alpha$, κληΐσαι, κεκλήμαι without the σ , but always ἐκληΐσθην. These forms had therefore, like the corresponding ones from $\tau i \omega$, $\mu \eta \nu i \omega$, &c., the ι according to the rules of formation long; consequently those editions of Homer which have έκλήϊσσε, κληΐσσαι are so far incorrect, and these forms, from being written thus, are erroneously given to $\kappa \lambda \eta^{2} \zeta \omega$, which verb has, it is true, in the lexicons, the meaning of to shut, but improperly so: for the old writers know κλητζω ἐκλήτσα in no other sense than that of celebro, and κληΐω ἐκλήισα in that of claudo. Hence arose again an Attic form $\kappa \lambda \eta \omega$, $\xi \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma a$, which occurs frequently in the text, and still more frequently as a various reading in the manuscripts. Valckenaer's (ad Phœniss. 268.) opinion, that κλείω must be older than $\kappa \lambda \eta \omega$, because in the earlier times the η 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 $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\omega$ was the general form in use at a later period, $\kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \omega$ 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 κέκλεισμαι, κέκλειμαι, κέκλημαι. See Thom. Mag. in voc. Theodosii Canones, p. 1020, 25. Cheerob. in Ind. Bekk. v. κέκλειμαι: and among the moderns Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 729. Matth. ad Hecub. 482. Androm. 495. Schneid. v. Kleiw.*

* [The article in Schneider runs thus: $\kappa \lambda \epsilon i \omega_{\omega}$. $\epsilon i \sigma \omega_{\omega}$ whence perf. pass. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon i - \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \omega_{\omega}$. According to the Etym. Mag. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon i \mu \omega_{\omega}$ was used for $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \mu \omega \omega_{\omega}$. In Demosth. Philipp. p. 22 Bekker reads κεκλημένων τῶν ἐμπορίων. In Eur. Hel. 983. stands κεκλήμεθα: and in Æschyl. Suppl. 957. κεκλειμένοs for κεκλεισμένοs. --Ed.] The Ionic 3. plur. κεκλέαται (for κεκλήαται from κεκλήμαι) belongs to this verb quite as much as it does to καλέω when put for κεκλήαται from κέκλημαι: see ἀποκεκλέατο, Herodot. 9, 50. and κεκλέαται (from καλέω), 2, 164.

The Dorians had a fut. $\kappa \lambda \alpha \xi \tilde{\omega}$ and an aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \alpha \xi a$ formed from $\kappa \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ Dor. for $\kappa \lambda \eta \tilde{\tau} \zeta \omega$: compare $\Gamma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \omega$ and $\Theta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \omega$.

There is one instance of a fut. 2. $\kappa\lambda\iota\tilde{\omega}$ as used by the Comic poet Eupolis according to a remarkable observation of Cheeroboseus (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 $\phi\nu\gamma\tilde{\omega}\nu$, $\delta\rho\mu\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$, or they are presents." And then is added, "solitary exceptions there are in $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$ and in $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\iota\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ from $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\iota\omega$ in Eupolis $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ X $\rho\nu\sigma\tilde{\varrho}$ $\gamma\epsilon'\nu\epsilon$. El $\mu\eta' \tau\iota\varsigma a\dot{\nu}\eta\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\iota\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$."

Κλέπτω, I steal : fut. κλέψομαι ; perf. κέκλοφα* ; perf. pass. κέκλεμμαι, Att. κέκλαμμαι: [aor. 1. pass. ἐκλέφθην ;] aor. 2. pass. ἐκλάπην.

Kλέω[†], κλείω, *I celebrate*; pass. κλέομαι, *I am celebrated*. In II. ω, 202. ἐκλέο is the 2. sing. imperf. for. ἐκλέεο, like φοθέο, αἰτέο, ἐξηγέο. In Callim. Del. 40. ἕκλεο Δῆλος must at all events be accented like the above, ἐκλέο, in as much as either *celebrabaris* is poet. for *vocabaris*, or the poet thought himself at liberty to use the syncope thus, ἐκαλέεο, ἐκαλέο, ἐκλέο.

Κλίνω[‡], *I bend*: fut. κλίνῶ; aor. 1. ἐκλίνα; aor. 1. midd. ἐκλινάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐκλίνθην and ἐκλίθην (ĭ), both forms in Homer, but ἐκλίνθην § exclusively Ep. and Poet.: much less frequent is the aor. 2. pass. and perhaps used only in the compounds as κατακλϊνῆναι, Plato and Aristoph. ξυγκατακλϊνείς, Aristoph. Ach. 981. Perf. pass. κέκλϊμαι, part. κεκλϊμένος. — MIDD.

* 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. $\pi \ell \mu \pi \omega - \pi \ell \pi \rho \mu \phi \alpha$. 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 placed here merely on account of $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha_i$, some have wished to bring back to the text of Eurip. Alc. 449. (461.) and lph. A. 1047. (1035.). See Matthiæ on the former passage.

 \ddagger On the formation of the perf. and aor. 1. pass., see Teivw.

§ Examples however of $\kappa \lambda u \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a u$ may be found in Plutarch (see Stephan, Thesaur.); and in Æsop, Fab. 143. Heusing., but in this latter the reading is uncertain. Kλύω, I hear, a poetical verb, whose imperf. ἕκλυον is used as an aorist, and also in the present sense of to be in the habit of hearing; see above in $E_{\nu \nu \epsilon \pi o \nu}$. Imperat. κλύε, κλύετε, more commonly κλῦθι, κλῦτε, like βῆθι, γνῶθι, &c., and with Homeric reduplication κέκλῦθι, κέκλῦτε; see Káµνω. To this syncopated aorist belongs the adjectival part. pass. κλύμενος synonymous with the verbal adj. κλυτός, celebrated.

With regard to the aoristic usage of $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\nu\sigma\nu$ it is to be observed that the pres. indic. $\kappa\lambda\omega\omega$ never occurs in Homer: Hesiod has it once, ϵ , 724., the Tragedians frequently.

KMA-. See Κάμνω.

Κνάω, I scrape, scratch, infin. $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\alpha} \nu$, but in the more accurate Att. writers $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\eta} \nu$, like $\sigma \mu \tilde{\eta} \nu$ and $\psi \tilde{\eta} \nu^*$, Pollux, 7, 196.; fut. $\varkappa \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\mathring{\epsilon} \varkappa \nu \eta \sigma \alpha$; of an aor. 2. $\mathring{\epsilon} \varkappa \nu \eta \nu$, as formed from $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\eta} \mu \iota$, is found only a 3. sing. $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\eta}$, and that but once, II. λ , 639. compare Herodot. 7, 139. — MIDD. $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Att. $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Plat. Gorg. p. 494. c. Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 30. (Schneid. 3.)

Kνώσσω, I sleep: fut. κνώσω, &c. See Άρμόττω: 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. κατακνώσασα is found in many of the manuscripts, but the old reading κατακνώσσουσα is likewise in the best manuscripts (see Brunck), so that nothing can be decided in favour of either.

Kοιμάω, Ion. κοιμέω, Herodot. 2. 95. I cause to sleep, put to rest: fut. κοιμήσω, &c. Pass. (and in the Epics midd. also) I sleep. [Homer has the pass. κοιμάομαι with fut. κοιμήσομαι, and the aor. κοιμήσασθαι as well as κοιμηθήναι; the former is used by the poets only. — Passow.]

Kολάζω, Ipunish: fut. κολάσω (Xen. Athen. 1, 9.), and more frequently κολάσομαι (Xen. Anab. 2, 5, 13.); the apparently Attic forms of the fut. κολῶ, midd. κολῶμαι†, are used by Aristophanes (Equ. 459.), merely as a play on the word; the participle of the fut. midd. κολώμενος (not κολούμενος) is the true reading of Aristoph. Vesp. 244., as

logy can be laid down: for while in $\beta_{i-\epsilon} d\zeta_{\omega}$ the Attic fut. is very common, in $\alpha\gamma\rho\sigma d\zeta_{\omega}$ and others it is a barbarism: see Lex. Seguer. p. 331. and Maitt. pp. 47 48.

 ^{*} See also ζῆν from Ζάω, χρῆσθαι from Χράω, διψῆν, πεινῆν, &c.
 † Most of the polysyllabic verbs in -ίζω

⁺ Most of the polysyllabic verbs in $-i\zeta\omega$ prefer the Attic fut. to the other; but of those in $-i\zeta\omega$ nothing like a decided ana-

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 $\varkappa \alpha \lambda \alpha \omega \omega$. 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 $\varkappa \alpha \lambda \alpha \sigma \omega$, Xen. Anab. 2, 5, 13. Hellen. 1, 7, 20. Porson post Hemsterh. Plut. p. 575.—Passow.]

Κολούω, I mutilate: fut. κολούσω, &c. The pass. is formed both with and without σ; thus perf. pass. κεκόλουμαι and κεκόλουσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐκολούθην and ἐκολούσθην.

Schneider in Theophr. Caus. Plant. 2, 20. (15.) invariably reads $\kappa o \lambda o \nu \sigma \theta \tilde{\epsilon} \tilde{\iota} \sigma a$, $\kappa o \lambda o \nu \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta}$ on very slight authority : but the form without the σ does occur in other writers (see Stephan. Thesaur.), and $\kappa \epsilon \kappa o \lambda o \nu \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu o \varsigma$ in Philippi Epigr. 25. is undisputed.

Koμίζω, I bring: fut. χομίσω, Att. - ĭῶ, &c.—MIDD. χομίζομαι, I get: fut. χομιοῦμαι, &c. See Aristoph. Av. 552.

Kovíw, I cover with dust: fut. $\times ovi \sigma \omega$. This is the old and genuine form of the verb; whence the perf. pass. $\times \varepsilon =$ $\times i v \overline{\iota} \mu \alpha \iota$; and hence in the poets the only way of writing . the aorist is $\dot{\epsilon} \times i v \iota \sigma \varepsilon$. The Attic form $\times ovi \zeta \omega$, fut. $\times ovi \tilde{\omega}$ and $\times ovi \sigma \omega$, perf. pass. $\times \varepsilon \times i v \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, did not come into use until later.*

Κόπτω, I hew, cut down: fut. κόψω; perf. κέκοφα; aor. 2. pass. έκόπην. — MIDD.

Homer has the perf. 2. in the sense of the present, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \sigma \pi \omega_{S}$, Il. ν , 60. Od. σ , 334.

* See the examples in Stephens, and compare the various readings. Brunck was therefore quite right in Theore. 1, 30. in preferring the reading of the majority of the manuscripts; as was Jacobs in Hegesippi Epigr. 3. (Anth. Vat. p. 164.) in suspecting the reading of the Vatican manuscript *kekorymére* to be, what is much more probable, and must at all events be preferred in the hexameter, $-\mu \epsilon i x a$. The assertion of Hemsterhuys (on Lucian Timon. 45.), that кеконцие́ноs and кеконисцие́ноs are both equally good, cannot, as applied there, be satisfactory : compare $\mu \eta \nu i \omega$. Whether, as some critics contend (see Valck. ad Theoer. I. c.), we ought in Thom. Mag. instead of Kal кеконацие́ноs кal кеконцие́ноs to read Kal кеконацие́ноs к. к., and whether there be sufficient grounds for the rejection of кона́v in the sense of to cover with dust, require perhaps a closer investigation. Κορέννυμι, *I satiate*: fut. χορέσω; aor. 1. ἐχόρεσα. The pass. takes σ; thus perf. χεχόρεσμαι; aor. 1. ἐχορέσθην.— ΜΓDD.

The Att. fut. must have been $\kappa o \rho \tilde{\omega}$, for the Epic one is $\kappa o \rho \tilde{\omega} \omega$, Il. 9, 379, ν , 831. The Ionic dialect takes the η in the perf., as act. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \delta \rho \eta \kappa a$, pass. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \delta \rho \eta \mu \alpha \iota$; and the Epic language has also a perf. part. with act. form and pass. meaning, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa o \rho \eta \omega \varsigma$, Od. σ , 372. See $\tau \epsilon \tau \mu \eta \omega \varsigma$, in note under Té $\mu \nu \omega$.

Κορύσσω, I arm (with a helmet): fut. κορύζω; aor. 1. midd. ἐκορυσσάμην (in Hippocr. ἐκορυζάμην), part. κορυσσάμενος, Il. τ, 397.; perf. pass. κεκόρυθμαι, part. κεκορυθμένος.

Κοτέω, and more frequently in midd. κοτέσμαι, **I** feel enmity against: Ep. fut. κοτέσσμαι; Ep. aor. 1. midd. κοτέσσατο, part. κοτεσσάμενος. This verb retains ϵ in the formation, except in the Ep. perf. part. κεκοτηώς, with the meaning of the pres. increased in force; thus κεκοτηότι $\vartheta v \mu \tilde{\varphi}$, Hom. The part. of the aor. 1. act. κοτέσασα occurs in Hymn. Cer. 254. The word is entirely poetical.

Κράζω, I scream, croak: fut. κεκράξομαι; aor. 2. ἕκράγον, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 337. But instead of this present the perf. κέκραγα (with the force of a pres.) is generally used, whence by syncope 1. plur. κέκραγμεν (pluperf. ἐκέκραγμεν), imperat. κέκραχθι, infin. κεκραγέναι, part. κεκραγώς. The 2. plur. imperat. of the perf. κεκράγετε 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 γέγωνε, and κεχήνετε under Χάσκω.

Κραίνω, *I complete*: fut. κράνῶ; aor. 1. ἔκρηνα, imperat. κρῆνον, infin. κρῆναι, Od.; aor. 1. pass. ἐκράνθην, Pind. The Epic infin. fut. midd. in a pass. sense is κρανέεσθαι, Il. ι, 622. In Eurip. Hippol. 1255. κέκρανται 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 tenses, as imperf. ἐκραίαινεν, aor. 1. infin. κρηῆναι, perf. pass. κεκράανται.*

* As the Epic aor. of $\phi a i \nu \omega$ is $\partial \phi a a \mu \nu$ $\partial \eta \nu$ because that verb is contracted from $\phi a e i \nu \omega$, so is the remarkable production of the tenses of $\kappa \rho a i \nu \omega$ the result of contraction, and most probably of $\kappa \rho a i \nu \omega$ from $\kappa\rho\epsilon a i \nu \omega$: 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 $\phi \tilde{\omega}s$ is contracted from $\phi d o s$ Κρεμάννῦμι, I hang (any thing); pass. I am hanged; midd. I hang myself: in addition to which comes a particular form for the intransit., $\varkappa \rho έμαμαι$, I am hanging. This last is conjugated like δύναμαι with conj. $\varkappa \rho έμωμαι$, opt. $\varkappa \rho εμαίμην^*$, $\varkappa \rho έμαιτο$. In the inflexion α is short, as in the fut. $\varkappa \rho εμάσω$ and aor. 1. $ἐ\varkappa ρ έμασα$, and the pass. takes σ. The Att. fut. is $\varkappa \rho εμῶ, -α̃s, -α̃$, &c. The aor. 1. pass. $ἐ\varkappa ρ εμάσθην$ is common to the passive (with a passive and middle sense) and to the intransitive; but the fut. $\varkappa \rho εμασθήσομαι$ belongs wholly to $\varkappa \rho εμάννομι$, as the intransit. sense has its own future $\varkappa \rho εμήσομαι$, 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 $i\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\omega$, 2. sing. aor. 1. for $i\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\sigma$, ll. o, 18. 21. and the aor. 1. infin. $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\dot{\alpha} \sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (with an accus.) to hang any thing on, Hes. ϵ , 627. The pres. $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\dot{\alpha}\omega$ is used by the later writers.[†] In the pure Attic language the only future is $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\omega$, $-\tilde{q}c$, &c., Epic $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\delta\omega$.

In Aristoph. Vesp. 298. all the manuscripts have the optat. $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\theta\epsilon$ from $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\rho\mu\rho\iota\sigma$, except the Venetian, which has $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\theta\epsilon$, naturally leading us to $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon$. The other reading however is not to be rejected too hastily: compare $\mu\rho\rhoroi\mu\eta\nu$, $\mu\epsilon\muroi\mu\eta\nu$ with the accentuation of the optat. and conjunct. under $\Delta\delta\nu\rho\mu\rho\iota$. There must however have been a uniformity in Aristophanes, and we find in Nub. 868. Acharn. 944., at least as the text now stands, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\rho\iota\sigma$.

An Attic sister-form of this verb in the pres. and imperf. is $\kappa \rho \, \eta \, \mu \, \eta \, \mu \, \iota$, $\kappa \rho \, \eta \, \mu \, \mu \, \mu \, \iota$, which deviates from analogy by the η in the radical syllable.[‡] Hence this way of writing it may well appear doubtful, particularly as $\kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \nu$ - and $\kappa \rho \mu \nu$ - are found occasionally in the manuscripts. § On the whole however they are in favour of the η ; and we find $\kappa \rho \eta \mu \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ (without any known various reading) in Æschyl. Sept. 231. $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \rho \eta \mu \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$, Aristoph. Nub. 377. $\kappa \rho \eta \mu \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, Pind.

and again produced to the Ep. φόωs: compare also δώκοs, δόωκοs and δαάσσω in Buttm. Lexil.

^{*} On the accentuation of these forms see Δύναμαι.

⁺ Stephens quotes it from two works falsely attributed to Aristotle : Hist. Mirab. c. 6. and Œc. 2.

[‡] This verb is the only instance of the change of ϵ to η , κρεμάω and κρεμάνυμι to κρήμνημι : see note under Κεράννυμι.

See Müncker ad Ant. Lib. 13. extr. Var. Lect. ad Eurip. El. 1217. Barnes. et Musgr. ad Eurip. Herc, 520. Piers, ad Mœr. v. Ἐκρεμάννυεν.

Pyth. 4, 43. the imperat. κρήμνη, Etym. M. in voc. and in fragments of Euripides there quoted (see Piers. ad Moer. v. $\kappa i \rho \nu \eta$). Eustathius also on Il. 9, 19. (if any reliance is to be placed on it) expressly mentions the change of ϵ to η . And lastly in the subst. $\kappa \rho \eta \mu \nu \delta \varsigma$ (an overhanging precipice), which is of the same family, the η is undoubted.

Κρίνω*, I separate, judge: fut. κρίνῶ; aor. ἔκρινα; perf. κέκρικα; perf. pass. κέκριμαι; aor. 1. midd. ἐκρινάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐκρίθην (ĭ). In Homer is also a poet. part. aor. pass. xpubels, Il. v, 129. Od. 9, 48. This verb has a middle voice, but only in the Epic language (xpivaobas overpous, to interpret, Il. e, 150.): it has however two compounds, depon. midd.

άποκρίνομαι, Ianswer; ὑποκρίνομαι, Iexplain, represent.

Hence in good writers the passive form $\dot{a}\pi \sigma\kappa\rho\iota\theta\tilde{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$ is nothing more than a real passive of $\dot{a}\pi o\kappa \rho i \nu \omega$, I separate: but later writers used it for άποκρίνασθαι: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 108. The perf. 2. κέκρινα belongs to the later writers.

Kpouw, I knock, push: perf. pass. xéxpoupart, and xéκρουσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐκρούσθην. - MIDD.

Κρύπτω, I conceal: fut. κρύψω. The characteristic is β . Pass. aor. 1. ἐκρύφθην; aor. 2. ἐκρύβην (ŭ) - MIDD.

The aor. 2. act. "κρύβον and the forms with the simple characteristic φ, as ἕκρυφον, are found only in the later writers, Quintus, Nonnus, &c. See also Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318. The Ep. imperf. κρύπτασκον (see ρίπτασκον) is in Il. 9, 272. The perf. pass. κέκρυμμαι in Od.

Κτάομαι, Ion. κτέομαι, Herodot., I get possession of, obtain : fut. κτήσομαι; aor. 1. έκτησάμην; perf. κέκτημαι‡, I possess, Hes. ε, 439. Ion. έκτημαι, Il. 1, 402. perf. conj. κέκτωμαι, η, ηται, &c., perf. opt. κεκτήμην, κέκτηο, κέxτητο, &c. There is also another form of the perf. opt. κεκτώμην § (like μεμνώμην from μέμνημαι), of which we

logy of verbs beginning with two conso-nants (not mutes before liquids), which take ϵ 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-

^{*} On the formation of the two perfects and the aor. 1. pass., see Teivw. + Aristoph. Ach. 459. according to the

manuscripts.

[‡] The perf. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \eta \mu a \mu$, like $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \mu a \mu$ from $\mu \nu d \omega$, is formed with the regular reduplication ; but Ekryman follows the ana-

find ×ε×τώμεθα, Eurip. Heracl. 283. Compare Il. ψ, 361. Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 3.

In a somewhat later period we find the passive $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \tau a$. [Indeed $\kappa \tau a \dot{\epsilon} \mu a \iota a a$ 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. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \eta \theta \eta$ occurs in a passive sense in Thucyd. 1, 123. the fem. part. aor. $\kappa \tau \eta \theta \epsilon \bar{\iota} \sigma a$ in Eurip. Hec. 453., and the perf. part. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} r \sigma g$ in Thucyd. 7, 70. An active $\kappa \tau \dot{a} \omega$ is never found. — Passow.]

Κτείνω, I kill: fut. $x \tau \epsilon v \tilde{\omega}$, Ion. $x \tau \check{\alpha} v \tilde{\omega}$; aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon} x \tau \epsilon i v \alpha$; aor. 2. $\check{\epsilon} x \tau \check{\alpha} v o v$; perf. 2. $\check{\epsilon} x \tau o v \alpha$. We have only to observe 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 $\check{\epsilon} x \tau o v \alpha$. The perf. pass. and aor. pass. were not used in the common language, but in their places the verb $\Im v \eta \sigma x \omega$ in a passive combination, $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \vartheta v \eta x \epsilon v$ or $\dot{\alpha} \pi \acute{\epsilon} \vartheta \alpha \omega \epsilon v$ $\dot{\upsilon} \pi \check{\omega}$.

From the opinions of the Grammarians which have come down to us confused and corrupted (Thom. Mag. in $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\sigma\nu\alpha$, Mœr. in $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\sigma\nu\epsilon\nu$) 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 $\kappa\alpha'\nu\epsilon\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\nu\epsilon'\nu$. See Sturz. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\epsilon'\nu\epsilon\nu\nu$. The perf. $\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha$, $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha$, always however accompanied with the various reading $\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha$, 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. $ol_{\mu}n\nu$ was affixed to $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta\nu$ -, which contained the stem of the verb, making $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta ol_{\mu}n\nu$. This was changed according to Ionic custom (like $r\eta\delta$ s to $r\epsilon\kappa\delta$) to $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\phi_{\mu}n\nu$, and again contracted by the Attics to $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\phi\mu\nu$. The form in $-\hbar\mu\eta\nu$ appears to have been preferred by the older Attics, that $\delta f - \phi\mu\eta\nu$ to be peculiar to Euripides and Xenophon.

* Of the two non-Attic forms ἕκταγκα was undoubtedly the more disagreeable to the ear, while the better-sounding ἕκτακα was recommended by the analogy of τέτακα. I would therefore, contrary to the opinion of the above-mentioned philologists, acquit the language of Menander at least of having used that form, and in a fragment of him preserved by Suidas defend the old reading (which is also that of the Ed. Mediol.) àmekrákaat. The direction in Thom. Mag. 'Amékrova káλλιον \hbar àmékrewa. àmékravov $\delta è$ àbôkuμον πάντη is nonsense arising from repeated mistakes. In that passage three perfects must have been mentioned, and nothing can be more suited to the point in question than, 'Amékrova κάλλιον \hbar àmékraka. àmékrayna $\delta è$ àbôkuμον πάντη. That is to say, the strict Atticist preferred 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 language. Mœris, whom we may with the There existed also a perf. $\epsilon\kappa\tau\delta\sigma\eta\kappa a$, formed like $\delta\epsilon\delta\delta\sigma\kappa\eta\mu\epsilon\sigma\sigma$ from $\delta\epsilon-\chi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ or $\mu\epsilon\mu\delta\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ from $\mu\epsilon\ell\rho\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$.^{*} Wherever this form occurs in the older Attics it is corrupted; as in Plat. Apol. p. 38. c. the present reading taken from the best Codd. is $\delta\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\sigma\sigma\sigma$, and of Xen. Hier. 3, 7., the various reading $\delta\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$ is in Stobæus: but we must allow 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 ν (see $K\lambda i\nu\omega$ and $T\epsilon i\nu\omega$), $\epsilon\kappa\tau a\theta\eta\nu$ and $\epsilon\kappa\tau a\nu\theta\eta\nu$, of which the latter was again used in the later prose, as $\kappa\tau a\nu\theta\eta\nu a\iota$ in Dio Cassius (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 36.), and $\kappa\tau a\nu\theta\epsilon i\varsigma$, Brunck Anal. Ænigm. 34. "Εκτάθεν is Æol. 3. plur. for $\epsilon\kappa\tau a\theta\eta\sigma a\nu$, Il. λ , 691. Od. δ , 537.

Homer has the syncopated aorist, corresponding with the aor. 2., like $\xi \in \eta v$, $\xi \gamma v \omega v$, &c. (see under $\Gamma_i \gamma v \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$); thus $\xi \kappa \tau \check{a} v$, -a, -a, plur. $\xi \kappa \tau \check{a} \mu \epsilon v$, &c., and 3. plur. $\xi \kappa \tau a v$ for $-a\sigma a v$; opt. $\kappa \tau a \dot{i} \eta v$; infin. $\kappa \tau \dot{a} \mu \epsilon v$, $\kappa \tau \dot{a} \mu \epsilon v a$, for $\kappa \tau \check{a} v a \iota$; part. $\kappa \tau \dot{a} \varsigma$. The Homeric conj. is $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ for $\kappa \tau \breve{\omega}$ (like $i\sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ for $i\sigma \tau \breve{\omega}$; see "I $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$), whence $\kappa \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega \mu \epsilon v$, Od. χ , 216. To this we must add a corresponding aor. midd. with passive meaning, $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \dot{a} \mu \eta v \dagger$, - σo , - τo (like $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \eta v$ from $\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega$), infin. $\kappa \tau \ddot{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$, part. $\kappa \tau \dot{a} \mu \epsilon v \sigma \varsigma$; all formed as from $\kappa \tau \dot{a} \omega$. Homer has also an Epic conj. pres. $\kappa \tau \epsilon \dot{\iota} \nu \omega \mu \iota$, Od. τ , 490.

The fut. in Homer is the common one $\kappa\tau\epsilon\nu\tilde{\omega}$, but always in a resolved form $\kappa\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon\omega$, $-\epsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\epsilon\epsilon\iota$, in which the manuscripts agree in almost every instance: only the compound with $\kappa a\tau \dot{a}$ takes, as universally, the change of vowel to a, as $\kappa a\tau a\kappa\tau a\nu\epsilon ov\sigma\iota\nu$, Il. ζ , 409., $\kappa a\tau a\kappa\tau a\nu\epsilon \sigma\theta\epsilon$, ξ , 481., consequently they are fut. midd. with a *passive sense*. To these we must add the simple form $\kappa a\ell \tau\epsilon \kappa\tau a\nu\epsilon o\nu\tau a \kappa a\tau\epsilon\kappa\tau a$, Il. σ , 309., where however 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. $\kappa a\tau\epsilon\kappa\tau a$ is here used in the sense of to be accustomed to slay). But the context immediately preceding, $\xi\nu\nu\delta\sigma$ "Apps, requires much rather this sense,," they slay and are slain" \ddagger ; which leads us to conjecture that from $\kappa\tau a\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ arose a

greatest certainty restore from the manuscripts thus, 'Aπέκτονεν 'Aττικŵs, ἀπέκταγκεν 'Eλληνικŵs, speaks more concisely to the same point. And lastly, Sextus, who (Adv. Gramm.10.) says, κτείνεται μεν λέγεται, ἕκταγκα δὲ οὐ λέγεται, 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, that ἕκταγκα was rejected. * From κτείνω we suppose a form κτονέω, like φέρω and φορέω (see $\Delta \epsilon \mu \omega$), from which comes regularly ἐκτόνηκα.

† 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. $\delta \rho \mu \eta \nu$, $\epsilon \kappa \tau d \mu \eta \nu$, $\epsilon \phi \delta (\mu \eta \nu$, $\epsilon \sigma \sigma \delta \mu \eta \nu$.

‡ [Or still more literally, "war is accustomed to slay the slayer." — Ed.] new present $\kappa rav \epsilon \omega$, by which the continuation of the action appears to have been expressed, just as it is by $\epsilon \pi i r \rho a \pi \epsilon o v \sigma i$ in κ , 421.

An Attic sister-form of this verb for the pres. and imperf. in prose is $\kappa \tau (\nu \nu \nu \mu \iota)$; for so this form is generally written in the text; but the manuscripts fluctuate between ι and $\epsilon \iota$, ν and $\nu \nu$.*

Κτίζω, I found, build: fut. ίσω, &c. The part. pass. κτίμενος (like πτάμενος under πετάννυμ, θύμενος, ἁρπάμενος; see ἐκτάμην under
Κτείνω), and the verb. adj. κτιτός, which occur in the compounds ἐϋκτίμενος, ἐὕκτιτος, come from the older form in ίω, whence also περικτίονες.

Κτυπέω, *I* resound: fut. κτυπήσω, &c., is regular: but the Epics have the aor. 2. ἕκτύπον (like ἕπιτνον under πιτνέω), in which indeed lies the true primitive form or stem of the verb, and the subst. κτύπος as well as κτυπέω are derivatives from it.

Kυλίνδω and κυλίω, I roll (any thing). The only formation which occurs from these two verbs is fut. κυλίσω; aor. 1. ἐκύλισα, infin. κυλίσαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐκυλίσθην; perf. pass. κεκύλισμαι. — MIDD. To these we must add a lengthened present κυλινδέω[†], 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 $\kappa \nu \lambda i \nu \delta \omega$ (of which he uses only pres. and imperf.) with the aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \lambda i \sigma \partial \eta \nu$. It is also probable that $\kappa \nu \lambda i \nu \delta \omega$, fut. $\kappa \nu \lambda i \sigma \omega$, was the original form of this verb, and that $\kappa \nu \lambda i \omega$, which is found in the later poets, arose merely from the fut. $\kappa \nu \lambda i \sigma \omega$.

With the midd. κυλικδείσθαι, to roll (neut.), correspond three other forms,

άλινδεισθαι, καλινδεισθαι, είλινδεισθαι,

* Phrynichus in Lex. Seguer. 1. p. 29, 7. prefers writing $\kappa \tau i \nu \nu \mu$ 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 ν , there is nothing to lead us to a stem $\kappa \tau \iota -$ or $\kappa \tau \epsilon \iota -$ only to $\kappa \tau a - (\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \tau a \nu, \tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \tau a)$, and analogy would therefore require $\kappa \tau \alpha i \nu \nu \mu \mu$. But if it is formed from $\kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu -$ as a stem, we have (like $\delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu \nu \mu \mu$: and as a diphthong before $\nu \nu$ is something unusual, it was to be expected that the pronunciation would either drop one ν or shorten the ϵ_i to ι . The latter is the most current tradition; but $\kappa \tau \epsilon (\nu \nu \mu \iota)$ is found in the best manuscripts, as for instance almost invariably in the Cod. Clark. of Plato. Hence I conjecture that this is also the opinion of Phrynichus, and that $\delta \pi \sigma \kappa \tau \mu \nu \sigma \kappa u$, which is now the reading there, is owing to the common corruption of ι for ϵ_i .

+ Of this force we find only the present, but it is probable that the formation in $-\hbar\sigma\omega$, 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 $\epsilon \omega$; thus $\epsilon i \lambda i v \delta \eta \mu \epsilon v \varphi$ or $\eta \lambda i v \delta \eta \mu \epsilon v \varphi$, Plut. Agis 3., and in a passage quoted by Stephens $\epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \lambda i v \delta \eta \mu \epsilon v \eta$. The form $\delta \lambda i v \delta \epsilon \tilde{i} \sigma \theta a i$ is pre-eminently the Attic, 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,

(άλισαι) έξαλισαι, έξηλικα,

for these are the only forms which occur (see Piers. ad Mœr. p. 51.), and they are evidently from $d\lambda i \nu \delta \omega$, $d\lambda i \sigma \omega$. See all these forms detailed fully in Buttm. Lex. p. 396., &c.

Κῦνέω, I kiss: (fut. xύσω*;) aor. 1. ἔxῦσα, like βυνέω,
ἔβυσα.† The comp. προσκυνέω, I salute, worship, is regular; but in verse it has also the aor. infin. προσκύσαι,
e. g. in Soph. Phil. 657. Aristoph. Equ. 156. See Κύω.

Κύπτω, I bow, bend forward, is regular: fut. $\varkappa \dot{\psi} \psi \omega$; perf. $\varkappa \dot{\epsilon} \varkappa \bar{\psi} \phi \alpha$.

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 $\kappa \dot{v} \phi o_{\mathcal{G}}$; it must therefore remain long in syllables long by position, and consequently be written $\kappa \tilde{v} \psi a\iota$, like $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \bar{a} \gamma a$, $\pi \rho \tilde{a} \xi a\iota$, and the like.

Kύρέω, I meet with, an Ionic verb, used by the Attics for $\tau v \gamma \chi \acute{a} v \omega$ in poetry only ‡, is regular. But the poets made use also of the older barytone form with $v \log \beta$, κύρων, which however is not very frequent. Thus we find the imperf. ἐκύρωνν, and in Soph. Œd. C. 1159. ἔκῦρον, whence 3. sing. κῦρε, Il. ψ, 821.§ Fut. κὕρῆσω and κύρσω; aor. ἐκύρησα, infin. κὕρήσαι, Hom. Epigr. 6, 6., part. κὕρήσας, Hes. ε, 757.; and (from κύρω) ἕκυρσα, infin. κύρσαι or κῦρσαι, Hes. ε, 693., part. κύρσας, Il. γ, 23. The formation from κύρω is more usual in all the poets than that from κυρέω. The midd. κύρομαι is used as a deponent in II. ω, 530.

* The fut. κυνήσομαι depends entirely on the corrupted passage of Eurip. Cycl. 171.: the comp. προσκυνήσω (Plat. Rep. p. 469. a.) is no argument in favour of the simple form, for in the comp. we find προσκινησα as well as προσέκυσα, in the simple ἕκυσα only. In Aristoph. Thesm. 915. κύσω is conjunctive.

† The midd. κυσάμεναι, kissing or caressing each other, is in Athen. 9. p. 394. d.

\$\$ Κεκυρηκότα in the second Alcibiades
 6. belongs to the orthography of Plato,

which it would be so desirable to ascertain.

§ The pres. act. $\kappa \nu \rho \omega$ has been also restored to some passages by criticism on which we may depend: see Herm. ad Soph. Aj.307. Math. ad Eurip. Hipp. 741. with which I may reckon the passage in Aj. (314. Br.), where Hermann has left $\kappa \nu \rho \epsilon i$, but the reading of the Scholiast, $\kappa \nu \rho \sigma i$, is more agreeable. Nor would I reject his historical information that the Attics used in the optat. $\kappa \nu \rho \sigma i$ rather than $\kappa \nu \rho \sigma i$ (or $\kappa \nu \rho \sigma i$). Kύω and χυέω, I am pregnant. The formation through all the moods and tenses is χυήσω, &c. To these we may add an inchoative form χυίσχω, and χυίσχομαι, I conceive.

To fix the usage between $\kappa \dot{\nu} \omega$ and $\kappa \nu \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ is difficult, because the forms which occur most frequently vary only in the accent, as kuel κυεῖ, κύουσα κυοῦσα, &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 κύοντα and κυοῦντα,) all the manuscripts have in the following passages, κυοῦμεν, Theæt. p. 210., κυοῦντι, Symp. 206. e., exice, 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 wiw + ; for instance, κύοντα, Aristot. H. A. 7, 5., τα κυόμενα παιδία, id. Probl. (see Stephens): το δέ κύεται, is in the womb, Poll. 5. 12. p. 73., έκυε, 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 κυέουσαν, Il. ψ , 266. and ἐκύει, τ, 117. perhaps we may be safest in attributing KUETV to the older, and KUELV 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, κυέω, like στυγέω, $\kappa \tau \nu \pi \epsilon \omega$, &c. To the simple stem belonged also, as in other verbs, an aor. 1. EKUJa with a causative meaning, to fructify, outpog ... EKUJE yaïav, Æschyl. Fr. Danaid. ap. Athen. 13. p. 600.: and with this is connected the Epic midd. κυσαμένη, ὑποκυσαμένη, literally "suffering herself to be impregnated," conceiving, which form, on account of its apparent affinity with κύσαι (see Κυνέω), is erroneously written with double σ . To express the same meaning was afterwards formed a present κυΐσκομαι (Aristot.); with which the active κυΐσκω as inchoative from κνέω was synonymous. ±

* In Hippoer. I find more than once $\kappa v \dot{\epsilon} o v c a$ (e.g. in De Superfetat.), which I think may be reconciled with $\kappa \dot{v} \epsilon c$ occurring 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.

‡ Schneider in the Supplement to his

Lexicon [and Passow follows him] takes $\kappa v \delta \sigma \kappa \omega$ to be the causative of $\kappa v \delta \sigma \kappa \omega a \omega$, 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. Theor. 2, 66. Stephan. Thesaur. Hippocr. De Steril. Λαγχάνω, I receive by lot or fate: fut. λήξομαι; aor. 2. ἕλαχον, see note under Αἰσθάνομαι; perf. εἴληχα (like εἴληφα from λαμβάνω), or Λέλογχα*, which the Atticists rejected: see Lucian Solæc. 7.

The fut. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \xi_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$ appears to have been rare: I find it in Plat. Repub. 10. p. 617. e. For $\lambda \dot{\eta} \xi_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$ the Ionics have $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \xi_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$, Herodot. 7, 144. with a short according to the Ion. analogy of changing η into short α .

In this verb the aor. with reduplication, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \chi \omega \sigma \iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \chi \eta \tau \epsilon$, Hom., is not the same as the common aor. 2. but has the causative sense to make a person partaker of, as in II. η , 80.

Λάζυμαι and λάζομαι, I lay hold on, take, an Ionic (Hom., Hippocr.) and poetic (Eurip.) defective deponent, used only in pres. and imperfect.

ΛΑΚ-. See Λάσκω.

Λαμδάνω, I take: fut. λήψομαι; aor. 2. ἕλαδον†, imperat. λάδε and λάδέ (see "Ερχομαι), infin. λάδεῖν, part. λάδών; perf. εἴληφα with ει prefixed instead of reduplication, like εἴληχα, εἴρηκα. — MIDD. aor. 2. ἐλάδόμην, &c.

The regular augment of the perf. occurs however sometimes in the dramatic writers : in the perf. pass. for instance instead of $\epsilon' \lambda \eta \mu \mu \alpha$, we find $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \eta \mu \mu \alpha$, Æschyl. Agam. 885. Eurip. Ion. 1113. Aristoph. Eccl. 1090.

The Ionics have in the perf. act. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \delta \delta \eta \kappa a$, Herodot. 3, 42. 4, 79. 8, 122. and (retaining the μ of the pres.) a fut. $\lambda \delta \mu \psi o \mu a\iota$; perf. pass. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda a \mu \mu a\iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \delta \mu \phi \theta a\iota$; aor. I. pass. $\epsilon \lambda \delta \mu \phi \theta \eta \nu$ (instead of $\epsilon \lambda \eta \phi \theta \eta \nu$), Herodot. and a verbal adj. $\lambda a \mu \pi \tau \epsilon o c$. \ddagger The Dorics likewise have $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \delta \delta \eta \kappa a$, and in pass. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda a \mu \mu a\iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \delta \phi \theta a\iota$ with a long for η . In the fut. they have also $\lambda a \psi o \tilde{\nu} \mu a\iota$ and $\lambda a \psi \epsilon \tilde{\nu} \mu a\iota$. The Epics and Ionics have the aor. 2. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$, Hes. Fr. 61. and Herodot.

* In order to bring this change of vowel into an acknowledged analogy, it is perfectly allowable to suppose a change of the stem to $\Delta E\Gamma X$ - on account of $\pi \epsilon \nu \theta os$, $\pi a \theta \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$, $\pi \epsilon \pi o \nu \theta a$.

† Compare Βλαστάνω έβλαστον, Λαγχάνω έλαχον, and see note under Αἰσθάνομαι.

‡ The infin. ἀναλελάμφθαι stands in the text of Hippocr. Offic. Med. 7. The gloss $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\epsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\phi\theta\alpha\iota$ in Erotian and Hesychius refers without doubt to it: but although this latter way of writing the perf. corresponds with the Ionicism ($\lambda\epsilon-\lambda\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\iota$, $-\dot{\alpha}\phi\theta\alpha\iota$ with short a for $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\eta\mu\alpha\alpha\iota$, as in $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, $\lambda\dot{\alpha}\xi\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, &c.), yet the former way agrees too well with the other forms, and (to mention one) with $\lambda\alpha\mu \pi\tau\epsilon os$, Herodot. 3, 127. extr., for us to hesitate a moment in retaining it. Λαμπω and λάμπομαι, I shine: fut. λάμψω and λάμψομαι, whence in comp. ἐλλάμψεσθαι, Herodot. 1, 80. 8, 74.; perf. λέλαμπα, Eurip. Androm. 1025. Tro. 1295.

Λανθάνω, less frequently $\lambda \eta \theta \omega^*$ (Xenoph.), *I lie hid*, am concealed: fut. $\lambda \eta \sigma \omega$; aor. 2. ἐλάθον, infin. $\lambda \alpha \theta \epsilon \tilde{i} \nu$; perf. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta \alpha$, synonymous with the present. Midd. $\lambda \alpha \nu - \theta \delta \alpha \nu \mu \alpha \alpha$, less frequently $\lambda \eta \theta \theta \mu \alpha \alpha$, *I forget*; fut. $\lambda \eta \sigma \theta \mu \alpha \alpha$; aor. 2. ἐλαθόμην; perf. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \alpha$.

Λήσομαι occurs in the sense of to be concealed, in Aristot. Analyt. Prior. 2, 21. Apollon. 3, 737. The passive $\lambda \eta \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$ (obliviscendus) in Soph. El. 1248. is a lyric licence. The aor. 1. midd. $i\lambda \eta \sigma \delta \mu \eta \nu$ is frequently used by the later poets; see Mosch. 3, 63. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 719. Theocritus has the aor. 1. pass. $i\lambda \eta \sigma \theta \eta \nu$: he has also made a depon. pass. from the midd. in the infin. aor. $\lambda \alpha \sigma \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\lambda \eta \sigma \theta \eta \nu \alpha_i$, 2, 46. The Dorics have also $\lambda \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \tilde{\omega}$ for $\lambda \eta \sigma \omega$, and in the midd. $\lambda \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \tilde{\nu} \mu \alpha_i$ for $\lambda \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha_i$.

For $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \mu a \iota$ the Epics have $\lambda \epsilon \lambda a \sigma \mu a \iota$ with short Ionic a. Pindar Ol. 10, 4. uses the perf. act. $\epsilon \pi \iota \lambda \epsilon \lambda \bar{a} \theta a$ for the perf. pass. with the sense of *I have forgotten*.

The Epic $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is the same as $\lambda\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ according to the analogy of $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\mu\omega$, &c. (see $K\mu\nu\omega$), Il. μ , 235. compared with τ , 136.⁺ But the *active* form $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ is distinguished in usage from $\lambda\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$, in as much as it is the exact causative of $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, in the sense of to make to forget, Il. 0, 60. β , 600. Hymn. Ven. 40. Theocritus, in order to express this meaning in the present tense, merely changed the accent, and retained the reduplication, using $\tau \delta \nu \epsilon \kappa\lambda\epsilon\lambda\delta\theta\sigma\tau \alpha$ as a fixed epithet for Hades.[‡]

This same sense of causing to forget is expressed by the aor. 1. (which does not occur elsewhere) in Od. v, 85. $i \pi i \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon v \, i \pi i \lambda \tau \omega v$: and undoubtedly that meaning belonged also to the pres. $i \pi i \lambda \eta \theta \omega$, of which we find in Od. δ , 221. the neut. part. $i \pi i \lambda \eta \theta \sigma v$, if we follow

• [The old pres. $\lambda \eta \theta \omega$, midd. $\lambda \eta \theta o_{\mu \alpha i}$, is seldom used by the Attics, frequently by Homer, who on the other hand never uses $\lambda \alpha \nu \theta \omega \omega$, though he has the imperf. of it three times and the imperf. midd. once. — Passow.]

† In Hes. 3, 471. δπως λελάθοιτο τεκοῦσα, for λάθοι, is an Epic inaccuracy.

‡ It is quite a mistake to compare this form with those presents of Theocritus formed from perfects (such as $\delta\epsilon\deltaoi\kappa\omega$, 15, 58. &c.), not only because there is no perf. $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\theta\alpha$, but because $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\alpha$ has not this meaning. We may be sure that Theor. had merely the Homeric $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\sigma\nu$ (11. β , 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.

M 2

some of the Grammarians in accenting it thus instead of $\ell \pi i \lambda \eta \theta \sigma \nu$ as an adjective.* In another passage Homer has for this sense a particular present $\lambda \eta \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, $\ell \kappa \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon$, Od. η , 221. Of rare occurrence is the form $\ell \kappa \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha c$ in Alcæus ap. Hephæst. Gaisf. p. 16.

Λάσκω, I sound, speak: fut. λāκήσω; fut. midd. λακήσομαι, Aristoph. Fr. 383.; aor. 1. ἐλάκησα; aor. 2. ἕλἄκον, infin. λἄκεῖν, ll.; aor. 2. midd. ἐλακόμην; perf. act. λέλāκα synonymous with the present.

That ΛAK - is the stem of this verb is evident from the aor. 2.: the σ in the present is therefore inserted to strengthen it, as in $i\sigma\kappa\omega$ from $\epsilon i\kappa\omega$, $\tau \iota \tau i \sigma \kappa \omega$ from $\tau \epsilon i \chi \omega$. This however is only the Attic form; the Ionics use $\lambda \eta \kappa \epsilon \omega$ and the Dorics $\lambda \bar{\alpha} \kappa \epsilon \omega$. But $\epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \kappa \eta \sigma a$, $\lambda \alpha \kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \alpha \iota$, which belong to the Attics, can according to analogy be formed only from the aor. 2. $\epsilon \lambda \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu$, $\lambda \alpha \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, and have therefore the α short, as appears also from $\lambda \alpha \kappa \eta \sigma \eta c$, Aristoph. Pac. 382. \dagger

The Epics have the Ionic η in the perf. also, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \eta \kappa a$, but shorten it in $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \breve{a} \kappa \upsilon \breve{a}$, like $\mu \epsilon \mu \alpha \kappa \upsilon \breve{a}$ and others; see $\dot{a} \rho \alpha \rho \upsilon \breve{a}$ under 'A $\rho \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \kappa \omega$. They have likewise the aor. 2. midd. with redupl., $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \breve{a} \kappa \circ \tau \sigma$, Hymn. Merc. 145.

Λάω. See Λῶ. ΛΕΓΧ-. See Λαγχάνω.

Λέγω, in the sense of to say, has no perf. act.[‡], and in the pass. the perf. $\lambda έ \lambda ε γ μ α ι$ and aor. 1. $έ \lambda έ χ θ η ν$. But in the compounds, which have the meaning of to collect, to choose, the perf. is (είλοχα) συνείλοχα, έξείλοχα, &c.; and this augment remains also most commonly in the passive, $\varkappa α τ ε ί λ ε γ μ α ι §$: with which is joined the aor. 2. pass. $\varkappa α τ ε$.

* Through Aristarchus this is now become the established reading. That this adj. occurs nowhere else would be no objection 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 λήθομαι, I forget; in as much as to forget is " to lose the consideration of an object," but Ahlew Twd is "to withdraw oneself from the observation or consideration of another." This therefore has the causative idea from the object itself, but & ιλήθειν from a third object. It is however conceivable that usage adopted different forms to express that difference, and thus AEAaBEir and the compound $\epsilon \pi i \lambda \eta \theta \omega$, together with the particular form $\lambda \eta \theta d\nu \omega$ (see above), attached themselves to this particular meaning.

+ We may well therefore be surprised at $\delta ia \lambda a \kappa h \sigma a \sigma a$ 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 $\delta i a - \lambda a \kappa \epsilon \omega$ from $\lambda a \kappa \epsilon \omega$ for $\lambda n \kappa \epsilon \omega$ and quotes as his authority the above passage.]

⁺ 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 $\epsilon\delta$ $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha i$ or for $\epsilon\delta$ $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\chi\alpha s$.

§ There is also the regular augment with

λέγην. The depon. διαλέγομαι, *I discourse*, has also διείλεγμαι; but in the aor. 1. διελέχθην, for which Aristotle has διελέγην, Top. 7, 4, 2. 8, 3, 7. On the imperat. λέξεο see άξετε p. 7. and δρσεο p. 193.

In the old poetry the aorists of this family of verbs have another and a very different meaning: $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\zeta}a$, *I laid* (any one) down to sleep, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\zeta}a$ · $\mu\eta\nu$, *I lay* (myself) down to sleep; and in a similar sense to this aor. midd. is used also the syncopated aor. $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\eta\nu$, $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\sigma$, &c., with the imperat. $\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\zeta}o$ or $\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\zeta}\epsilono$. The pres. and imperf. never occur with this meaning. On $\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\zeta}a\tau$, $\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\zeta}a\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau$, to lay, to lie, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 403.

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, $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi \tau \sigma c \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \eta \nu$, Od. 1, 335., sometimes quite as a depon. $\lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \sigma \delta' \dot{a} \rho \iota \theta \mu \dot{o} \nu$, he counted the number, δ , 451.

Λείπω, *I leave*, fut. $\lambda \varepsilon i \psi \omega$, has in the active voice in general use the aor. 2. $\check{\varepsilon} \lambda i \pi \omega \nu$, infin. $\lambda i \pi \varepsilon i \nu$, and the perf. 2. $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega \pi \alpha \dots M$ IDD.

The aor. 2. midd. $\epsilon \lambda \iota \pi \delta \mu \eta \nu$, with a kind of passive meaning, *I was left, I remained behind*, is very common in the Epic poets, e. g. Od. δ , 710. ν , 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. $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi a$ belonged solely to $\lambda \epsilon \ell \delta \omega$; it is occasionally however found as the aor. of $\lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \omega$ 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 Schaf. Gnom. Græc. p. 148. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 713. For the pluperf. $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \tau \sigma$ see $\gamma \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon \theta a$ under $\Gamma \epsilon \iota \omega$. In the formation of the aor. 1. pass. the $\epsilon \upsilon$ of the present was shortened to υ , as $\tau \epsilon \iota \chi \omega \epsilon \tau \iota \chi \theta \eta \nu$, and sometimes in the dialects a change took place of $\epsilon \iota$ to ι , as $\epsilon \lambda \iota \phi \theta \epsilon \nu$, Callim. Cer. 94. See Ernesti on this passage, and Brunck on Apollon. Rhod. 1, 1325.

Λείχω is regular. For λελειχμότες see Λιχμασθαι.

Λέπω, I shell, peel, &c. This verb, like β λέπω, λέγω, πλέχω, ϕ λέγω, ψέγω, does not change the radical ε in forming the aor. 2 pass., as, έφλέγην, β λεπείς, &c.

this meaning; e. g. ξυλλελεγμένοs, Aristoph. Eccl. 58. and έπιλελεγμένοs from έπιλέγω is very common: yet in Isoer. Paneg. p. 71. b. Bekker has adopted from the best manuscript $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu s$. Λεύσσω^{*}, *I see.* The fut. λεύσω and aor. 1. ἕλευσα are certainly not old forms, if indeed they are Greek, Reisig Comm. Critt. de Soph. Œd. C. 120. We find indeed ἕλευσας in Æschyl. Pers. 707., but the acknowledged reading is now the imperf. ἕλευσσες. Again in Soph. Œd. C. 1197. λεύσης is a very probable emendation for λύσης, but Tyrwhitt's reading λεύσσης is as good or better.

Λεύω, I stone. The pass. takes σ .

ΛΗΒ-. See Λαμβάνω.

Λήθω. See Λανθάνω.

Ληκέω. See Λάσκω.

ΛΗΧ-. See Λαγχάνω.

Λιάζω, I bend (any thing). Pass. I bend myself, turn aside: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 404. But the perf. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda i \eta \mu a \iota$ see in Λιλαίομαι.

Λίγξε βιός, the bow twanged, Il. δ, 125. For this form a pres. $\lambda i \zeta \omega$ has been supposed, according to the analogy of $\pi \lambda i \zeta \omega$, $\kappa \lambda i \zeta \omega$, $\sigma a \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$; but it nowhere occurs. †

Λιλαίομαι, *I desire*, long for; formed from λάω (see $\Lambda \tilde{\omega}$) by reduplication. It is used only in pres. and imperfect. But from λιλάω or λιλέω (λιλεĩ· φθονεĩ, ἐπιθυμεῖ, Hesych.) comes the perf. λελίημαι, *I* strive, hasten, for λελίλημαι: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 406.

Λίσσομαι, I beg, less frequently λίτομαι: fut. λίσομαι; aor. 1. ἐλισάμην; aor. 2. ἐλιτόμην. Homer has the Ep. imperf. λισσέσκετο; of the aor. 1. the Ep. 1. pers. ἐλλισάμην and the Ep. imperat. λίσσαι; and of the aor. 2. the infin. λἴτέσθαι and optat. λἴτοίμην. This is one of the few verbs whose pure theme (from which comes the aor. 2.) is used also as a present: e. g. λίτομαι, Hom. Hymn. 15., λιτόμεσθα, Aristoph. Thesm. 313.

Λιχμάσμαι, I protrude the tongue. We mention this verb for the sake of observing that the Hesiodic participle $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \chi \mu \acute{\sigma} \epsilon \varsigma$ bears the same relation to it as $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \mu \nu \kappa a$ does to $\mu \nu \kappa \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$; for the diphthong of the radical $\lambda \epsilon \acute{\iota} \chi \omega$ 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.

πεφυζότες, Hom.,

μεμυζότε, Antim. ap. Eust. ad Od. ν, 401. p. 523, 46. Basil., λελειχμότες, Hes. 9, 826.,

* The difficulty of ascertaining whether the Greeks ever used a fut. $\lambda\epsilon \dot{\sigma}\sigma\omega$ is greatly increased by our finding the present very commonly written in the manuscripts with a single σ .

† [Passow says that λίζω occurs only

in the later authors, and in the sense of to give a superficial wound, graze, scratch, consequently akin to the Homeric $\lambda(\gamma\delta\eta\nu$. He forms $\lambda(\gamma\xi\epsilon$ from $\lambda(\gamma\gamma\omega$, and connects it with $\lambda(\gamma\alpha, \lambda(\gamma)\delta s.)$ 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 (ζ 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 connexion with the context resemble that of a verb, but rather of an adjective 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.

Λούω, I wash: fut. λούσω. 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 ε and \circ in the termination, as in the imperf. ²λου for ²λουε, and ²λοῦμεν</sup> for ²λούομεν</sup>; in the pass. λοῦμαι for λούομαι, λοῦται for λούεται, λοῦσθαι for λούεσθαι, &c. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 189.

Homer has a 3. sing. aor. 2. $\lambda \delta \epsilon$, Od. κ , 361.; and in Hymn. Ap. 120. is a 3. plur. $\lambda \delta \delta \nu \tau$: from $\lambda \delta \epsilon \omega$ he has an imperf. $\epsilon \lambda \delta \epsilon \nu \nu$, and an infin. aor. act. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota$, part. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \varsigma$, an aor. midd. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \tau \sigma$, infin. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota$; 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 suppose that from the simple stem $\lambda \delta \omega$ came the lengthened one $\lambda \delta \epsilon \omega$ (compare $K \delta \omega$, $\kappa \nu \epsilon \omega$), and from this by contraction the common $\lambda \delta \delta \omega$, $\epsilon \lambda \delta \nu \sigma \alpha \iota$. 'E $\lambda \delta \delta \epsilon \sigma \nu$, Hymn. Cer. 290., is a form of $\lambda \delta \delta \omega$ again produced or resolved.

With regard to those *abridged* forms, the accentuation of $\partial \delta \tilde{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu$, Aristoph. Plut. 657., of $\partial \delta \tilde{\nu} \tau \sigma$, Herodot. 3, 125., and of $\partial \delta \tilde{\nu} \tau \sigma$, Xen. Cyr. 4, 5. 4., lead us to suppose that they are contracted from $\lambda \delta \omega$, $\partial \delta \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$, &c., which is confirmed by the infin. $\lambda \sigma \tilde{\nu} \nu$ as quoted from Hippocr. in Galeni Gloss.; although in the works of Hippocr. it is always written $\lambda \sigma \tilde{\nu} \epsilon \nu$. Accordingly we do not with some of the older grammarians reckon $\lambda \sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu \iota$ among the examples of the syncope like

* The Germans say "the heavens are (gestint) 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.] + [In Hes. ϵ . 751. Schneider is correct in having accented it $\lambda o \epsilon \sigma \theta a a$ as the infin. aor. midd.: and instead of $\lambda \delta \epsilon \iota$ (Scol. 21, 4. Br.) the true accentuation is $\lambda o \epsilon \hat{\iota}$. — Passow.]

м 4

 $\delta i \mu \alpha i$, but suppose the verb in common use to be a mixture of the contractions of the two old forms $\lambda \delta \omega$ and $\lambda \delta \epsilon \omega$.*

This statement is fully confirmed by a further piece of information from Bekker's labours on Aristophanes. In Nub. 838, the old reading is " $\Omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho \tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\bar{\omega}\tau_{02}\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\circ\dot{\nu}\epsilon\iota \mu\sigma\sigma\nu\dot{\nu}\delta'$ $\beta'_{10}\sigma\nu$, where the verb is the 2. sing. midd., "thou squanderest my property in bathing;" see the Scholia. Brunck assisted the metre by the reading of a Paris manuscript, $\mu\sigma\sigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\circ\dot{\nu}\epsilon\iota$, 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, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota$. 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 $\lambda\circ\dot{\nu}\epsilon\iota$, which is the same as the 3. sing. indic. act., but preferred the shorter form; not however in the inharmonious contraction $\lambda\delta\tilde{\epsilon}$, but without the contraction $\lambda\delta\epsilon\epsilon\iota$.

The 2. and 3. sing. of the pres. act. also might certainly have been $\lambda \delta \epsilon \iota c_{2}$, $\lambda \delta \epsilon \iota c_{3}$; but these persons were undoubtedly occupied by $\lambda \delta \iota \omega$, which had already established itself in all the dialects in the 1. sing.,

* The Scholiast on Aristoph. Plut, 657. has both opinions; 'Eλοῦμεν' ἀπὸ τοῦ λόω (the corrupted λύω of the first editions has been erroneously altered to λούω), \hbar ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλούομεν κατὰ συγκοπήν. But Plutarch (De Poesi Hom.) quotes λοῦται and οἶμαι as instances of the Attic usage τοῦ ἐξαιρεῶν τὰ βραχέα.

† If those forms were abridged by syncope, then, according to general analogy, we should find between $\lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a \dots \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$ and between $\hat{\lambda} o \hat{\nu} \mu m \dots \hat{\lambda} o \hat{\nu} \tau a$ and between $\hat{\lambda} o \hat{\nu} \mu m \dots \hat{\lambda} o \hat{\nu} \tau a$ persons $\lambda o \hat{\nu} \sigma a$ and $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \nu \sigma o$, nor would the imperat. $\lambda o \hat{\nu} \sigma a$ be defective. But these nowhere occur either in authors or grammarians : for $\lambda o \hat{\nu} \sigma a$, which stands in some editions of Phrynichus (see Ed. Pauw. p. 80.), is a mere corruption of $\lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$. Lobeck has extracted the whole article from the first edition, according to which the forms disapproved of by Phrynichus (and they are the common ones) are the following — $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu \eta \nu$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \sigma \nu$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \pi a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \pi a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \pi a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \eta \nu$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \sigma$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \eta \mu$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \sigma \hat{\ell} a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \pi a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \eta \nu$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \sigma$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda o \hat{\nu} \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \tau a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \nu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \nu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \nu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \nu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \nu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta \nu \mu a$, $\hat{\ell} \lambda \delta$ bably because it was strange to the Grammarians, who rejected it wherever it occurred in the way that it does in the before-mentioned passage of Aristophanes. On the other hand *ελούου* is expressly objected to; consequently the form recommended in its stead, which is the very one we are in search of, whether it be έλουσο or έλοῦ (from έλόου), has been omitted by mistake. Now the gloss of Hesychius, $\Lambda o\hat{v}$, $\lambda o\hat{v}\sigma a\iota$, will assist us in discovering it. Here Nov 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. (contracted from Noov), 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. $\delta \lambda \hat{v}$, which by a very conceivable over-sight was omitted in Phrynichus before ελούτο. The abridged form in the passive voice is therefore, when completed, λοῦμαι, λόει, λοῦται, &c., ἐλούμηρ, ἐλοῦ, ἐλοῦτο, &c., infin. λοῦσθαι, imperat. λοῦ.

as it did also in the optat. $\lambda o \dot{\nu} o \iota \mu \eta \nu$, in the conj. $\lambda o \dot{\nu} \omega$, $-\eta \varsigma$, & c., in the part. $\lambda o \dot{\nu} \omega \nu$, and probably also in the imperat. act. $\lambda o \tilde{\nu} \epsilon$. See note in the preceding page.

Λύω, Iloose: fut. λύσω $(\bar{\upsilon})$; aor. 1. ἕλ $\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha$; perf. λέλ $\bar{\upsilon}\kappa\alpha$; perf. pass. λέλ $\bar{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\iota$; pluperf. ἐλελ $\bar{\upsilon}\mu\eta\nu$; aor. 1. pass. ἐλ $\bar{\upsilon}$ θην ($\bar{\upsilon}$).

This verb together with $\delta i \omega$ and $\Im i \omega$ 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 $\Delta i \omega$ and $\Theta i \omega$.

In Od. σ , 238. Homer has the 3. sing. optat. perf. pass. $\lambda i \lambda \overline{\nu} \tau \sigma$ for $\lambda \epsilon \lambda i \delta \iota \tau \sigma$; where the v is lengthened by its absorbing the ι of the optative; and the accent on the antepenult., though not according to the directions of the Grammarians, is yet agreeable to analogy, and corresponds with $\delta a i \nu v \tau \sigma$ in Hom. and $\pi i \gamma \nu v \tau \sigma$ in Plato, as they are found accented in the great majority of the manuscripts. Again from an Epic syncop. aor. pass. $\delta \lambda i \mu \eta \nu$ (corresponding with the regular aor. 2. midd.), Homer has a 1. and 3. sing. $\lambda i \mu \eta \nu$, $\lambda i \sigma \sigma$, and 3. plur. $\lambda i \nu \tau \sigma$. An imperat. syncop. aor. act. $\lambda \overline{\nu} \theta \iota$ (for $\lambda \overline{\nu} \sigma \sigma \nu$) in Plato, ap. Etym. M. v. $\delta \iota \theta i \omega \rho \sigma \mu \sigma \sigma$ 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. $\lambda \tilde{\omega}$, $\lambda \tilde{\eta}c$, $\lambda \tilde{\eta}$, 3. plur. $\lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$, optat. $\lambda \ell \omega \mu \iota$, Hesych. infin. $\lambda \tilde{\eta} \nu$; compare Markl. Eurip. Suppl. 221.

Μ.

Maίνομαι, I am mad, has a fut. midd. and an aor. 2. pass. ἐμάνην, infin. μανῆναι, part. μανείς. The perf. μέμηνα has the meaning of the present. But the aor. 1. act. ἕμηνα, Aristoph. Thesm. 561., has the causative meaning to make mad, in which tense, and indeed in the present also, the compound ἐχμαίνω is more usual.

The fut. 2. pass. $\mu \check{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ is not Attic *; see Mœr. and Thom. Mag. the perf. pass. $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ is used in Theocrit. 10, 31. in the same sense as the pres. $\mu \alpha i \nu \rho \mu \alpha \iota$.

* [Passow says that the Attics use μανήσομαι as a kind of exclamation, as we say "I shall go mad." He mentions also a fut. 2. μἄνοῦμαι.] Μαίομαι. See ΜΑΩ.

MAK-. See Μηκάομαι.

Maλκι \tilde{y} ν is an Attic infin. mentioned by Phrynichus (in Lex. Seg. p. 51.), Photius and Hesych. from μαλκιάω, *I am frost-bitten*. Perhaps the suspected form μαλκι \tilde{c} ν in Æl. N. A. 9, 4. should be μαλκι \tilde{y} ν. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 82.

Μανθάνω, Ilearn: aor. 2. ἔμἄθον; fut. μαθήσομαι; perf. μεμάθηκα. See notes under Λαμδάνω and Αἰσθάνομαι; also 'Ακαχίζω. The aor. pass. is wanting.

The Dor. fut. 2. μἄθεῦμαι for μαθοῦμαι, Theocr. 2, 60. (like μαχοῦμαι, πιοῦμαι, &c.) supposes a root ΜΗΘΩ.

Μαπέειν. See Μάρπτω.

Μάρνăμαι, *I* contend, fight; used only in pres. and imperf. which follow $i\sigma_{\tau}a\mu a\iota$ or δύναμαι; thus infin. μάρνασθαι, part. μαρνάμενος, but the optat. is μαρνοίμην, Od. λ, 512., imperf. έμαρνάμην. [But έμαρνάσθην, Il. η, 301., is an aor. — Passow.]

Μάρπτω, I seize: fut. μάρψω; aor. 1. ἕμαρψα; part. perf. μεμαρπώς, Hes. ε, 206. To these must be added the Ep. aor. 2. with redupl. (ἕμαρπον) μέμαρπον, Hes. a, 245. or with ρ dropped (ἕμἄπον), infin. μăπέειν, Hes. a, 231. 304., optat. with redupl. μεμάποιεν, Hes. a, 252.

Maρτυρέω (υ short), I bear witness (for or against a person or of a thing). Μαρτύρομαι (υ long) depon. midd. I call as a witness.

In this case the active $\mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \omega$, which is not in use, must be considered as the causative to $\mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \epsilon \omega$, I cause witness to be borne; and $\mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho \mu \omega$ the midd. of it, I cause witness to be borne for myself, call to witness.

Mάσσω, Att. μάττω, I knead: fut. μάξω; perf. μέμăχα, Aristoph. Equ. 55.; perf. pass. μέμαγμαι, ib. 57. Also aor. 2. pass.

See also in note to Maioµaı, p. 172., another µάσσω which has been erroneously supposed to exist.

Μάχομαι, I fight: fut. μαχέσομαι and more generally μαχοῦμαι (compare καθεδοῦμαι under «Ιζω); aor. 1. ἐμαχεσάμην; perf. μεμάχημαι. Verbal adj. μαχετέος and μαχητέος.

The perf. μεμάχημαι is in Isocr. Archid. p. 127. b. Another form of the perf. μεμάχεσμαι, found in good manuscripts in Xenoph. Cyr. 7, 1,

14., would be recommended by analogy, but the context makes the common reading preferable, $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \delta \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \xi \nu \mu \mu \alpha \chi \epsilon \sigma \tilde{\alpha} \mu' \nu \omega \nu$. The form $\mu \alpha \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \sigma \nu$ 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 $\epsilon\sigma\sigma$ 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 the fut. $\mu\alpha\chi\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ and in the aor. $\mu\alpha\chi\ell\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau\sigma$.*

The Ionics had also in the pres. $\mu \alpha \chi^{\epsilon o \mu \alpha}$ ($\mu \alpha \chi^{\epsilon o \iota \tau o}$, II. a, 272. $\sigma \nu \mu \mu \alpha \chi^{\epsilon \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota}$, Herodot. 7, 239.), which form therefore as to time is ambiguous, unless perhaps the Ionic prose used as a fut. $\mu \alpha \chi^{\epsilon \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota}$ only: see Fisch. 3. p. 131., Schweigh. Lex. Herodot., and compare II. β , 366. not. Heyn. Homer has, on account of so many short syllables following each other, lengthened each of the vowels in the pres. part. $\mu \alpha \chi_{\epsilon \iota \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma}$ and $\mu \alpha \chi_{\epsilon \circ \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma}$. Compare 'Peoúµενος.

MA-. To this stem or root belong three poetical verbs + :

1. $\mu \epsilon \mu \alpha a$, *I* strive after, an eager, desire; a perf. with the force of a pres., of which however we find in use only the 3. plur. $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \sigma$, and the syncopated 1. plur. $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu$, 2. plur. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$, 2. dual $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \ddot{\alpha} \tau \sigma \nu$, the 3. sing. imperat. $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$, 3. plur. pluperf. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \ddot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma$, and the part. $\mu \epsilon \mu \ddot{\alpha} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma$, which the fem. is $\mu \epsilon \mu \ddot{\alpha} \sigma \ddot{\alpha}$, and the gen. $\mu \epsilon \mu \ddot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma$ or $\mu \epsilon \mu \ddot{\alpha} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma$, 11. β , 818. Theorer. 25, 105., compare $\beta \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \omega \varsigma$ and $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \alpha \omega \varsigma$.— The form $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \alpha \epsilon \nu$ in Theorer. 25, 64. is a false reading. \ddagger That all these forms are connected immediately with $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \sigma \sigma \sigma$, will be shown under Mér ω .

* See Heyne's critical notes on II. a, 153. β , 801. γ , 137. 254. and on α , 304. β , 377. γ , 393. o, 633. It would be a very hazardous step therefore to follow Aristarchus and Wolf in introducing the reading with the η in all the passages. Besides, if we wish to observe analogy, we should rather make the eor the universal reading, as some of the older critics have proposed: see Heyne on II. α , 298. Compare the verb Atopau (for although aidéoµau became the common form in a later period, it is still to be looked upon like µaxéoµau), of which the fut. aidéoooµau is the only defensible form in II. χ , 419. while in Od. ξ , 388. it is opposed by aidhooµau: 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 separate them. The identity of the first verb with $\mu \ell \mu o \nu a$, $\mu \ell \nu o s$, will be shown under $M \ell \nu o s$ but then it does not unite so immediately with $\mu a \ell e \nu a \ell a$, $\ell \pi \iota \mu d \sigma \alpha \sigma \ell a$, $\mu d \sigma \tau \ell$ (which evidently come from the physical idea of *feeling*), as grammatical and exceptic etymology require. We therefore place together, in pursuance of our present object, three verbs only, leaving to the philosophical philologist to extend the inquiry.

‡ If $\mu \neq \mu a \in \nu$ 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 $\delta \epsilon \delta a \epsilon$ which is an aor. with reduplication. Brunck has with some probability preferred $\mu \epsilon \mu a \nu \epsilon$, but the context requires the imperf. (pluperf.) consequently $\mu \epsilon \mu \delta \rho \epsilon a \nu a \delta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \delta \epsilon \sigma a \epsilon$ μῶμαι, I desire, seek after: part. μώμενος (Soph. Œd. C. 836.) contracted from μάομαι; but the ω generally prevails, as in the infin. μῶσθαι, Theogn. 769., the imperat. μώεο, Epicharm. ap. Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 20. formed as from μώομαι. Compare μνώεο from μνάομαι μνῶμαι under Μιμνήσκω, and Ζάω: see also Toup. ad Suid. v. ὡχρός.

3. $\mu a i o \mu a i$, I feel, touch; seek for, desire. To this belong the fut. $\mu \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \mu a i$, aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a \sigma \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu$, with a short; but occurring principally in the compounds, as infin. aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \dot{a} \sigma a \sigma \theta a i$, Od. λ , 591., fut. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau a i$, II. δ , 190., aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \mu \dot{a} \sigma \sigma a \tau o$, II. ρ , 564. For that the above present and this aor. answer exactly to each other, we may see by such passages as Od. ι , 441. and 446., confirmed by the analogy of $\delta a i \omega \delta \dot{a} \sigma a \sigma \theta a i$, $\nu a i \omega \nu \dot{a} \sigma a \sigma \theta a i^*$ — Verb. adj. $\mu a \sigma \tau \dot{c}$.

Mεθύω, I am drunken, used only in pres. and imperf., takes its other tenses from the pass., as $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\theta\dot{\upsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, &c. : for the other tenses of the active, as $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\epsilon}\theta\dot{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha$, &c., belong to $\mu\epsilon\theta\dot{\upsilon}\sigma\kappa\omega$, I make drunken. †

Mείρομαι, I share, partake, obtain. The older poets have (beside this present, II. ι, 616. Theogn. 1228.) a 3. sing. ἕμμορε. This is plainly an aorist in II. a, 278. οὕποθ' ὁμοίης ἕμμορε τιμῆς βασιλεύς, " never yet has a king received such honour." The later Epics use it in the same way, e. g. Apollon. 3, 4. ἕμμορες. 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. (ἕμμορα for μέμορα), e.g. in Od. ε, 335. Nῦν δ' ἀλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι θεῶν ἔξ ἕμμορε τιμῆς, " now she is a partaker of divine honours." And this is confirmed by the Doric Ἐμμόραντι· τετεύχασι, Hesych. ‡

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. $\mu\epsilon\rho\rho\mu\alpha$ was used in the present. The act. $\mu\epsilon\rho\rho\omega$ (properly to divide, whence $\mu\epsilon\rho\sigma$) had therefore the causative sense to give out

* We find in the lexicons for $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma \theta a \alpha$ a present $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, fut, $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$; but there are no grounds for such a present, nor does any such exist. Má $\sigma \sigma \omega$, $\mu d\xi \omega$, I knead, although perhaps akin to it, is a different verb.

+ In the well-known Alcaic fragment, instead of $N \hat{v} v \chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \theta \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ we must read $\mu \epsilon \theta \dot{v} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, Æolic infin. for $\mu \epsilon \theta \nu - \sigma \theta \eta \nu a$. \ddagger [Thus Passow has $\mu \epsilon i \rho \rho \mu \alpha i$; aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \mu \mu \rho \rho \rho \nu$; perf. $\tilde{\epsilon} \mu \mu \rho \rho \alpha$.]

§ 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*. in shares, to allot, whence comes the perf. pass., which occurs only in the third person :

είμαρμαι, 3. pers. είμαρται * (with the syllable εi instead of the reduplication like είληφα, είρημα, &c.), it is allotted by fate, it is fated: part. είμαρμένος: ή είμαρμένη (scil. μοῖρα), that which is allotted to any one, his fate, destiny. Pluperf. είμαρτο. Compare πέπρωμαι in Πορείν.

In Apollonius, 1, 646. 973., we find in a similar sense $\mu\epsilon\mu\delta\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, and in 3, 1130. $\mu\epsilon\mu\rho\rho\mu\epsilon\nuo_{2}$: the latter with the change of vowel to o retained in the perf. pass. as in $\eta\rho\rho\tauo$, $\mu\rho\tauo$, the former according to the analogy of $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega$ $\phi\rho\rho\epsilon\omega$ (see under $\Delta\epsilon\mu\omega$), or of $\delta\epsilon\delta\sigma\kappa\eta\mu\epsilon\nuo_{2}$ and $\epsilon\kappa\tau\delta\nu\eta\kappa\alpha$ (see $K\tau\epsilon\ell\nu\omega$).

Μέλλω, I am about to do a thing, intend to do it: fut. μελλήσω; aor. 1. ἐμέλλησα, I have delayed doing it. The Attics add the temporal augment to the syllabic one of the imperfect making ἤμελλον, like ἦδυνάμην, ἦδουλόμην : see Βούλομαι.

Mέλπω, midd. μέλπομαι, I sing, play. It has no perfect.

Mέλω, 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. μέλει, μέλουσι; imperf. ἕμελε; fut. μελήσει; infin. pres. μέλειν, fut. μελήσειν, &c., it is an object of care, &c. Pass. μέλομαι, I am careful of, anxious about, more generally ἐπιμέλομαι, -ήσομαι, &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. $i\nu \alpha \nu \epsilon \rho \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \lambda \omega$, 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 $\mu \epsilon \tau a \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$, it repents,

* The aspirate on this word may be compared with that on $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa a$, and on the presents $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\mu a$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\mu a$, whence we may conclude that it was intended as a substitute for the reduplication; but this principle, 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 frequently recurring form in the Milesian Inscription in Chishull, p. 67. $d\phi \phi \sigma a \lambda \kappa a$, which supposes the existence of $\delta \sigma \tau a \lambda \kappa a$. On the other hand the instances of $\epsilon i \mu a \rho_{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$ with the lenis, which Schæfer (Melet. p. 22. and ad Soph. (Ed. 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 $\mu \ell \lambda o \mu a \iota$ bears exactly the same relation to the imperf. $\mu \ell \lambda \epsilon \iota$, as $\delta \ell o \mu a \iota$ does to $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$.

The forms of the compound $i \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma o \mu a \iota$, &c., are generally placed with $i \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma \theta a \iota$, which is an exactly synonymous sister-form of $i \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$; 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 $i \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ being the older form, to which the inflexion of $i \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \sigma o \mu a \iota$ originally belonged.

The perf. $\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta\kappa\epsilon$ $\mu\epsilon\iota$ 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. $\mu\epsilon\mu\eta\lambda\epsilon$, Dor. $\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\epsilon$, 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. $\mu\epsilon\mu\eta\lambda\epsilon\iota$ for $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\eta\lambda\epsilon\iota$ with the force of an imperf., II. β , 614. The same perf. has, however, sometimes the personal meaning of the pass. $\mu\epsilon\lambda\mu\alpha\iota$; in the first place as a real perfect, $\tau a \tilde{\nu} \tau a \mu\epsilon\mu\eta\lambda a\varsigma$, these things hast thou thought carefully about, invented, Hymn. Merc. 437., and next equally as much like a present, $\mu\epsilon\mu\eta\lambda\omega\varsigma$ $\tau \iota\nu\varsigma\varsigma$, thinking carefully, anxiously about any thing, intent upon it, II. ϵ , 708. ν , 297.

The pass. $\mu \epsilon \lambda o \mu a \iota$ is also used poetically for $\mu \epsilon \lambda \omega$, as $\mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \omega$ or, Od. κ , 505., $\tilde{4}$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, cui curæ sumus, Eurip. Hipp. 60., in which sense we find also the perf. as a pres. and consequently the pluperf. as imperf., $\sigma o \iota \mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau o$, tibi curæ erat, Theorr. 17, 46., in which usage it has undergone also an Epic abridgement, as perf. $\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau a$, pluperf. $\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau o$, Il. τ , 343. ϕ , 516. Hes. 9, 61.* like $\mu \epsilon \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \iota a$ from $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho a$. —[The aor. 1. pass. $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta \eta \nu a \iota$ is sometimes used actively, to have taken care of, $\tau \alpha \phi o \nu$, Soph. Aj. 1184., sometimes passively, to be taken care of, Epig. Ad. 112, 3.—Passow.]

Mέμφομαι, I blame : fut. μέμψομαι. Depon. midd. without a perfect.

[This verb occurs first in Hes. ϵ , 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. $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \eta \nu$ also.

* As no other forms occur than the 3. sing. μέμβλεται, μέμβλετο, a first person μέμβλομαι has been supposed to exist as the present from which these might be formed. But it is far more correct to compare this with the similar perfects $\mu \epsilon - \mu \nu \epsilon \sigma$ for $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \sigma \sigma$, and $\delta \rho \eta \rho \epsilon \mu a \mu$. Μένω, *I remain*: Epic fut. μενέω, Attic contracted μενῶ; aor. 1. ἔμεινα; perf. μεμένηκα.* Verbal adj. μενετέος, Plato Rep. 1. p. 328. b.

The Ionic and poet. perfect $\mu \ell \mu \rho \nu a$, I feel a strong desire, I am determined, I intend (Herodot. 6, 84. II. ϵ , 482. ω , 657. &c.), belongs to a stem or family differing in meaning from the above $\mu \ell \nu \omega$, as we see from its derivative $\tau \partial \mu \ell \nu \rho c$, from which again is derived another Epic verb, $\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon a (\nu \omega)$, $\mu \epsilon \nu \ell \eta \nu a$ having in its most common acceptation the same sense as $\mu \ell \mu \rho \nu a$, e.g. II. ν , 628. o, 565. Od. δ , 282. At the same time the analogy of $\gamma \ell \gamma \rho \nu a \gamma \epsilon \gamma \delta a \sigma \iota \nu$, &c., leads to one evident remark, that the relation between those two perfects is the same as between $\mu \ell \mu \rho \nu a$ and $\mu \epsilon \mu \delta a \sigma \iota \nu$, &c., which latter correspond also in meaning. All this must prevent us from placing $\mu \ell \mu \rho \nu a$, which could not be done without violence, among the forms of $\mu \ell \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, to remain ; although Euripides, who uses $\mu \ell \mu \rho \nu \epsilon$ quite in the old sense at Iph. T. 656. $\delta (\delta \nu \mu a \mu \ell \mu \rho \nu \epsilon \phi \rho \eta \nu$, has the same word in another passage (Iph. A. 1495.) for $\mu \ell \nu \epsilon \iota$; this latter is however merely an instance of Lyric caprice, without proving any thing as to the language.

METIΩ, or μετίημι, Ion. for μεθίημι; of which we find among others the 3. pres. μετίει, Herodot. 6, 37. 59.; the 3. sing. imperf. midd. μετίετο (or ἐμετίετο) for μεθίετο, Herodot. 1, 12.; the infin. fut. midd. μετήσεσθαι for μεθήσεσθαι, Herodot.; and μεμετιμένος part. perf. pass. for μεθειμένος, Herodot. According to the analogy of τίθημι the 3. sing. pres. should be accented μετιεῖ, and μετίει should be the imperf.; see Heyne on Il. ζ, 523. where Wolf now reads in his last edition μεθιεῖς. Compare the simple "Ιημι.

Μηκάομαι, I bleat, cry out : probably a depon. midd. like μυκάομαι.

This verb has some simpler Epic forms; e. g. $\mu \ell \mu \eta \kappa a$ with the force of a pres., whence part. $\mu \epsilon \mu \eta \kappa \omega_{\varsigma}$, ll. κ , 362., and fem. with the short Ion. a, $\mu \epsilon \mu \breve{a} \kappa \upsilon \breve{a}$, ll. δ , 435. And as this perf. had the sense of a present, an imperf. $\ell \mu \epsilon \mu \eta \kappa \upsilon \nu$ (Od. ι , 439.) was formed from it, like $\pi \epsilon \phi \upsilon \kappa a$, $\ell \pi \epsilon \phi \upsilon \kappa \sigma \nu$, Hes. a, 76. 9, 673. To this we must add the aor. $\ell \mu \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu$, of which however only the part. $\mu \alpha \kappa \omega \nu$ remains, Il. π , 469. Compare Od. κ , 163. Thus this verb is strictly analogous to the Epic forms of $\mu \upsilon \kappa \delta \sigma \mu a$.

* The verbs in $\mu\omega$ ($\nu \epsilon \mu \omega$, $\delta \epsilon \mu \omega$, $\beta \rho \epsilon \mu \omega$, $\tau \rho \epsilon \mu \omega$) cannot follow the analogy of verbs which have λ , μ , ν , ρ as their characteristic, further than the fut, and aor.; hence in their other tenses they are sometimes defective, and sometimes form them as from a verb in - $\epsilon\omega$, in which latter case $\mu\epsilon\nu\omega$ may be joined with them, as $\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon \nu\eta\kappa\alpha$, $\nu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\mu\eta\kappa\alpha$, $\delta\epsilon\delta\mu\eta\kappa\alpha$, &c. Mialvo, I stain, defile: fut. μιανῶ; aor. 1. ἐμίηνα, Att. also ἐμίāνα, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 24.; aor. 1. pass. ἐμιάνθην; perf. pass. μεμίασμαι.

At II. δ , 146. $\mu \iota \acute{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta \nu a \" \imath \mu \eta \rho o \imath$, the verb is either the 3. dual or plural. The old Grammarians explained it to be for $\mu \iota a \nu \theta \eta \tau \eta \nu$, but of such an abbreviation no other instance is to be found; the moderns have considered it to be for $\acute{\epsilon} \mu \iota \acute{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$, but the η is so unusual in the abridged 3. plur., that no example of it can be adduced even in the dialects*; compare $\check{\epsilon} \tau \nu \phi \theta \epsilon \nu$, $\check{\epsilon} \tau \nu \pi \epsilon \nu$ for $-\eta \sigma a \nu$, or $\check{\epsilon} \check{\epsilon} \check{a} \nu$, $\check{\epsilon} \check{\delta} \check{\nu} \nu$, &c. I consider therefore $\mu \iota \acute{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta \nu$ to be the dual of a syncop. aor. pass.: (3. sing. $\acute{\epsilon} \mu \iota a \nu \tau \sigma$) 3. dual $(\acute{\epsilon} \mu \iota \acute{\alpha} \tau \sigma \theta \eta \nu)$ $\acute{\epsilon} \mu \iota \acute{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta \nu$, like $\delta \acute{\epsilon} \chi \theta a \iota$, $\check{\delta} \rho \theta a \iota$, in both of which the σ is dropped before the θ .

Μίγνυμι, or μίσγω†, I mix: fut. μίξω, &c. Pass. aor. 1. ἐμίχθην; aor. 2. ἐμίγην; perf. μέμιγμαι, part. μεμιγμένος, Plat. Legg. 12. p. 951. d.

In the old Attic inscriptions the derivatives of this verb are very often written with $\epsilon\iota$, as $\xi i \mu \mu \epsilon \iota \pi a$, which shows that the ι (except in the aor. 2. pass.) is long. We must therefore write $\mu \tilde{\iota} \xi a \iota$.

Μιμνήσκω, I remind, has from MNAΩ a fut. μνήσω and aor. 1. ἕμνησα, &c., II. α, 407. Pass. μιμνήσκομαι, I remember, also I mention; aor. 1. ἐμνήσθην; fut. μνησθήσομαι; verbal adj. μνηστός. The perf. pass. μέ μνημαι has the force of a present, I remember, whence imper. μέμνησο, optat. μεμνήμην, II. ω, 745. Att. μεμνοίμην and μεμνώμην, Herm. Soph. Œd. T. 49. (whence μεμνώτο, Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 3. contracted from the Ion. μεμνεώμην, μεμνέωτο, II. ψ, 361.), conj. μέμνωμαι, -η, -ηται, &c.‡ To this perf. belong the pluperf. ἐμεμνήμην (whence Ion. 3. plur. ἐμεμνέατο for ἐμέμνηντο, Herodot. 2, 104.), and the fut. 3. (paullo-post fut.) μεμνήσομαι, Herod. 8, 62.

* I must not conceal that in a Cretan inscription in Chishull, p. 111., $\delta_{i\epsilon\lambda}\epsilon\gamma\eta\nu$ occurs as a plural; but as the other Cretan inscriptions in the same collection have $\delta_{i\epsilon\lambda}\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu$, it naturally throws great suspicion on the former, which however, whether true or not, would be of very little authority in deciding on a Homeric form. † [Mίσγω is used by Homer and the Attics, and by Herodot. exclusively, particularly in the pass. voice. The common pres. μ ίγνυμ is never found in Hom. either act. or pass. : in the fut. he has the midd. μίξομαι, and the pass. μιγήσομαι, while Hes. has μ εμίξομαι. — Passow.]

‡ See Kraopal with notes.

Ionic abbreviations are $(\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \epsilon \alpha \iota) \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta 2$. sing. indicat. for $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta - \sigma \alpha \iota$, Hom., and $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \epsilon \sigma$ imperat. for $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \sigma \sigma$, Herodot. 5, 105.: compare $\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma$.

The radical form $\mu \nu \acute{a} \circ \mu a \iota$, $\mu \nu \widetilde{\omega} \mu a \iota$ is in the above sense solely Ionic, in which dialect the *a* is changed into ε , consequently we have 3. sing. pres. $\mu \nu \acute{e} \tau a \iota$ (like $\chi \rho \acute{e} \tau a \iota$ from $\chi \rho \acute{a} \circ \mu a \iota$), and by the similar Ionic change of *a* to $\varepsilon \omega$ (like $\chi \rho \acute{a} \circ \mu a \iota$ to $\chi \rho \acute{e} \omega \mu a \iota$), we have the part. $\mu \nu \varepsilon \acute{\omega} - \mu \varepsilon \nu o \varepsilon$: again by the Ionic lengthening of ω to ωo (like $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \acute{\omega} \circ \tau \tau \epsilon \varepsilon$, $\dot{\eta} \acute{\omega} \circ \nu \tau \epsilon \varepsilon$, $\dot{\eta} \acute{\omega} \circ \iota \iota \dot{\eta} \acute{\omega} \circ \iota \iota \iota$), we find the 3. plur. imperf. $\mu \nu \acute{\omega} \circ \tau \circ \varepsilon$, $\eta \acute{\omega} \circ \iota \iota \dot{\eta} \acute{\omega} \circ \iota \iota$, he imperat. $\mu \nu \acute{\omega} \epsilon o$, Apollon. Rh., and the part. $\mu \nu \omega \acute{\omega} \epsilon o$, Od. The fut. of $\mu \nu \acute{\alpha} \circ \mu a \iota$ is $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \mu a \iota$, but we have also $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \mu a \iota$, Herodot. 8, 62., and the aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \acute{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma \partial a \iota$ is used not only in Homer but also in the common language.

Μολείν. See Βλώσκω.

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:

Mυέω, I initiate into the mysteries, is regular.

Mύω (whence also χαταμύω, χαμμύω), I shut, close, e.g. the lips, eyes, &c., and used both transit. and intransit. This verb is regular. Perf. μέμῦχα, I am shut, I am silent.

Mύζω, I emit a sound by compressing the lips and breathing loud through the nose, I moan, grumble; aor. 1. ἕμυσα, Hippocr. (of the rumbling of the intestines; see Foes. and Schneider): but ἕμυξα, ἐπέμυζαν are used by Homer as sounds of anger and reproach. This latter formation, with γ as its characteristic, is common to many verbs which express the uttering of some sound or exclamation, as κράζω, στενάζω, τρίζω, οἰμώζω, whence μυγμός, στεναγμός, οἰμωγμός, &c.

Mύζω, I suck: fut. μυζήσω, &c., from which inflexion first arose, it appears, in a later æra the pres. μυζάω and μυζέω.*

For the part. μεμυζότε see Λιχμάομαι.

Μύσσω, μύττω, but more generally ἀπομύττω, emungo: fut. μύζω, &c. – Μιρρ.

[The simple verb occurs only in the writings of the Grammarians

* See Hemst. ad Lucian. Tim. 8. and Schneider's Lexicon. That $\mu\nu'\zeta\omega$ is the older form appears certain not only from the glosses of Hesychius, who explains $\mu\nu'\zeta\epsilon\iota$, $\xi\mu\nu'\zeta\epsilon\nu$, $\mu\nu'\zeta\rho\nu\iota$; but in Hipporr. π . $d\chi\chi$. 8. we find $\mu\nu'\zeta\epsilon\iota$, and $\xi\mu\nu'\zeta\epsilon\nu$, and in Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 27., where the text now has $\epsilon i_s \tau \delta \sigma \tau \delta \mu a \dot{a} \mu \delta (\epsilon w)$, it is evident that this last form, which occurs nowhere else, is corrupted by the addition of a superfluous a. and as the root of ἀπομύττω, ἐπιμύττω, προμύττω, and of the Lat. mungo, emungo. — Passow.]

Mūxáoµaı, I bellow, roar: Dep. midd.

From the simple stem of this verb the Epics have formed a perf. with the force of a pres. $\mu \epsilon \mu \bar{\nu} \kappa \alpha$, part. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \kappa \omega' \varsigma$, and an aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \mu \bar{\nu} \kappa \sigma \nu$. Compare M $\eta \kappa \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mu \alpha$.

N.

Naιετάω, 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 vaιετάω, Od. ι, 21., vaιετάει, Hes, \Im , 775., vaιετάονσι, vaιετάοντες, Hom., Conj. vaιετάωσι, Hes. \Im , 370. The only instance of the regular production is in the imperf. vaιετάασκον, and of an irregular one in the fem. part. vaιετάωσα.*

Naíw, I dwell, forms its tenses with simple ă.† In the active, however, we find only the aor. 1. (ἕνἄσα) ἕνασσα with a causative meaning, to cause to inhabit, settle, or cause to be inhabited, colonize, found. The midd. and pass. fut. νάσσομαι (Apoll. Rh. 2, 747.), the aor. 1. midd. ἐνασσάμην (ἀπενάσσατο, Hom.), and the aor. 1. pass. ἐνάσθην have the intransit. sense of to settle in a place. The post-Homeric poets, however, use the midd. ἐνασσάμην in the sense of ἕνασσα also: see Brunck. ad Apollon. 1, 1356. The perf. νένασμαι is not found before the later poets. See Schneider's Lexicon.

The syncop. aor. $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon' \nu \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$, you have settled yourselves, you dwell, (comp. Hesych. $\nu \alpha' \sigma \theta \alpha \iota - o l \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha \iota$) in Aristoph. Vesp. 662. in the anapæsts would be remarkable, but both the best manuscripts have $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon' \nu \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$, and the third person suits the passage very well.

See also Náw, I flow.

Nάσσω, I stop up, I fill in and beat close together (as earth into a hole): fut. νάξω, aor. 1. ἕναξα: but the perf. pass. is νένασμαι, and the verbal adj. ναστός.‡

That this was the old traditionary form is clear from the observations of the Grammarians in Schol. 11. γ , 387. in the Etym. M. in voc., and particularly from Aristarchus having written vaierówora (Schol. 11. ζ , 415.). Uncritically enough. For if we suppose that Homer, having used vaieróword, could not use vaierówora, both analogy and the old way of writing lead us to vaierówora, which the 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. $\sigma d\omega$ under $\Sigma \omega \zeta \omega$.

+ The termination $-\alpha l\omega$, like $-d\zeta \omega$ and $-\alpha \nu \nu \nu \mu \iota$, serves to strengthen the pres. where the α is short in the other tenses.

‡ This verb, like ἀφύσσω 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 Baστάζω, Διστάζω. See also 'Αρμόττω. The passive formation with the σ , as above given, is most indisputable in the verbal adj. $\nu a \sigma \tau \delta c$. The perf. $\nu \epsilon \nu a \sigma \tau a \iota$, too, is undoubted in Aristoph. Eccl. 840., on which and some other suspected passages see the note to N $\epsilon \omega$ 1. The only trace which I find of the regular form $\nu \epsilon \nu a \kappa \tau a \iota$ is in Suidas in voc., where it is quoted from Josephus.

Náw, I flow, an old verb, found only in pres. and imperf.; written also vaíw. See Schol. Od. i, 222. On $\nu \tilde{\omega} \sigma_i \nu$, &c., see Néw 2.

Νεικέω, I rebuke, dispute, retains ϵ in its inflexion, thus fut. νεικέσω, &c.

[Hom. and Hes. have also, when the metre requires it, an Ion. sisterform νεικείω, whence 3. conj. νεικείησι; imperf. νείκειον and νεικείεσσον; fut. νεικέσσω; aor. 1. νείκεσσα, &c.-Passow.]

· Νείφω. See Νέφω.

Νέμω, I distribute allot: fut. νεμῶ and νεμήσω; aor. 1. ένειμα; perf. νενέμηκα; aor. 1. pass. ἐνεμήθην and ἐνεμέθην.* Verbal adj. νεμητέος. — MIDD.

The fut. $\nu \epsilon \mu h \sigma \omega$ is mentioned by Herodian (post Mœr. 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 $\nu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is in Demosth. Mid. p. 579. infra. [The later writers have also an aor. 1. midd. $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \mu \eta \sigma \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 742.—Passow.]

Nέφω: 3. sing. νέφει, more generally συννέφει, it is overcast with clouds; or Zεdς συννέφει, covers the sky with clouds, Aristoph. Av. 1489. Perf. συννένοφεν.

See Aristoph. ap. Suid. v. $\xi \nu \nu \nu \epsilon' \nu \sigma \phi \epsilon \nu$. The forms of the pres. are also written with the circumflex, as $\sigma \nu \nu \nu \epsilon \phi \epsilon \tilde{i}$, $-\tilde{o} \sigma a$: see Schneid. Lexicon. The pres. $\nu \epsilon \ell \phi \omega$ (with the explanation $\beta \rho \epsilon \chi \omega$) which the Grammarians connect with the above verb (see the Etymologica, and Eust. ad II. a, 420.) is only another way of writing $\nu \ell \phi \omega$, to snow, which the later writers used also of rain : see Stephens in $N \ell \phi \omega$.⁺

Νέω, 1. I heap up: aor. 1. ένησα, infin. νησαι, &c.; perf. pass. νένημαι or νένησμαι. Verbal adj. νητός.

The pres. $\nu \epsilon \omega$ is found only in Herodotus, $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \nu \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$, 6, 80., $\epsilon \pi \iota \nu \epsilon \delta \upsilon \sigma \iota$, 4, 62.[‡] Homer has a lengthened form which fluctuates between $\nu \eta \epsilon \omega$

ing article : Né $\phi \omega$, fut. $\nu \acute{e} \psi \omega$, perf. $\nu \acute{e} - \nu \phi \phi \alpha$, same as $\nu \acute{l} \phi \omega$; a rare, nay a suspected form.

+ [Passow in his Lex. has the follow-

‡ See, however, the following note.

N 2

^{*} We find νεμηθώσιν, Demosth. Neær. 1380. ult., and νεμεθείσης, id. Phorm. 956, 12.

and $\nu\eta\nu\epsilon\omega$. The inflexion follows the former, as the imperf. $\nu\eta\epsilon\sigma\nu$, II. ψ , 139., aor. 1. $\nu\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, Od. τ , 64., infin. $\nu\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$, o, 321. Herodot. 2, 107., aor. 1. infin. midd. $\nu\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, II. ι , 137.

The perf. pass. without σ see in Lex. Seguer. 1. p. 13, 24. Thucyd. 7, 87. Xen. Anab. 5, 4, 27. The other form vérnoµal seems to me to stand on good grounds in Aristoph. Nub. 1203., where with autoopic νενησμένοι is the various reading νενασμένοι, which being untenable on account of the sense, could have arisen only from the true verb being written with the σ . Nor is the reading less sure in Aristoph. Eccles. 838., which I will quote at length: 'Ως ai τράπεζαί γ' εἰσὶν ἐπινενασμέναι Άγαθων απάντων και παρεσκευασμέναι, Κλιναί τε σισυρών και $\delta a \pi i \delta \omega \nu \nu \epsilon \nu a \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$. Now the reading of $\epsilon \pi i \nu \epsilon \nu a \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ is quite as untenable as that of *vevaoµévai* (looking at the sense) is certain; and Brunck's emendation $i\pi i \nu \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha i$ is now confirmed by the quotation in Phryn. Seguer. p. 13. 'Aya $\theta \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \dot{a} \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \tau a \iota \dot{\eta} \tau \rho \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \zeta a$: for the writing with the σ is supported here again by the false reading $i\pi i\nu \epsilon$ - $\nu \alpha \sigma \mu$ - and by the similarity of this case to that quoted above from the Nubes. Lastly we must examine the passage of Theorr. 9, 9. where vévaoral is used of a heap of skins, which, it is true, the derivation from $\nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ appears to suit: but as the dialect of this poet requires vévakrai, it would seem, according to the direction of the scholium σεσώρενται, that in the passage in question it should be pronounced νένασται, i. e. νένησται.

2. I spin: fut. $\nu\eta\sigma\omega$, &c.; in addition to which was formed, but at an early period, another pres. $\nu\eta\omega\omega$ (like $\pi\lambda\eta\omega\omega$, from $\pi(\mu\pi\lambda\eta\omega)$, $\Pi\Lambda E\Omega$); and this became afterwards the common form.

It is difficult to decide any thing on the usage of $\nu\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu$ and $\nu\dot{\eta}\theta\epsilon\nu$ 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, $N\dot{\eta}\theta\epsilon\nu$, $o\dot{v}\ \mu\dot{o}\nu\sigma\nu\ \nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, 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 $\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu, \nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$, Hes. ϵ , 779., $\check{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$, Hesych., the other contractions are invariably quoted by all the Grammarians in ω instead of ov; as $\nu\tilde{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu$, Pollux 7, 32. 10, 125., $\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu\tau a$, Hesych., $\nu\dot{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu oc$, Phot.* The contraction to ov was

* Photius has also $N\hat{\omega}r\sigma s$, $\sigma\omega\rho\epsilon b\sigma r\sigma s$, belonging therefore to $N\epsilon\omega$ 1. This agrees also very well with the sup-

position, which indeed is pretty certain, that the meanings of to heap up (glomerare) and to spin are properly the therefore studiously avoided, and from $\nu \tilde{\omega}$, $\nu \tilde{\omega} \nu$ the ω was carried on through the tenses.

The passive forms I find quoted always with the σ ; but it is possible that these came first into use with $r\eta\theta\omega$, and that the old form for the meaning of to spin was $r\epsilon r\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, to which we are also led by the verbals $r\eta\tau\delta\varsigma$, $r\eta\mu\alpha$, &c.

3. I swim. None of the forms of the pres. are contracted by the Attics in this short verb except those in ε_{I} (compare $\Delta \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$, $I \, bind$); thus $\nu \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$, $\nu \hat{\varepsilon} \omega \nu$, $\nu \hat{\varepsilon} o \mu \varepsilon \nu$, &c., but $\nu \tilde{\varepsilon} \tilde{\iota}$, $\nu \tilde{\varepsilon} \tilde{\iota} \nu$, &c. Fut. $\nu \tilde{\varepsilon} \circ \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\nu \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \tilde{\upsilon} \mu \alpha \iota$ (like $\pi \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$, $\pi \lambda \tilde{\varepsilon} \circ \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$); aor. 1. $\tilde{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \sigma \alpha$, &c.

An Epic sister-form is $\nu \eta \chi \omega$, and the later prose writers use $\nu \eta \chi o$ - $\mu \alpha_i$, a depon. midd.

4. The poetical verb $\nu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, $\nu \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma \theta a \iota$, to go, more generally to go away, return, is used in present and imperfect only : the pres. indic. has the force of a future, as $\nu \epsilon \delta \mu a \iota$, contr. $\nu \epsilon \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota$, Epic 2. sing. $\nu \epsilon \tilde{\iota} a \iota$ like $\mu \nu \theta \epsilon \tilde{\iota} a \iota$, $\nu \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \tau a \iota$ like $\mu \nu \theta \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \tau a \iota$.

Níζω, I wash, takes its tenses from $\nu i \pi \tau \omega$, an unusual verb in the older writers : fut. $\nu i \psi \omega$; aor. 1. $\xi \nu i \psi \alpha$, &c.; perf. pass. $\nu \xi \nu i \mu \mu \alpha i. - M$ IDD.

The pres. $\nu i \zeta \omega$ 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. σ , 178.; and this is the more remarkable, as in ten others the reading is $\nu i \zeta \epsilon_i \nu$. See Damm.

Nissopai, I go, return to. Two questions have been started respecting this verb, one as to its orthography and another as to its inflexion. With regard to the first, we find $\nu i \sigma \sigma \mu a_i$, II. ψ , 76., $\nu \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, Eurip. Pheen. 1240., $\dot{a} \pi \sigma \nu \iota \sigma \dot{o} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, Apollon. Rh. 3, 899., and in each case the manuscripts fluctuate between $\epsilon \iota_{S}$, $\epsilon \iota \sigma \sigma$, $\iota \sigma$. The form $\nu \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ is found in the best manuscripts (whence we infer that the vowel is

same. Nor is this at variance with the $\ell \pi u \nu \epsilon_{000}$ of Herodot, quoted at the beginning of No. 1.; for the Ionics constantly use this form, like all those from verbs in ϵ_{00} , without contraction. On the other hand we are warranted in supposing that the Attics from $\nu \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ to heap up, to spin, formed vŵoi, from veiv, to swim, véouoiv.

* Thom. Mag. admits both forms ; kal $\xi \nu \iota (\xi \nu)$: for this is the reading of the manuscripts. The note of Hemsterhuys, which exactly reverses the usage, is incorrect.

N 3

long independently of the $\sigma\sigma$), and its authenticity is further supported by the cognate forms réqual, reloyal, as well as by its being actually found in inscriptions of the purest times, Bœckh Pind. Ol. 3, 10. On the other hand usage was in favour of vioropai (see Etym. M. p. 606, 12.); and the Grammarians seem to have agreed in writing the pres. νίσσομαι, the fut. νίσομαι, Eustath. Il. ψ , 76. Heyne Il. ι, 381. There are other passages with the same doubtful orthography, as velogovrai, Hes. Op. 235., veiosopévwv, Theog. 71. Gaisf., both with the various reading vioo.; and vioovro, 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 future, as in $\epsilon l \mu \iota$ and $\nu \epsilon 0 \mu \alpha \iota$, Il. ν . 186. 0, 577. : thus in Il. ψ , 76. if we read visopan we have the future, if vissopan we have the present with the meaning of a future : compare also the scholium in the passage of Euripides. On the gloss of Hesychius veioavro, until we know to what it refers, nothing can be said.

Νίφω, νείφω. See Νέφω.

Noέω, *I think*, has in the Ionic writers the same contraction and accentuation as $\beta o \dot{a} \omega$; e. g. perf. νένωμαι; pluperf. ἐνενώμην, whence 3. sing. ἐνένωτο for ἐνενόητο, Herodot. 1, 77. and the compound aor. 1. part. ἐννώσας for ἐννοήσας, ib. 1, 86. See the note on Boáω.

Nυστάζω, *I nod* (as being sleepy), *I sleep*: fut. νυστάσω and νυστάξω *: but all the derivatives are formed with the palatic letter, as νυστακτής, &c.

E.

 $\Xi_{\epsilon\omega}$, *I* shave, scrape, retains ϵ in the inflexion, and takes σ in the passive : thus fut. $\xi_{\epsilon\sigma\omega}$, Epic $\xi_{\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omega}$.

Ξυρέω, I shave, shear, has more commonly in the midd. ξύρομαι; aor. 1. έξυράμην; but the perfect is έξύρημαι.

The midd. form $\xi v \rho \epsilon o \mu a \iota$ is Ionic; but it occurs in Attic writers, as $\xi v \rho o \delta \mu \epsilon v o v$, Alexis ap. Athen. 13. p. 565. b. In the later writers the pres. $\xi v \rho \delta \omega$ was common, but the inflexion in $-\delta \sigma \omega$ is never found. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 205. Passow has also another later form $\xi v \rho (\xi \omega, \xi v \rho (\xi \sigma \mu a).$

* See Stephan. Thesaur. in κατανυστάζω. Fisch. 2. p. 328. Asclep. Epig. 10. (ἐνύστασε). Ξύω, I shave smooth, polish: fut. ξύσω, &c. It takes σ in the passive: ξύσασθαι, aor. 1. midd. to polish for one's self, for one's own use, Xen. Cyr. 6, 2, 11.

0.

'Οδόρομαι, *I lament*, *bewail*; depon. midd. with both trans. and intrans. sense. The act. appears to have never been in use.

'Οδύσσομαι, I am enraged with, I hate. Neither this pres. nor δδύω, δδύζω, or δδύζομαι appears to have been ever in use; but we find in Hom. an aor. 1. midd. (ω δυσάμην) -ao, -aτo and 3. plur. without the augm. δδύσαντο, part. δδυσσάμενος; also 3. sing. perf. pass. with the force of a pres. δδώδυσται for ώδυσται, Od. ε , 423.

^{*}Οζω, I send forth a (good or bad) smell: fut. $\delta \zeta \eta \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\omega \zeta \eta \sigma \alpha$, Aristoph. Vesp. 1059.; perf. with the force of the pres. $\delta \delta \omega \delta \alpha$. Generally with gen. of the thing or part from which the smell proceeds.

The inflexion δζέσω, ὥζεσα is found in the Ionic (Hippocr. De Steril. 10. De Superfet. 10.) and the later writers.

Oiyw, or oiyvvµ, *I* open: fut. oitw; aor. 1. $\tilde{\psi}$ ta, part. oitac: but the Epics generally separate the diphthong in the augmented forms, as in the aor. 1. \tilde{w} ttev, \tilde{w} ttev, and in the imperf. pass. \tilde{w} tyvvvτo. In prose the following compound is in use:

ἀνοίγω, ἀνοίγνυμι. In the augmented tenses the syllabic augment is added to the temporal as in the imperf. ἐψνοχόει from οἰνοχοέω, ἐήνδανε from ἀνδανω; thus imperf. ἀνέψγον; aor. 1. ἀνέψξα (infin ἀνοῖξαι), &c.; perf. 1. ἀνέψχα; perf. 2. ἀνέψχα. 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. ἀνέψγμαι. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 157, 158.

In the dialects, as in Herodot., Theorr., &c., we find the aor. 1. with the regular augment $d\nu\tilde{q}\xi a$; and in the later writers the act. $i/roi\xi a$, pass. $i/roi\gamma\eta\nu$, &c., Fisch. III. pp. 36, 37. Oidéw, I swell. For this verb with the forms oidáw, oidáw, oida/vw, we cannot lay down any fixed usage. We can only observe that the formation in $-i\sigma w$ is the only one for all four forms; and that the two last are used also in a causative sense. See Stephens' Thesaur.

Οἰμώζω, I bewail: fut. οἰμώξω * and οἰμώξομαι; aor. 1. ὄμωξα.

O'oµaı, I think: imperf. $\psi \delta \mu \eta \nu$; fut. $\partial i \eta \sigma \rho \mu a_i$; aor. 1. $\psi \eta' \partial \eta \nu$, infin. $\partial i \eta \partial \tilde{\eta} \nu a_i$, part. $\partial i \eta \partial \varepsilon i \varsigma$. The 1. pers. sing. of both pres. and imperf. was also pronounced in a syncopated form, $\partial i \mu a_i$, $\psi \mu \eta \nu$. The 2. pers. sing. of the pres. $\partial \varepsilon_i$, (like $\beta o \psi \lambda \varepsilon_i$ and $\delta \psi \varepsilon_i$) 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 oluar was used only of things fixed and certain, consequently merely a milder expression for "I am convinced, I know well." That is to say, oluar, yunv 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 olopau, 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 $o^{i}\omega$, but only in the present; more frequently they separate the diphthong, $\partial^{i}\omega$, and in the middle always, $\partial^{i}c_{\mu}\alpha_{\iota}$, in which the ι is long: and in this form, which has the

only in the Orac. Sibyll.: see Jac. Anim. in Athen, p. 170.]

^{* [}Passow says that the Attic fut. is οἰμώξομαι, not οἰμώξω, which last occurs

midd. as well as the pass. aorist, we find only the regular inflexion; e. g pres. $\delta i_{0\mu\alpha\imath}$, $\delta i_{e\alpha\imath}$, &c., part. $\delta i_{0\mu} \epsilon_{\nu\sigma\sigma}$; imperf. $\delta i_{0\mu} \nu$; aor. 1. pass. $\delta i_{\sigma} \eta_{\nu}$, part. $\delta i_{\sigma} \theta_{\ell} \epsilon_{j}$; aor. 1. midd. $\delta i_{\sigma} \delta_{\mu} \epsilon_{\nu\sigma\sigma}$. 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, $o i_{\sigma} \theta_{\omega\sigma\iota}$ (Ind. 13, 5.), which however may also be written $\delta i_{\sigma} \theta_{\omega\sigma\iota}$. From $\delta t_{\sigma} \theta_{\eta\nu}$ the later (not Attic) writers formed again an infin. aor. $o i_{\sigma} \theta_{\eta\nu \alpha\iota}$ with the part. $o i_{\sigma} \theta_{\ell} \epsilon_{j}$: and Aratus has with the common formation an aor. 1. infin. midd. $o i_{\eta\sigma\alpha-\sigma} \theta_{\alpha\iota}$, used by still later writers in prose: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p.719.

Οίχομαι, I go, I am gone : imperf. (or aor.) ψχόμην, I went away ; fut. οἰχήσομαι.

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 oixopat never means I am going, but always I am gone. We will first prove this by a number of decisive passages. At Il. 0, 223. ήδη Έννοσίγαιος Οίχεται εἰς ἄλα δĩαν, after it had been before said δῦνε δὲ πόντον ἰών. At ε, 472. πη δή τοι μένος οιχεται δ πριν έχεσκες ; see also ξ, 11. Again έκπέφευν', οίχεται φροῦδος, Aristoph. Acharn. 208. Πόσον χρόνον δέ μητρός οίχονται πνοαί; how long has thy mother's breath been gone? Eurip. Or. 440.; compare also 844. In Xenophon we find many instances; e. g. (addressing a dead body) σίχη δή ἀπολιπών ήμᾶς, Cyrop. 7, 3, 8.; see also 5, 4, 11. 6, 1, 45. and Anab. 3, 1, 32. This usage is continued in the imperf. $\dot{\omega}\chi \phi \mu \eta \nu$, I was gone ; as Penelope says to her son, ού σ' ἕτ' ἕγωγε "Οψεσθαι έφάμην, έπεὶ ὤχεο νηι Πύλονδε, when I heard that thou wert gone to Pylos, Od. π , 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 ψχετο; e. g. Ούτω δή ούτος μέν ψχετο οί δέ Μήδοι παρήσαν: this 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. Xwóuevos o ό γέρων παλιν ψχετο, ΙΙ. α, 380. 'Ακούσαντες δε οι Χαλδαΐοι ταῦτα.... ψχοντο οίκαδε, Xen. Cyr. 3, 2, 14. compared with 8, 3, 28.

That the original meaning of $o''_{\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota}$ was simply to go, without the addition of away, is clear not only from the sister-form $o'_{\chi\nu\epsilon\omega}$, but from the compound $\dot{\epsilon}\pi o'_{\chi o \mu \alpha \iota}$, I go to or towards, as well as from some passages of Homer, in which the simple verb, but never in the pres. conj. (quære, is this accidental?), is used in that original sense: e.g. $\kappa a\tau\dot{\alpha}$ $\sigma\tau\rho a\tau o'\nu \,\,\psi_{\chi\epsilon\tau\sigma} \,\,\pi\dot{\alpha}\,\nu\tau\eta$ 'Orp $\dot{\nu}\nu\omega\nu \,\mu\alpha\chi\epsilon\sigma a\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, II. ϵ , 495. and ' $E\nu\nu\eta\mu\alpha\rho$ $\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu \,\,\dot{\alpha}\lambda\dot{\alpha}\,\sigma\tau\rho a\tau\dot{\alpha}\nu \,\,\psi_{\chi\epsilon\tau\sigma}\,\kappa\eta\lambda\alpha$ $\Im\epsilon\sigma\delta\sigma$, a, 53. with some similar passages.

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 $oi\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ was used of one who had been 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 $\check{\varphi}\chi\epsilon$ - τo , as imperf. of the common $oi\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, 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 same meaning; e. g. $i\pi\epsilon\iota \delta a \mu \pi i \omega \tau \delta \phi a \rho \mu a \kappa o \dots oi\chi horo \rho a u a mi a mi a w$ $<math>\epsilon l \xi' \mu a \kappa a \rho w \delta h \tau \iota v a \xi \epsilon \delta \delta a \mu \rho v i a \xi' \delta a \mu a \kappa \delta w$.

From what has been said, a perf. of this verb is superfluous for general use; it does however sometimes occur (e. g. yxnua, Ion. o'xnua, Herodot. 4, 136.), but in the common language in the compounds only. in which therefore $\pi a \rho o (\chi o \mu a \iota)$ and $\pi a \rho \phi \chi \eta \mu a \iota$, $\pi a \rho \phi \chi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$ are synonymous; see Stephan. Thesaur. and Sturz. Lex. Xen. : and so is the other compound in Herodot. 4, 136. ai hμέραι διοίχηνται, compared with Soph. Aj. 973. Alag διοίχεται. In the older language the perf. is found in an active form also ($\ddot{\psi}\chi\eta\kappa\alpha$), which will therefore connect it with oixvéw: it is however rare, and in Homer occurs but once, viz. in $\pi a \rho \psi_{\chi} \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu$, is past, Il. κ , 252.; of more frequent occurrence is the form οίχωκα*, which has exactly the common meaning of οίχομαι; e.g. οίχωκ', όλωλα, Soph. Aj. 896., οίχωκώς, Herodot. 8, 108., οίκωγότας, 9. 98. In this last writer οἰχώκεε, 8, 126. and παροιχώκεε, 8, 72. are evidently pluperfects with the force of an imperfect; but at 1, 189. 4, 127. 165. οἰχώκεε is exactly the same as ψχετο 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. ἐπψχατο also occurs, but seldom. A regular fut. o'iξομαι is found in some manuscripts in Herodot. 2, 29. - The pres. olytopal, contracted by the Ionics to olytopal, is met with only in Leon. Tar.; for the act. o'xw there is no authority .--- Passow.]

* The formation of this perf. corresponds exactly with that of $\delta\chi\omega\kappa\alpha$ from $\xi\chi\omega$; thus $\delta\chi\omega$, perf. $\delta\chi\alpha$, with redupl. $\delta\kappa\omega$ - $\chi\alpha$ (for the ι of the second syllable could be omitted for no other reason than because there was one in the first; compare $\delta\epsilon \delta\kappa \kappa \tau \sigma$ from $\delta\epsilon \kappa \kappa \tau \nu \mu\alpha\iota$), and thence, by transposition of the two palatic letters, olxwra.

+ It is certain that the common meaning of $\phi \chi e \tau o$ may be explained in this same way, that is to say, as a pluperf., $o'_{\chi e \tau a \iota}$ having the force of a perf.: but the view which I have taken of it appears to me simpler. Oiw. See Oiopar and $\Phi \epsilon \rho \omega$.

'Οχέλλω, I land, has (beside the pres. and imperf.) only the aor. ὤχειλα, infin. ἀχεῖλαι, &c.: τὰς νῆας ὤχελλον, they stranded, &c., Herodot. 8, 84.

Όλισθάνω, I slip up or off from : fut. όλισθήσω; aor. 2. άλισθον, infin. όλισθεΐν, part. όλισθών.

The form $\partial\lambda\sigma\theta a i\nu\omega$ is not Attic: see Porson ad Phæniss. 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. $\omega\lambda i\sigma\theta\eta\sigma a$ is also used by the later writers; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 742. Passow has also a perf. $\omega\lambda i\sigma\theta\eta\kappa a$.

^{*}Ολλυμι[†], *I destroy*, annihilate: fut. ἀλῶ; aor. 1. [™]λεσα; perf. ἀλώλεχα. Midd. *I perish*, am undone; fut. ἀλοῦμαι; aor. 2. ἀλόμην; to which belongs the perf. 2. (perf. midd.) ὅλωλα.

The intransitive forms $\partial \delta (\mu \eta \nu$ and $\partial \lambda \partial \lambda a$ serve at the same time for passives $(\partial \pi \sigma \partial \omega \lambda \delta \nu a \iota \partial \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \iota \nu \sigma c :$ compare $\partial \pi \sigma \partial \alpha \nu \delta \iota \nu)$, whence the proper forms of the pass. are not used; none but writers of a very late period having $\partial \lambda \delta \sigma \partial \eta \nu$, $\partial \lambda \epsilon \sigma \partial \eta \nu a \iota$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 732.

Of the same æra is also the fut. $\partial\lambda\epsilon\sigma\omega$, e. g. Long. 3, 17. $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\lambda\epsilon\sigma\omega\nu$, 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, $\partial\lambda\epsilon\kappa\omega$, of which (both in the act. and midd.) Homer has only the pres. and imperf.; the latter without the augment, $\partial\lambda\epsilon\kappa\sigma\nu$, $\partial\lambda\epsilon\kappa\sigma\nu\tau\sigma$. Compare $\ell\mu\epsilon\mu\eta\kappa\sigma\nu$ under M $\eta\kappa\dot{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$.

In II. τ , 135. stands the iterative imperf. $\delta \lambda \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$, which supposes an imperf. $\delta \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu$ not quite agreeable to analogy. Heyne has adopted the reading $\delta \lambda \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$, which would be the iterative aorist; but the

* [According to Porson $\delta \lambda \iota \sigma \theta dx \omega$ is the only form used by good writers, but $\delta \lambda \iota \sigma \theta dx \omega$ is found in Aristoph. Equ. 494. and is therefore as pure Attic as the other: $\delta \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon \omega$ on the contrary is not a genuine form. — Passow.]

† If we compare the analogy of $\&\gamma\nu\nu\mu\mu$, &c., with this verb, we shall see that the latter is a euphonic change for $\delta\lambda\nu\nu\mu\mu$.

‡ [What can Buttmann mean by stating $\delta\lambda\epsilon\sigma\omega$ to be the usage of the later writers only ? We find it in Od. ν , 399. Hes. ϵ , 178. and $\delta\lambda\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omega$, 11. μ , 250. — Ed.]

178. and $\delta\lambda\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omega$, 11. μ, 250. — Ed.] § [Beside this Epic pres. we find $\delta\lambda\lambda\omega$, $\delta\lambda\epsilon\omega$, $\delta\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\omega$, which are not Greek, $\delta\lambda$ - $\lambda\nu\nu\epsilon\omega$, which is suspected, and $\delta\lambda\lambda\lambda\omega$ in Hesych. — Passow.] iterative imperfect is the only tense to suit the passage, therefore the various reading $\partial \lambda \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ ought to have been adopted long ago.

The part. aor. midd. $\partial \lambda \dot{\phi} \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$, beside its proper meaning (e. g. $\omega_{\varsigma} \sigma'$ $\partial \lambda \dot{\phi} \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega$, Eurip. Or. 1384.), is used as an adjective with the active sense of *destructive*, $\partial \lambda o \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \nu' E \rho_{i\nu} \nu \dot{\nu} \nu$, Phœn. 1036. In the Epic poets, who on account of the metre can have only $o \dot{\iota} \lambda \dot{o} \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$, the adjectival usage is the only one, and generally in the active sense with $\mu \eta \nu_{i\varsigma}$, "Aτη, &c. : but it has also the strictly passive meaning wretched, undone, $o \dot{\iota} \lambda o \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \varsigma$, $\tau \eta_{\varsigma} \tau \epsilon Z \epsilon \dot{\iota} \varsigma$ " $\partial \lambda \delta o \nu \dot{a} \pi \eta \dot{\nu} \rho a$, Od. σ , 273.

[At Il. 3, 449. δλλῦσαι is the regular pres. part. fem. 'Ολέσσαι is the Ep. aor. infin. in Hom. and Hes. — Passow.]

^{*}Ομνῦμι, I swear: fut. ὀμοῦμαι, -εῖ, -εῖται, &c., infin. ¿μεῖσθαι*; the other tenses take an o in the inflexion, as aor. 1. ὤμοσα; perf ἐμώμοχα; perf. pass. ὀμώμοσμαι, part. ὀμωμοσμένος; but in the remaining forms and in the aorist the Attics generally drop the σ , as in 3. sing. perf. pass. ὀμώμοται, and aor. 1. pass. ὠμόθην. — The middle occurs in the compounds, e.g. ἐπωμοσάμην.

From the σ having been properly admitted into those forms only in which the three μ 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 $i \pi \sigma \mu \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \sigma \varsigma$, and in Demosth. c. Leptin. p. 805. extr. $i \mu \omega \mu \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ has been restored from the best manuscript. \dagger

[Homer generally uses the aor. 1. without the augment, and frequently with double σ , $\partial_{\mu} \delta \sigma \sigma a\iota$, &c. In the simple verb he has the imperf. $\dot{\omega}_{\mu\nu\nu\epsilon}$ as from $\partial_{\mu\nu'\nu\omega}$, but in the compound $\dot{\alpha}\pi\omega_{\mu\nu\bar{\nu}}$, Od. β , 377. In Herodot. 1, 153. is the Ionic part. pres. $\partial_{\mu}o\bar{\nu}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ as from $\partial_{\mu}\delta\omega$.—Passow.]

Ομόργνῦμι, I wipe off: fut. ὀμόρξω; aor. 1. ὤμορξα; aor. 1. midd. ὠμορξάμην, infin. ὀμόρξασθαι, &c. This verb is inflected according to the analogy of ἄγνυμι, δείχνυμι, &c. — MIDD.

perides ap. Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 725. ὑπομοσθείσης; and in Eurip. Rhes. 816., without any necessity from the metre, ὀμώμοσται.

^{*} This verb is formed according to the analogy of $\&\gamma\nu\nu\mu\mu$: compare also $\Delta\epsilon i$ - $\kappa\nu\nu\mu\mu$, \sim OAA $\nu\mu\mu$.

⁺ In Andocides de Pace, p. 27, 43., the text still has δμοσθήσεται; in Hy-

'Ονίνημι, I am of use to, I help: (no imperf. act.*) fut. ονήσω; aor. 1. ώνησα. Midd. ονίναμαι, I derive assistance, advantage; fut. ονήσομαι; aor. 2. ωνήμην, -ησο, -ητο, &c., part. ονήμενος (Od. β , 33. ω, 30.); but the other moods of this aorist have the α , as optat. οναίμην, infin. ὄνασθαι; and the indicative also borrowed this formation, but not until a later period, ωνάμην.

On this peculiarity of the aorist see Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 12, 13. Hence $\&ua\sigma\theta\epsilon$ in Eurip. Herc. 1368., and occurring in that passage only, well deserves our consideration. For a further account of this aor. $\&ua\mu\eta\nu$ and the similar one from $\&ua\mu\eta\nu$, see the latter verb. The aor. pass. $\&un\eta\eta\nu$ is also found (instead of $\&un\eta\eta\nu$) in Xen. Anab. 5, 5, 2. Theore. 15, 55.

This is one of those verbs formed by the reduplication of the first syllable like $\dot{a}\rho a\rho (\sigma\kappa\omega)$, $\dot{a}\kappa a\chi (\zeta\omega)$; only that in this case the vowel of the reduplication is ι (as in $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\delta (\delta \omega \mu \iota$, &c.), and it is substituted for the vowel of the root, as the temp. augment η is in $\dot{a}\kappa \eta \kappa \sigma a$, &c.; thus $\dot{o}\nu \dot{a}\omega$ (whence $\dot{\omega}\nu \dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$) $\dot{o}\nu (\nu\eta\mu\iota$, like $\dot{a}\tau \dot{a}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\dot{a}\tau\iota\tau \dot{a}\lambda\lambda\omega$, and $\dot{o}\pi\tau\epsilon \dot{\nu}\omega$ $\dot{o}\pi\iota\pi\tau\epsilon \dot{\nu}\omega$. There is however no instance of $\dot{o}\nu \dot{a}\omega$, $\dot{o}\nu \dot{\epsilon}\omega$, or $\ddot{o}\nu\eta\mu\iota$ being used by any writer.

The 3. sing. pres. act. $\partial v i v \eta \sigma \iota$ and the midd. $\partial v i v a \mu a \iota$ 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 $\dot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon \bar{\iota}v$. 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. $\partial v i \nu \dot{a} v a$ would have been avoided. This however cannot be asserted positively; and there is even great probability in Matthiæ's suspicion that $\partial v i \nu a \iota$ in Plat. Rep. 10. p. 600. d. may be a corruption of this word. \ddagger

*Ovoµaı, I think lightly of, reject with disdain, 2. sing. övoσaı, 3. plur. övovτaı, imper. övoσo and övoσσο§, opt. öνοίµην, övoιτο (compare δύνωµaı, δύναιτο, &c., under Δύναµaı); fut. öνόσοµaı, whence in Hom. the infin. with double σ , öνόσσεσθαι; aor. 1. pass. ωνόσθην;

* See Grammat. ap. Herm. de Em. Gr. Gr.

† [The imperf. midd. however occurs in Plato. The perf. ὤνημαι is also found, but rarely. — Passow.]

[‡] The manuscripts fluctuate indeed between δυίναι, -ιναι, -ειναι, -ηναι, and Bekker has thence adopted δνήναι; but I cannot prefer that aor. 2. act. (unknown in any other instance, and used here for the common $\delta\nu\eta\sigma\omega$,) to Matthiæ's correction; particularly as the imperf. is the only ensure anturally suited to that passage.

§ Τών μηδέν κατόνοσσο, Arat. 1142. according to the Paris manuscript. aor. 1. midd. $\omega vo\sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta v$, whence in Hom. the opt. $\dot{o} vo\sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta v$, -a10, -a170, and infin. with double σ , $\dot{o} v \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$.

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 Ω . We must not therefore consider, as others frequently have done, $\delta\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\nu\rho\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, $\delta\nu\rho\iota\tau\alpha$, $\delta\nu\rho\iota\tau\alpha$, $\delta\nu$, as forms of the common barytone conjugation.

The inflexion of this verb however is certainly nothing more than a lengthening of the simple root ON- by the insertion of the vowel o, to which we are led by two Homeric forms, viz.

1. Aor. $\delta\nu a\tau\sigma$, II. ρ , 25. This Homeric form is separated from the $\delta\nu a\tau\sigma$ of the later language belonging to $\partial\nu i\nu\eta\mu\iota$, 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, $\partial\nu i\nu\eta\mu\iota$, $\partial\nu i\nu\eta\mu\iota$ is a formation in $\mu\iota$ with the radical vowel a, ONA-: $\partial\nu i\mu\eta\nu$ therefore bears the same relation to it as $i\sigma\tau á\mu\eta\nu$, if it were in use, would to $i\sigma\tau\mu\mu\iota$, or as $i\pi\tau i\mu\eta\nu$ actually does to $i\pi\tau\mu\mu\iota$, and it is the aor. 2. midd. Whereas the formation of $\delta\nu\rho\mu\iota\iota$ 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 $\partial\nu i\mu\eta\nu$ is the aor. 1. midd. of ON Ω ; or (which is the same thing) the aor. 2. $\partial\nu i\mu\eta\nu$, $\partial\nu\epsilon$ - τo , &c., took the Ionic a, making $\partial\nua\tau o$, like $\epsilon\nu\rhoa\tau o$, &c.

2. Pres. $o\ddot{v}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, II. ω , 241. Here the o of the radical syllable is lengthened, as in $o\dot{v}\lambda\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$. It stands therefore for $\ddot{o}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, and this again for $\ddot{o}\nu\sigma\sigma\theta\epsilon$, which is singular; as there was no metrical reason for forming this particular present from the simple stem. +

OII-. See Opáw.

'Οπυίω, I marry, cohabit with, loses in the inflexion the ; thus fut. ἀπύσω, &c., Aristoph. Acharn. 255.

• [The radical idea of the old root ONQ was perhaps to speak of a person in his absence, give him a good or bad character; whence $bro\mu a$ (by some incorrectly derived from $v \not \in \mu \omega$), a good or bad name; and the same double meaning was originally in $bv \not \in \partial s c$ (likewise a derivative from this word), as in the Lat. hons: $\delta v \not (v \eta \mu u$ on the other hand belongs to a different root, and has no connexion with $\delta v \rho u a (- Passow.]$

+ Both ancient and modern commentators, mistaking the Epic language, were led by the explanation δνησιν ξχετε to place this form under δνίσημι. But grammatical analogy gains nothing by such an arrangement, for the pres. $\delta v \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ is as strange in connexion with the root ONA- as with ONO-. Yet Hesychius has the glosses $O i \lambda i a \sigma \theta \epsilon$ (corrupted from $o \delta v a \sigma \theta \epsilon$), $O \delta v \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, and $O \delta v o \sigma \theta \epsilon$, all three with that false explanation; for all evidently refer to the Homeric passage. From this and from Aristarchus writing $\delta v \delta \sigma \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon$ 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 $o \delta v \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon$; nay, this becomes a certainty by the occurrence of the same phrase in the 2. sing. $\hbar \delta v \sigma \sigma a \dots \ldots$; Od. ρ , 378. therefore in plur. $\hbar (\delta v \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon)$ [According to Piers. ad Moer. p. 278. and Porson on Od. δ , 798. the old and genuine form was $\partial \pi i \omega$; compare Schæf. Schol. Par. Apoll. Rh. 1, 45.—Passow.]

^Oράω, I see: imperf. with double augment ἑώρων (see ἀνοίγω under Oἴγω); perf. ἑώρāκα or ἑόρāκα^{*}; from the verb εἶδω (which see) were borrowed the aor. 2. εἶδον, imper. ἴδε Att. ἰδέ (see ἐλθέ under Ἐρχομαι), opt. ἴδοιμι, infin. ἰδεῖν, part. ἰδών. Midd. aor. 2. εἰδόμην, imper. ἰδοῦ (as an interjection ἰδού, ecce), infin. ἰδέσθαι; and from an unusual stem OΠ... the fut. in the midd. form ὄψομαι (I shall see). The perf. pass. is either ἑώραμαι (ἑόραμαι), or ὅμμαι, ῶψαι, ὅπται, &c., infin. ὦφθαι; but in the aor. 1. pass. the Attics use only ὅφθην, while the later writers formed this tense from ὁράω, as infin. ὁρāθῆναι. Verbal adj. ὁρāτός and ὁρāτέος, or ὀπτός † and ὀπτέος. The midd. ἱρᾶσθαι, ἰδέσθαι is in the simple verbs solely poetical.

The regular imperf. of $\delta\rho\delta\omega$ is $\delta\rho\omega\nu$, Ion. $\delta\rho\epsilon\sigma\nu$ from the Ion. pres. $\delta\rho\epsilon\omega$, Herodot. 2, 148.; compare $\eta\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\nu$ from 'A $\nu\tau\delta\omega$, and $\mu\nu\epsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, $\chi\rho\epsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ under $M\iota\mu\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$. We find also an Epic 2. sing. pres. midd. $\delta\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ or $\delta\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ (for $\delta\rho\delta\eta$ or $\delta\rho\delta\epsilon\alpha\iota$), as from $\delta\rho\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, Od. 5, 343. If we adopt the latter accentuation we must suppose it formed as from a verb in $\mu\iota$; if the former (which is expressly mentioned by Eustath. p. 548,40. Basil.), we form $\delta\rho\delta\epsilon\alpha\iota$ $\delta\rho\delta\alpha\iota$ like $\mu\nu\theta\epsilon\epsilon\alpha\iota \mu\nu\theta\epsilon\epsilon\alpha\iota$, and we can

* The general form of this perfect, as handed down to us in all the writers both of the Attie and common dialect, is $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\rho_{ac}$. 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. $&\rho\alpha\alpha\alpha$. There were however other passages where this did not suit; these he altered arbitrarily, substituting for instance in Aristoph. Thesm. 32, 33. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\rho\alpha s$: and he supported his general principle by the analogy of $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\Delta}\rho \alpha$ and $\dot{\eta}\lambda \alpha\kappa\alpha$, both Attic forms. Tyrwhitt however (ad Dawes. p. 454.) quoted two passages of the Alexandrine comic poet Machon, from Athen. 6. p. 244. with $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$, as M $\dot{\eta}$ mage $\dot{\omega}\rho\alpha \kappa\alpha$ " $\dot{\rho}\rho\chi\epsilon\phi\omega\nu$..., and $\Pi\tau\sigma\lambda\epsilon\mu\alpha\overline{a}$ " $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\rho\alpha \kappa\alpha$ mp $\omega\tau\sigmas...$, both of which verses require $\delta \delta \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha$. Now as all the passages where Dawes wrote $\delta \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha$ (except two totally corrupted in Athen. 2. p. 49.) become quite regular by adopting Tyrwhit's emendation, $\delta \delta \rho \alpha \alpha$ has been considered an undoubted Attic form, and adopted in all the above-mentioned passages: see Porson ad Eurip. Pheen. 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 $\delta \delta \alpha \alpha \alpha$, which must then be pronounced occasionally as a trisyllable.

+ This same ἀπτόs is also formed from ἀπτάω, I roast, consequently for ἀπτητόs, as in Lat. assus for assatus. easily see why the η was preferred to the α , a change not uncommon in the Epic language, as in $\pi \rho o \sigma a \nu \delta \eta \tau \eta \nu$ and the infinitives in - $\eta \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ and - ŋval. The 3. sing, imperf. midd. δρητο or δρητο, having come down to us only as a various reading of Zenodotus for $\delta\rho\tilde{a}\tau\sigma$, cannot certainly with any propriety be admitted into Homer's text, as long as oparal and όρãσθαι 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 $\delta \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$, όρη, κοιμήτο, &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 μ . We should rather say that the infin. in $-\epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ being a sister-form of that in $-\epsilon \iota \nu$ may be supposed to exist in the contracted shape also, and as there is no other Epic sister-form for $-\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ and $-\tilde{\epsilon}\nu$ than that in $-\eta\mu\epsilon$ - $\nu \alpha \iota$, the natural supposition is that this belongs to the same contraction. There are instances enough in the Epic language of η used for $\epsilon\epsilon$, 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 by the old Attics, said $\xi \pi \lambda \eta \nu$, $\xi \phi \phi \eta \nu$, for $\xi \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, $\xi \phi \phi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$." At all events 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. And the infin. in - $\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ is proved to be pure Doric by $\dot{\alpha}\rho\iota\theta\mu\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ in Tim. Locr.- The imperfect generally used by Homer is (always without the augment) the 3. sing. act. opa, midd. oparo, and plur. ορῶντο.

[Homer has used this verb both in a contracted and resolved shape, as $\delta\rho\omega$, $\delta\rho\alpha$, $\delta\rho\alpha$, $\delta\rho\omega$, $\delta\rho\omega$, $\delta\rho\omega\sigma\alpha$, $\delta\rho\omega\mu\alpha$, $\delta\rho\alpha\tau\alpha$, $\delta\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha$, $\delta\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\sigma$, 3. sing. opt. $\delta\rho\omega\tau\sigma\sigma$, 3. plur. $\delta\rho\omega\sigma\sigma\sigma$, Hom. Epig. 14, 20.; again $\delta\rho\delta\omega$, $\delta\rho\delta\alpha\sigma$, $\delta\rho\delta\omega\nu$, $\delta\rho\delta\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha$, 2. plur. opt. $\delta\rho\delta\omega\tau\epsilon$, for $\delta\rho\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon$, $\delta\rho\omega\tau\epsilon$ (II. δ , 347.), $\delta\rho\delta\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha$, &c. — Passow.]

From the root OII- comes the Ion. perf. (2.) $\ddot{o}\pi\omega\pi\alpha$, never used by the Attic prose writers; and thence in the Od. we find the 3. sing. pluperf. $\dot{o}\pi\omega\pi\epsilon\iota$, in Herodot. $\dot{o}\pi\omega\pi\epsilon\epsilon$, 1, 68. 5, 92, 6. 7, 208., but at 3, 37. $\dot{o}\pi\omega\pi\epsilon\epsilon$ is a pure perfect: compare $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\theta\epsilon\epsilon$ under "E $\theta\omega$.

In the compounds $i \pi o' \psi o \mu a \iota$ must be distinguished from $i \pi \iota o' \psi o \mu a \iota$. The former is the common fut. of $i \phi o \rho \tilde{a} \nu$ occurring in Il. ξ , 145. Od. η , 324.; the latter has the particular sense of to select, choose, Il. ι , 167. Od. β , 294., which $i \phi o \rho \tilde{a} \nu$ never has. And it is a singular fact that of both forms we find an aor. 1. midd. (the simple being never used*), as

Œd. T. 1271. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 734.]

^{* [}Passow speaks of the aor. midd. ψάμην being merely a rare form, whence the 3. plur. opt. δψαιντο in Herm. Soph.

for instance, $\epsilon \pi \delta \psi a \tau o$, from $\epsilon \phi o \rho \tilde{\mu} \nu$, in Pind. Fr. 58. Bœckh.; and $\epsilon \pi \iota - \omega \psi a \tau o$, he chose, in an old Attic expression, for which see Piers. ad Mœr. v. $\epsilon \rho \delta \rho \phi o \rho o$.*

[']Ορέγω, I stretch out, reach out: fut. $\partial \rho \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$, &c. with accusative. Pass. and midd. I desire, with genitive; e.g. aor. 1. infin. midd. $\partial \rho \dot{\xi} \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota$, Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 15., aor. 1. pass. $\omega \rho \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \eta \nu$, ibid. 16.

In the poets the midd. occurs also in its proper meaning, I stretch myself out, or with $\pi \sigma \sigma \sigma i \nu$, $\chi \epsilon \rho \sigma i$, &c., I stretch out my feet, hands; in which sense is found also the perf. pass. $\partial \rho \omega \rho \epsilon \gamma \mu a \iota$, 3. plur. $\partial \rho \omega \rho \epsilon \chi a \tau a \iota$, II. π , 834., and 3. plur. pluperf. $\partial \rho \omega \rho \epsilon \chi a \tau \sigma \iota$, II. λ , 26.

^{*}Ορνυμι⁺, I raise, excite, put in motion : fut. ὅρσω; aor. 1. ὅρσα, part. ὅρσας, and frequently in Hom. the Ionic aor. ὅρσασκε for ὅρσε. Midd. ὅρνυμαι, I raise myself, rise up; imperf. ὡρνύμην; aor. 2. ὡρόμην, or more frequently by syncope (ὅρμην), 3. sing. ὅρτο, imper. ὅρσο, Epic ὅρσεο (like ἀείσεο, λέξεο ‡), contracted ὅρσευ, Il., 3. sing. conj. ὅρηται, Od., infin. ὅρθαι § for ὀρέσθαι; part. ὀρμένος for ὀρόμενος: for an account of these syncopated forms see ἕγεντο under Γείνομαι.

I know of no authority for the fut. midd. $\delta\rho\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$, instead of which Homer has (from a fut. 2. $\partial\rho\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$) the 3. sing. $\partial\rho\epsilon\sigma\alpha$ (II. v, 140.); but the various reading $\delta\rho\eta\tau\alpha$ as aor. 2. conj. may very well be preferred to the future.

With the above are joined two reduplicated forms:

 ὄρωρα, a perf. belonging to the immediate meaning of the middle, *I am risen up.* Of this form Homer has only the 3. sing. ὄρωρε, conj. *δρώρη*; pluperf. *δρώρει* and *ὦρώρει*, Il. σ, 498.

2. ($\[mu]{\omega}\rho\rho\rho\nu$) $\[mu]{\omega}\rho\rho\rho\epsilon\nu$, aor. 2. with redupl. according to the analogy of $\[mu]{\eta}\rho\alpha\rho\epsilon\nu$, $\[mu]{\kappa}\alpha\chi\epsilon\nu$, &c.; see note on $\[mu]{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ under "Ay ω . Like $\[mu]{\eta}\rho\alpha\rho\epsilon\nu$ it has generally a causative meaning and is therefore the same as the aor. 1. $\[mu]{\omega}\rho\sigma\alpha$: but like that perfect it has sometimes the immediate meaning; and this was the foundation of an earlier opinion, according

* 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 Δv of *mporfhowres emolywara*," where the common reading is $\epsilon m \delta \psi \omega r \pi a$, but the best manuscript has $\epsilon m \delta \psi \omega r \pi a$, which is evidently a corruption of that old Attic and unusual form.

† [Homer forms his imper. from the verb in μ, δρυΰθι, δρυΐνε, but the rest of the pres. and the imperf. from $\delta \rho \nu \delta \omega$ (---).— Passow.] ‡ See άξετε, p. 7., έδύσετο under $\Delta i\omega$, and οίσε under Φέρω.

§ This perfectly regular form was for a long time ejected from Il. 3, 474. by δp - θa_i , because $\delta p \theta a_i$ was considered to be the perfect (see Heyne), the cause of the abbreviation being unknown. But Homer never uses the perf. $\delta p \mu a_i$, while he has the aor. $\delta p \sigma o$, $\delta p \sigma o$, $\delta p \mu e \sigma o$ frequently. The true reading $\delta p \theta a_i$ is now restored to the text from the most undoubted sources. to which $\breve{\omega}\rho\rho\rho\epsilon$ was supposed to be a perfect with the quantities transposed, which idea seemed also supported by II. ν , 78. Our $\nu \tilde{\nu} \nu \kappa \alpha i$ $\dot{\epsilon}\mu \partial \pi\epsilon \rho \partial \delta \delta \dot{\nu} \rho \alpha \tau \chi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \rho \epsilon \varsigma \ \ddot{\alpha} \alpha \pi \tau \rho \iota M \alpha \iota \mu \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$, $\kappa \alpha \ell \mu \rho \iota \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \varsigma \ \ddot{\omega} \rho \rho \rho \epsilon$, $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \theta \epsilon$ $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \sigma \sigma \dot{\nu}$ "E $\sigma \sigma \nu \mu \alpha \iota$. But as the a oristic meaning of this form is firmly established by analogy and usage, $\breve{\omega} \rho \rho \rho \epsilon$ must be understood here as well as elsewhere to indicate the moment of his courage being first roused, and indeed in this passage $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \rho \theta \eta$ might have been joined with the pres. and perf. quite as well as $\breve{\omega} \rho \rho \rho \epsilon$.

Beside the above Homer has from a perf. pass. $\partial\rho\omega\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ the 3. sing. $\partial\rho\omega\rho\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (Od. τ , 377. 524.) and the conj. $\partial\rho\omega\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ (II. ν , 271.). In the Epic language are three similar perfects $\partial\kappa\eta\chi\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, $\partial\rho\eta\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, $\partial\rho\omega\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$: and as from AX Ω , $\eta\kappa\alpha\chi\sigma\nu$ came a perf. pass. $\eta\kappa\alpha\chi\mu\alpha\iota$, so from $d\rho\eta\rho\alpha$ and $\delta\rho\omega\rho\alpha$ were formed $\partial\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, $\partial\rho\omega\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, and all three were smoothed off into their present shape according to the analogy of the formation in $\epsilon\omega$: thus the conj. $\partial\rho\omega\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ is quite as agreeable to analogy as $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, &c., is from $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta\mu\alpha\iota$.

Lastly, there is a difficult form $\delta \rho o \nu \tau a \iota$ in Od. ξ , 104. $i \pi \iota \delta' d \nu \epsilon \rho \epsilon \varsigma$ $i \sigma \theta \lambda o \iota \delta \rho o \nu \tau a \iota$, the herdsmen.... over the herds. Here the old Grammarians, as the meaning of the verb is not clear, supposed a separate verb $\delta \rho \rho \mu a \iota$ with the meaning I take care of; of which $\delta \rho o \nu \tau o$, at Od. γ , 471. (where the same phrase recurs) would be imperfect.⁺ But at Il. ψ , 112. we find in the same sense of an overlooker or superintending servant, $i \pi \iota \delta' d \nu \eta \rho i \sigma \theta \lambda \delta \varsigma \delta \rho \omega \rho \epsilon \iota$. I know of no other way to reconcile these passages, but to suppose a separate verb $\delta \rho \rho \mu a \iota$ synony-

* [Passow has given this verb a place in his Lexicon, and supposes it to be synonymous with δρυυμαι.]

Ορομαι (from olipos, δράω), I watch,

keep watch, Od. ξ , 104. Others place the verb in this passage under OP Ω , $\delta \rho \nu \nu \mu i$; but neither $\delta \rho \omega$ nor $\delta \rho \rho \mu \omega$ is ever found in actual usage, and the sense of the passage is contrary to it.]

^{+ [}Passow has the following article:

mous with $\partial \rho \delta \rho \mu a_i$; then $\delta \pi \delta \rho \rho \rho \mu a_i$ 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. $\delta \pi \lambda \dots \delta \rho \omega \rho \epsilon_i$ was substituted for it with the sense of, he had bestirred himself, had risen up (to accompany them). Thus in both passages the preposition $\delta \pi i$ gives of itself the idea of guard or protection.

'Ορύσσω, -ττω, Idig: fut. ὄρυξω, &c.; perf. (with Attic reduplication) ὀρώρϋχα; pluperf. ὀρωρύχειν; perf. pass. ὀρώρυγμαι, Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 7. MIDD. e. g. aor. 1. infin. ὀρύξασθαι, 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. $\tilde{\omega}\rho\nu-\gamma\mu\alpha_i$, of which we may see instances from the time of Polybius in Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 33. Whether we ought to suffer $\tilde{\omega}\rho\nu\kappa\tau\sigma$, 1, 186. and $\tilde{\omega}\rho\nu\kappa\tau\alpha_i$, 2, 158. to remain in the text of Herodotus, when we find $\hat{\omega}\rho\omega\rho\nu\kappa\tau\sigma$ only a few lines afterwards in the former passage, I will not venture to decide.

'Οσφραίνομαι, I smell (something): fut. ἀσφρήσομαι; aor. ἀσφρόμην: see note under Αἰσθάνομαι. [It is joined with. accus. in Herodot. 1, 80.'; in the later writers as Ælian, Lucian, &c., with genitive. — Passow.]

The pres. δσφρασθαι was also an Attic form, Antiphanes ap. Athen. p. 299. e., δσφρασαι, Lucian. Piscat. 48.

Instead of $\omega\sigma\phi\rho\delta\mu\eta\nu$ we find, but less frequently, $\omega\sigma\phi\rho\delta\mu\eta\nu$, whence $\ddot{\sigma}\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\nu\tau\sigma$, Herodot. 1, 80, 26.; see $\epsiloni\lambda\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ under $Ai\rho\epsilon\omega$ and $\epsilon\dot{\nu}\rho\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ from $E\dot{\nu}\rho\prime\sigma\kappa\omega$. The aor. 1. midd. $\omega\sigma\phi\rho\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ 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. $\dot{\sigma}\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\nu\theta\bar{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$, verbal adj. $\dot{\sigma}\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\nu\tau\dot{\sigma}c$, &c., and that in Aristotle.

[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 $\partial\sigma\phi\rho a(\nu\omega \tau \iota\nu \dot{a} \tau \iota\nu \iota, I give a person something to smell at, Lobeck$ ad Phryn. p. 468. But the presents, which have been erroneously $derived from aorists, as <math>\partial\sigma\phi\rho\omega$, $\partial\sigma\phi\rho\rho\omega$, $\partial\sigma\phi\rho\dot{a}\omega$, $\partial\sigma\phi\rho\dot{a}\omega$, and the like, are not Greek. — Passow.]

Ούλόμενος. See "Ολλυμι.

Ούνεσθε. See "Ονομαι.

regular no writer at say soperies

Ouρέω, mingo : imperf. (with syllabic augment) ἐού-

It only has an accuse of the cognitive word offind in same the

it has a sentice toggarto unpinter : The society in the

Οὐτάω, I wound: fut. οὐτήσω; aor. 1. οὕτησα; aor. 1. pass. οὐτήθην. The following Epic forms belong to a syncopated aorist with a short (like ἕκταν, ἕκτα; see ἕγνων under Γιγνώσκω), as 3. pers. sing. οὖτὰ, infin. οὐτάμεναι and οὐτάμεν, part. pass. οὐτάμενος. Beside the above Homer has the pres. οὐτάζω, with its aor. 1. οὕτᾶσα, and perf. pass. οὕτασμαι; also the imperf. οὕτασκε and οὐτήσασκε.

Οφείλω, I owe, I ought, I must: fut. ὀφειλήσω, &c. The aor. 2. ὤφελον is used only as a wish, as ૐφελον ποιῆσαι, Oh that I had done it! also with είθε and ώς: so ૐφελες, ὤφελε oh that thou hadst, that he had, &c.

There are some Ionic forms of the present which come immediately from $\partial \phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \omega$, as $\partial \phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon o \delta \sigma \eta$, $\partial \phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \epsilon$, Euseb. Philos. ap. Stob. S. 44. p. 309.

Homer uses $\partial \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ sometimes as a separate verb with the sense of *I* increase, enlarge, sometimes as synonymous with $\partial \phi \epsilon \lambda \omega$.[‡]

The form $\[delta]\phi\epsilon\lambda\rho\nu$, $-\epsilon_{\zeta}$, $-\epsilon$ (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. $\[delta]\phi\epsilon$, $\lambda o\nu$, $-\epsilon_{\zeta}$, $-\epsilon_{\zeta}$; and in this form as well as in the other the Epics doubled the λ whenever the metre required it, as $\[delta]\phi\epsilon\lambda\rho\nu$, $\[delta]\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\rho\nu$, $\[delta]\phi\epsilon\lambda\rho\nu$, $\[delta]$

* This verb, like $\dot{\omega}\theta\epsilon\omega$ and $\dot{\omega}\nu\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, took the syllabic augment instead of the temporal; thus, $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\omega\dot{\rho}\sigma\nu\nu$, Demosth. c. Conon. init., $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\nu\sigma\mu\kappa\dot{\sigma}\tau\alpha$ s, Aristoph. Lys., $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\dot{\nu}\rho\epsilon\iota$, Lucian. Conviv. 35. Compare $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\alpha$ under Eiko.

 \dagger Obp $\hat{p}\nu$ is joined by the Grammarians Gaza and Chrysoloras (see Fisch. 1. p. 127.) with $\pi\epsilon\nu\hat{p}\nu$ and $\partial_{\nu}\hat{p}\hat{p}\nu$ as an acknowledged form; we may therefore be sure that they had precedents for it from the older Grammarians. ‡ That this verb is sometimes written in Homer $\delta\phi\epsilon i\lambda\omega$ (II. λ . 686. 688. 698.), and sometimes $\delta\phi\epsilon \lambda\omega$ (II. τ . 200. Od. γ , 367. ϑ , 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 $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$; consequently the three verses in II. λ . ought properly to be written the same as the others. Of $\ddot{o}\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$, *I* increase, there is in Homer an anomalous 3. sing. opt. $\dot{o}\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$, II. π , 651. Od. β , 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 subject 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 $\ddot{o}\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$ can be no other than $\ddot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha$, opt. $\dot{o}\phi\epsilon\dot{\iota}\epsilon\nu$; and it is not at all improbable that the Rhapsodists, who had but an obscure feeling of analogy, being reminded by this form of the meaning of $\dot{o}\phi\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda\omega$, might have altered it to the clearer but less analogous $\dot{o}\phi\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$.*

'Οφλισκάνω, I am guilty (of a crime), incur (as a punishment): fut. $\partial \phi \lambda \eta \sigma \omega$; perf. $\omega \phi \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$; aor. $\omega \phi \lambda \delta \nu$, infin. $\partial \phi \lambda \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$, part. $\partial \phi \lambda \omega \nu$, Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 689. and Eurip. Heracl. 985.

A pres. $\delta\phi\lambda\omega$ is nowhere found, and wherever $\tilde{\omega}\phi\lambda\sigma\nu$ occurs, it presupposes a juridical decision or something equivalent to have already taken place; while $\delta\phi\lambda\iota\sigma\kappa\acute{a}\nu\omega$, $\dot{\omega}\phi\lambda\acute{a}\kappa\acute{a}\nu\sigma\nu$ represents the investigation 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 $\delta\phi\lambda\iota\sigma\kappa\acute{a}\nu\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega\tau a$, he incurs laughter, makes himself ridiculous, and the like. Bekker was therefore quite right in accenting $\delta\phi\lambda\epsiloni\nu$ for $\delta\phi\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ according to the reading of the best manuscripts in Plat. Alcib. I. 35. (p. 121. b.): but with regard to $\delta\phi\lambda\acute{u}\nu$ for $\delta\phi\lambda\omega\nu$ we must not decide too hastily: compare $\Pi\epsilon\phi\nu\omega\nu$. The aor. 1. $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\phi\lambda\eta\sigma a\iota$ (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 remarkable is that of the 3. pers. of the imperf. $\epsilon\epsilon$ for ϵ in three verbs, $\ddot{\epsilon}\psi\epsilon\epsilon$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsiloni\chi\epsilon\epsilon$, $\ddot{\omega}\phi\lambda\epsilon\epsilon$, Herodot. 1, 48. 1, 118. 8, 26. See also $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\theta\epsilon\epsilon$ under "E $\theta\omega$.

It is clear that $\delta\phi\lambda\sigma\nu$ is properly the aor. of $\partial\phi\epsilon\lambda\omega$ according to the analogy of $\eta\gamma\rho\epsilon\tau\sigma$ and $\eta\lambda\theta\sigma\nu$; and that the other forms for this particular meaning were framed after it.

* If all the above suppositions are correct, it will follow that there was an old verb $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$, imperf. $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$, aor. 1. $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$ 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 $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\omega$.

 \dagger Some verbs have a pres. both in $-\sigma\kappa\omega$ and $-d\nu\omega$, as $d\mu\beta\lambda/\sigma\kappa\omega$, $d\mu\beta\lambda/\sigma\kappad\nu\omega$: see $d\lambda\delta\sigma\kappaa\nu$ under ' $\lambda\lambda\delta\sigma\kappa\omega$: but in $\delta\phi\lambda$ - $\sigma\kappad\nu\omega$ no other present is in use than the one thus doubly strengthened by combining both terminations.

0 3

Π.

Παίζω, I sport, joke: fut. παίξομαι and παιξοῦμαι; whence the later writers formed an aor. 1. ἔπαιξα, perf. pass. πέπαιγμαι, &c.; but in the Ionic and pure Attic dialect the aor. 1. is always ἔπαισα and the perf. pass. πέπαισμαι^{*}, notwithstanding their similarity to the same tenses in παίω.

[This verb does not occur at all in the Iliad; but in the Odyssey we find (beside the pres. and imperf.) the imperat. aor. $\pi \alpha i \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon$, Od. 9, 251. On the other hand the later writers, as Plutarch, &c., have the regular Dor. aor. infin. $\pi \alpha i \xi \alpha \iota$; the aor. 1. pass. $i \pi \alpha i \chi \theta \eta \nu$; perf. act. $\pi i \pi \alpha i \chi \alpha$, perf. pass. $\pi i \pi \alpha i \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 240. — Passow.]

Παίω, *I strike*, is regular. The pass. takes σ .—MIDD. as aor. 1. $\frac{2}{\sigma}$ παίσατο, Xen.

The Attics have another fut. $\pi \alpha i \eta' \sigma \omega$, which is more in use than the regular one, Aristoph. Nub. 1125. Lys. 459.

Παλαίω, I wrestle, struggle: fut. παλαίσω; aor. 1. ἐπάλησα, whence 3. sing. opt. παλήσειε, Herodot. 8, 21. where however one manuscript has παλαίσειεν. The pass. takes σ .

Πάλλω, I shake, swing: aor. 1. ἔπηλα, Soph. El. 710. Pass. aor. 2.

Homer has also the aor. 2. act. with the reduplication in the compound part. $\dot{a}\mu\pi\epsilon\pi a\lambda\dot{\omega}\nu$: and the syncop. aor. 2. midd. $\pi\dot{a}\lambda\tau\sigma$, II. o, 645. In Callimachus 1. 64. we find the aor. 1. midd. infin. $\pi\eta\lambda a\sigma\theta ac$.

Πάομαι, *I acquire*, occurs only in its aor. 1. $i \pi \bar{a} \sigma \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \dot{a} \sigma a \sigma \theta \alpha i$; and perf. $\pi i \pi \bar{a} \mu \alpha i^{\dagger}$, 3. sing. pluperf. $\pi i \pi \bar{a} \tau o$. This verb was used exactly like κτάομαι, κέκτημαι. 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 $\pi a \tau i o \mu a \iota$, (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 σ .[‡]

‡ 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.

^{*} See Πιέζω.

⁺ A false reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \mu$, as also $\pi \sigma \lambda \nu \pi \alpha \mu \mu \omega \nu$, is now banished from the printed text. Compare the subst. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \mu \alpha$, $\kappa \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$.

Πάσσω, Att. πάττω, I strew, sprinkle, besprinkle: fut. πάσω (~-); perf. pass. πέπασμαι. — MIDD. See Πλάσσω and 'Αρμόττω.

Some of the forms of this verb are written the same as those of $\pi a \tau \epsilon_{0 \mu \alpha \iota}$.

Πάσχω^{*}, I suffer: fut. πείσομαι as the fut. midd. of πείθω; perf. 2. πέπονθα (from the stem ΠΕΝΘ- as seen in the subst. πένθος); aor. 2. ἔπαθον. Verbal adj. παθητός. †

Beside the above, we find the following old sister-forms; in Od. ρ , 555. a fem. perf. part. $\pi\epsilon\pi\ddot{\alpha}\theta\nu\ddot{\imath}a$, which supposes a perf. $\pi\epsilon\pi\eta\theta a$ according to the analogy of $\dot{a}\rho a\rho\nu\ddot{\imath}a$ and others under 'A $\rho a\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$: and in Æschyl. Agam. 1635. in the Iambics the aor. 1. part. $\pi\dot{\eta}\sigma a\varsigma$ (from an aor. $\check{\epsilon}\pi\eta\sigma a$). The fut. $\pi\dot{\eta}\sigma a\rho\mu a\iota$ is uncertain. \ddagger

We find also in Homer a syncopated perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon$ for $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \nu \theta a \tau \epsilon$, like $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \sigma \rho \theta \epsilon$ for $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \delta \rho a \tau \epsilon$, by an imitation of the passive termination: that is to say, as soon as in $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \nu \theta a \tau \epsilon$ the θ preceded the τ , it was changed to σ (as $\delta \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \sigma \tau \epsilon$) and the ν was dropped, making $\pi \epsilon - \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon$; a transition was then made to a passive form $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon$.

Πατάσσω, I strike, is regular: it was used by the Attics in the active voice only. See Πλήσσω.

 $\Pi_{a\tau\epsilon\omega}$, *I tread*, is regular. The pres. pass. accidentally coincides with the following verb.

Πατέομαι, I taste, eat, an Ion. depon. midd. : aor. 1. ἐπασάμην, infin. πάσασθαι; perf. πέπασμαι. That these forms belong to each other is proved by the identity of usage (e. g. Herodot. 1, 73. and 2, 47. ἐπάσαντο and πατέονται τῶν κρεῶν), as well as by the exact analogy of δατεῖσθαι, δάσασθαι.

Παύω, I cause to cease, stop: fut. παύσω; aor. 1. ἐπαυσα, &c.: there are no traces of a perfect. Midd. παύομαι, I cease: fut. πεπαύσομαιξ; perf. pass. πέπαυμαι, I have ceased, i. e. I no longer continue to do so; aor. 1. midd. ἐπαυσάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐπαύθην and ἐπαύσθην];

* Dæderlein has a very good remark, that while from $\Pi A \Theta$ - is formed $\pi \acute{a} - \sigma \kappa \omega$ by affixing the termination $-\sigma \kappa \omega$, the aspiration of the θ , which disappears, is thrown on the κ , making $\pi \acute{a} \sigma \chi \omega$.

thrown on the κ , making $\pi d\sigma \chi \omega$. \dagger The fut. $\pi \alpha \theta h \sigma \omega$, which is quoted by the old Grammarians, rests on a false separation of $\epsilon \partial \pi \alpha \theta h \sigma \omega$. t 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 παύσομαι,

§ [The regular fut, midd. is $\pi a \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \mu a$, but the purer Attic writers prefer $\pi \epsilon \pi a \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \mu a$, Soph. Ant. 91. Piers. ad Mcer. p. 293.— Passow.]

|| [There is said to have been also an o 4

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 $\pi a \tilde{v} o v$: and there is one instance mentioned of the aor. $\tilde{\varepsilon} \pi a v \sigma a$ in this same sense, viz. Od. δ , 659. $M \nu \eta \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \rho \varepsilon_{\varsigma} \delta' \, \check{a} \mu v \delta \varepsilon \kappa \dot{a} \theta - \iota \sigma a v \kappa a \cdot \pi a \tilde{v} \sigma a v \dot{a} \dot{\epsilon} \theta \lambda \omega v$, but the excellent Cod. Vindob. 56. has $M \nu \eta - \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \rho a \varsigma$, 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.

Πείθω, I persuade: fut. πείσω; aor. 1. έπεισα †; perf. πέπεικα. Pass. πείθομαι, I am persuaded, I believe, obey: fut. midd. πείσομαι; perf. pass. πέπεισμαι, I have been convinced, therefore I believe firmly: aor. 1. ἐπείσθην: to which we may add the perf. 2. πέποιθα, generally with the intransitive sense, I trust.

In II. β , 341. δ , 159. we find a syncop. 1. plur. pluperf. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \pi i \theta \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \pi i \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$. In this form, as in $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu$ from $\kappa \rho a \zeta \omega$, $\epsilon i \lambda \eta \lambda o \nu - \theta \mu \epsilon \nu$ from $\epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \upsilon \theta a$ under "E $\rho \chi \rho \mu a \iota$, and several others, every thing between the root and the termination is dropped: and as some of these perfects ($\kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho a \gamma a$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \iota \theta a$, &c.) have the force of a pres., they have also an imperative ending in $\theta \iota$, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho a \chi \theta \iota$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \iota$, Æschyl. Eum. 602., in which latter the diphthong of the root is retained.

Poetry has also (see the Indexes of Aristoph. and Eurip.) the aor. 2. act. $\check{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\,o\nu$, $\pi\iota\theta\check{\omega}\nu$, for $\check{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma a$, &c., and an aor. 2. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\acute{\omega}\mu\nu$, $\pi\iota\thetao\nu$, $\pi\iota\theta\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta a\iota$, for $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, &c. The Epic language never uses the act. aor. without the redupl. $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\sigma\iota\mu$, &c.; but in the midd. it has the usual $\pi\iota\theta\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta a\iota$. The reduplicated form of the midd. (at least in the only passage where it occurs) belongs as to meaning to $\pi\epsilon\pi\sigma\iota\theta a$, e. g. $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\sigma\iota\theta$ ' $\check{\epsilon}\tilde{\varphi}$ a $\dot{\nu}\tau\sigma\tilde{\nu}$ $\vartheta\nu\mu\tilde{\varphi}$, Il. κ , 204.; as does the act. $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\dot{\omega}\nu$, Pind. Isth. 4, 122.‡

From this aor. 2. arose again other active forms, as fut. $\pi\epsilon\pi$ i θ i/ $\sigma\omega$, and π i θ i/ $\sigma\omega$, aor. 1. $\epsilon\pi$ i θ i/ $\sigma\alpha$, and part. π i θ i/ $\sigma\alpha$; but with this difference.

aor. $\epsilon \pi \alpha \eta \nu$, Chœroboscus A B. 3. p. 1324. - Passow.] † [Of this tense Homer has only the opt. πείσειε, Od. ξ. 123. — Passow.]

‡ Bœckh says the same of the simple aor. part. $\pi\iota\theta\omega\nu$, Pyth. 3, 28. (50.), but I cannot subscribe to his opinion.

^{*} It must be observed, however, that even in Thucydides (2, 77, 5, 91, 100.) the reading $\pi a u \theta \eta \nu a \iota$ has been restored from the best manuscripts.

that $\pi \epsilon \pi \iota \theta \eta \sigma \omega$ has the meaning of to persuade, but $\pi \iota \theta \eta \sigma \omega$, $\pi \iota \theta \eta \sigma \omega$, the intransitive sense of $\pi \epsilon \ell \theta \circ \mu \omega$ and $\pi \epsilon \pi \circ \iota \theta a$, 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 $\pi \epsilon \pi o i \theta \omega_{S}$ and $\pi i \theta \eta \sigma a_{S}$ would be used in many passages indifferently, without distinction of sense or metre. Now it should be observed, that $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta \omega \varsigma$, of which the established meaning has always been, trusting to, relying on, fretus, never occurs in any other sense ; as νηυσί, λαοῖς, χείρεσσι, ἀλκὶ, ποδωκείησι. $\pi \epsilon \pi o i \theta \omega_{\rm S}$, &c.: while we cannot but feel, that in opposition to these the following two passages, φρεσί λευγαλέησι πιθήσας, Il. 1, 119., and avaιδείηφι πιθήσας, Hes. ε, 357., express a very different idea, viz. 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; e. g. $\pi_i \theta'_{\eta \sigma \epsilon_i \varsigma}$, thou wilt obey, Od. ϕ , 369. In the same way when at II. δ , 398. Tydeus, having slain all the Thebans (who lay in wait for him), excepting Mæon, spares him alone, θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας, it is quite clear that he does it "in obedience to the signs of the gods." When, however, at ζ, 183., Bellerophon attacks and kills the terrible Chimæra, and the same expression is used, GEWV TEPáETOU TIBήJOAS, the word can mean nothing more than trusting to, confiding in. But we find in the same sense at II. μ , 256. speaking of the Trojans attacking the Grecian walls, Tounter di (i. e. of Jupiter,) τεράεσσι πεποιθότες: which passage alone makes it very probable that $\pi \epsilon \pi o i \theta \omega_{\varsigma}$ was also the original reading in the other, viz. ζ, 183. And this supposition is strengthened by II. v, 369. Od. ϕ , 315. where our text reads $\pi i \theta \eta \sigma a_{\beta}$ in the same sense of trusting to, but the manuscripts actually have the various reading $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta \omega \varsigma$. 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 $\pi\epsilon\pi\sigma\iota\theta\omega_{\rm S}$ was also the original reading in Il. λ , 235. ρ , 48. χ , 107., and Hes. ϵ , 669.

Πείκω, I shear, comb: fut. πέξω, &c. Compare the Ion. δέξω from δείκνυμι. — MIDD. In the Attic language the pres. πεκτέω was in use.*

* As the verb occurs but seldom, (in the former sense $\kappa\epsilon i\rho\epsilon \nu$ is more usual, in the latter $\kappa \tau \epsilon \nu i (\xi \epsilon \nu)$, $\xi a i \nu \epsilon \nu$,) little can be said with any certainty on the use of its forms. Whether $\pi \epsilon \kappa \omega$ is ever found I know not. Stephens has $\pi \epsilon \kappa \delta \mu \epsilon \nu c \nu$ $\delta \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha$, but without giving the passage from which he has taken it. The Epics have $\pi \epsilon i \kappa \omega$, $\pi \epsilon \xi \omega$, &c.; and this is the only formation which occurs. That the old Grammarians also considered $\pi \epsilon i \kappa \omega$ as the pres. of $\pi \epsilon \xi \omega$, is clear from Schol. Theor. 5, 98. Etym. M. vv. πέσκοs and πείκω (p. 667, 40.), Etym. Gud. v. πείκω (p. 456.). Aristophanes has πεκτεῦν and πεκτοῦμενον: but whether πέκτειν or πεκτεῖν is doubtful. In Pollux 7. c. 33, 1. we find πέκτειν as a pres. of πέξατο, but through a misunderstanding the text of our editions has πέκειν. See Jungermann's note. Thus we see that the simple stem πέκω was strengthened by the Attics to πέκτω, which again was changed to πεκτῶ, like βίπτω to βιπτῶ. Πεινάω, *I hunger*: fut. πεινήσω, &c. This verb, like διψάω, ζάω, &c., has both in the Attic and common dialect an η, as infin. πεινῆν, διψῆν, &c. We find also ζῆς, ζῆ, ἔζη, πεινῆς, χρῆται, δίψητε, so that in these forms the indic. and conj. are the same.

Πειράω, *I try*, is regular, with α long, Ion. η, 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 $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\dot{a}\zeta\omega$ with a frequentative meaning, to try, to prove, which again became common in the language of the later writers, while the Attics always used $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\ddot{a}\nu$ only. The passive with the σ belongs entirely to this later $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\dot{a}-\zeta\omega$. The form $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ may come also from $\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\nu\omega$. See $\Pi\epsilon\rho\dot{a}\omega$.

Πέκω, πεκτέω. See Πείκω.

Πελάζω, *I approach*, is regular. The Attic fut. $\pi \epsilon \lambda \tilde{q} \nu$ 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. $\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}\zeta\rho\mu a$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ takes the immediate sense, which the active has in the common language. Homer has $\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}\zeta\omega$ in the older meaning only, succeeding poets in both.

The sister-form $\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}\omega^*$ occurs as a present in Hymn. Bacch. 44. $\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}q\nu$. The poetical aor. $\epsilon\pi\lambda\dot{a}\theta\eta\nu$ used by the Attics, and the verbal adj. $\epsilon\pi\lambda\bar{a}\tau o_{2}$ 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 $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\bar{a}\kappa a$ from $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{a}\omega$, $\pi\epsilon \pi\rho\bar{a}\kappa a$ from $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{a}\omega$, &c. And in the same way we must explain in the Epics, 1. the perf. pass. $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\mu a\iota$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\mu\epsilon\nu o_{2}$, Od. μ , 108., and 2. the aor. $\epsilon\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$, $\pi\lambda\bar{\eta}\tau o^{\dagger}$; that is to say, as syncopated forms from $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\dot{\kappa}\lambda\dot{a}\mu a\iota$, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$, like $\epsilon\kappa\tau\dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$ under $K\tau\epsilon\epsilon\prime\nu\omega$. Here therefore a contraction takes place, as it does in the similar case of $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\bar{a}\kappa a$ (under $K\epsilon\rho\dot{a}\nu\nu\nu\mu\mu$), Ion. into η , Att. in \bar{a} . \ddagger We find also frequently $\epsilon\pi\lambda\dot{a}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, but this is indisputably through the common fault of corrupting the θ

* Wherever we find in the common language a verb in $-d\zeta\omega$, which is not admissible in the hexameter, the Epics generally use a sister-form in $-d\omega$.

† This aor. must not be confounded with $\epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \mu \eta \nu$ under Π $(\mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu$.

t According to general analogy, this

contraction should take place in both dialects in η ; for the α in $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho \bar{\alpha} \kappa \alpha$ arises from the influence of the ρ . Perhaps, therefore, the Atticism in this verb was only to avoid a similarity with $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, particularly in $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$ mentioned at the top of the next page. of the aor. 1. pass. into $\sigma\theta$; for it cannot be supposed that beside $i \pi \lambda \delta \theta \eta \nu$ and $i \pi \epsilon \lambda \delta \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ 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 $\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\theta\omega$, 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 α .

A pres. $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ (for $\pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$) is also supposed, on account of $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\epsilon}$ πλαζε, Od. λ, 583., and the particip. προσπλάζον, Il. μ , 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, Il. ϕ , 269., where the wave that is approaching Achilles πλάζ' ὤμους καθύπερθεν. Hence some of the commentators understand this last also to be for $\pi i \lambda \alpha \zeta \epsilon$, although here the context makes it far less probable. In addition to this we must observe that the common $\pi\lambda\dot{a}\zeta\omega$, $-\dot{a}\gamma\xi\omega$ 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 $\pi\lambda\dot{a}\zeta\omega$ 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 $\pi\lambda\dot{a}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta a$, to wander about.

Another Epic sister-form is made by changing -aw into -νάω, -νημι, and the ε of the root into ι, as πελάω, πίλνημι, πίλναμαι: see κίρνημι from κεράω in note under Κεράννυμι.

Πέλω and more frequently πέλομαι, *I* am, an old verb which remained in use among the Dorics (πέλει, πέλη, 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. ἕπλε; 2. sing. imperf. midd. ἕπλεο, contr. ἕπλευ; 3. sing. ἕπλετο.* And here we find this peculiarity, that the imperfect passive has very commonly the meaning of the present, as II. a, 418. ζ , 434.

To the above verb belong the Epic participles $i\pi i\pi\lambda \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$, $\pi \epsilon \rho i\pi\lambda \delta - \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma^{\dagger}$, in what appears to be the original meaning, *I am employed about*, prevail amongst, versor, and with the same syncope: as in Od. ν , 60. (old age and death,) $i\pi^{\dagger} a \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o i \sigma i \pi \epsilon \lambda o \nu \tau a i (i \pi i \pi \epsilon \lambda o \nu \tau a i)$, pre-

† Euphorion indeed (ap. Tzetz. ad Lycophr. 494.) has the simple πλόμενος.

^{* [}Homer has also a 2. sing, imperf. midd. $\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma$, Il. χ , 433. and in Hes. Fr. 22, 4. is the 3. sing. $\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\sigma$.— Passow.]

vail among men, frequentant, versantur; in which sense Homer elsewhere uses $\pi\omega\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, $i\pi\iota\pi\omega\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, which is therefore the only instance of the termination $-\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ having the change of vowel to ω .

Πέμπω, *I* send: fut. πέμψω; aor. 1. ἔπεμψα; perf. πέπομφα.* In the passive Pindar and Herodotus have the aor. 1. part. πεμφθείς, and Photius the part. perf. πεπεμμένος. The other tenses are generally supplied by ἀποστέλλω.

ΠΕΝΘ-. See Πάσχω.

Πένομαι, I am poor: in Hom. I labour, and transit. I prepare by labour, δαῖτα, &c. It is used only in pres. and imperf.

Πεπαρεΐν or Πεπορεΐν — and Πέπρωμαι. See Πορεΐν. Πέποσθε. See Πάσχω. Πέπρωμαι, &c. See Πορεΐν. Πέπτω. See Πέσσω.

Περάω, I go over, pass over or through : fut. περάσω, Ion. περήσω; aor. 1. ἐπέρασα, Ion. ἐπέρησα. This verb is regular, with a long, Ion. η.

Different from the above is an inflexion with a short, $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}-\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigmaa$, 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 $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{\omega}$, infin. $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{\alpha}\nu$ is in this sense a future. Hence comes the verb in common use $\pi\iota\pi\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega$ with the subst. $\pi\rho\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\iota$. 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 $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{\alpha}\nu$ is to go over, and it governs as a transitive the accusative of the space to be passed, as $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{\alpha}\nu \tau\dot{\eta}\nu$ $S\dot{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$; but it may also be 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 $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ and its derivatives meant only to sell, while $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$ retained only the sense of to pass over, with the single exception of $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\varsigma$ in Homer, for which see $\Pi\iota\pi\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omega$.

* Like κέκλοφα from κλέπτω, and τέτροφα from τρέπω; see note under Κλέπτω.

+ I have not yet found any certain instances of this meaning in its strict and proper sense; for in the Hymn. Merc. 133. (see Hermann) the reading is not sure; and $\pi\epsilon\rho\tilde{\mu}\nu$ $\pi\delta\delta a$, Eurip. Hec. 53. is like $\beta a(\nu\epsilon\nu\nu \pi\delta\delta a, for which see Ba(\nu\omega)$. With these verbs we must compare a third, $\pi \epsilon \rho a i \nu \omega$, from $\pi \epsilon \rho a c$, an end, (consequently with the meaning of to complete,) which is regular and takes a long in the aor., $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \bar{a} \nu a$, Ion. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \nu a$. Perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho a \rho \mu a$, 3. sing. $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho a \nu \tau a$, and on account of the metre $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a i \nu \omega$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho a \nu \tau a$, Od. μ , 37. Soph. Trach. 581.*

Πέρδω, more generally πέρδομαι, pedo: aor. 2. ἔπαρδον; fut. παρδήσομαι; perf. πέπορδα.

In Aristoph. Vesp. 394. $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\pi\alpha\rho\delta\tilde{\omega}$ is accented falsely. It must be $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\pi\dot{\alpha}\rho\delta\omega$ as aor. 2. conj.; for this conjunctive, after the particles $o\dot{v}$ $\mu\dot{\eta}$, has the force of a future, even when it is joined in a sentence with real futures.

Πέρθω, I lay waste : fut. πέρσω; aor. 1. ἔπερσα; aor. 2. ἔπρἄθον[†], infin. πράθεῖν, poet. πράθέειν. Homer has also a fut. pass. πέρσομαι, Il. ω, 729., and a syncopated aor. (but only in the infin.) πέρθαι, which is to be explained by ἐπέρθμην, infin. πέρθ-θαι, and dropping the θ πέρθαι, like δέχθαι. The perf. act. πέπορθα is post-Homeric.

Πεσείν. See Πίπτω.

Πέσσω, πέττω, $I \operatorname{cook}$: fut. πέψω, &c.; perf. pass. πέπεμμαι, infin. πεπέφθαι. The pres. πέπτω which corresponds with this formation, is found in the later writers.

That HEH- is the simple stem or root is clear from some of the derivatives, as $\pi \epsilon \pi \omega \nu$, $a \rho \tau \sigma \sigma \delta \sigma \sigma c$: and the change from π to $\sigma \sigma$ or $\tau \tau$ is found also in $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \sigma$ for $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \pi \omega$: compare $\phi \delta \sigma \sigma \sigma$ the fem. of $\phi \delta \psi$, &c., as well as Kœn. ad Greg. Æol. 42., and Buttm. Lexilog. p. 126.

Πετάννυμι, οr πεταννύω, I spread wide, open: fut. πετάσω (ǎ); aor. 1. ἐπέτᾶσα, Ερ. πέτασσα, &c. Perf. pass. by syncope πέπτᾶμαι; but aor. 1. pass. ἐπετάσθην.

The Att. fut. $\pi\epsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$, &c., was generally preferred to $\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{a}\sigma\omega$: 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 present, e. g. $\grave{a}\nu a\pi\epsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\sigma a\iota$ (for $\grave{a}\nu a\pi\epsilon\tau a\nu\nu\tilde{\upsilon}\sigma a\iota$, Lucian. de Calumn. 21. The perf. pass. $\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{e}\tau a\sigma\mu a\iota$ occurs in its compound $\grave{e}\kappa\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{e}\tau a\sigma\tau a\iota$ in an oracle of Herodot. 1, 62., and in $\grave{a}\nu a\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{e}\tau a\sigma\tau a\iota$, 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, $\grave{e}\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{a}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ under that verb; Parmenides (Fragm. v. 18.) had a part.

* [Hermann doubts the admissibility of this Epic form in an Attic poet, and prefers reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon i \rho a \pi \alpha \iota$. — Passow.] † In this aor. as in $\delta \delta \rho \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu$ from $\delta \delta \rho \kappa \omega$, the natural length of the middle syllable is removed by transposing the letters. For the form $\pi(\tau\nu\eta\mu$, $\pi(\tau\nu\dot{\alpha}\omega)$, see $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$ in note under K $\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\nu\nu\nu\mu$, and the end of the article on $\Pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$. Schneider in his Lexicon quotes the following authorities for it; viz. $\pi(\tau\nu\alpha)$ for $\dot{\epsilon}\pi(\tau\nu\alpha)$, imperf. of $\pi(\tau\nu\dot{\alpha}\omega)$, Π . ϕ , 7., $\pi(\tau\nu\dot{\alpha}\omega)$, part. pres. of $\pi(\tau\nu\eta\mu)$, Od. λ , 392., $\pi(\tau\nu\alpha\nu)$ 3. plur. for $\dot{\epsilon}\pi(\tau\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\nu)$, Pind. Nem. 5, 20. In Hes. Scut. 291. the reading of $\ddot{\epsilon}\pi(\tau\nu\sigma\nu)$ from $\pi(\tau\nu\omega)$ is doubtful, and Gaisford reads $\ddot{\epsilon}\pi(\tau\pi\lambda)\sigma\nu$. Schneider improperly confounds this verb with $\pi(\tau\nu\dot{\epsilon}\omega)$, $\pi(\tau\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu)$, a sister-form of $\pi(\pi\tau\omega)$: see the latter.

Πέτομαι, I fly, depon. midd. : fut. πετήσομαι, Hom. and Aristoph. Pac. 77. 1126., but in Attic prose generally πτήσομαι; syncop. aor. 2. ἐπτόμην, infin. πτέσθαι.*

In addition to the above, which according to the Atticists are the only legitimate forms in Attic prose, we find also frequently a pres. $i\pi\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ with the aor. 1. $i\pi\tau\alpha'\mu\eta\nu$, infin. $\pi\tau\alpha'\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$; and in an active form the aor. $i\pi\tau\eta\nu$, infin. $\pi\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$, part. $\pi\tau\alpha'\varsigma$.

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.† The aor. $i\pi\tau \dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$ 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.‡: 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 $\pi\tau i\sigma\theta a\iota$, $\pi\tau i\rho\mu\nu occ$, &c. The form $i\pi\tau\eta\nu$ 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 $\pi \epsilon \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\pi \epsilon \tau \alpha \delta \mu \alpha \iota$ used in the later prose; in which they are free from all suspicion, as even the pass. aor.

* [Passow adds the perf. act. $\pi \ell \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$: 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 $\Delta \pi \epsilon$. πτατο for ἀφίπτατο in the former of the two passages. But as Lucian will not once allow the form iπτατo to be μετοικικόν, this emendation does not appear to me too bold.

‡ Hermann's opinion on Soph. Œd. T. 17., that $\pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a$ is an imperf., still wants the necessary proofs : in the passage itself the sense of the imperfect is by no means decisive. έπετάσθην (for ἐπτόμην), notwithstanding its identity with the aor. pass. of πετάννυμι, occurs in it, e. g. Aristot. H. A. 9, 40. (9, 27, 5. Schneid.) and in Lucian. Rhet. Præcept. 6. For the form πέταμαι there is older authority in the poets; for πέταται is found not only in Pindar, but also in the chorus and the anapæsts of the dramatic poets*; and Anacreon has the infin. πέτασθαι and the 2. sing. πέτασσαι.[†]

Lastly come the forms with the change of vowel to o or ω according to the analogy of φέρω and φορέω, τρέμω and τρομέω, or στρέφω and στρώφαω, τρέχω and τρωχάω, and others mentioned under $\Delta \hat{\epsilon} \mu \omega$; in which however it must be observed that this is the only verb with the formation in $-\dot{\alpha}\omega$ which changes the vowel to o: for the principal form, used also by the Attic poets, is $\pi o \tau \acute{a} o \mu \alpha \iota$ ($\pi o \tau \tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha \iota$, $\pi o \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha \iota$), which in the Epics takes the formation in $-\epsilon \omega$, but only in a resolved shape, as $\pi \sigma \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \tau \alpha \iota$; and when the metre requires, it has an ω in the stem or root, as $\pi\omega\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu\tau\sigma$. Of the further formation of this verb we find the Doric forms πεπόταμαι, Eurip. Hippol. 564., and ἐποτάθην, Aristoph. Av. 1338. Aristophanes has however the perfect $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \tau \eta \mu \alpha_i$, 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 $\pi \dot{\epsilon}$ τομαι in the Attic dialect: for I know of no authority for the active $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \kappa a \pm$ beyond grammatical tradition. If this supposition be correct, the Attic prose usage of the above verb will be as follows:

Πέτομαι, πτήσομαι, έπτόμην, πεπότημαι.

ΠΕΤ-. See Πίπτω.

Πεύθομαι. See Πυνθάνομαι.

Πέφνον, ἕπεφνον, I slew; the reduplicated and at the same time syncopated aorist of ΦΕΝΩ (whence φόνος), like ἐκεκλόμην from κέλομαι. The participle is accented contrary to analogy πέφνων (II. π, 827. ρ, 539.), and this is expressly mentioned by the Grammarians as a peculiarity; see Etym. Mag. vv. ἕπεφνον, βαλών, ἐών.§ Of the aoristic

* e.g. in Eurip. Ion. 90. and Aristoph. Av. 573, 574. where Brunck, contrary to all the manuscripts, reads as Attic πέτεται.

† 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 πετάσαι. Compare ἕρασσαι from ἕραμαι, and ὅνοσσο from ὅνομαι.

† The perfects πέπταμαι, πέπτηκα, πέπτωκα, πεπτηώς (see Πετάννυμι, Πέτομαι, Πίπτω, and Πτήσσω), formed from verbs coming from the root ΠΕΤΩ, are to be explained by syncope as for πεπέταμαι, &c. These perfects, like κέκτημαι and μέμνημαι, are exceptions to the general rule of verbs, beginning with two consonants, and forming their perfect with ϵ instead of the reduplication. See note under Κτάομαι.

§ I see clearly however that we cannot build much on this grammatical tradition. It is possible that the acristic 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 $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \phi \nu o \nu$ there can be no doubt; and the supposition of a pres. $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \omega$, as shown also by the analogy of $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \tau o$ and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \phi \rho \alpha \delta o \nu$, is perfectly untenable.*

With this we must join the perf. pass. $\pi\epsilon\phi\check{\alpha}\mu\alpha\iota$, of which Homer has the 3. sing. $\pi\epsilon\phi\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, 3 plur. $\pi\epsilon\phi\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, infin. $\pi\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, and the 3. fut. (paulo-post fut.) $\pi\epsilon\phi\acute{n}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, $\pi\epsilon\phi\acute{n}\sigma\epsilon\alpha\iota$, Il. v, 289. o, 140. Od. χ , 217. This $\pi\epsilon\phi\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ bears exactly the same relation to the root Φ EN- as $\tau\epsilon-\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ does to TEN- in $\tau\epsiloni\nu\omega$; while $\pi\epsilon\phi\acute{n}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ is formed from $\pi\epsilon\phi\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ like $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{n}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ from $\delta\epsilon\acute{\delta}\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\acute{\nu}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ from $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\lambda}\check{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$. The same future form comes also from the root Φ A- in $\phi\alphai\nu\omega$; and Lycophron has allowed himself to use, in the sense of *killed*, the perf. part. $\pi\epsilon\phi\alpha\sigma\mu\epsilon-\nu\sigma$, which belongs also to $\phi\alphai\nu\omega$ and $\phi\eta\mui$.

Πήγνῦμι and πηγνύω, *I fix*: and in the later writers πήσσω, Att. πήττω; fut. πήξω†; aor. 1. ἔπηξα; aor. 1. pass. ἐπήχθην; but more generally aor. 2. ἐπάγην (α̃); aor. 1. midd. ἐπηξάμην: the perf. 2. πέπηγα has the sense of the pass. πήγνυμαι, *I am fixed*, *I stick firm*‡; pluperf. ἐπεπήγειν: an aor. 2. midd. ἐπηγόμην occurs in Æsop. Fab. 146. Ern.— MIDD.

Πηδάω, I leap: fut. midd. πηδήσομαι.

Πιέζω, I press: fut. πιέσω; aor. 1. ἐπίεσα, Herodot. 9, 63.; aor. 1. pass. ἐπιέσθην, infin. πιεσθῆναι, but in Hippocr. πιεχθῆναι; perf. pass. πεπίεσμαι, but in Hippocr. πεπίεγμαι, infin. πεπιέχθαι. This verb therefore, like ἀρπάζω, παίζω, 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 $\pi \iota \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \omega$, as we find in Homer $\pi \iota \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \upsilon \nu$ 3. plur. imperf. for $\epsilon \pi \iota \epsilon \zeta \sigma \nu$, in Herodotus $\pi \iota \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \varsigma$, and in Plut. Thes. 6. $\pi \iota \epsilon \zeta \sigma \tilde{\nu} \nu \tau \sigma \varsigma$.

Πίμπλημι, I fill, infin. πιμπλάναι, follows ίστημι in its pres. and imperf., imitating it even in the admission or rejection of the forms in -αω: fut. πλήσω; aor. 1. ἔπλησα;

- + See "Αγνυμι, "Αξω.
- ‡ See ἔαγα under Αγνυμι.

^{* [}The earliest occurrence of the pres. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\omega$ seems to be in Oppian. Hal. 2, 133.—Passow.]

aor. 1. midd. ἐπλησάμην; perf. pass. πέπλησμαι; aor. 1.

pass. έπλήσθην.

In the compounds of this and the following verb $\pi i\mu$ - $\pi\rho\eta\mu$, whenever a μ precedes the first π , it is dropped before the second, as $\epsilon\mu\pi i\pi\lambda\eta\theta_i$, Il. ϕ , 311.; but resumed when the augment intervenes, as $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\pi i\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$.

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. $i \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$, imper. $\pi \lambda \ddot{\eta} \sigma o$, opt. $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu$ (like $\beta \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu$), &c., is one of the few aorists of this kind which are found also in Attic prose; e.g. in Aristoph. $i \mu \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu o c$, $i \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu$.* In this last the diphthong of the optative $\epsilon \iota$ is remarkable, as the formation $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha$, $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \mu \alpha$, &c., supposes a stem or root $\Pi \Lambda \Lambda$ -. But in the same way $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$, which comes from $\chi \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$, has in the opt. $\chi \rho \epsilon i \eta$.⁺ The supposition most agreeable to analogy is, that $\Pi \Lambda \Lambda \Omega$ was changed after the Iono-Doric manner to $\Pi \Lambda E \Omega$, whence therefore the Lat. *pleo*. To this we must add the Hesiodic (\Im , 880.) $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \tilde{\nu} \sigma \alpha \iota$; for as in the Epic Ionicism, unlike to the later, $\alpha o \nu$ in those verbal forms is changed to $\epsilon \nu$, the above participle supposes a present $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \omega$.

The immediate sense to be full belongs to $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$. This verb, beside the pres. and imperf., has no other tense than the perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \theta a$ synonymous with the present, Phereer. in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 330, 23. Antim. Theb. Fr. 12. Arat. 774.[†]

* An aor. 2. act. of this form, $\xi \pi \lambda \eta \nu$ like $\xi \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, appears also in the later language, but contrary to general analogy it has the same causative sense as $\pi i \mu$ - $\pi \lambda \eta \mu, \xi \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$; if indeed the reading $\Delta \nu \epsilon$ - $\pi \lambda \eta \mu \nu$ in Alciphron 3, 46. be genuine.

† We have shown in the note on βλείο under Βάλλω, that there are no grounds in the analogy of this optative for anything but the pure diphthong a or e. I cannot therefore adopt πλήμην as proposed by Dawes, although in Aristoph. Ach. 236. the reading $\ell \mu \pi \lambda \eta' \mu \eta \nu$ is supported by the Cod. Rav. instead of the common $\ell \mu$ πλε(μην; and in Lysistr. 235., where the opt. is required, the emendation first suggested by the common corrupted reading $\ell \mu \pi \lambda \eta' \sigma \theta \eta$ is that judiciously adopted by Dawes, $\ell \mu \pi \lambda \eta' \theta' \eta$. In this case then, as in βλείο, βλη of the reaging a twofold 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 reading $\ell\mu\pi\lambda\epsilon\partial\theta$ $\dot{\eta}$, $\kappa\delta\lambda\lambda\xi$.

‡ This πλήθω is very commonly supposed to be the radical form, principally on account of $\epsilon \pi \lambda \hbar \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; but the supposition is erroneous, as we may learn from comparing it with $\epsilon \chi \rho \hbar \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ and others. We should much rather say that $\pi \lambda \hbar - \theta \omega$ and $\pi \rho \hbar \theta \omega$ may be quite as well deduced immediately from a radical form in - $\epsilon d \omega$, as $\sigma \hbar \theta \omega$ and $\nu \hbar \theta \omega$ are from similar forms in - $\delta \omega$ and - $\epsilon \omega$. For the actual usage of the pres. $\pi \lambda \hbar \theta \omega$ in the causative sense of $\pi \ell \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$ we have but a bad authority in Pseudo-Phocyl. 154. On the other hand we find a striking instance of Πίμπρημι, *I burn* (transit.), infin. πιμπράναι, follows in the common language the analogy of πίμπλημι in every part of its formation, even to the dropping or retaining of the μ before the π .

Photius in Lex. v. $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \omega \tau \alpha \iota$ quotes as one of the older Atticisms $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$.

The shortening of $\xi \pi \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon$ to $\xi \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \epsilon$ in Hes. 9, 856. is remarkable. Compare the forms under $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ which lead to a formation in $-\epsilon \omega$.*

In this verb the form $\pi \rho \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ is synonymous with $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu i$, but found only in II. i, 589. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \pi \rho \eta \theta \sigma \nu$.

Πίνω, I drink : fut. πίομαι (like ἔδομαι); aor. 2. ἔπιον, infin. πιεῖν, &c., imper. πίε (Od. 1, 347. Eurip. Cycl. 560.) solely poetical, the common term being πĩθι (like ×λῦθι, βῆθι, γνῶθι, &c.), Athen. 10. p. 446. B. The other tenses come from the root ΠΟ-, with variable quantity, as perf. πέπωκα †; perf. pass. πέπομαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐπόθην; verbal adj. ποτός, ποτέος, whence the Lat. poto.

The Ion. particip. $\pi i \nu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$ (like $\pi i \epsilon \ddot{\zeta} \epsilon \dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$) for $\pi i \nu \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, is found in Hippocr. de A. A. L. 22.

A future in the shape of the fut. 2. $\pi\iota\sigma\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$ is of frequent occurrence from the time of Aristotle. We find indeed $\pi\iota\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma\theta\epsilon$ in Xen. Symp. 4, 7. but probably the old reading $\pi\iota\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ ought to be restored : see also Schweigh. Athen. 5. p. 497. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 31. — The ι in $\pi\iotao \mu\alpha\iota$ 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 $\pi\iotao\mu\alpha\iota$ (with ι long) as a present for $\pi\iota\nu\omega$ is found in Pind. Ol. 6, 147.

The syncop. infin. $\pi i \nu$ or $\pi \epsilon i \nu$, accented also $\pi i \nu$, $\pi \epsilon i \nu$, occurs in Lucill. Epig. 28, 3. Meineke Euphor. Fr. 105. See Mus. Antiqu. Stud. p. 247. sqq. Herodian. Hermanni, §47.

the aor. $d\pi o\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a in a neuter sense in$ $Herodot. 8, 96. <math>d\sigma re \ d\pi \sigma \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \ \tau \delta \nu \ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \delta \nu$; for nothing but a very improbable 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 common sense in all the other passages of Herodotus (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. $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\theta a_i$, which we have seen above in the Attic usage, have belonged to Ionic prose also?

* The various reading $\ell\mu\pi\mu\pi\rho\epsilon ls$ in Herodot. 8, 159. deserves also in this respect our attention. It may be an ancient form and grounded perhaps on some old uncertainty in the actual usage. Compare $\Gamma\eta\rho\omega\omega$.

+ Compare βώσεσθε under Biów.

Πιπίσκω, I give to drink: fut. πίσω (Pind. Isthm. 6, 108. with ι long); aor. 1. ἕπισα. Compare Μεθύω and Μεθύσκω.

Πιπράσκω, *I sell*, Ion. πιπρήσκω, Herodot. It has in the common language neither fut. nor aor. active: the other forms are, perf. πέπρāκα; perf. pass. πέπρāμαι, infin. πεπρᾶσθαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐπράθην (ā), Ion. ἐπρήθην, Herodot. In all these forms the Ionics changed the long α to η.

In the common language the defective tenses were made up by $\dot{a}\pi o-\delta\dot{\omega}\sigma o\mu a\iota$, $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon\delta\dot{o}\mu\eta\nu$. The forms properly belonging to this verb are, in the old and Epic language, fut. $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{a}\sigma\omega$ (with a short), Att. $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{\omega}$, \mathcal{G} . $\pi\varphi\dot{\omega}$ infin. $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{\alpha}\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}q\nu$; aor. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\,\alpha\sigma\,a$; of which the pres. $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$, 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 $-\ddot{a}\sigma\omega$, Ion. $-\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$. The above $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\ddot{a}\kappa\alpha$ with the other forms came from the formation $\pi\epsilon\rho\ddot{a}\sigma\omega$ ($\pi\epsilon\pi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\ddot{a}\kappa\alpha$) by the same metathesis which we have frequently seen, for instance in $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\nu\nu\nu\mu\mu$, $\kappa\epsilon\rho\ddot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, ($\kappa\epsilon\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\rho\ddot{a}\kappa\alpha$) $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\ddot{a}\kappa\alpha$, Ion. $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\eta\kappa\alpha$.

The Homeric $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$, II. ϕ , 58., formed from $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{a} \omega$, $-\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, and referring to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu$ at v. 40., would therefore be a particular deviation from the above; according to which it would stand for $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon - \rho \ddot{a} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \varsigma$ 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 η , the form $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu o \varsigma$; which without doubt is the true reading of the passage.*

The pres. $\pi \iota \pi \rho \eta' \sigma \kappa \omega$ does not occur in the Epic language, but in its stead is found $\pi \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \iota$ (compare $\delta a \mu \nu \dot{a} \omega$, $\delta \dot{a} \mu \nu \eta \mu \iota$, under $\Delta \epsilon \mu \omega$). In the old language, therefore, the following is the established usage: $\pi \epsilon \rho \omega \eta \mu \iota$, $\pi \epsilon \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \omega$ ($\pi \epsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$), $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \tilde{a} \sigma a$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \tilde{a} \kappa a$, &c.

The Atticists lay it down as a rule that $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \mu a\iota$, not $\pi \rho a$ - $\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a\iota$, 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 $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \tau a\iota$ where there is not the slightest expression of certainty or quickness. And what is particularly confirmed by the rule is this, that although $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho \dot{a} \theta \eta \nu$ is good Attic, yet $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \bar{a} \sigma \theta a\iota$ is very frequently found, without any of the force of a perfect, instead of the mere aorist, e. g. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\eta} \rho \nu \xi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \pi \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \theta a\iota$, "he proclaimed that should be sold,"

* It is true that in Heyne I find no variety of reading mentioned; but in Seber's Index this verse is quoted under $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon$ - $\rho\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigmas$, and under $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigmas$, and in each case the other form is expressly referred to as a various reading.

P 2

Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 15. Τούτοις ή μεν ἕκτισις ην ἐπὶ τῆς ἐννάτης πρυτανείας εἰ δὲ μὴ, διπλάσιον ὀφείλειν καὶ τὰ κτήματα αὐτῶν πεπρᾶσθαι, Andoc. de Myst. p. 10, 18. These forms therefore bear the same relation to each other as $\tau \epsilon \theta r \acute{a} v αι$ does to $\tau \epsilon \theta r \acute{g} ε \sigma \theta αι$. See $\Theta r \acute{g} σ κω$.

Πίπτω, *I fall*, with *ι* naturally long *, consequently the imperat. is accented $\pi i \pi \tau \varepsilon$: the formation is from ΠΕΤΩ; e. g. fut. $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \delta i \mu \alpha \iota$, Ion. $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \delta \delta \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 2. $\xi \pi \varepsilon \sigma \delta v$ †, infin. $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \delta v$; perf. $\pi \xi \pi \tau \omega \kappa \alpha$, Attic part. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \omega \varsigma$, $\delta \tau \sigma \varsigma$.

We find also both a rigularly formed from the simple stem or root $\Pi ET\Omega$: viz.

1. $\xi \pi \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu$, aor. 2. in Pindar and other Doric writers.

2. $\xi \pi \varepsilon \sigma a$, the regular aor. 1. As we shall see hereafter that in $\chi \xi \zeta \omega$, a verb of the common popular dialect, the two aorists $\xi \chi \varepsilon \sigma a$ and $\xi \chi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \nu$ 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, $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \pi \varepsilon \sigma a$, Tro. 291., $\pi \epsilon \sigma \varepsilon \iota \epsilon$, Alc. 471., in both which passages these forms have been rejected in the latest editions by a precipitate criticism. \ddagger

* See Draco, p. 73, 18. 79, 21. Hermann ad Eurip. Herc. F. 1371. — Passow.]
 † Compare ἐδόσετο, p. 73. and οἶσε under Φέρω.

[‡] 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 a instead

of ov, as elda, ella, Elabar, 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 $\epsilon l\pi \alpha$, $\hbar \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \alpha$, the form $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \alpha$ on the other hand is the regular aor. 1., and with its future $\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\hat{v}$ μαι answers to έπλευσα, πλευσούμαι, and many others, in short to half the language. In this case therefore, where the anomalous Execov was in current use, the analogous but unusual έπεσα (οὐκ ἐν χρήσει τδ έπεσα, 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

Πιτνέω, I fall ; aor. έπιτνον, infin. πιτνείν, part. πιτνών. Such 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 στυγέω, έστυγον and similar verbs, from the aorist of which arises a pres. in $-\epsilon\omega$: see $K\tau\nu\pi\epsilon\omega$. The accentuation however of $\pi\ell\tau\nu\omega$ for $\pi i \tau \nu \tilde{\omega}$, of $\pi i \tau \nu o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, &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. ccx1.) The only cases where the aorist appears to me evident, are those where we find $\xi \pi i \tau \nu \rho \nu$, $\xi \pi i \tau \nu \epsilon$. Since however this aorist does not contain the simple root, which is much more conspicuous in the Pindaric $\xi \pi \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu$ (see $\Pi (\pi \tau \omega)$; the formation of the aor. $\xi \pi \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu$, pres. $\pi \ell \tau \nu \omega$, has in its favour the analogy of the aor. $\xi \delta \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu$, pres. dárvw. I do not therefore by any means reject the supposition that $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ and $\pi \iota \tau \nu \epsilon \omega$ might have existed together (like $\beta \nu \nu \epsilon \omega$ and βύνω, δυνέω and δύνω), without $\ddot{\epsilon}$ πιτνον being therefore necessarily an imperfect; for ἕκλυον from κλύω 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 Emerov remained in the Æolo-Doric 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 unavoidable for Exerov, xérou to have intruded themselves as various readings, it was quite inconceivable that transcribers or correctors of the metre should have interpolated energa and néoeie. For who has ever seen an instance of Christian transcribers having introduced into the tragedians or any of the Attic writers those other forms $\epsilon l \delta \alpha$, $\epsilon \lambda \alpha \delta \alpha \nu$, which are so 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 $\hat{\epsilon}s$ $\delta \acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho \nu a$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma \kappa$ $\tau \delta$ $\delta \acute{\epsilon}\eta \tau \rho \rho \nu$. I much fear, that when $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma \epsilon$ 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

Р3

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, ή Πελοπόννησος άπασα διειστήκει. But the passage of Herodotus is so corrupted in Longinus that it contradicts the reason for its being quoted : the manuscripts have $i\pi\epsilon$ σαν or έπεσον οἱ δεώμενοι. It will perhaps be said that the whole sentence has been corrupted, by the attempts made to explain it, from Exerce to Sentpor, which is now adopted as the text in Longinus also : this would be possible, if the reading had been only $\xi\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\nu$; but how came the commentator or his corrupter by $\xi\pi\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$? Let us now suppose that the old reading both in Herodotus and Longinus was έπεσαν το Sentpov, and we then discover the corruption in each writer; in the former eneoe, in the latter of Dewnevor. If aught were wanting to complete the proof of $\xi\pi\epsilon\sigma\alpha$ being a genuine form, it would be found, I think, in the compa-rison with the aorists $\xi\chi\epsilon\sigma\alpha$ and $\xi\chi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\nu$, the confusion between which was not remarked until very lately.

present $\pi i \tau \nu \tilde{\omega}$, it appears very natural that a distinction should have been made between the aor. $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi i \tau \nu o \nu$, and the imperf. $\hat{\epsilon}\pi i \tau \nu o \nu$.*

Πίτνημι, Πιτνάω. See Πετάννυμι.

ΠΛ-. See Πέλω.

ΠΛΑ-. See Πελάζω and Πίμπλημι.

Πλάζω, I cause to wander, turn from its course : fut. $\pi\lambda$ άγξω; aor. 1. ἕπλαγξα. Pass. $\pi\lambda$ άζομαι, I am driven from my course, I wander about : fut. $\pi\lambda$ άγξομαι; aor. 1. ἐπλάγχθην. See also Πελάζω.

These tenses are formed as from a pres. $\Pi\Lambda\Lambda\Gamma X\Omega$; or, which comes to the same, $\pi\lambda\dot{a}\zeta\omega$ has $\gamma\gamma$ for its characteristic letter, like $\kappa\lambda\dot{a}\zeta\omega$ and $\sigma\alpha\lambda\pi\dot{a}\zeta\omega$.

Πλάσσω, *I form*: fut. πλάσω, &c. This verb, like πάσσω, πτίσσω, ἐρέσσω, βράσσω, and βλίττω, has for its characteristic letter a lingual instead of a palatic, which is generally seen by a σ in the inflexion instead of ξ , γ , \varkappa , or χ : see 'Aρμόττω. From the compounds ἰπνοπλάθος, χοροπλάθος the characteristic letter would seem to be 9.

Πλέκω, *I plat*, weave : fut. $\pi\lambda$ έξω; aor. 1. midd. $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\lambda$ εξάμην; perf. pass. π έπλεγμαι. The aor. 2. pass. is generally $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\lambda$ άκην, but Bekker has always found in the best manuscripts of Plato $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\lambda$ έκην: see Βλέπω.

Πλέω, I sail: fut. πλεύσομαι, or more generally πλευσοῦμαι; aor. 1. ἔπλευσα; perf. πέπλευκα. The pass. takes σ; thus, perf. pass. πέπλευσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐπλεύσθην.

This verb was still found in the older Attic writers in a resolved form : at least the instance of $\xi \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ (not $\xi \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$), in Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 27. has great weight ; and in Thucyd. 4, 28. Bekker has followed the majority of the Codd. in retaining $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$. See note to $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, *I want*.

There is an Ionic form of this verb $\pi\lambda\omega\omega$ †, infin. $\pi\lambda\omega\epsilon\iota\nu$; fut. $\pi\lambda\omega\sigma\omega$; aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\omega\sigma a$; perf. $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\omega\kappa a$. Euripides, who introduced this

Hermann can read only $\pi i\tau \nu o \dot{\nu} \tau \omega \nu$, of which he avails himself also in $(\pi \rho o \sigma \pi i \tau - \nu \rho \nu \tau \epsilon s)$, Æschyl. Pers. 461. If my view of the subject be adopted, no change is necessary.

+ [Homer seems to have used $\pi\lambda\omega\omega$ with its derivatives more in the sense of to swim, and $\pi\lambda\omega\omega$ with the meaning of to sail.— Passow.]

^{*} In the passage of Soph. (Ed. Col. 1732. I consider the sense of $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\tau\tau\nu$ to be evidently that of an aorist, though Reisig doubts it; for the imperfect can hardly be compatible with the meaning of $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\sigma$ - ϕ os (cadebat insepultus). On the other hand he appears to me to be perfectly right in his opinion that $\pi\tau\tau\nu\delta\sigma\tau\omega\nu$ in Eurip. Supp. 691. is a present. But then

perfect on the Attic stage (Hel. 539.), appears to have been ridiculed by Aristophanes (Thesm. 878.) for so doing. To this verb belongs also an Epic aor. 2. $\xi \pi \lambda \omega \nu$, $-\omega \varsigma$, $-\omega$, $-\omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, &c.; part. $\pi \lambda \omega \varsigma$, $\pi \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \sigma \varsigma$; and its compounds $\delta \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \omega \nu$, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \omega \nu$, $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \pi \lambda \omega \nu$ with their participles $\epsilon \pi i \pi \lambda \omega \varsigma$, &c., II. ζ , 191. See $\epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \nu$, &c., under $\Gamma i \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$.

Πλήθω. See Πίμπλημι.

Πλήσσω, Att. πλήττω, I strike: fut. πλήξω; perf. 2. (sometimes in a pass. sense) πέπληγα; perf. pass. πέπληγμαι; aor. 2. pass. ἐπλήγην.

Beside the active and passive of this verb we find in Homer the middle also $(\mu\eta\rho\delta\nu \pi\lambda\eta\xi\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma)$; 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 $\pi\alpha\tau\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$, 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 $i\varkappa\pi\lambda\eta'\tau\tau\omega$ and $\varkappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ - $\pi\lambda\eta'\tau\tau\omega$, 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, $\check{\epsilon}\xi \epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha}\gamma \eta \nu$, $\varkappa\alpha\tau\alpha\pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta\nua$.

On the relative usage of $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\sigma\omega$ and $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\sigma\sigma\omega$ as laid down above, see Valcken. ad Act. Apost. 12, 7. and the passage of Lysias there quoted, $\pi\delta\tau\epsilon\rho\rho\nu$ $\pi\rho\delta\tau\epsilon\rho\rho\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\eta\nu$ η $\epsilon\pi\delta\tau\alpha\xi\alpha$, 4, p. 102, 9.

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 $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma a$: as in Aristoph. Av. 1350. $\delta_{\mathcal{S}} \dot{\alpha} \nu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma \eta \tau \partial \nu \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \tau \partial \varsigma \ \omega \nu$.* In the later language the perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha$ was used in a passive sense: see

* See also Xen. Anab. 5, 9, 5. This passage alone would however leave the point still problematical. The old reading is $\tau b \pi \delta x \theta \rho a \pi o \nu \pi \pi \lambda \eta \chi \ell \nu a t, a$ form for which there are nowhere any grounds; with a various reading $\pi \pi \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \ell \nu a t.$ But from the context it would be much more

natural to understand the accusative as the subject of the passive, a construction in which we cannot well use $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \epsilon \nu a$ in Xenophon. I conjecture therefore that under $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \chi \epsilon \rho a$ is concealed the true reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \chi \epsilon \rho a$. έάλωκα under Άλίσκομαι; Stephan. Thes. in v.; and Oudend. ad Thom. Mag. v. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \omega_{c}$, p. 703.

On $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\gamma\eta\nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\dot{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu$ compare what has been said on "A $\gamma\nu\nu\mu\mu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu$. We have only further to observe that Homer uses on account of the metre $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\gamma\eta\nu$, II. γ , 31.

The Epics have also an aor. 2. act. and midd. but only with the reduplication, as $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \circ \nu$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, and $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \epsilon \tau \circ$, in the same sense as $\epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \xi a \nu$, $\epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \xi a \tau \circ$.

From a rare sister-form πλήγνυμι, Thucydides 4, 25. has $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\gamma\nu\nu$ -σθαι.

Πλύνω (\bar{v}), *I* wash : fut. πλὕνέω, contracted πλὕνῶ; aor. 1. ἕπλυνα; perf. πέπλὕκα; perf. pass. πέπλὕμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐπλύθην (\check{v}).* This verb is generally poetical.

Πνέω, poet. πνείω, I blow: fut. πνεύσω, later πνεύσομαι, more generally πνευσοῦμαι; aor. 1. ἔπνευσα, &c.; aor. 1. pass. ἐπνεύσθην.

There is no instance of a perf. pass. formed according to the above formation; the only one in use is the poetical $\pi \epsilon \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \mu a$, with the force of a present and the particular meaning of to be inspired with wisdom, be wise, intelligent : hence perf. infin. $\pi \epsilon \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \sigma \theta a$, and 2. sing. pluperf. (with the force of an imperf.) $\pi \epsilon \pi \nu \nu \sigma \sigma$, Od. ψ , 210. By the same formation come the Epic syncopated aor. 2. $\check{a} \mu \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \sigma \sigma$ for $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon \pi \nu \nu \sigma \sigma$; the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{a} \mu \pi \nu \nu \nu \delta \eta$ for $\dot{a} \mu \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \delta \eta$ (like $i \delta \rho \dot{\nu} \nu \eta \nu$); and the imper. aor. 2. act. $\check{a} \mu \pi \nu \nu \epsilon$ for $\dot{a} \nu \dot{a} \pi \nu \nu \epsilon$, consequently from an aorist $\check{a} \mu \pi \nu \nu \nu \nu$ used by the later Epics, as Quintus, &c. † On the aor. 1. pass. $\epsilon \pi \nu \dot{\nu} \nu \theta \eta \nu$ see $T \epsilon i \nu \omega$.

Πνίγω, I choke: fut. midd. (with transit. meaning) πνίξομαι \ddagger or πνιξοῦμαι, and in Lucian πνίξω; aor. 1. ἔπνιξα, infin. πνίξαι. Passive, I am being choked: fut.

* On the formation of the two perfects and the aor. 1. pass. see $T \epsilon i \nu \omega$.

+ A more strict analogy would have given $\tilde{\pi}n\bar{\nu}\nu$, $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\pi\nu\bar{\nu}\theta_i$, to which $\tilde{\alpha}\mu\pi\nu\nu e$ bears the same relation as πfe does to $\pi \hat{\eta}\theta_i$, only that $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi i \nu$ is actually in use.

‡ It has been stated rather hastily that the Doric $\pi \nu i \hat{c} \hat{o} \hat{\mu} \mu a i$ is the only acknowledged 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 : olov al ubrai do emergrange or with the states of the σθε, Epicharm. ap. Athen, p. 60. Without attempting to restore the whole of this tetrameter, I shall content myself with amending what the language and sense require, of μόκαι and ἀνπεσκληκότες (oi ἀπεσκλ.): 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 future πνιξοῦμαι having been used in the Attic dialect is strengthened by φευξοῦμαι, παιξοῦμαι. Lucian however (Contempl. 23.) has ἀποπνίξειs. πνιγήσομαι; aor. 2. ἐπνίγην. The i is long except in the aor. 2. pass., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 107.

ΠΟ-. See Πίνω.

Ποθέω, I long for, regret: Ionic and old Attic fut. ποθέσω, more generally ποθήσω, Xen. Mem. 3, 11, 3., also ποθέσομαι not only Ionic in Herodotus, but in Plato, e.g. Heind. Phædo, p. 98. a.; aor. 1. act. ἐπόθεσα, whence 3. plur. πόθεσαν, infin. ποθέσαι, Hom., and ἐπόθησα, Xen. and Isocr.; both forms of the aor. 1. are found in Herodot. 3, 36. 9, 22.; perf. πεπόθηκα; perf. pass. πεπόθημαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐποθέσθην.

Πονέω, *I labour*, suffer, is inflected regularly; thus, fut. πονήσω, &c.: but when it signifies physical pain or suffering, it makes πονέσω.

Such is the statement of the Grammarians; see Cheerob. in Bekk. Anecd. in Ind.; where we find also quoted as an exception, $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \nu \eta \kappa a$. $\tau \omega \sigma \kappa \epsilon \lambda \eta$, Aristoph. Pac. 820.: but the probability is that the perfect is always formed with the η (whatever be its meaning) as in $\pi o \theta \epsilon \omega$. The formation of $\pi o \nu \epsilon \sigma \omega$, &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. $\pi ov \acute{e} \rho \mu \alpha_i$, - $\dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha_i$ in an absolute sense : see Homer passim. — Passow.]

Πορεῖν, to give, infin. of ἕπορον, a defective aorist used by the poets. [The indicative without the augment is found frequently in Homer;] the part. πορών in Æschyl. Prom. 954.; the infin. πορεῖν in Hesychius.

In Pind. Pyth. 2, 105. is an infin. $\pi\epsilon\pi\sigma\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, but the majority of the manuscripts have $\pi\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$. 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 $\pi\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu-\dot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\xi\alpha\iota$, $\sigma\eta\mu\tilde{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$, which appears to me to suit the sense of Pindar better; ostentare. See Bœckh. In this latter case it is therefore a solitary form of some lost verb.*

By the principle of the metathesis, as shown under Bá $\lambda\lambda\omega$ and Ka $\lambda\epsilon\omega$, we find that to the stem or root of $\pi o\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ (with the sense of to impart, allot,) belongs the perf. pass. $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, I am allotted

^{*} Perhaps this verb might have arisen from the sense of the preposition $\pi \alpha \rho d$, as $\pi d\rho a$, it is there.

by fate, fated; part. $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\nu_{0}$; whence 3. sing. pluperf. $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\omega\tau_{0}$, Hes. Th. 464. Compare Meipopan.

ΠΟ-. See Πίνω.

Πέποσθε. See Πάσχω.

ΠΡΑ-. See Πιπράσκω and Πίμπρημι.

Πράσσω, Ep. and Ion. πρήσσω, Att. πράττω*, transit. I do, intransit. I am doing (well or ill), find myself in a certain state or situation: fut. πράξω, Ion. πρήξω; perf. πέπρāχα; perf. 2. πέπρāγα; perf. pass. πέπραγμαι, &c. In the older writers πέπραγα was the only perfect; afterwards arose the custom of using πέπραγα in an intransitive sense only, πέπραχα in a transitive. The α is naturally long.

The above usage may be gathered from the direction of the Atticists, who merely tell us that $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma a$ is Attic, $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \chi a$ common Greek: see Piers. ad Mœr. 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

Πρήθω. See Πίμπρημι.

Πρίασθαι, to buy, infin. of ἐπριάμην, a defective aorist (according to the analogy of ἐπτάμην), used by the Attics instead of the obsolete aorist of ωνέομαι[‡]; imperat. πρίασο

 * [With the exception of the Tragedians, who always use πράσσω, Herm. ad Soph. Phil. 1435. — Passow.]
 † That the perfect in -γα was the older

† 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, kakâs $\pi \epsilon - \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \alpha$, $\epsilon \delta \pi \epsilon - \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \omega \beta$, &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 Atticists sufficient to warrant our positively asserting that this form was not used by Xenophon.

‡ 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 $\delta v \epsilon i \sigma \theta a a$ should be used, as a form of $\pi \rho i a \sigma \theta a$ may stand in its place. At the time this was said, no one could misunderstand it, as a pres. $\pi \rho i a \mu a b$ was unheard of in the whole range of Greek literature, and $\ell \pi \rho i \Delta - \mu \eta \nu$ was equally unknown as an imperfect. The only thing intended was to guard against some forms of $\delta v \epsilon^2 \sigma \theta a$. The grammarian excludes therefore from (Aristoph. Ach. 870.), or $\pi \rho i \omega$ (id. Nub. 614.); opt. $\pi \rho i \alpha i \mu \eta \nu$; conj. $\pi \rho i \omega \mu \alpha i$; infin. $\pi \rho i \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha i$; part. $\pi \rho i \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu \rho \varsigma$. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 137. 360.

Πρίω, I saw, gnash (the teeth): imperat. πρĩε, Aristoph. Ran. 927. The passive takes σ ; as, aor. 1. ἐπρίσθην; perf. πέπρισμαι.

The ι is undoubtedly long throughout all the inflexions of $\pi\rho\iota\omega$: and with this the σ in the passive agrees, according to the rule mentioned under $\dot{a}\rho\delta\omega^*$; so that it is not necessary on that account to have recourse to a present $\pi\rho\iota\omega$, which, it appears, became very common at a later period.⁺ See also Buttm. Lexil. p. 485.

Προΐσσομαι. See Καταπρ.

Προσελείν, Προυσελείν. See under Είλω.

Πρῶσαι, an infin. aor. of rare occurrence and of a rather uncertain character, supposed to be a contraction from προῶσαι, and explained as an expression of the palæstra in Lucian. Asin. 10. where (ib. 9.) we find also the imperat. ἐπίπρωσον as an emendation of τρώσας, and again of Straton. Epigr. 48., where the text has the part. πρώσας. Both Schneider and Passow derive it from προωθέω; fut. προωθήσω or -ώσω; aor. 1. προέωσα or ἐπρόωσα, contracted ἕπρωσα, infin. πρῶσαι, &c.

Πταίω, I stumble : fut. πταίσω, &c. It takes σ in the passive, as perf. ἔπταισμαι, &c. See ᾿Αρόω and Πρίω.

ΠΤΑ-, ΠΤΕ-. See Πετάννυμι, Πέτομαι, Πίπτω, and Πτήσσω.

Πτήσσω, I duck or drop the head from fear : fut. πτήξω, &c., is regular : perf. ἔπτηχα.

In Æschyl. Eum. 247. all the manuscripts have $\kappa a \tau a \pi \tau a \kappa \omega \nu$, which some have changed to $\kappa a \tau \epsilon \pi \tau a \kappa \omega \rho$, on account of the Hesychian gloss $\epsilon \pi \tau a \kappa \epsilon \nu a \rho \nu \phi \epsilon \nu a$. But the verse requires a short a; and an aor. 2. $\epsilon \pi \tau a \kappa \kappa \rho \nu \phi \epsilon \nu a$. But the verse requires a short a; and an aor. 2. $\epsilon \pi \tau a \kappa \kappa \rho \nu \phi \epsilon \nu a$. But the verse requires a short a; and an aor. 2. $\epsilon \pi \tau a \kappa \kappa \rho \nu \phi \epsilon \nu a$. But the verse requires a short a; and an aor. 2. $\epsilon \pi \tau a \kappa \kappa \rho \nu \phi \epsilon \nu a$. But the verse requires a short a; and an aor. 2. $\epsilon \pi \tau a \kappa \kappa \rho \nu \phi \epsilon \nu a$. But the verse requires a short a; and an aor. 2. $\epsilon \pi \tau a \kappa \kappa \rho \nu \phi \epsilon \nu a$. But the verse requires a short a for a short a for a short a

* To the verbs mentioned under $d\rho \delta \omega$, as taking the σ in the passive, may be added, ἀκούω, κελεύω, λεύω, Ͽραύω, παλαίω, πταίω, πρίω, χρίω, βύω, ξύω, ὕω.

+ See Pollux 7. c. 26. The instance in Plat. Theag. p. 124. a. is of sufficient antiquity, notwithstanding the spuriousness of the dialogue.

the Attic style the whole aorist $\ell\omega\nu\eta\sigma d_{\mu\eta\nu}$, and even the perfect $\ell\omega\nu\eta\mu$ in cases where the aorist $\ell\pi\rho_{\mu}d\mu\eta\nu$ would supply its place. Compare Herodian Ed. Piers. p. 453.

a long for $\xi \pi \tau \eta \kappa a$. Consequently the inflexion will run thus, $\pi \tau \eta \sigma \sigma \omega$; fut. $\pi \tau \eta \xi \omega$; aor. 1. $\xi \pi \tau \eta \xi a$; aor. 2. $\xi \pi \tau a \kappa o \nu$; perf. $\xi \pi \tau \eta \chi a$ and $\xi \pi \tau \eta \kappa a$.

We find in the poets other forms from a more simple stem or root $\Pi TA\Omega$; as in Il. 9, 136. $\kappa a \tau a \pi \tau \eta \tau \eta \tau \eta$, 3. dual aor. 2. from $\check{\epsilon} \pi \tau \eta \nu$ (see $\check{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \nu$ under $\Gamma_{\ell} \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$), and a part. perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \dot{\omega} c$ (see $Ba(\nu \omega)$), which is not to be confounded with $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \omega \dot{c}$ under $\Pi(\pi \tau \omega)$. All the above, and in particular this reduplication ($\pi \epsilon \pi \tau -$) comes from the root IIET-, as we have observed in a note at the end of $\Pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \sigma \mu a$.

Πτίσσω, *I stamp* (grain): fut. πτίσω; perf. pass. ἔπτισμαι. See 'Αρμόττω and Πλάσσω.

ΠΤΟ-. See Πίπτω.

Πτύρω, I make fearful: fut. πτυρώ. Pass. πτύρομαι, with aor. 2. $\epsilon \pi \tau$ ύρην, I become fearful, said particularly of horses; infin. πτυρήγαι τον θάνατον.

Πτόσσω, Ifold up: fut. πτόξω, &c., is regular.—MIDD. [Ifold or wrap (anything) round me, with accus. Aristoph. Nub. 267.—Passow.]

Πτύω, I spit: fut. πτύσω. The pass. takes σ, as perf. ἔπτυσμαι.

[It is written also $\psi i \omega$, whence the Latin *spuo*. The v is long in pres. and imperf., but short in fut., &c.: see Graefe Mel. 124, 7., yet in Theorr. 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.]

Πύθω, I cause to rot: fut. πύσω; aor. 1. ἔπυσα, &c. Pass. I rot. The v is long throughout; yet Callimachus (Fr. 313.) has allowed himself to use πύσε for πῦσε with v short. Compare ἔπρεσε and ἕστᾶσαν.

Πυνθάνομαι, I inquire, learn by inquiry, depon. midd., forms its tenses from πεύθομαι *, which is still used by the Epic and Tragic poets; thus, fut. πεύσομαι †; aor. ἐπυθόμην, [imper. πυθοῦ, but Ion. with change of accent πύθευ, Herodot. 3, 68., Epic opt. πεπύθοιτο, infin. πὕθεσθαι;] perf. πέπυσμαι ‡, 2. sing. πέπὕσαι, Plat. Protag. p. 310.

+ Perhaps also πευσούμαι, see Brunck

65

^{*} Like ἀνδάνω, λανθάνω, λαμβάνω, λαγχάνω, μανθάνω, and others : see note under Αἰσθάνομαι.

ad Eurip. Hippol. 1104. Æschyl. Prom. 987.

 $[\]ddagger$ On the v of this perf. see note under $X \not\in \omega$.

b., Epic πέπυσσαι, Od. λ, 494.; pluperf. ἐπεπύσμην. Verbal adj. πευστός, πευστέος.

Πυρέσσω, Att. -ττω, I am in a fever : fut. πυρέζω; aor. 1. ἐπύρεξα, &c., although it is derived from πυρετύς. Compare ἐρέσσω.

P.

'Paíνω, I besprinkle, forms the following tenses regularly: fut. ῥάνῶ; aor. 1. ἔῥῥāνα; perf. pass. ἔῥῥασμαι.

In the Epic language we observe two irregular forms; 1.) the aor. 1. imper. $\dot{\rho}\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\sigma\tau\epsilon$, Od. v, 150.; and 2.) the 3. plur. perf. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\dot{\alpha}\dot{\partial}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota^*$, Od. v, 354. pluperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\dot{\alpha}\dot{\partial}\alpha\tau\sigma$, Il. μ , 431. That is to say, from the simple stem or root PA- were formed one derivative with its full complement of tenses $\dot{\rho}\alpha\dot{\iota}\nu\omega$, and another very defective PAZ Ω . †

'Ράπτω, I sew: fut. ῥάψω, aor. 1. ἔῥῥαψα; aor. 2. pass. ἐῥῥάφην.

[Nonnus has an irregular aor. ἕμράφε, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318. — Passow.]

'Ρέζω, *I* do: fut. ῥέζω; aor. 1. ἔρῥεζα or ἕρεξα This word is the same as ἕρδω, from which it is formed by transposing the two first letters; ἕρδω, fut. ἕρζω, aor. 1. ἕρξα; perf. ἕοργα; pluperf. ἐώργειν. Of the passive we find only ῥεχθῆναι, as ἕρχθην and ἕεργμαι are formed only from ἕργω, εἰργω. Verbal adj. ῥεκτός, ῥεκτέος.

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 γ and δ , with which is connected that of γ to ζ occurring in other verbs, e. g. $\kappa\rho\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, $\kappa\rho\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu$. The next thing to be observed is, that the forms $\epsilon\rho\delta\omega$, $\epsilon\rho\zeta\alpha$, with the subst. $\epsilon\rho\gamma\sigma\nu$, have the digamma in the old language, and that the aspirate which is joined with the ρ was frequently in the dialects changed into the digamma, for instance in the Æolic $\beta\rho\delta\delta\sigma\nu$, i. e. *wrodon* for $\rho\delta\delta\sigma\nu$, a rose. We must therefore consider $\epsilon\rho\zeta\alpha$ as werxai,

* Though there is neither δ nor ζ in the present to account for the δ in this form, yet there are sufficient grounds for it in the σ of $\xi\delta\rho\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$; for this perf. may be considered as the connecting link with a form in $-d\zeta\omega$, from which comes $\delta\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$. † According to Apollon. de Adv. p. 600, 28. the fut. $\beta \alpha \nu \hat{\omega}$ was used by the Attics with α long : on which see $\Phi \alpha i \nu \omega$.

‡ [Consonants are divided into aspirated, as ϑ , ϕ , χ ; smooth, as κ , π , τ ; and middle, as β , γ , δ . ρέξαι as wrexai, ἔοργα as weworga, in order to distinguish in them the same appearance as we find in δέρκω, δρακεῖν, δέδορκα.*

'PE-. See Είπεῖν.

ee ..

'Pέω, I flow : fut. δεύσομαι, Theogn. 448.; aor. 1. έρpeura; but these two forms are seldom found in the Attics (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 739.), who generally use the fut. 6. i. puήσομαι, the aor. 2. pass. (with an active sense) έρρύην, a valuty and the perf. eppinna. This fut. and perf. are formed from · frk fr the aorist. †

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 έρδύην.

The part. δεούμενος in an oracle in Herodot. 7, 140. ίδρῶτι δεού- μ evos, dropping with sweat, is merely a lengthening of the o in β eó μ evos, like μαχεούμενος for μαχεόμενος; and the various reading δεεύμενος, introduced into the passage without the slightest authority, is therefore to be rejected.

'Pήγνυμι, I break : fut. pήξω‡, fut. midd. pήξομαι; aor. 1. έρρηξα, aor. 1. midd. ερρηξάμην; aor. 2. pass. ερράγην. All the above have a transitive meaning, in which, however, there occurs no perfect; but we find in an intransitive sense a perf. 2. ">ppwya, I am broken, with the change of vowel from η to ω : on which see note on $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\gamma\gamma\alpha$ under "Αγω, and έάλωκα under 'Αλίσκομαι.

[In Homer we find an Epic imperf. βήγνυσκε for έββήγνυ, Il. η, 141., and in Arat. Dios. 85. an Ion. 3. plur. pass. phyvuato. There is a sister-form of ῥήγνυμι in Il. σ, 571. ῥήσσω, Att. ῥάσσω: this last, however, is particularly used as an expression of the palæstra, to throw to the ground, Jac. Ach. Tat. p. 821.-Passow.7

'Piyéw, I shudder: fut. $\beta_{i\gamma}\eta\sigma\omega$; perf. with the force of a pres. έρριγα. On the irregular Epic part. ἐρρίγοντι (Hes. Sc. 228.), see κεκλήγοντος under Κλάζω, and πεφρίκοντας under Φρίσσω. The word is solely poetical. - Passow.]

* 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 pronounced ; therefore wright is bekrys. Compare Buttm. Lexil. p. 376.

† [A pres. βέσμαι occurs also in the poets.-Passow.]

t See 'Aγνυμι.

'Ριγώω, I freeze: fut. $\dot{\rho}$ ιγώσω, &c. This word, like iδρώω, is contracted into ω and φ instead of the regular ou and oi; e.g. infin. $\dot{\rho}$ ιγῶν, Aristoph. Vesp. 446. Av. 935. (yet we find $\dot{\rho}$ ιγοῦν, Nub. 442.); dat. part. $\dot{\rho}$ ιγῶντι, Ach. 1145.; part. fem. $\dot{\rho}$ ιγῶσα, Simonid. De Mul. 29.; opt. $\dot{\rho}$ ιγώην, Brunck. Aristoph. Ach. 1146. Av. 935. Lucian De Luct. 11. Plut. Apoph. Lac. p. 233. a. Hippocr. De Sal. Diæt. 1.; conj. $\dot{\rho}$ ιγῷ, Plat. Gorg. p. 507. d. (p. 527. Heind.) with Buttm. notes. See also Piers. ad Mœr. pp. 336. 339. All these are Attic forms.

Pίπτω, I throw: fut. $\dot{\rho}i\psi\omega$, &c.; aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}i\phi\eta\nu$. There are also two sister-forms $\dot{\rho}i\pi\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega^*$, $\dot{\rho}i\pi\tau\omega$, from the former of which comes the imperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}i\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\nu$, Herod. 8, 53.; but the formation follows $\dot{\rho}i\pi\tau\omega$. The *i* is long by nature (whence $\dot{\rho}i\pi\tau\epsilon$, $\dot{\rho}i\psi\alpha$), except in $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}i\phi\eta\nu$.

In Homer we find an Epic imperf. $\delta(\pi \tau a \sigma \kappa o \nu, -\epsilon c, -\epsilon)$ like $\kappa \rho \delta(\pi \tau a \sigma \kappa o \nu, \epsilon)$ the only two instances in Homer of a instead of ϵ , except perhaps the doubtful $\delta \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \sigma a \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, Od. ψ , 95. To these we must add $\delta \nu a \sigma \sigma \epsilon i a \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, Hymn. Apoll. 403. and $\delta o i \zeta a \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, Hes. 9, 835. [A reduplicated infin. perf. pass. $\delta \epsilon \rho \tilde{\rho} \theta \theta a \iota$ is found in Pind. Fr. 281.—Passow.]

'Ροίζασκε, Epic imperf., with the force of an aorist, from $\dot{\rho}$ οιζέω: see the preceding paragraph.

'ΡΥ-. See 'Ρέω. 'Ρύομαι.' See 'Ερύω.-'ΡΩΓ-. See 'Ρήγνυμι.

'Ρώννῦμι or ῥωννὑω, I strengthen : fut. ῥώσω, &c. (compare ''Αγνυμι, Κεράννυμι, Ζώννυμι): perf. pass. ἔῥῥωμαι (with the force of a pres.), I am strong in health, [whence the pluperf. ἐῥῥώμην has the sense of an imperf., e.g. ἔῥῥωντο, Thucyd. 2, 8.]; imperat. ἔῥῥωσο, like vale, farewell : part.

* [The form $\beta i \pi \tau \epsilon \omega$ is found only in the pres. and imperf., and seems to bear the same relation to $\beta i \pi \tau \omega$ as *jactare* does in Latin to *jacere*, i. e. it has the collateral idea of frequency, Herm. Soph. Aj. 235. Antig. 131. It occurs first in Herodot. 4, 94. 188. &c., afterwards in Xen. and other Attic writers. Elmsley excludes it from the Tragedians, but without grounds; while Buttmann confines the distinction between $\beta i m \tau \omega$ and $\beta i m \tau \omega$ to the Attic writers. — Passow.] έρρωμένος. The aor. 1. pass. is the only tense which takes the σ, as ἐρρώσθην.

'Ρώομαι [an old Epic depon. midd.], *I move with rapidity, rush,* wave, Il. ψ , 367.; fut. ῥώσομαι; aor. 1. ἐβῥωσάμην, Il. ω, 616. Od. ψ , 3. It is probably akin to ῥέω, as πλώω is to πλέω, χώομαι to χέω. [Some, however, connect it with ῥώννυμι, ῥώμη, ῥύομαι, ῥύμη and the Lat. ruo.—Passow.]

Σ.

Σαίρω, I brush, sweep away : fut. σαρῶ; aor. 1. ἔσηρα, part. σήρας, Soph. Ant. 409. No other tenses are in use.

Another form $\sigma a \rho \delta \omega$, $-\omega \sigma \omega$, 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 $\sigma a \rho o \delta \mu \epsilon v o \varsigma$.

From the same stem or root, but with a different radical meaning, comes a perfect, with the force of a present, $\sigma \in \sigma \eta \rho \alpha$, $I \ grin$; part. $\sigma \in \sigma \eta \rho \omega \varsigma$, $-\omega \tilde{\alpha} , -\delta \varsigma$, Theorr. 7, 19. Epic fem. $\sigma \in \sigma \tilde{\alpha} \rho \omega \tilde{\alpha}$, Hes. Sc. 268.

Σαλπίζω, I blow the trumpet: fut. σαλπίγξω; aor. 1. ἐσάλπιγξα, Il. φ, 388., but the later writers use σαλπίσω, ἐσάλπισα, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 191. So also the old subst. was σαλπιγκτής, the later one σαλπιστής. Compare Πλάζω and Συρίζω.

Σαόω. See Σώζω.

[°]Σάω, an old form for $\sigma \eta \theta \omega$, *I sift*, whence 3. plur. $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota$, Herodot. 1. 200.

Σβέννῦμι, or σθεννύω (Pind.), I extinguish: fut. σθέσω, less frequently σθήσομαι, Plat. Legg. 7. p. 805. c.; aor. 1. έσθεσα*; the perf. ἔσθηκα, and the syncopated aor. 2. ἔσθην, 1. plur. ἔσθημεν, opt. σθείην, infin. σθῆναι have the intrans. sense of the passive. † Pass. σθέννυμαι, I am extin-

[Passow, however, advises us not to be too hasty in condemning it, on account of the fut. ochooua.]

+ See note under Τεύχω.

^{*} The direction in Phryn. Appar. p. 16. that the aor. 1. act. should be written with an η , not with ϵ , appears to be an error. Aristophanes Plut. 668. has $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma s$.

guished, I die away, dry up; perf. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha i$; aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma \delta \acute{\epsilon}\sigma \delta \eta \nu$. The passive therefore takes σ . On the formation of $\check{\epsilon}\sigma \delta \eta \nu$ see $\check{\epsilon}\gamma \nu \omega \nu$ under $\Gamma_{i}\gamma \nu \dot{\omega}\sigma \varkappa \omega$: and on the intrans. sense of $\check{\epsilon}\sigma \delta \eta \nu$ and $\check{\epsilon}\sigma \delta \eta \varkappa \alpha$ see note under $T\epsilon \dot{\nu}\chi \omega$.

Strictly speaking, $\xi \sigma \xi \varepsilon \sigma \mu \alpha i$ and $\xi \sigma \xi \delta \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ have only the passive sense, to be extinguished; but as in verbs of this kind the immediate sense comes so near to the passive, not only does $\sigma \xi \delta \nu \nu \nu \mu \alpha i$ serve for a pres. to $\xi \sigma \xi \eta \nu$, $\xi \sigma \xi \eta \kappa \alpha$, but also $\xi \sigma \xi \delta \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ stands for $\xi \sigma \xi \eta \nu$, only that this latter, or rather its compound $\delta \pi \delta \sigma \xi \eta \nu$, is by far the more common of the two.

In the Doric dialect έσβην takes an a, έσβαν, Theocr. 4, 39.

Σέδω or σέδομαι, *I revere*, is found only in the present, and in the aor. 1. pass. ἐσέφθην, *I was filled with re*verence, Soph. ap. Hesych. whence part. fem. $\sigma \varepsilon \phi \theta \varepsilon \tilde{i} \sigma \alpha$, Plat. Phædr. p. 254. b.

[The act. $\sigma \ell \mathcal{C} \omega$, fut. $\sigma \ell \psi \omega$, is post-Homeric. — Passow.]

Σείω, I shake: fut. σείσω; aor. 1. ἔσεισα, &c.; perf. pass. σέσεισμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐσείσθην. For the Epic imperf. ἀνασσείασκε see ῥίπτασκον under Ῥίπτω.

Σεύω, I drive: pass. and midd. I hasten. This verb, like those beginning with ρ , doubles the first consonant in the augmented tenses, and retains it even in the perfect instead of the reduplication; e. g. imperf. ἕσσευον; imperf. pass. and midd. ἑσσευόμην; perf. pass. ἕσσυμαι*; aor. 1. pass. ἑσσύθην, Soph. Aj. 294. And having the σ thus doubled, it has none in the termination of the aor. 1. act. or midd., as ἕσσευα (see ἕκηα under καίω), ἑσσευάμην, part. σευάμενος, &c. The forms with one σ are of less frequent occurrence; ἑσύθην, Eurip., ἐξεσύθη, Hom. In this as in other cases, the Epic dialect rejects the augment entirely; as σεῦα, σεῦε, σεύατο.

The perf. pass. žσσυμαι, I am put in motion, has the meaning of, I am restless, eager for, as in II. ν , 79. Od. κ , 484. in which sense the particip. žσσύμενος (see åκηχέμενος under Ἀκαχίζω) has the accentuation of a present, žσσύμενος πολέμου, II. ω, 404. According to this the pluperf. žσσύμην would have the force of the imperfect; but it coincides in form with the syncop. aor. (see ἐκτάμην in note under Κτείνω) as in 2. sing. žσσυσ for ἕσσυσο, in 3. sing. ἕσσυτο, Epic σύτο, part. σύμενος; and the sense is therefore always that of an aorist. In the

^{*} On the change from the diphthong to the v of this perf. pass. see note unler $X \in \omega$.

second person of this pluperf. or a rist $\xi \sigma \sigma v \sigma$ (II. π , 585.), the σ in the last syllable is rejected for the same euphonic reason as in $\xi \sigma \sigma \varepsilon v a$.

We find also syncopated forms of the present; as 3. sing. $\sigma\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\tau\alpha\iota$, Soph. Trach. 645. but most commonly with a change of vowel, $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}\tau\alpha\iota$, Æschyl. Ch. 636., $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, Pers. 25., whence the imperatives used in common life, $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}$, run, quick, Aristoph. Vesp. 209., or $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}\sigma\sigma$, $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}\sigma\theta\omega$, $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}\sigma\theta\epsilon$, and infin. $\sigma\sigma\tilde{\nu}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.* [These forms are used only by the Attic poets.—Passow.]

And lastly to this place belongs the well-known Laconian $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$, he is gone, from Xen. Hellen. 1, 1, 23. explained to be an aor. 2. pass. for $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\delta\eta$.

Σήπω, I make rotten or putrid. Pass, σήπομαι, I rot, putrefy, mortify; aor. 2. ἐσάπην; perf. act. (with the intrans. meaning of the pass.) σέσηπα.

 Σ ίνομαι, Ion. σινέομαι, I harm, injure; a defective depon., used only in pres. and imperfect. The rare perf. σέσιμμαι is found in an inscription in a passive sense.

[We find, however, in Herodot. 8, 31. the aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma i \nu a \nu \tau \sigma$. The act. $\sigma i \nu \omega$ never occurs; and, except in the above-mentioned perfect and in Orph. Arg. 212., $\sigma i \nu \sigma \mu a \iota$ has never a passive sense.—Passow.]

Σκάπτω, I dig: fut. σκάψω: perf. pass. ἔσκαμμαι; aor. 2. pass. ἐσκάφην. The characteristic letter is therefore ϕ .

Σκεδάννυμι, or -ννύω, *I disperse*, scatter: fut. σκέδασω, \checkmark Att. σκεδῶ, -ặς, -ặ, Aristoph. Vesp. 229. but found also γμί in Herodot. 8, 68. The passive takes σ, as perf. ἐσκέδασμαι; aor. 1. ἐσκεδάσθην.

Sister-forms of the above are $\sigma \kappa i \delta \nu \eta \mu i$ (compare $\kappa i \rho \nu \eta \mu i$ from $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{a} \nu \nu \nu \mu i$), $\sigma \kappa i \delta \nu a \mu a i$; and in the Epic poets, dropping the σ , $\kappa \epsilon \delta \dot{a} \nu \nu \nu \mu i$, $\kappa i \delta \nu \eta \mu i$, like $\sigma \mu \kappa \rho \delta c$, $\mu \kappa \rho \delta c$, &c. Apollonius and others have also $\kappa \epsilon \delta a \dot{a} \omega$: [Such a form as $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \dot{a} \zeta \omega$ appears to have never occurred.—Passow.]

* As $\sigma\epsilon\delta\tau a\iota$ is indisputably a syncopated form, we class the others with it on account of the greater simplicity of the analogy; therefore $\sigma\epsilon \omega \alpha$, $\sigma o \delta \omega \cdot \sigma \epsilon \delta \tau a \alpha$, $\sigma o \delta \tau a \alpha$. Otherwise we may suppose a theme $\Xi O \Omega$, particularly on account of $\sigma o \delta$; as then $\sigma o \delta \sigma \sigma$ would be from $\sigma \delta o \mu a$, contr. $\sigma \delta \mu \mu a$, like $\xi \epsilon \delta \gamma \nu \sigma \sigma$ from Geiγνυμαι. In case we adopt the syncope, $\sigma c \bar{c} \sigma \sigma$ will be quite regular, and $\sigma c \bar{v}$, 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 $\Lambda o t \omega$.

Σχέλλω, or σχελέω, I dry any thing. But more frequently used in the pass. σχέλλομαι or σχελούμαι, Ibecome dry: fut. oxinjoouas; to which we must add (with the same intransitive sense of the passive) the active forms, aor. 2. EoxAyu, opt. oxhainu, infin. oxhnuas; and perf. έσκληκα. See note under Τεύγω.

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 ἕσκειλα. But in the Epic writers we find forms of an aorist $\xi \sigma \kappa \eta \lambda \alpha$, as opt. $\sigma \kappa \eta \lambda \epsilon \iota \epsilon$, Il. ψ , 191., conj. $\epsilon \nu \iota \sigma \kappa \eta \lambda \eta$, Nicand. 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 α and ε , that we may with full confidence suppose a theme $\sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega$ to have existed in the old Ionic dialect with the former meaning, as we find the α in the optative $\sigma \kappa \lambda \alpha i \eta \nu$ (although known to us only from amoorkhain in Hesychius), and we have therefore here the metathesis ΣΚΑΛ-, ΣΚΛΑ-, according to the analogy of βάλλω βέβληκα, καλέω κέκληκα, and many others.

Σκέπτομαι, I look around me, consider, (a depon. midd.) is inflected regularly. The Attics scarcely ever used the pres. and imperf., but generally σχοπώ or σχοπούμαι; on the contrary in the future always σκέψομαι, never σκοπήσω or σχοπήσομαι, as also in the aor. έσχεψάμην, and in the perf. Eoxemuas, part. Eoxemuéros, Elmsl. Eurip. Heracl. 147. 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. σκεπτέος.

The pres. and imperf. belong principally to the Epic language; e. g. σκέπτετο, Il. π, 361., imperat. σκέπτεο, Il. ρ, 652. Theogn. 1091., σκεπτόμενος, Apoll. Rhod. In the older Attics I have found σκεπτόμεθα in Plat. Lach. p. 185. and προυσκέπτετο in Thucyd. 8, 66. (see however the note below). In the later writers these tenses are found more frequently, as in Lucian, &c.*

* The above account of the genuine Grammarians; but that the great rarity of

Attic usage of this verb does not, it is true, rest on any statement of the old proved by the very frequent occurrence

Q 2

An aor. 2. pass. $\ell \sigma \kappa \epsilon \pi \eta \nu$ is found in the LXX, as in Numb. 1, 19. $\ell \pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \pi \eta \sigma a \nu$, they were numbered.

Σκοπέω, or σκοποῦμαι, *idem*. It is used only in the pres. and imperf.: all the other tenses are supplied by σ κέπτομαι; which see.

Σκώπτω, I joke, make a joke of : fut. midd. σκώψομαι, Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 278. 844. [aor. 1. ἔσκωψα; and in Aristoph. Nub. 296. Reisig has restored to the text the act. fut. σκώψω. Compare Comm. Crit. de Soph. Œd. C. 398.— Passow.]

Σμάω, Ion. σμέω, I smear, anoint: fut. σμήσω, Dor. σμάσω; aor. 1. midd. ἐσμήσαμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐσμήχθην; verbal adj. σμηντός. These two last are formed from a sister-form σμήχω (fut. σμήξω, aor. 1. ἔσμηξα, &c.), used by the Epics and in the later language; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 253. The present is contracted to σμῶ and inflected in η, as σμῆς, σμῆ, &c., infin. σμῆν; (see Πεινάω) nor do σμᾶς, σμᾶν, &c., ever occur before the time of Lucian; Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 61.

Σούμαι. See Σεύω.

Σπάω, I draw: [fut. σπάσω; aor. 1. ἔσπασα; perf. ἔσπακα; perf. pass. ἔσπασμαι; aor. 1. midd. ἐσπασάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐσπάσθην.] The α is short in all the tenses.

 $\Sigma \pi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, &c. See "E $\pi \omega$.

Σπείρω, I sow : [fut. σπερῶ; aor. 1. ἔσπειρα; perf. 2. ἔσπορα; perf. pass. ἔσπαρμαι;] aor. 2. pass. ἐσπάρην with α short. — MIDD.

of ἐσκεψάμην, σκέψομαι, ἕσκεμμαι, σκοπῶ, σκοποῦμαι (compounds as well as simple), coupled with the decided defectiveness of the forms of σκοπεῶν in -ἡσω, and -ἦσαι, of which I nowhere find any mention. Instances where σκέπτομαι 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 τὰ ἑηθησόμενα πρό-

critic. In the passage of Thucydide the manuscripts have τα βηθησόμενα μυξαι \$1.9.553 τερον abroîs προυσκέπτετο. 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 προβσκεπτο, 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. Σπένδω, I pour out: fut. σπείσω; aor. 1. ἔσπεισα; perf. ἔσπεικα, Plut. Sertor. 14.; perf. pass. ἔσπεισμαι.

[Homer has the Ionic imperf. σπένδεσκε and the aor. σπείσασκε, as also the Ep. 2. sing. conj. pres. σπένδησθα, Od. δ, 591.—Passow.]

Στάζω, I drop: fut. στάξω, &c. Compare Βαστάζω, Διστάζω.

Στείδω, I tread, tread upon : [fut. στείψω; aor. 2. ἔστίδον;] aor. 2. pass. ἐστίδην, Soph. Aj. 883.

Στείχω, I stride, march : fut. στείξω ; aor. 1. εστειξα ; aor. 2. εστίχον. [The word is solely Poet. and Ion.]

Στέλλω, I send: [fut. στελῶ, Ep. στελέω; aor. 1. ἔστειλα; aor. 1. midd. ἐστειλάμην; perf. ἔσταλκα; perf. pass. ἔσταλμαι; pluperf. ἐστάλμην;] aor. 2. pass. ἐστάλην; and in the poets aor. 1. ἐστάλθην,

In Herodot. 7, 89. we find a 3. plur. pluperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau a\lambda\dot{a}\dot{\delta}a\tau o$, which however is perhaps nothing more than an old error for $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{a}\lambda a\tau o$, occurring in Hes. Scut. 288.

Στενάζω, I groan: fut. στενάξω, &c. Compare Στάζω, Βαστάζω, Διστάζω.

 $\Sigma_{\tau \not\in v \omega}$, I sigh, is used only in pres. and imperf.*

The poets (Æschyl. and Eurip.) use also a pass. $\sigma \tau \acute{\epsilon} \nu o \mu a \iota$, Epic $\sigma \tau \acute{\epsilon} \nu o \mu a \iota$, in the sense of I am narrow, full.

Στέργω, I love, am contented with: fut. σ τέρξω, &c.; perf. 2. ἔστοργα, Herodot. 7, 104.

Στερέω, I deprive, bereave: fut. στερήσω, but also στερέσω, Schæf. Schol. Par. Apollon. Rh. 1, 850. Jacob. Anthol. Poet. pp. 680.711. whence the infin. aor. στερέσαι, Od. ν, 262. This verb is complete and regular in all its tenses in its compound ἀποστερέω, which, beside the more general idea of to deprive, has oftener the more immediate sense of to take away; e.g. fut. ἀποστερήσω; aor. 1. ἀπεστέρησα, &c.: pass. ἀποστεροῦμαι; aor. 1. ἀπε-

^{* [}Reisig conjectures that we should read a fut. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{i}$ in Soph. (Ed. Col. 1710. – Passow.]

στέρηθην; with the fut. midd. ἀποστερήσομαι. In the simple verb the pres. in general use is στερίσκω, στερήσω, ἐστέρησα, &c.; and in the passive στεροῦμαι or στερίσκομαι, privor, I lose; fut. στερήσομαι; perf. ἐστέρημαι; aor. 1. ἐστερήθην.

A particular form is $\sigma \tau \not\in \rho \circ \mu \alpha \imath$ with the meaning of Iam 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 $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \mu a \iota$ with $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota$ or $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho i \sigma \kappa \rho \mu a \iota$. The meaning of $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma c$ is always deprived, that of $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ 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. $\nu \tilde{\nu} \nu \delta' \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \eta$ $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \delta \pi \epsilon \rho o \rho \iota \omega \nu$ (of my foreign property) $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o \rho \mu a \iota \kappa a \iota \tau a \epsilon \gamma \gamma \epsilon \iota a o \upsilon \kappa a \rho \pi \sigma \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota$: see also Anab. 3, 2, 2.

The poets have also from $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \mu a \iota$ the part. aor. 2. pass. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \varsigma$, synonymous with $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \varsigma$ and $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \epsilon \ell \varsigma$.

Homer seems to have inflected $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$ with the ϵ , for he has the aor. 1. infin. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma a \alpha$, Od. ν , 262. The fut. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon$ of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \delta \epsilon$, which occurs in the old Atticism (Andocid. Myster. extr.) is to be explained by the same inflexion.

Στεῦται, 3. sing. pres. and στεῦτο, 3. sing. imperf., Epic defective deponent. The above forms occur frequently in Homer in the sense of he gives to understand, promises, threatens: and we find the 3. plur. στεῦνται once in Æschyl. Pers. 49. in the same sense. At Od. λ , 584. στεῦτο δὲ διψάων, in a description of Tantalus, Passow derives it from ιστημι, and translates it in its literal sense, he stood, but Voss renders it, he strove, endeavoured.

Στηρίζω, I fix: fut. στηρίσω; aor. 1. ἐστήριξα, aor. 1. midd. ἐστηριξάμην; perf. pass. ἐστήριγμαι; pluperf. ἐστηρίγμην. Compare Βαστάζω, Διστάζω. Στίζω, I prick: fut. στίξω; aor. 1. έστιξα; perf. pass. έστιγμαι. See the preceding.

Στορέννυμι, I spread, strew, abbrev. στόρνυμι, and by metathesis στρώννυμι; so also in the formation*, fut. στορέσω or στρώσω (Att. παραστορῶ, Aristoph. Equ. 484.); aor. 1. ἐστόρεσα or ἔστρωσα; in the other tenses the usual forms are perf. pass. ἔστρωμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐστρώθην; verbal adj. στρωτός.

Hippocrates uses καταστορεσθηναι; see Foes. Œc. Hippocr. : and Hesychius explains έστορέσθη and έστορήθη by έστρώθη.†

Στρέφω, I turn (transit.); fut. στρέψω; perf. 2. ἔστροφα, Vintr Theognet. Conv. Athen. 3. p. 104. c. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 578. perf. pass. ἔστραμμαι (like τέτραμμαι and τέθραμμαι, with a instead of ε‡); aor. 1. pass. ἐστρέφθην (compare Ἐτρέφθεν under Τρέπω); aor. 2. ἐστράφην.

The aor. 1. pass. ἐστράφθην occurs in the Doric dialect of Theorr. 7, 132. I know of no authority for a pres. στράφω; compare τράπω, τράφω. In Il. σ, 546. στρέψασκον is 3. plur. aor. for ἕστρεψαν.

Στυγέω, *I fear*, *hate*, is regular. The perf. $\dot{\alpha}\pi$ εστύγηχα has the force of a present, Herodot. 2, 47.

From an obsolete stem $\Sigma TY\Gamma\Omega$ or $\Sigma TYZ\Omega$ Homer has the aor. 2. $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\nu\gamma\rho\nu$; and an aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\nu\xi a$, opt. $\sigma\tau\nu\xi a\iota\mu\iota$, Od. λ , 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.

Συρίζω, Att. συρίττω, *I pipe*: fut. συρίξω, more frequently and purer Attic συρίξομαι, Non-Attic συρίσω, Dor. συρίσδω; see Hemsterh. Aristoph. Plut. p. 229. The aor. 1. infin. συρίσαι is found in Lucian. Harmon. 2. Compare Βαστάζω and Διστάζω.

Σύρω, I draw, drag along. Pass. σύρομαι; aor. 2. εσύρην.

^{*} Compare 'Αγνυμι and Κεράννυμι.

[†] Stephens in his Thesaurus quotes κατεστόρηντο from Herodot. 8, 53., where

however the text has κατάστρωντο without any various reading.

[‡] See note on τέτραμμαι under Τρέπω.

Σφάζω, Att. σφάττω, [I cut the throat, slaughter, offer up in sacrifice : fut. σφάξω; aor. 1. ἔσφαξα; perf. pass. ἔσφαγμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐσφάχθην, Herodot. 5, 5. and Pind.] but in the Attic writers generally aor. 2. ἐσφάγην, part. σφăγείς. Compare Βαστάζω, Διστάζω.

Σφάλλω, I deceive: [fut. σφαλῶ; aor. 1. ἔσφηλα, infin. σφῆλαι; aor. 2. ἔσφαλον, Pind.; perf. pass. ἔσφαλμαι;] aor. 2. pass. ἐσφάλην.

Σφίγγω, I tie together, fasten together: fut. $\sigma \phi'_i \gamma \xi \omega$; perf. pass. $\xi \sigma \phi_i \gamma \mu \alpha_i$ (but 3. sing. $\xi \sigma \phi_i \gamma \times \tau \alpha_i$), infin. $\xi \sigma \phi_i \gamma - \xi \alpha_i$, &c.

Σφύζω, *I bedt* (as the pulse does), *palpito*: fut. σ φύξω, &c. Compare $\Sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, $\Sigma \tau \dot{i} \zeta \omega$, &c.

 $\Sigma_{\chi}\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, *I drop*, open: fut. $\sigma_{\chi}\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, &c. This verb has in the older language a pres. in $-\dot{\alpha}\omega$, as $\sigma_{\chi}\dot{\alpha}\omega$, infin. $\sigma_{\chi}\tilde{q}\nu$: imperf. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma_{\chi}\omega\nu$; 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 $\xi_{\chi\omega}$, $\sigma_{\chi}\epsilon\theta_{\omega}$, $i\sigma_{\chi\omega}$. An Alexandrian form $\epsilon\sigma_{\chi}\alpha\zeta\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu$ for $\epsilon\sigma_{\chi}\alpha\zeta\sigma\nu$ is found in Lycophr. 21. — Passow.]

Σχεῖν, ἔσχον, ἔσχεθον. See Έχω.

Σώζω, I save: fut. σώσω, old Attic σώω; aor. 1. ἕσωσα; perf. pass. Att. σέσωμαι, otherwise generally σέσωσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐσώθην. — MIDD.

The radical form is $\sigma a \delta \omega$, $\sigma a \omega \delta \sigma \omega$, coming regularly from $\sigma \delta \alpha \varsigma$, salvus; and as from $\sigma \delta \alpha \varsigma$ came $\sigma \omega \varsigma$, so by contraction from $\sigma a \delta \omega$ was formed $\sigma \omega \omega$, $\sigma \omega \sigma \omega$, $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \omega \mu a\iota$, $\epsilon \sigma \omega \theta \eta \nu$. The pres. $\sigma \omega \omega * \sigma \omega \epsilon\iota$, &c., remained in the usage of the Epic poets; but $\sigma \omega \zeta \omega$, which sprung from it, was introduced into the common language, and gave rise afterwards to $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \omega \sigma \mu a\iota$. The rarity of the older form $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \omega \mu a\iota$ (on which see Suid. v. $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \omega \sigma \tau a\iota$) arose from transcribers using the one then in common use.⁺

There is perhaps no instance whatever in the Epic writers of the pres. $\sigma \omega \zeta \omega. \pm$ In the other tenses they use the resolved form only, as fut.

^Φ [Hence the part. σώοντες, Od. ι, 430. and the Ionic imperf. σώεσκον, Il. 3, 363. Apoll. Rhod. has also σώετε, and the midd. σώεσθαι. — Passow.]

+ Bekker has in many cases restored the old form from the manuscripts. t The single occurrence of $\sigma\omega'_{\omega}\omega_{\nu}$ in O.I. ϵ , 490. is most likely a false reading for $\sigma\omega\omega_{\nu}$, as we find at i, 430. $\sigma\omega'_{\sigma}\sigma\epsilon_{\sigma}$: and in Hes. ϵ , 374. $\sigma\omega'_{\omega}\omega_{\nu}$ is a rejected reading. Among the Alexandrine Epics Apollon. Rhod. has invariably $\sigma\omega\omega_{\nu}$ &c. σαώσω; aor. 1. έσάωσα; aor. 1. pass. έσαώθην; fut. midd. σαώσομαι; and in the present beside $\sigma \omega \omega$, &c., a shortened form of it; as, conj. σόης, σόη, σόωσιν, Il. 1, 393. 424. 681. But the resolved form is seldom found in the present in the Epic writers ; oaoi, Theogn. 868. Bekk. and Callim. Del. 22., σαοῦσι*, Tyrt. 2, 13. The imperative would therefore be σάου, and the imperf. (ἐσάουν) 3. sing. ἐσάου, σάου, 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 $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\dot{\alpha}\omega$, $\sigma\dot{\alpha}\omega$, Il. ϕ , 238. π , 363. as the 3. sing. imperf., and $\sigma\dot{\alpha}\omega$, Od. ν , 230. ρ , 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 $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega$. Besides it has been already mentioned under vautaw, that this form is lengthened in the same anomalous manner as valeráwoa; that is to say from έσάου, σάου came έσῶ, σῶ; which contraction, instead of being resolved into -ow according to general analogy, was changed to $-\alpha\omega$.

In an Attic inscription in Corp. Inscr. Gr. T. 1. p. 107. no. 71. stands legibly ΣOO , while the context requires the fut. $\sigma \omega \sigma \omega$: that form must therefore be read $\sigma \omega \omega$, which is the same old future as the Epic $\ell \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \sigma$, $\tau \alpha \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \sigma$, and which had therefore left its traces in the Attic language: see $\ell \kappa \gamma \epsilon \gamma \delta \sigma \nu \tau \alpha \tau$ under $\Gamma \ell \nu \sigma \mu \alpha \tau$, and the end of the article on $E \rho \omega$.

Т.

TA-. We must suppose this stem or root on account of the old imperative $\tau \tilde{\eta}$, take ! here ! (in French tiens !) to which belonged also a plural $\tau \tilde{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ (Sophron. ap. Schol. Aristoph. Ach. 204.), formed according to the analogy of $\zeta \tilde{\eta} \nu$, &c.

Akin to the above is another stem or root TAT-+, from which Homer has a redupl. part. aor. 2. $\tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \gamma \omega' \nu$, seizing.

That the supposition of a stem or root TA- for the formation of $\tau \epsilon$ - $\tau \alpha \kappa \alpha$, &c., from $\tau \epsilon i \nu \omega$ is grammatically unnecessary, although there may be etymological grounds for it, is shown under $T \epsilon i \nu \omega$. See also an account of all the above-mentioned forms in Buttm. Lexil. Art. $T \epsilon \tau \alpha \gamma \omega \nu$, p. 503. et sqg.

TAT-. See TA- (TA Ω).

Ταλάω. See Τλάω.

* The false reading σάουσι, and the similar error of σάοι (amended by Bekker in the above-quoted passage of Theognis), gave rise to the adoption of a form $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega$. + Compare $\epsilon \tau \mu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu$ under $T \epsilon \mu \nu \omega$ ($\tau \epsilon - \tau \mu \eta \kappa a$). Tarύω, I stretch out, strain: fut. τανύσω; perf. pass. τετάνυσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτανύσθην. The Epic fut. in -ὑω*, τανύουσι occurs in Od. ϕ , 174. In Il. ρ , 393. we find a 3. sing. pres. τάνυται, as formed from τάνυμαι. The v is short in all the tenses, so that Homer, in order to lengthen it, doubles the σ.

Ταράσσω, Att. ταράττω, I disturb: fut. ταράξω[†], &c. Its inflexion is regular.

This verb has a sister-form of less frequent occurrence, 1.) in the Attics $\Im\rho\dot{a}\tau\tau\omega$ with long a, whence the neut. part. $\tau\dot{o}$ $\Im\rho\tilde{a}\tau\tau\sigma\nu$; the pres. was used in prose, the aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon}\theta\rho a\check{z}a$, infin. $\Im\rho\tilde{a}\check{z}a$ 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.

This $\Im\rho\dot{\alpha}\tau\tau\omega$ was formed from $\tau a\rho\dot{\alpha}\tau\tau\omega$ by transposing the first a with the ρ , and then contracting the two alphas into one long syllable: consequently the τ before the ρ became aspirated, like $\tau\ell\theta\rho\mu\pi\sigma\nu$, $\Im\mu\dot{\alpha}$ - $\tau\iota\nu$, $\phi\rho\rho\tilde{\nu}\partial\sigma_{\sigma}$, &c. In $\tau\ell\tau\rho\eta\chi\alpha$ the τ was necessarily restored, and the η for $\bar{\alpha}$ is a common Ionicism. From this perfect the later writers formed a pres. $\tau\rho\dot{\eta}\chi\omega$. See the Art. on $\tau\ell\tau\rho\eta\chi\alpha$ in Buttm. Lexil. p. 506.

Τάσσω, Att. τάττω, I set in order, arrange: fut. τάξω; perf. pass. τέταγμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτάχθην; aor. 2. (less frequent) ἐτάγην. Midd. τάσσομαι, &c.; aor. 1. ἐταξάμην. Ταφεῖν and ταφῆναι. See Θάπτω and ΘΑΦ-.

Tείνω, I stretch out, extend (any thing): fut. τενῶ; aor. 1. ετεινα; perf. τέτακα; perf. pass. τέταμαι; aor. 1. pass. ετάθην. See TA-, and Τανύω.

This verb, with $\kappa\lambda i\nu\omega$, $\kappa\rho i\nu\omega$, $\kappa\tau\epsilon i\nu\omega$, and $\pi\lambda i\nu\omega$, drops the ν in the perf. act., perf. pass., and aor. 1. pass., and takes the short vowel of the future; the two verbs in $-\epsilon i\nu\omega$ changing also the ϵ to α . When we observe that $\check{\epsilon}\phi\theta\iota\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\delta\nu\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ belong, both in form and meaning, to $\phi\theta i\omega$ and $\delta i\omega$ (not $\phi\theta i\nu\omega$, $\delta i\nu\omega$), that $i\delta\rho i\nu\theta\eta\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\nu i\nu\theta\eta\nu$ must come from $i\delta\rho i\omega$, $\pi\nu i\omega$, there being no trace of a pres. in $-\nu\omega$ for either, and that $\beta a i\nu\omega$ comes from BA Ω , $\phi\theta a i\nu\omega$ from $\Phi\Theta A\Omega$, &c. &c., we may conclude that the above five verbs also ($\tau\epsilon i\nu\omega$, &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 ν . But as in these five verbs the ν is carried on to the future,

* See the end of the article on $\Xi \omega \zeta \omega$, and the references there given.

^{† [}Thucyd. 7, 36. has the fut. midd. ταράξομαι in a passive sense. - Passow.]

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 λ , μ , ν , or ρ , particularly in the change of the vowel ϵ to α ; 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 KPI Ω , TA Ω , &c., by which the number of verbal anomalies would be unnecessarily increased.

Teipe, I rub out (attero), wear out, torment, is used only in pres. and imperf. Topeïv and Tépooµau must be considered as distinct stems or roots, which, although akin to each other, have been separated by usage. See both in their places.

ΤΕΚ-. See Τίκτω.

Tελέω, I finish, complete, fulfil: fut. τ ελέσω^{*}, τ ελέω (Il. 9, 415.), and Att. τ ελῶ, Plat. Protag. p. 311. b.; in the passive also τ ελεύμενα (Herodot. 3, 134.) is a future. See Δέμω and Καλέω. Pass. τ ελέομαι; fut. τ ελέσομαι; perf. τ ετέλεσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτελέσθην.

[Homer has also the aor. 1. act. $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma a$, of which Herodotus uses the infin. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma a \iota$. We find also in Homer the Epic pres. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega$ both in the act. and pass. voice. — Passow.]

Tέλλω, an old verb[†], occurring only in its compounds, which may be found in the Lexicons; e. g. ἀνατέλλω, ἐπιτέλλω, &c. It is reflected regularly according to the analogy of verbs having as their characteristic letter, λ, μ, ν , or ρ ; and in the passive has only the aor. 1.— MIDD.

[Passow gives the following inflexion: τέλλω; fut. τελῶ, Æol. τέλσω; aor. 1. ἕτειλα, Æol. ἕτελσα; perf. pass. τέταλμαι; pluperf. ἐτετάλμην; aor. 1. ἐτάλθην. Midd. τέλλομαι; aor. 1. ἐτειλάμην.]

Τέμνω, I cut: fut. τεμῶ; aor. 2. ἔτεμον and ἔταμον; pref. τέτμηκα ‡, perf. pass. τέτμημαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτμήθην: 3. fut. τετμήσομαι, whence ἐκτετμήσεσθον, Plat. De Rep. 8. p. 564. c. § – MIDD.

In II. ν , 707. $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \iota$ is a solitary instance of a pres. $\tau \epsilon \mu \omega$; and so it is

* [In Homer, where the metre requires it, τελέσσω. — Passow.]

‡ The part. perf. rerunds is found in

Apoll. Rhod. 4, 156. in a passive sense. See κεκορηώs under Κορέννυμι, and κεκμηώs under Κάμνω.

§ See note, p. 39.

[†] See the note on Τλήναι.

considered by Heyne: but Wolf and Passow read $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \tilde{\iota}$ as a future. The common form however in both Epic and Ionic writers is $\tau \dot{a} \mu \nu \omega$: yet the aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau a \mu o \nu$ 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 $\tau \mu \dot{\eta} \gamma \omega$; aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon} \tau \mu \eta \dot{\xi} \alpha$; aor. 2. $\check{\epsilon} \tau \mu \alpha \gamma o \nu$; aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \mu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu$. See also Τ $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \mu o \nu$.

Tέρπω, I delight: fut. τέρψω; aor. 1. ἕτερψα, &c. This verb is regular.

The pass. $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi o \mu a_i$, I am delighted, satiated, has in the Epic language three varieties of the aorist; viz. $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \phi \theta \eta \nu$ (Od. 9, 131.); $\epsilon \tau \alpha \rho \pi \eta \nu$ (II. λ , 779. whence the infin. $\tau \alpha \rho \pi \eta \nu a_i$, $\tau \alpha \rho \pi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu a_i$); and $\epsilon \tau \alpha \rho \pi \delta \mu \eta \nu$ (whence the conj. $\tau \alpha \rho \pi \omega \mu \epsilon \theta a_i$, II. ω , 636.) or with redupl. $\tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \rho \pi \delta \mu \eta \nu$, $\tau \epsilon \tau \delta \rho \pi \epsilon \tau o$, $\tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \rho \pi \omega \mu \epsilon \theta a_i$, $T \epsilon \tau \alpha \rho \pi \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o c_i$. But the aor. 1. pass. is found likewise in many passages of Homer with a change of vowel, e. g. $\tau \delta \rho \phi \theta \eta$, Od. τ , 213., $\tau \delta \rho \phi \theta \epsilon \nu$, ζ , 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 (II. γ , 441. ξ , 314. Od. ϑ , 292.) Homer has $\tau \rho a \pi \epsilon i \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$, which is aor. 2. conj. pass. for $\tau \rho a \pi \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\tau \rho a \pi \tilde{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$, and formed according to the analogy of verbs in μ , that is like $\vartheta \epsilon i \rho \mu a \iota$ for $\vartheta \epsilon \omega \mu a \iota$ from $\tau i \theta \eta \mu$, or $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ from $i \sigma \tau \eta \mu$. But in the above passages the verb comes from $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi \omega$, not from $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \omega$, by the same metathesis as in $\epsilon \pi \rho a \theta \rho \nu$: see $\Pi \epsilon \rho \theta \omega$.

Τέρσομαι, I become dry, depon. pass.; aor. 2. pass. $(\epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta \nu)$ infin. $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$, II. π, 519. Od. ζ, 98. The active voice does not occur in any ancient writer, but in its stead we find, in a causative sense, T $\epsilon \rho \sigma \alpha i \nu \omega$, I make dry, dry up, (regularly inflected) whence aor. 1. $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta \nu \alpha$ II. π, 529.

At Il. π , 519. we find $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha_i$, to become dry, and at v. 529. $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta \nu \epsilon$,

* Indeed the use of the two forms $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho$, $\phi \theta \eta \nu$ and $\epsilon \tau d \rho \pi \eta \nu$, 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. τ . 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

from $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \omega$, grounded on grammatical construction, is correct. To which we may add that Homer in such a sense (to turn oneself toward), never uses $\tau \rho \pi \pi \eta r \omega$ ut $\tau \rho \pi \pi \epsilon \sigma \omega r$; while on the other hand we meet with the same expression $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega$ $\phi \iota \lambda \delta \tau \eta \tau \iota$ at Od. ϵ , 227. In the passage of Od. 3. 292. we must join $\epsilon \upsilon r \hbar \theta \epsilon r \tau$ $\lambda \epsilon (\epsilon \tau \rho \sigma v \delta \epsilon$, like ϵs $\beta \rho \delta \nu \sigma r \delta \epsilon$ and the 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 $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta \nu \epsilon$ can be nothing but an aor. 1. act., $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu a\iota$ would then be the infinitive of the same tense, with an immediate or neuter meaning. But $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu a\iota$ (Od. ζ , 98.), which exactly corresponds with it, is clearly an aor. passive. *

Nicander (Ther. 96. 693. 709.) has some forms of an aor. $\xi \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma a$ for $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta \nu a$; and again in Theorr. 22, 63. I would, rather on account of the context, consider $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon \iota$ 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 $\tau \epsilon \rho \delta \omega$, I dry up (see the last note); fut. $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\xi \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma a$.

Τετάγών. See TA-.

Τετευχησθαι, to be armed, Od. χ , 104., a perfect derived from the subst. τεύχεα. Compare Ἐσθημένος.

Τετίημαι. See TIE-.

Tέτμον, ἔτετμον, I found, hit upon, attained: a defective aorist, of which we find no other tense than the conj. τέτμης, η, Od. o, 15. The analogy of ἕπεφνον and ἐκεκλόμην appears to lead us to a theme TEMΩ, which however being totally different in meaning from TEMΩ the stem or root of τέμνω, must be kept distinct from it, at least by the grammarian.

[Of this latter root we find $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \mu \epsilon \tau \sigma$ in Orph. Arg. 366. which, as well as $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \mu \sigma \nu$, Passow forms from an obsolete pres. $\tau \epsilon \tau \mu \omega$.]

Τετραίνω. See Τιτράω.

Tεύχω. The two following cognate verbs must be kept distinct from each other.

1. Τεύχω, I prepare : a poetical word, regularly inflected, as fut.

* It is true that there is no other instance of an aor. 2. pass. in $\sigma\eta\nu$; but this arises only from there being in the common language no verb with σ as its characteristic. This aorist is therefore quite regular; and consequently to suppose an intransitive active TEPSEQ, to which these infinitives might belong according to the analogy of $\phi\rho\eta\gamma\mu\alpha$, $\phi\rho\eta\gamma$ - $\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$, would be to increase unnecessarily the number of themes. Besides these forms must then be in the present, synonymous with $\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\thetaa$, 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 τέρσεσθαι with τείρειν by means of a future and an aorist of this verb, according to the analogy of κείρω ἕκερσα (compare 'λλέξω), must be pronounced incorrect, because the σ in τέρσεσθαι is in the root through the Ionicism of ρσ for ββ, as shown by the derivative subst. ταβρός and ταρσός, and the Lat. torreo. Nor is there so immediate an agreement between the meanings of (τέβρω) τέρσω, I dry up, and τείρω, I rub off, which latter may indeed have been pronounced in the Æolic dialect τέβρω ulso (see Greg. Cor. in Æol. ii.), as to justify the grammarian in joining both verbs under the same inflexion. τεύζω; aor. 1. ἕτευξα; perf. τέτευχα; perf. pass. τέτυγμαι*; fut. 3. τετεύζομαι; aor. 1. pass. έτύχθην.† Verbal adj. τυκτός or τευκτός.

2. $T_{0\gamma}\chi_{\alpha\nu\omega}$, I happen, chance to be, hit upon: fut. $\tau \varepsilon \delta \xi_{0\mu\alpha i}$; aor. 2. $\xi \tau_{0\gamma}\chi_{0\nu}$; perf. $\tau \varepsilon \tau \delta \chi_{0\gamma}\chi_{\alpha}$. On the formation of these tenses from $\tau \varepsilon \delta \chi_{\omega}$, see notes under $\Pi_{0\nu}\theta \delta_{\nu}\delta_{\nu}\delta_{\mu\alpha i}$: and on the derivation of $\tau \varepsilon \tau \delta \chi_{0}\chi_{\alpha}$ from $\xi \tau_{0}\chi_{0\nu}$ (without having recourse to a new theme $\tau_{0\chi}\xi_{\omega}$), see 'Axa $\chi \delta \zeta_{\omega}$ and note.

The meaning of ruy x arw, Erv xor is that of the passive of rev xw with an intransitive immediate force. That is to say, τετύχθαι very frequently means in the Epic poets to be fated, destined, brought on by circumstances, whence τετύκται is much the same as έστί, for which was afterwards used τυγχάνει ών or τυγχάνει; and έτύχθη in Il. β, 320. (θαυμάζομεν, οἶον ἐτύχθη) had precisely the same meaning as ἕτυχεν in prose. Thus έτυχέ μοι τοῦτο, this happened to me, was much the same as έτύχθη μοι: compare Il. λ, 683. ούνεκά μοι τύχε πολλά, because much had happened to me, with ρ , 704. $\mu\epsilon\gamma\dot{a}\lambda\eta$ $\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ $\pi\dot{o}\theta\eta$ $\Pi\nu\lambda\dot{i}oi\sigma\nu\dot{\epsilon}\tau\dot{\nu}\chi\theta\eta$, was prepared for them, was their lot: and sometimes in this as in other cases the relation is reversed, έτυχον τούτου, 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, έτενξα and ἕτυχεν, 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 $\eta \rho \epsilon \psi a$ and $\eta \rho i \pi \sigma \nu$, in έφυσα and έφυν 1, and in others: e. g. θεοί κακά κήδεα έτευξάν μοι (Od. a, 244.) and κακά κήδεα έτυχέ μοι, like τύχε μοι πολλά.

With this aor. 2. is connected also, according to the analogy given in the last note, the perf. act. from the same simple form, $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \chi \alpha$. This was the true Ionic perfect of $\tau \nu \gamma \chi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, e. g. in Herodot. 3, 14. extr., 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

* On the change of the diphthong to v, see note under $X \epsilon \omega$.

+ See the end of Art. on Acimo.

[‡] Wherever the causative and the immediate meaning are expressed by different active forms, the perf. (whether perf. 1. or 2.) and the nor. 2. belong always to the immediate sense, as

φύω, φύσω, έφυσα, Ι produce, - έφυν,

πέφυκα, I am produced, I grow.

The same may be observed of έστην and ἕστηκα, of ἕδυν and δέδυκα, of ἔσθην and ἐσθηκα, of ἕσκλην and ἕσκληκα (in σκέλλω), of ήριπον and ἐρήριπα. Again, by usage τέτευχα belongs not to τεύχω, but to τυγχάνω; and the Epics join τέτροφα with ἕτραφον. in Od. μ , 423. $\beta_{0\dot{0}s}$ $\dot{\rho}_{\iota\nu\sigma\bar{\iota}\sigma}$ $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\chi\dot{\omega}_{c}$, "made of cow-hide:" of which similar instances may be seen in a note under 'A λ *i* $\sigma\kappa$ $\rho\mu\alpha\iota$. For the perf. of $\tau\epsilon\dot{\nu}\chi\omega$ in an active sense, there is no genuine undisputed authority.*

From $\xi \tau \nu \chi \rho \nu$, $\tau \nu \chi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, were formed (according to the analogy of $\eta \kappa \alpha \chi c \tilde{\iota} \nu$, $d\kappa \alpha \chi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$, $d\kappa \alpha \chi \eta \sigma \omega$, $\eta \kappa \delta \chi \eta \sigma \alpha$: see $A\kappa \alpha \chi \ell \zeta \omega$ and note) a new aorist and perfect, precisely synonymous with those above-mentioned, viz. $\epsilon \tau \nu \chi \eta \sigma \alpha$ and $\tau \epsilon \tau \nu \chi \eta \kappa \alpha$, of which the aor. 1. remained in Epic usage, while the perfect became the Attic and common form.

In the Ionic 3. plur. of $\tau \epsilon \tau \nu \gamma \mu a\iota$ Homer has restored, on account of the metre, the diphthong of the present, making $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \chi \alpha \tau a\iota$, $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \chi \alpha \tau a\iota$; but we find also, at least in the later prose, $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \gamma \mu a\iota$ (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 728.); whence $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu o_{c}$, of a thing which has not answered the expectation, Lucian. Alex. 28.† And lastly in Homer, the fut. 3. is not formed with ν , but written $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \xi \sigma \mu a\iota$; which future is used at II. μ , 345. ϕ , 585. in the neuter sense only of $\tau \epsilon \tau \nu \gamma \mu a\iota$, and therefore cannot be mistaken at ϕ , 322.

The same uncertainty which is found in the vowel of $\tau \nu \kappa \tau \delta c$, $\tau \epsilon \nu \kappa \tau \delta c$, appears to have existed also in the aor. 1. pass.; at least in Anacr. 10. $\tau \delta \tau \epsilon \nu \chi \theta \delta \nu$ is the better accredited reading. Perhaps it was wished to distinguish $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \delta \chi \theta \eta \nu$ with the proper sense of $\tau \epsilon \delta \chi \omega$, from $\epsilon \tau \delta \chi \theta \eta \nu$, which has in all other instances a neuter meaning.

The Epic language has another aorist, always found in a reduplicated shape, the aor. 2. $\tau\epsilon\tau\nu\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, Midd. $\tau\epsilon\tau\nu\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$, and corresponding in meaning with $\tau\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\xi a\iota$, $\tau\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\xi a\sigma\theta a\iota$, to prepare: see Od. o, 94. II. a, 467. The κ comes from the Ionic dialect (see $\Delta\epsilon\kappao\mu a\iota$), and is retained in this old form, which may be compared with $\kappa\epsilon\kappaa\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ under Xáζω.

* In II. ν , 346. the reading of most of the manuscripts, and, until very lately, of the text also, was $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi a \tau o \nu$ in the sense of to prepare. But as the perfect cannot possibly stand in that passage, the other reading $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi \epsilon \tau o \nu$, which the Scholiast also follows, has been adopted. This, however, is equally inadmissible. For whether it be considered as a present (which is contrary to Homer's practice in the narrative), or as an imperfect with the termination of $\tau \epsilon \nu \chi \sigma$ for $\tau \epsilon \nu \chi o \sigma$ for $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \chi o \sigma$ for $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \chi o \sigma$ for $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \chi o \sigma \tau \epsilon \prime \tau \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \sigma$ such a form as $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi \omega \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \prime \tau \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \sigma$ that the reading of the Schol. Ven., extracted from some old copies ($\epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu$ for $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \chi \epsilon \tau \tau \nu)$, is the only true one. That is to say, as the termination in $\tau \sigma \nu$ of this imperfect, though not without parallel cases (II. κ , 364. σ , 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 $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \delta \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma \sigma$, and then to a perfect, which, as far as regarded formation, was a correct one. The present Scholium of this verse is most corrupt; that at II. κ , 364., attributed to the Alexandrines, and containing the Scholiast's opinion of this dual in all three passages, reads indeed in the one before us $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \delta \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma \sigma$, but it can only be rendered consistent with itself by our reading there also $\hbar \rho \omega \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega$ $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \delta \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma \sigma \delta \sigma \tau \tau$

† See also Stephan. Thesaur. in ἀποτυγχάνω, and Lex. Segner. (Antiatt.), p. 79., where the still more astonishing form ἀποτετύχηται is explained by ἀποτέτευκται. With this $\tau\epsilon\tau\nu\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is joined in the same Epic language a new present $\tau\iota\tau\nu\sigma\kappa\circ\mu\alpha\iota$, like $\lambda\delta\sigma\kappa\omega$ from $\lambda\kappa\epsilon\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu$, $\iota\sigma\kappa\omega$ from $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omega$. At II. ϕ , 342. this form has plainly and without force the meaning of $\tau\epsilon\nu\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, 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 $\tau\nu\gamma\chi\delta\iota\nu\omega$; for $\tau\iota\tau\nu\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\tau\iota\nu\circ\sigma$, (II. ν , 159.) to aim at any one, bears the same relation to $\tau\nu\chi\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu$ $\tau\iota\nu\circ\sigma$, to hit any one, as $\lambda\pi\circ\delta\iota\delta\rho\delta\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota$, he runs away (spoken of one who may still be caught), does to $\lambda\pi\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha$, he escaped, or as captare does to capere, and the like.*

Τόσσαι for τυχεῖν, see in its alphabetical place.

Τήχω, I melt, soften (trans.): fut. τήξω, &c. Pass. τήχομαι, with aor. 2. ἐτάχην (ᾰ), and perf. τέτηχα, I melt (intrans.): see ἔαγα, &c., under "Αγνυμι, and note under Tεύχω.

TIE-, whence $\tau\epsilon\tau i\eta\mu a\iota$, *I am vexed*, of which we find only the 2. dual $\tau\epsilon\tau i\eta\sigma\theta o\nu$, Il. 9, 447., and the part. $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\eta\mu\epsilon \nu o\varsigma$, Il. λ , 555. In the same sense Homer uses also the active form $\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\eta\omega\varsigma$ - $\delta\tau\sigma\varsigma$, Il. ι , 30. λ , 554. Compare $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\phi\eta\omega\varsigma$, $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\mu\eta\omega\varsigma$, $\beta\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\eta\omega\varsigma$, &c.: see also $\beta\epsilon\epsilon\sigma\omega\varsigma$ under Baivw.

Τίκτω, I bring forth, pario †: fut. τέξω ‡, more generally τέξομαι; aor. 2. ἔτεκον; perf. τέτοκα, part. τετοκώς, -υῖα, -ός, Hes. ε, 593.

* Modern critics have attempted to connect this verb with $\tau_{ITCM}\omega_{\mu}$ by deducing the idea of taking aim from that of drawing tight the string of the bow, and because at 11. 3. 41. $\delta\pi^* \delta\chi\epsilon\sigma\phi\iota \tau\iota\tau\delta\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\sigma$ is used of attaching the horses to the chariot, i.e. straining or drawing tight the traces. But independently of the two verbs ($\tau\iota\tau\alpha\iota\omega\omega$ and $\tau\iota\tau\delta\sigma\kappac\sigma$) being similar only in appearance, the similarity vanishes entirely between $\tau\epsilon\ell\omega\omega$ and $\tau\iota$ $\tau\delta\sigma\kappa\omega$; nor can $\tau\iota\tau\delta\sigma\kappac\sigma\delta at$ $\pi\delta\rho$ be explained 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 $\tau i \tau a l v \epsilon w \quad d \rho \mu a$ in the sense of the horses drawing along the chariot. $T i \tau b \sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \partial a u$ in the above passage is therefore only a slight deviation from $\tau \epsilon b \chi \epsilon w$, with the sense of to set in order, make ready, and hence the Greek commentators unanimously explain it by $\delta \tau o \mu a \zeta \epsilon w$.

 \dagger [Sometimes also, *I beget*, Eurip. Suppl. 1092., in which sense Homer very frequently uses the middle voice, II. β , 742. — Ed.]

[‡] Decisive authorities for this active form in the Iambic trimeter of the Attics, will be found in Aristoph. Thesm. 509, Eurip. Tro. 742. Æschyl. Prom. 868. non-Attic writers, e. g. in Hippoer. De Superfet. 8. and Pausan. 3, 7. The same perfect, with change of vowel, $\tau \epsilon \tau \sigma \gamma \mu a\iota$ occurs in Synes. Epist. 141. The middle voice, with the same meaning as the active, is poetical only; $\tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \sigma \tau a\iota$, Æschyl. ap. Athen. p. 600. b., aor. 2. $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \kappa \delta \mu \eta \nu$, $\tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \sigma \delta a\iota$, Hom. [The aor. 1. $\tau \epsilon \xi a \sigma \delta a\iota$ is found in some editions of Hes. 9, 889., but perhaps the better reading is $\tau \epsilon \xi \epsilon \sigma \delta a\iota$. The aor. 1. act $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \xi a$ is very rare, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 743.—Passow.]

A fut. infin. $\tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma \theta a\iota$ (as from $\tau \epsilon \kappa \delta \tilde{\iota} \mu a\iota$) is found in Hymn. Ven. 127., but I think $\tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta a\iota$ would suit the syntax of the passage quite as well, in which case $\tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \sigma \theta a\iota$ might be an old correction. The form $\tau \epsilon \xi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, Arat. 124., which must be explained by supposing a fut. $\tau \epsilon \xi \delta \tilde{\iota} \mu a\iota$, $\tau \epsilon \xi \epsilon \ell \rho \mu a\iota$, is very suspicious.*

Τίλλω, I pluck, tear up; fut. τἴλῶ; aor. 1. ἔτīλα; perf. pass. τέτιλμαι. — MIDD. This verb is inflected like χρίνω.

Τίνω, τίννυμι. See Τίω.

Tίτραω, I perforate: fut. τρήσω; aor. 1. ἐτρησα. We have also a sister-form Τετραίνω, fut. τετρανῶ, aor. 1. ἐτέτρηνα, Aristoph. Thesm. 18., but in Theophr. ἐτέτρανα.† 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. τέτρηκα, perf. pass. τέτρημαι, Herodot. 4, 158. — MIDD.

The aor. $\dot{\epsilon}\tau\dot{\epsilon}\tau\rho\eta\nu a$, formed contrary to the general rule of verbs in $-\alpha\ell\nu\omega$ (see $K\epsilon\rho\delta\alpha\ell\nu\omega$), is an Ionicism which remained in the Attic language. Authorities from Theophrastus for $\dot{\epsilon}\tau\dot{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\nu\alpha$ may be seen in Stephan. Thesaur. The form $\tau\iota\tau\rho\alpha\ell\nu\omega$, wherever found, is a corruption.

Τιτρώσχω, I wound: fut. τρώσω, &c. Perf. part. pass. τετρωμέναι νέες, injured, Herodot. 8, 18.

The stem or root of $\tau\iota\tau\rho\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ is in the verb $\tau o\rho\epsilon \tilde{\iota}\nu$ (as ΘOP_{-} is the root of $\Im\rho\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$, BOP- of $\beta\iota\ell\rho\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$), by the well-known metathesis detailed more at length under Bá $\lambda\lambda\omega$, $\Theta\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$, and Ka $\lambda\epsilon\omega$. But as the

* [Passow is of opinion that Buttmann has not sufficient grounds for suspecting these two forms.] Puer. c. 4. an Ionic form $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \nu \omega$, which Passow pronounces to be a false reading for $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha i \nu \omega$.

+ We find also in Hippocr. De Nat.

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. Homer has the present in a more simple shape, $\tau \rho \omega \omega$, $\tau \rho \omega \varepsilon \varepsilon$; but only once, and then in the general sense of to hurt or injure, Od. ϕ , 293.

Τιτύσκω. See Τεύχω.

 $T'_{i\omega}$. As usage has separated the two following verbs, it will be better to do the same.

Tíw, I honour, is solely poetical, and quite regular; e. g. fut. $\tau i \sigma \omega$, aor. 1. $\xi \tau i \sigma a$, &c.; perf. pass. $\tau \xi \tau i \mu a i$, II. v, 426. Od. v, 28., &c.

Tive, I pay or suffer (the penalty of an offence), forms, like the preceding, a fut. $\tau i\sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\xi \tau i\sigma \alpha$, &c.; perf. $\tau \xi \tau i\pi \alpha$; but the Attics make the *i* short in all the tenses, and the pass. takes σ , as perf. $\tau \xi \tau i\sigma \mu \alpha i$; aor. 1. $\xi \tau i\sigma \theta \eta \nu$. Midd. $\tau i\nu \sigma \mu \alpha i$, I punish (a person), avenge (a thing): fut. $\tau i\sigma \sigma \mu \alpha i$; aor. 1. $\xi \tau i\sigma \delta \mu \eta \nu$.

According to the general analogy of verbs in $-i\nu\omega$, the Epics have the ι long in $\tau i\nu\omega$ and all its tenses. The Attics, on the contrary, generally use it short: see, as instances of $\tau i\nu\omega$, Æschyl. Prom. 112., Soph. Œd. Col. 1203., Eurip. Or. 7.; and of $\tau i\sigma a\iota$, Aristoph. Eecl. 45. Vesp. 1424. The ι 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 ι 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. Œd. Col. p. 220.

We find an Ionic sister-form of the pres. $\tau i \nu \omega$ in $\tau i \nu \nu \nu \mu i$, $\tau i \nu \nu \nu \mu a$, written in the Attic poetry $\tau i \nu \nu \mu a$ with ι short, Eurip. Or. 313.*

Τλήναι, to bear or suffer, bear up manfully, venture, dare. Of this verb there is neither present nor imperfect: fut. τλήσομαι; perf. τέτληκα; aor. 2. ἕτλην, imper. τλήθι, opt. τλαίην†, infin. τλήναι, part. τλάς, τλᾶσα, τλάν. Compare ἕγνων, &c., under Γιγνώσκω.

These forms are used both in poetry and prose, while the defective tenses are supplied from the verbs of similar meaning $i\pi o\mu \epsilon r\omega$ and

short in the Attic writers, like $\tau i \nu \omega$.] † The conjunctive is not in use.

^{* [}Passow objects to the writing of this form with $\nu\nu$, and prefers $\tau (\nu\nu\mu)$ in all cuses, with the ι long in the Epic, and

ἀνέχομαι. Τέτληκα is a regular perfect, and used as such in Aristoph. Plut. 280., but the poets have formed from it (with the force of a present) the following syncopated forms; perf. plur. τέτλαμεν, τέτλατε, τετλᾶσι, dual τέτλατον; imper. τέτλαθι, τετλάτω, &c.; opt. τετλαίην*; infin. τετλάναι (ă), τετλάμεν and τετλάμεναι; part. τετληώς, -ότος; pluperf. plur. ἐτέτλαμεν, ἐτέτλατε, ἐτέτλασον, dual ἐτέτλατον, ἐτετλάτην. The Epic language has also an unusual aor. 1. ἐτάλασα, ἐτάλασσα †, ll. ρ, 166., whence conj. ταλάσσω, -μς, -μ, Il. ν, 829. o, 164., and in a later period we find a fut. ταλάσσω, Lycophr. 746.

TM-. See Τέμνω and Τέτμω.

Τμήγω. See Τέμνω.

Topεĩν (Hesych.), to pierce, stab: aor. 2. ἕτορον, a defective aorist, II. λ, 236., and (of less frequent occurrence) aor. 1. ἐτόρησα, part. τορήσας, Hymn. Merc. 119. A pres. τορέω is nowhere found. [There are also traces in Hesych. of a reduplicated aor. τέτορον explained by τρῶσαι.—Passow.]

The same idea of *piercing* lies in $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\rho\eta\sigma\omega$, a future with the meaning of to *pierce* (the ears), utter with a loud or shrill voice in Aristophanes (Pac. 381.), who has also in the same sense a present $\tau\rho\rho\epsilon\omega\omega$ (Thesm. 986.).[‡]

Τόσσας, Dor. τόσσαις, an aor. part. synonymous with $\tau v \chi \tilde{\epsilon i} v$, Pind. Pyth. 3, 48.; compare Bœckh. var. lect. p. 456. Beside the above we find only the compound ἐπέτοσσε, part. ἐπιτόσσαις, Pind. Pyth. 4, 43. 10, 52.

Τραπείω. See Τέρπω. Τράπω. See Τρέπω.

Τρέμω, I tremble, is used only in the pres. and imperf. Τρέπω, I turn : fut. τρέψω; aor. 1. ἔτρεψα; aor. 1. midd. ἐτρεψάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐτρέφθην; aor. 2. ἔτραπον; aor. 2. pass. ἐτράπην; aor. 2. midd. ἐτραπόμην; perf. 2. τέτροφα §

* The conjunctive is not in use.

† There is no doubt of the verb $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ having had in the older language the meaning of to bear, traces of which we see in the Lat. tollo and tuli. Now $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta}$ - $\nu \omega \tau \lambda \omega / \eta \nu$ have the same relation to $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$, as $\sigma \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \lambda \omega / \eta \nu$ have to $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$. In the course of time forms disappeared, and the meaning became modified, but was still quite perceptible in $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \omega$ and tollo. The simple meaning of to bear remained only in tuli. The present $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ disappeared entirely as a simple verb; in its compounds, in which it has the aor. 1. $\xi \tau \epsilon i \lambda \alpha$, the original sense is most evident in $\xi \pi i \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon i \nu$.

‡ As $\xi\mu\mu\rho\rho\sigma\nu$ comes from $\mu\epsilon\rho\sigma$, so is $\xi\tau\rho\rho\sigma\nu$ indisputably the aorist of a stem or root TEP-, which may be compared etymologically with $\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma$, although this latter cannot in its precise meaning be joined grammatically with $\tau\rho\rho\epsilon\sigma\nu$. Hesychius has preserved forms of the reduplicated aorist $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\rho\sigma\nu$ ($\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\rho\nu$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\eta$), but which are explained by $\tau\rho\omega\sigma\alpha$. See $Tir\rho\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$.

a § See note under Κλέπτω. This τεh τροφα is found in Aristoph. Nub. 858. n R 2

.

and $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \phi \alpha$; perf. pass. $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota^* - M$ IDD. Verbal adj. $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \tau \delta \varsigma$, and with the sense of the middle voice $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \eta \tau \epsilon \delta \varsigma$. With regard to the aorist, $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \omega$ 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 found in Plat. Cratyl. p. 395. d. η πατρίς αὐτοῦ ὅλη ἀνετράπετο.

In this verb, as in $\sigma\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\omega$ and $\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\omega$, the a of the perf. pass. is not carried on to the aor. 1., excepting in the Ionic and Doric dialects +: thus the Attics use $\epsilon\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\theta\eta\nu$, $\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\theta\eta\nu$, $\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\theta\epsiloni\varsigma$, Xen. Ven. 12, 5., but Herodotus (4, 12. 9, 56.) has $\epsilon\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\theta\epsiloni\varsigma$. At the same time it is difficult to form a decided judgment on this point, as Herodotus has not only a pres. $\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\pi\omega$, but also (3, 155.) $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\psi\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, and (4, 202.) $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\psi\epsilon$; though in all these instances the reading is uncertain. \ddagger Compare $\sigma\tau\rho\dot{\epsilon}\phi\omega$.

We find, in a multiplicity of verbs, as in $\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$, $\gamma\dot{\gamma}\gamma\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\alpha\rho-\theta\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$, $\pi\dot{\epsilon}\tau\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, &c., certain tenses formed from the aor. 2. (see $\dot{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\chi\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$ and note under $\dot{\Lambda}\kappa\alpha\chi\dot{\iota}\zeta\omega$): but in the verb before us, as well as in $\kappa\tau\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu\omega$, we have instances of a present so formed, e.g. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\rho\alpha\pi\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\nu\sigma\iota$, Il. κ , 421. We must here bear in mind that $\tau\rho\alpha\pi\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, I tread (the grapes), is a very different verb. See $\tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\dot{\iota}\circ\mu\epsilon\nu$ under T $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\pi\omega$. [We find also in Homer an imperat. perf. pass. $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\phi\theta\omega$, Il. μ , 273., an Epic 3. sing. of the pluperf. pass. $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\phi\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\phi\alpha\tau\sigma\iota$. Passow.]

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 $\tau \epsilon r \rho a \phi a$ from $\tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega$, it was changed to $\tau \epsilon r \rho a \phi a$, although from the uncertainty of the readings it is difficult 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 Æschin. e. Timarch. p. 179. Ctesiph. p. 545. $\lambda v a \tau \epsilon r \rho a \phi a$, ways accompanied by the various reading $\lambda v a \tau \epsilon r \rho a \phi a$, which latter Reiske has adopted in his text. Again in Dinarch. c. Demosth. pp. 23. 73., and c. Philocl. p. 93. we find $\tau \epsilon r \rho a \phi a$, but without any various reading hitherto discovered.

* This a is peculiar to the three per-

fects passive of $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \omega$, $\tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega$, and $\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega$: in $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \omega$ also usage fluctuates between $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \mu \mu a$ and $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda a \mu \mu a$. See Etym. M. voc. $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \delta \phi a \tau a \iota$, and Not. Crit. ad Aristoph. Vesp. 57. et ad Athen. 9. p. 409. c.

+ [Passow adds the Epic language of Homer, and quotes $\epsilon_{P}\rho\phi\phi\eta\nu$ from Od. o, 80., but the reading seems to be uncertain.—Ed.]

‡ However singular it may appear that in the Ionic dialect the verb should be inflected $\tau\rho \dot{a}\pi\omega$, $\tau\rho \dot{e}\psi\omega$, yet this is by far the most common mode of inflexion in our copies of Herodotus: see Schweigh. in $\dot{e}ni\tau\rho$.: nay, in the two passages quoted above we find $\dot{e}ni\tau\rho \dot{e}\psi \nu \tau a i$ and $\dot{e}\pi \dot{e}$ - $\tau\rho e\psi \dot{e}$ in very excellent manuscripts. Τρέφω, Inourish: fut. $\Im p$ έψω*; aor. 1. εθρεψα; perf. 2. τέτροφα (see τέτροφα and note under Τρέπω); perf. pass. τέθραμμαι (see τέτραμμαι and note under Τρέπω), infin. τεθράφθαι†; aor. 2. pass. ἐτράφην: verbal adj. $\Im p$ επτός.

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 language, but only in the aor. 2. $\xi \tau \rho a \phi o \nu$ and the perf. $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho o \phi a$, according to the rule laid down in the note under $T \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi \omega$: and undoubtedly these two forms had in that Epic language this intransitive meaning only, but in a later period the perfect took the causative sense also, as we see it in Soph. Œd. Col. 186., Alcæ. Messen. Epigr. 18. (Anal. 1. p. 490.), and Polyb. 5, 74., while the aor. 2. ($\xi \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon$, II. ϕ , 279. $\epsilon \tau \rho a - \phi \epsilon \tau \nu$, η , 199.) became obsolete.[‡] 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 II. ι , 143.), it soon spread to the aor. and perf. p s ve: and thus we find, even as early as Homer, the forms $\epsilon \tau \rho \dot{a} \phi \eta$, $\epsilon \tau \rho \dot{a} \phi \mu \epsilon \nu$, and $\epsilon \tau \rho a \phi \epsilon \nu$ for $\epsilon \tau \rho \dot{a} \phi \eta \sigma a \nu$.

* Among the laws which regulate the Greek aspirates, we may observe the following; that where two successive syllables 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 $\Theta PE\Phi$ -, whence $\tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega$, and again $S\rho \epsilon \psi \omega$.

† Not $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho a \phi \theta a \iota$, 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. Té $\theta \rho a \phi \theta \epsilon$ in Plat. Legg, init. is the correct reading. Compare $\tau \epsilon \theta \dot{a} \phi \theta a \iota$ under $\Theta \dot{a} \pi \tau \omega$.

‡ [Yet in Callim. Jov. 55. we find ετραφεs for ετράφηs.—Passow.] § Of the passages in which these pas-

§ Of the passages in which these passive forms are now found, we must first reject II. β , 661., where the old reading $T\lambda\eta\pi\delta\lambda\epsilon\mu\sigmas$ & $d\pi\omega$ $r\phi\phi'$ dw' $\mue\gammad$ poss dimfurous was first changed by $Barnes to <math>\tau\rho\phi\phi\eta$ dw, to the injury of the rhythm, and at the same time in opposition to almost all the manuscripts; for not one has $\tau\rho\phi\phi\eta$ dw in regular order, nor is there the least trace of such a reading in any of the Grammarians. There was evidently, therefore, in the text of Homer, as handed down to us, a discrepancy between this passage and two others (γ , 201. 'Os $\tau\rho d\phi\eta \ e\nu \ \delta\eta\mu\varphi$, and λ , 122. 'Os $\tau\rho d\phi\eta \ e\nu \ \delta\eta\mu\varphi$, and λ , 122. 'Os $\tau\rho d\phi\eta \ e\nu \ \delta\eta\mu\varphi$, which those Grammarians did not attempt to reconcile, and in which we ought to have followed their example. Nay, this discrepancy should rather have led us to conjecture that the passive forms had crept into Homer's text from the usage of a later period; that the 3. plur. $\tau\rho d\phi e\nu$, for instance, had taken the place of $\tau\rho d\phi \phi e\nu$, and that the original reading of the two passages quoted above was 'Os $\tau\rho d\phi \phi e\nu \ e^{\nu} \ \delta\eta\mu\varphi$, and 'Os $\tau\rho d\phi^{\dagger} \ e^{\nu} \ \partial\rho\eta \kappa\eta$. This conjecture is much strengthened by the circumstance, that the remaining passage, of which the emendation is not so easy ('AAX' $\delta\mu\omega\delta^{\dagger} \ s^{\dagger} \ e^{\tau} \ a^{\dagger} \ a$

R 3

The present with the radical vowel a, $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega$, is exclusively Doric, as in Pind. Pyth. 2, 82. 4, 205. Isthm. 8, 88. (7, 40. Bockh.)*

Tρέχω, *Irun*, forms its future like $\tau \rho \epsilon \phi \omega$ (see note under that verb); thus fut. $\Im \rho \epsilon \xi_{0\mu\alpha\iota}$; aor. 1. $\xi_{0\rho} \epsilon \xi_{\alpha}$: but by far the more common future comes from a very different stem or root, fut. $\delta \rho \alpha \mu \omega \tilde{\nu} \mu \alpha \iota^{\dagger}$; aor. 2. $\xi_{0\alpha\mu\nu\nu}$; perf. $\delta \epsilon \delta \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \varkappa \alpha$.

The forms $\xi \theta \rho \xi \xi a$, $\Im \rho \xi \xi \rho \mu a$, 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, $\mu \epsilon \tau a \theta \rho \xi \xi \rho \mu a \iota$ (see Fischer ad Well. 3. p. 182., Herm. ad Nub. 1005.) and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \theta \rho \xi \xi a \iota$, 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 α , $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \chi \omega$: see Boeckh on Pind. Pyth. 8, 34.

The perf. $\delta\epsilon\delta\rho \mu\eta\kappa a \ddagger$ is formed from the aor. 2. $\check{\epsilon}\delta\rho \mu\rho\nu$ according to the analogy described in note on $\dot{\alpha}\kappa a\chi \eta\sigma\omega$ under $\dot{\alpha}\kappa a\chi \ell \zeta\omega$. The fut.

that with the mere additional insertion of dé after 'as 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 ws from its natural place, where it answered to the corresponding Os de nal dorta, and sacrificed the $\pi \epsilon \rho$ which served to exalt the comparison, merely to introduce into the verse the regular $\epsilon \tau \rho \Delta \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \rho$, grating as this $\epsilon \tau \rho$...must have been to an Ionic ear by the harshness which it gave the metre. Now as far as regards this έτρά-φεμεν, Bœckh (on Pind. Pyth. 4, 115.), is of opinion that the ancients saw in all these Homeric forms (τράφε, τραφέμεν, &c.), nothing more than a shortening of the η . 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 έτραφε and τέτροφε, and the great leading analogy mentioned in a note under Melpouar, and again more fully illustrated in a note under Teuxo. The form erpápyv is not Homeric, but έτραφον had the intransi-tive sense expressed afterwards by έτρά- $\phi \eta \nu$ 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 $\tau \rho d\phi \epsilon$, $\tau \rho a \phi \epsilon - \tau \eta \nu$, &c., to be merely a metrical shortening

of the vowel, as in the conjunctives luelperal, vari($\lambda\lambda$ eral, &cc.: and thus ϵrpd - $\phi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ was introduced where the old Rhapsodist had used $\epsilon r \rho d \phi \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$, as also from the 3. plur. $\epsilon r \rho a \phi o \nu$ was made $\epsilon r \rho a \phi e \nu$. I have no doubt, therefore, that the old reading of the above verse was, ' $\Omega s \delta'$ $\delta \mu o \tilde{\nu} \epsilon r \rho a \phi \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$ $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu$ $\dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon r \epsilon \rho o \sigma i \delta \delta \mu o \sigma \sigma \nu$.

* In all three passages the forms in question are by some accented as aorists, $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$, $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\omega\nu$: but we dare not so easily suppose $\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\phi\sigma\nu$ to be used for $\epsilon\theta\rho\epsilon\psi\alpha$. In all three passages the present is correct, in the last it is indispensable.

+ This future in an active form is found in the comic writer Philetærus ap. Athen. 10. p. 416. $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho\delta\rho\mu\mu\omega$: for such is the syntax of that whole passage that the Attic language does not allow it to be transferred altogether to the conjunctive ($\beta d\lambda \omega$, $\delta\rho d\mu\omega$) by a change of accent.

 \pm Sufficient authority for this perfect is collected in Fischer vol. 3. p. 183., to which may be added $\epsilon \pi \delta \tilde{\epsilon} \delta \rho du \eta \pi a$, Xen. Gc. 15, 1. That the old Grammarians cite their proofs of $\delta \epsilon \delta \rho du \eta \pi a$ 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. δραμοῦμαι cannot be formed from it in the same way; for then it would end in -ήσομαι like μαθήσομαι, γενήσομαι, &c. It must be derived therefore from the theme itself, which, on account of the old perf. δέδρομα (Od. ε, 412. ζ, 45.), is supposed to be $\Delta \text{PEM}\Omega$; from which, it is true, that future cannot be formed in the usual Attic manner of verbs having λ , μ , ν , or ρ 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 Βάλλω and Λαγχάνω.

The 3. sing. of a fut. $d\nu a\delta\rho d\mu\epsilon\tau a\iota$ is found in Philipp. Thess. Epigr. 24, 4., for which it is probable the writer had some old Epic authority.

Tρέω, *I tremble*, retains ε in the inflexion : thus infin. $\tau \rho \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$; fut. $\tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\epsilon \tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \alpha$. This verb keeps all its forms resolved, except where they can be contracted in $\epsilon \iota$: see $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, *I bind*.

[The Epic poets double the σ , making (with the omission of the augment) the aor. $\tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, $\tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma a \nu$, &c. A poetical present is $\tau \rho \epsilon \omega$. —Passow.]

Τρίδω, I rub: fut. τρίψω; aor. 1. pass. ἐτρίφθην, Thuc. 2, 77., but more frequently is used the aor. 2. ἐτρίθην (on which see Γράφω); perf. pass. τέτριμμαι.

[Homer has the aor. 1. act. of this verb in its compound $\delta_{ia\tau\rho i\psi a\varsigma}$, 11. λ , 846. The fut. midd. $\tau \rho i \psi o \mu a \iota$ is used in a passive sense in Thucyd. 6, 18.—Passow.]

Τρίζω, I twitter, chirp: fut. τρίσω and (Hemsterh. Aristoph. Plut. 1100.) τρίξω; perf. with force of a pres. τέτριγα, like χέχραγα, λέλαχα, κέχλαγγα, &c. The pure characteristic letter of this verb is γ .

The Epics allowed themselves the liberty of pronouncing long the accented o in the oblique cases of the part. perf., as $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho_i\gamma\tilde{\omega}\tau\alpha_s$ for $-\gamma\delta\tau\alpha_s$, Il. β , 314. Compare $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\omega_s$, $-\tilde{\omega}\tau\sigma_s$, with note, p. 51.

ΤΡΥΦ-. See Θρύπτω.

Τρύχω, I rub in pieces, wear out, consume, forms from τρυχόω (a present of rare occurrence) an aor. 1. ἐτρύχωσα; aor. 1. pass. ἐτρυχώθην; part. perf. pass. τετρυχωμένος, &c. The pres. pass. τρυχοῦται is found in Mimnerm. Fr. 2.

R 4

Τρώγω, I gnaw, eat: fut. τρώξομαι; aor. 2. ἔτραγον; aor. 2. pass. ἐτράγην.

The α in this aorist would seem to lead us to a theme TPHF Ω , a sister-form of $\tau \rho \omega \gamma \omega$, like $\pi \tau \eta \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\pi \tau \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$. An aor. 1. in the compound $\kappa a \tau a \tau \rho \omega \xi a \nu \tau \epsilon_{\Sigma}$ is found in Timon Phlias. Fr. 7.

Τυγχάνω. See Τεύχω.

Τύπτω, *I beat*: fut. τύψω, &c.; aor. 2. pass. ἐτύπην. — MIDD. — Instead of the regular inflexions the Attics used a fut. τυπτήσω, a perf. pass. τετύπτημαι, and a verbal adj. τυπτητέος.

On the above deviation from the regular inflexion, see Thom. Mag. in voc. and Stephan. Thesaur. The fut. midd. $\tau v \pi \tau \eta \sigma o \mu a \iota$ in Aristoph. Nub. 1382. with a passive sense, may possibly be a mistake for $\tau v \pi \eta \sigma o \mu a \iota$; as the old reading $\omega \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$ in Eurip. Med. 336. is now proved by the Codd. to have been a corruption from $\omega \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota$. The aor. 1. $\xi \tau v \psi a$, $\tau \dot{v} \psi o v$, &c., appears to have been in constant use from Homer's time: the aor. 2. $\xi \tau v \pi o v$ is seldom found, but it does occur in Eurip. Ion. 766.

Τύφω, I smoke, burn: fut. θύψω *; aor. 1. ἔθυψα; perf. pass. τέθυμμαι or τέθυμαι; aor. 2. pass. ἐτύφην.

Υ.

Υπισχνέομαι. See "Εχω.

Υφαίνω, I weave: fut. ὑφανῶ; aor. 1. ὕφηνα, Att. ὕφανα, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 26. perf. ὕφαγκα.

A very suspicious reduplicated perf. pass. $i\phi\eta\phi\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ is quoted by Suidas in voc., Phrynich. Seguer. p. 20, 3., Herodian π . $\mu\rho\nu$. $\lambda\xi\xi$. 44, 25. The Grammarian in Suidas is puzzled how to account for the η in the second syllable, whence I conjecture it to be a corruption of $i\phi i\phi \alpha\sigma \tau \alpha\iota$, which is quoted in the Etym. M. in voc. as an old and rare form from Zenodotus. In all our Attic writers we find invariably $i\phi\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$. Homer has from the radical form $i\phi\dot{\alpha}\omega$ a sister-form $i\phi \delta\omega\omega$, whence the 3. plur. $i\phi\delta\omega\sigma\iota$, Od. η , 105.

"Yω, I rain, make wet with rain: fut. ύσω; aor. 1. υσα. Pass.

* On the formation of this future see Tpéqu, Spéuu, and note.

^vομαι, I am rained upon, made wet with rain; fut. midd. (in the same sense) ^vσομαι, Herodot. 2, 14., aor. 1. pass. ^vσθην, Herodot. 3, 10.

Φ.

ΦA-. See Φημi: also Φaiνω and Πέφνον. ΦAΓ-. See Ἐσθίω.

Dalvo, I bring to light, show : intrans. I shine. Pass. I am brought to light, I appear. Act. φαίνω; fut. φανῶ; aor. 1. έφηνα, infin φήναι; perf. πέφαγκα*; perf. 2. πέ-Φηνα. Pass. Φαίνομαι; fut. Φανήσομαι; aor. 1. έφάνθην; aor. 2. έφάνην, infin. φανήναι; perf. πέφασμαι. Midd. Φαίνομαι; fut. Φανούμαι; aor. 1. infin. Φήνασθαι, Soph. 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 \$\phiau as a transitive verb, and in this sense it employs the aor. 1.; e.g. tà parbérta, the things announced or declared, Demosth. c. Theocr. p. 1325., Φρούρα ἐφάνθη, was announced, Xen. Hell. 6, 4, 11., ἀπεφάνθη, 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, but it is met with in prose also, e. g. parnouro, Isæ. de Philoct. p. 58, 33. avadavnjoovras, Xen. Hell. 3, 5, 11. The perf. 2. of the active serves as a perf. to \$\pha_a\u00edroual 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. Φήνασθαι, Soph. Phil. 944.) in the transitive sense of the active, which is particularly common in the compound anopaivw.

Dinarchus has ἀποπέφαγκα twice.

This verb is contracted from the old $\phi \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu \omega$ (Hom.), as $\alpha \iota \rho \omega$ is from $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon \iota \rho \omega$. Hence in the Epic writers the radical syllable admits of being lengthened, as $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta \nu^*$ and the comparative $\phi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \rho o \varsigma$, &c. This aor. 1. is used by Homer in the same sense as $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \nu$.

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 $\phi a \epsilon \nu \tilde{\omega}$. Apollonius (De Adv. p. 600, 28.) expressly mentions this quantity, and Bekker notices the same in Aristoph. Equ. 300. where the words $\kappa a i \sigma \epsilon \phi a \nu \tilde{\omega} (---)$ have been arranged differently in opposition to all the Codd. The coincidence of this verb with the same appearance in $a i \rho \omega$ makes the thing certain: still however in both verbs the usual quantity is not altered in the Attic writers: e. g. $\phi \tilde{\alpha} \nu \tilde{\omega}$, Soph. Aj. 1362., and $\phi \tilde{\alpha} \nu \tilde{\omega} \mu \omega \omega$

An aor. 2. act. and midd. of this verb is also quoted, but there is no certain authority for either. At II. π , 299. the old editions certainly did read the 3. plur. $\check{\epsilon}\phi a \nu o \nu \ddagger$; but as many of the most undoubted forms of $\phi a \nu \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota$ occur in Homer, it has been correctly altered to $\check{\epsilon}\phi a \nu \epsilon \nu$, which is found in the best manuscripts. It is true that $\phi \acute{a} \nu \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu$ (II. λ , 64.) appears to point to such an act. aorist; but this iterative may very well be formed from $\check{\epsilon}\phi \acute{a} \nu \eta \nu$, as $\check{\epsilon}\sigma \kappa \epsilon$ was from $\tilde{\eta} \nu$, $\sigma \tau \acute{a}\sigma \kappa \epsilon$ from $\check{\epsilon}\sigma \tau \eta \nu$, &c. The forms $\pi \rho o \check{v}\phi a \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ (Soph. Phil. 1191.) and $\phi \acute{a} \nu \eta \varsigma$ (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 $\phi a \nu o \iota \mu \eta \nu$ the various reading $\phi a \iota \nu o \iota \eta \nu$ is the Attic optat. fut. of the active voice.

At Od. ξ , 502. we find the stem of this verb in its most simple form, the 3. sing. $\phi \dot{\alpha} \epsilon$ in the sense of the aorist, "the morning *broke*," which may be considered as the aor. 2. ($\check{\epsilon}\phi ao\nu$, $\phi a\epsilon \tilde{\epsilon}\nu$) from which came the pres. $\phi a\epsilon \epsilon \nu \omega$. But Aratus has taken the liberty of using this simple form as a present, $\lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\alpha} o \nu \sigma a \iota$, 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. $\pi \epsilon \phi \dot{\eta} - \sigma \rho \mu a \iota$, II. ρ , 155. (will have appeared, will have burst over), written precisely the same as the fut. of $\Phi E N \Omega$.

* See note under Koalvw.

† It is singular that Apollonius does not, as might have been expected, quote $\dot{\alpha}\rho\hat{\omega}$ from $d\rho\omega$ as similar in quantity to $\phi\alpha\nu\hat{\omega}$, but $\dot{\rho}\alpha\nu\hat{\omega}$, of which the proofs are not so strong as they are of the two others. But perhaps the original word there was $\kappa\rho\alpha$ - $\nu\hat{\omega}$, which is very similar to $\phi\alpha\nu\omega$ and at $\rho\omega$: or is $\beta\alpha\nu\hat{\omega}$ correct, and did the ρ produce the same effect here as in $\kappa\epsilon\rho\hat{\alpha}$ tos?

‡ [Passow unhesitatingly condemns this aorist as entirely obsolete; see Pors. Eurip. Or. 1266., Buttm. Soph. Phil. 1191., Meineke Menand. p. 416.— Ed.]

Φάσκω See Φημί.

Φαύσκω or Φώσκω (compare τρῶσαι, τραῦμα), I appear or break forth as the morning does; a verb occurring only in its compounds with διά, $\epsilon \pi i$, and $\nu \pi o$ (see the examples in Schneider's Lexicon*), of which the inflexion (fut. φαύσω, aor. εφαυσα) 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. $\nu \pi o \phi a \nu \sigma c_c$, Herodot. 7, 36.

The Epic verb $\pi\iota\phi a\dot{\upsilon}\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\pi\iota\phi a\dot{\upsilon}\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu a\iota$, *I show, give to understand*, of which we find only the pres. and imperf., is distinct from $\phi a\dot{\upsilon}\sigma\kappa\omega$.

Φείδομαι, *I spare*, Depon. midd. : fut. φείσομαι ; aor. 1. έφεισάμην, infin. φείσασθαι, Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 17.

The Epic poets have the aor. 2. with reduplication, e. g. infin. $\pi\epsilon\phi\imath\delta\epsilon'$ $\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, opt. $\pi\epsilon\phi\imath\delta o\iota\mu\eta\nu$, whence a fut. $\pi\epsilon\phi\imath\delta\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$: compare $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\eta\sigma\omega$ from $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ under $\Pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omega$, and $\dot{a}\kappa\alpha\chi\eta\sigma\omega$ with note under $A\kappa\alpha\chi\iota\omega$. In Euseb. 10. p. 130. Valckenaër (ad Herodot. 8, 10.) has correctly amended $\phi\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nuo\iota$ to $\phi\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nuo\iota$ as from $\phi\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, Ion. for $\phi\epsilon\iota\delta\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, like $\dot{c}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nuo\varsigma$ in Euseb. and $\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nuo\varsigma$ in Hesiod.

ΦΕΝ-. See Πέφνον.

Φέρδω, I feed, nourish: perf. πέφορδα; pluperf. ἐπεφόρδειν, Hymn. Merc. 105. Pass. I am nourished, τινός, Hom. Hymn. 30, 4. The fut. and aor. are defective both in the act. and pass.

Φέρω, I bring or carry, forms its tenses from very different stems or roots; thus, fut. $\delta' \sigma \omega$, 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 aor. $\delta' \sigma \varepsilon$, $\delta' \sigma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$, $\delta \sigma \delta' \tau \omega$, $\delta' \sigma \delta' \tau \omega \tau^{\dagger}$, Od. χ , 106. 481., Aristoph. Bat. 482. Ach. 1099. 1101. 1122., Antim. Fr. 10.: see έδώσετο, p. 73. From the stem EΓKΩ or ENEΓKΩ come the aor. 1. $\eta' \nu \varepsilon \gamma \varkappa \alpha$, aor. 2. $\eta' \nu \varepsilon \gamma \varkappa \omega \nu$. In the first person of these two aorists and in the optative (ένέγ παιμι, ένέγ πειε, and - $\omega \mu \iota$, - ω) the usage is very fluctuating, as the Grammarians have observed.[‡] Of the remaining forms we find a preference given (the Attic usage

+ To these must be added the Epic infin. οἰσέμεν, οἰσέμεναι (which occurs as an aorist in Od. γ . 429. II. γ , 120., but as a fut, in II. σ , 191.), and $\sigma \sigma \epsilon w$, which has the force of a present in Pind. Pyth. 4, 181.

[‡] See Greg. Cor. in Att. 78. with the quotations there made by Koen.; and Phryn. Appar. p. 35, 24.

^{*} [^{*}Αμ² ἡμέρη διαφαυσκούση, Herodot, 3. 86. Διεπιφώσκω, Dionys. 9, 63. ^{*}Σπιφώσκων φέγγος ἐρυθρόν, Poet. Vet. de Herb. 25. ^{*}Υποφώσκωι ἡμέρα, Diod. Sic. 13, 18.]

is sometimes exclusive), in the active voice to the infin. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\tilde{i}\nu$, the part. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\omega\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\delta\nu\tau\sigma\varsigma$, and the 2. sing. imper. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon$, all from the aor. 2.; while the others together with the whole of the middle are taken from the aor. 1., e. g. $\eta'\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\nu$, $-\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$, $-\kappa\alpha\tau\sigma$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\dot{\alpha}\tau\omega$, $-\kappa\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\imath$, $-\kappa\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$, &c.: imperat. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\imath$. Perf. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta'\nu\epsilon\sigma\alpha$; pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta'\nu\epsilon-\gamma\mu\alpha\imath$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta'\nu\epsilon\gamma\xi\alpha\imath$, $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta'\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\tau\alpha\imath$ (e.g. Corp. Inscr. i. 76, 4.) and $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta'\nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\imath$; aor. 1. pass. $\eta'\nu\epsilon\chi\theta\eta\nu$; fut. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\chi\theta\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\imath$ and $\sigma\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\imath$: verbal adj. $\sigma\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\varsigma$, $\sigma\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\varsigma$ (poet. $\phi\epsilon\rho\tau\dot{\epsilon}\varsigma$). — MIDD.

The old aorist, of which the imper. $\delta i \sigma \epsilon$ and infin. $\delta i \sigma \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ are the only remaining tenses, was mentioned at the beginning of this article and in the note there subjoined. If this $\delta i \sigma \epsilon$ 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 $\dot{a}\epsilon i\sigma\epsilon \sigma$, $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \sigma$, $\delta \rho \sigma\epsilon \sigma$, $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma\epsilon \sigma$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\upsilon} \sigma\epsilon \sigma$, $\delta \dot{\upsilon} \sigma\epsilon \sigma$, p. 73. This aorist occurs also with 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 $\dot{a} \nu \tilde{\varphi} \sigma a u$ (1, 157.); and this lengthening is again found in another form, in which it is quite as extraordinary, $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\omega} i$

^{*} Compare also $d\nu d\gamma \kappa \eta$, which is evidently a reduplication from the stem $d\gamma \chi \epsilon i \nu$.

 $\sigma\tau\sigma c$ (6, 66.), both words having the same sense of sending (referre) to consult an oracle.* Suspicious examples of the aorist $\delta \delta \sigma a \epsilon$ 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. $\pi \rho o \delta \delta \sigma \tau a \epsilon$, in which for the sake of perspicuity the $o \epsilon$ is left unchanged, and the augment therefore can only be recognised by means of the accent.

The few forms coming immediately from $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega$, which are in general use are the following; the imperf. $\check{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu$ like $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\rho\delta\mu\eta\nu$ from $\phi\epsilon\rho\rho\mu\alpha$; the syncopated Epic imper. $\phi\epsilon\rho\tau\epsilon$ for $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, II. 1, 171.; the 3. sing. $\phi\epsilon\rho\eta\sigma\iota$ as from $\phi\epsilon\rho\eta\mu\iota$, Od. τ , 111.; the Ion. 3. sing. imperf. $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon$, and 3. plur. $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\sigma\nu$, Od. 1, 429. κ , 108.; and the poetical verbal adj. $\phi\epsilon\rho\tau\sigma\epsilon$. From $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega$ was formed $\phio\rho\epsilon\omega$, like $\tau\rhoo\mu\epsilon\omega$ from $\tau\rho\epsilon\mu\omega$, $\deltao\mu\epsilon\omega$ from $\delta\epsilon\mu\omega$; 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. $\phio\rho\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, and $\phio\rho\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ for $\phio\rho\epsilon\nu\iota$: compare $\gammao\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, $\kappaa\lambda\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, $\pio\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, &c. See $\Phi\rho\epsilon\omega$ below.

Φεύγω, I fly: fut. Φεύξομαι and Φευξοῦμαι‡; perf. πέ-Φευγα; aor. 2. ἔφυγον. There is no passive voice. Verbal adj. Φευχτός, Φευχτέος.

The perf. pass. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$ is a passive in form only, as the Epics use the part. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$ in the active sense of having escaped, Od. a, 18.§ On the v of this perf. see note under X $\epsilon\omega$.

The Epic language uses the verbal adj. $\phi \nu \kappa \tau \delta \varsigma$: whence $\check{a}\phi \nu \kappa \tau \delta \varsigma$ came into the common dialect.

For the Homeric part. πεφυζότες see λελειχμότες under Λιχμάομαι

* Reiz, Schneider in his Lexicon voc. ανώστος, and Lobeck, Parerg. p. 733., consider both as corruptions and read ανοιora, άνοιστος; and certainly in Herodot. 7, 149. we find the fut. ἀνοίσειν in a similar 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 dialect, has (2, 11.), ἀνώτστοs from ἀναφέρω, consequently an imitation of Herodotus. 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 ἀνώτστοs, unexpected, which is correctly formed from ἀ and (οζομαι) ἀτστόs, like ἀνώτυχως, ἀνώμαλος, &c. And why should not the gloss of Suidas, $d\nu \sigma \partial \sigma \alpha i$, although explained only by the general expression $\kappa o \mu i \sigma \alpha i$, refer to the above. passage of Herodotus? Still, however, greater certainty is requisite before we alter the text of Herodotus.

 \dagger Of this verb we find an instance ($\phi o - \rho \epsilon \sigma a \iota$) as early as Isæus; in the later authors it is more frequent.

‡ [Φευξοῦμαι is properly Doric, but is found in Aristoph. Ach. 203., and elsewhere in that writer. Very late authors have a fut. 2. ϕ uyῶ, — Passow.]

§ We may compare this participle with δεδακρυμένος; in both verbs the perf. pass, expresses the completion of an action belonging rather to the middle voice, having shed a flood of tears, having conveyed himself to a place of safety. See also αλιτήμενος. Φημί, I say: Φής, Φησί, &c., imper. Φάθι*, opt. Φαίην, conj. Φῶ (3. sing. Φήη, Hom.), infin. Φάναι, part. Φάς; imperf. ἔΦην; fut. Φήσω; aor. 1. ἔΦησα. Of the midd. were used the following forms, viz. the infin. and part. pres. Φάσθαι, Φάμενος; both used by Homer, the latter by the Attics also; and the imperf. ἐΦάμην. Of the passive we find some perfect forms, as the part. πεΦασμένος, Il. ξ, 127., and the imperat. πεΦάσθω. Verbal adj. Φατός, Φατέος, and the Hesiodic Φατειός.

This verb is the only genuine instance of a dissyllable in $-\mu\iota$ (beginning 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. $\phi \eta \varsigma$ there is no ground for the ι subscriptum, and the accute 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 ov $\phi\eta\mu\iota$, I dissent, deny. The present $\phi\eta\mu\iota$ 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 $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$. 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 $\phi \acute{a}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ (which does not otherwise occur in prose), and by the midd. $\phi \acute{a}\sigma\theta a\iota$, $\phi \acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu o\varsigma$; e. g. $\check{\epsilon}\phi\eta$ $\sigma\pi ov \acute{a}\acute{a}\epsilon\iota\nu$, he said he was in haste, but $\check{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\kappa\epsilon\sigma\pi ov \acute{a}\acute{a}\epsilon\iota\nu$, he maintained that he ...; $\phi \acute{a}\sigma\kappa\omega\nu$, asserting, maintaining; ov $\phi \acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu o\varsigma$, denying.

In the 2. sing. of the imperfect we generally find in the Attic writers $\xi\phi\eta\sigma\theta a$; see Thom. Mag. p. 397.: the simple $\xi\phi\eta\varsigma$ becomes more frequent in the later authors; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 236. This $\xi\phi\eta\nu$ is commonly used as a complete aorist, synonymous with $\epsilon I \pi o \nu$; and

* The Grammarians are at variance on the accent of this form : see Schol. Aristoph. Equ. 22. Lobeck (ad Phryn. pp. 60. 172.), unhesitatingly rejects $\phi d\theta_i$, but I prefer it to $\phi a\theta_i$, as this imperative is not enclitic like $\phi n\mu i$.

+ Matthiæ in his Grammar directs that the 2. sing. indic. should be written without the *i* subscriptum, like $\sigma \tau \eta s$, but the conjunctive with it. Passow however in his Lexicon says expressly $\phi \eta s$ (not $\phi \eta s$) or $\phi \eta s$): the latter he restricts to the 2. sing. imperf. Ion. for $\xi \phi \eta s$, Hom. See the Etym. M. voc. $\phi \eta s$ and Cheerobose. MS. ap. Bekk. p. 345. v. — Ed.]

to this imperfect we may add the infin. $\phi \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha_i$, which is confined so entirely to express *past* time only ($\phi \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha_i \tau \partial \nu \Pi \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \alpha_i$, that Pericles has said), that as soon as an infin. pres. is wanted $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ or $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ 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 Grammarians that there was also a particular aor. 2. $\ddot{\epsilon} \phi \eta \nu$, which retained the η in the plural, and had $\phi \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ or $\phi \tilde{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota$ in the infinitive, it is entirely unfounded. If we find $\phi \tilde{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota$ 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 $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \tilde{\alpha} \nu \alpha \iota$.

By aphæresis the following forms have arisen from $\phi\eta\mu$ i in the language of common conversation; $\eta\mu$ i, say I (inquam), in a quick repetition in Aristoph. Nub. 1145. Ran. 37.; and again in the imperf. $\bar{\eta}\nu$ $\delta' \dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$, said I, $\bar{\eta}$ $\delta' \delta_{\mathfrak{L}}$, said he (for $\check{\epsilon}\phi\eta\nu$, $\check{\epsilon}\phi\eta$), in the conversational 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. $\phi a \tilde{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\phi a \ell - \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$; the 3. conj. $\phi \eta \eta$ for $\phi \tilde{\eta}$; the imperf. $\phi \tilde{\eta} \nu$, $\phi \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$, $\phi \tilde{\eta}$, for $\check{\epsilon} \phi \eta \nu$, $\check{\epsilon} \phi \eta \varsigma$, $\check{\epsilon} \phi \eta$, and the 3. plur. $\check{\epsilon} \phi a \nu$, $\phi a \nu$, for $\check{\epsilon} \phi a \sigma a \nu$; also the imperat. midd. $\phi \dot{a} \sigma$ for $\phi \dot{a} \sigma \sigma$, Od. π , 168. σ , 170. — Passow.]

Φθάνω †, I get before, anticipate: fut. Φθησομαι; aor. 2. ἔφθην, opt. Φθαίην, conj. Φθῶ, infin. Φθῆναι, part. Φθάς; perf. ἔφθᾶxα. The aor. 2. is preferred by the Atticists to the aor. 1. ἔφθᾶσα; but this latter is used by the best Attic writers, e g. by Thucyd. 3, 49., and from the time of Xenophon is the more usual form of the two.

The fut. $\phi\theta\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ is found only in the later writers, e.g. in Dio Chrys. 12. p. 195.; and an aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\theta\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ occurs in Joseph. Ant. 8, 6. A part. aor. midd. $\phi\theta\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$ is used by the Epic poets synonymous with $\phi\theta\dot{\alpha}\varsigma$, like $\phi\dot{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\phi\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$, from $\phi\eta\mu\dot{\iota}$. We find also a Doric fut. $\phi\theta\dot{\alpha}\xi\omega$, aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\theta\alpha\dot{\alpha}a$. Παραφθαίησι in Il. κ, 346. is a lengthened aor. opt. not conj.; as the $\alpha\imath$ would be an unheard of diphthong in the conjunctive of $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, and the $-\sigma\iota$ is admissible in lengthening the optative, though less usual than in the conjunctive.

Φθέγγομαι, I sound, depon. midd.; fut. φθέγξομαι; aor. 1. ἐφθεγξάμην. The active Φθέγγω never occurs.

However, in Plat. Hipp. Maj. p. 289.
 9., φάναι is considered as a genuine present.

+ [The a is long in the Epic, but short

in the Attic writers; and in the later authors common; see Jacob. Anthol. Poet. p. 884.—Passow.] Φθείρω, I corrupt, is regular: thus, fut. Φθερῶ (Epic Φθέρσω, Il. ν, 625.); perf. ἔφθαρκα; perf. 2. ἔφθορα; perf. pass. ἔφθαρμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐφθάρην; verbal adj. Φθαρτός. The perf. 2. ἔφθορα, διέφθορα, had originally, the 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. ἔφθαρμαι, ἐφθάρην. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 160. Still however we find the perf. 1. ἔφθαρκα in the early Attic writers : see the old instances collected in Piers. ad. Mœr. p. 127.

The fut. of the neuter meaning is generally $\phi \theta a \rho h \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$, for which the Ionics have the fut. 2. midd. (with the change of vowel to a), $\delta \iota a - \phi \theta a \rho \epsilon \sigma \mu a \iota$, Herodot. 8, 108. 9, 42.*

 $\Phi\theta$ ive and $\phi\theta$ ie, I pass away, come to an end, perish. This verb is generally poetical, and the pres. $\phi\theta i\omega$ with its imperf. $\xi \phi \theta i\omega \nu$ 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 Il. σ , 446. $\phi \rho \epsilon \nu \alpha \varsigma \epsilon \phi \theta \iota \epsilon \nu$ is to be understood intransitively, as is also $\phi \theta i \omega$ at Od. β , 368. $\omega_{\varsigma} \kappa \epsilon \delta \delta \lambda \psi \phi \theta i \eta \varsigma$. The transitive meaning of $\phi \theta i \nu \omega$ is found in Soph. El. 1414. and Theorr. 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. $\phi \theta i \sigma \phi \mu a_i$, the perf. (see $\epsilon \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ in note under $K \tau \epsilon i \nu \omega$) a syncopated aorist, e.g. in Eurip. Hipp. 839., Soph. Œd. T. 962. 970., and in this respect it has its own moods, as opt. $\phi\theta i \mu \eta \nu$, $(\phi\theta i o)$, $\phi\theta i \tau o$, Od. κ , 51. λ , 330+; conj. $\phi\theta i \omega$ μαι, shortened to $\phi \theta i o \mu \alpha \iota$, $\phi \theta i \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$; infin. $\phi \theta i \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$; part. $\phi \theta i \mu \epsilon \nu o \varsigma$.

On the other hand the transitive meaning is established in the fut. act. and aor. 1. $\phi \theta i \sigma \omega$, $\xi \phi \theta \iota \sigma a$: see note under Meipoman, and compare $\xi \gamma \eta \rho a \sigma a$ under $\Gamma \eta \rho \delta \omega$.

 Διεφθαρέατο 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 Hermann, the pluperfect διεφθάρατο.

+ In the latter passage the reading of the text was until lately $\phi\theta\epsilon\hat{r}\sigma$, arising from a false conception of the unusual form $\phi\theta\hat{r}\sigma$. The quantity of the ι (both in the present in $-\nu\omega$ and in the tenses formed from $\phi\theta\iota\omega$) is the same as that of $\tau\iota\nu\omega$, long in the Epic poets, but short in the Attic writers : e.g. compare $\phi\theta\iota\nu\omega$, Od. λ , 182. ξ , 161, with Soph. Ant. 695., Eurip. Alc. 201.; and $\phi\theta\iota\sigma\omega$, &c., II. π , 461. χ , 61., with Soph. Trach. 709., Aj. 1027. On the contrary the perf. pass., and consequently the syncop. aor. also, together with the derivatives $\phi\theta\iota\sigma\iota$, $\phi\theta\iota\tau\delta\iota$, have always the ι short. Compare the ν short in $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\nu\theta\eta\nu$ while it is long in $\lambda\nu\omega$, $\lambda\nu\sigma\omega$.

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 $\phi\theta i\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (having perished), Lucian. Parasit. 57., $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\theta i\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\ell$ $\tau i\mu\omega\rho\eta\theta\epsilon i\varsigma$ $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$, Plut. Cons. ad Ap., $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\phi\theta i\nu\eta\kappa\dot{\sigma}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, Vit. Cicer. 14.

In a verse thrice repeated (Od. ϵ , 110. 133. η , 251.) "Ev θ ' $\ddot{a}\lambda\lambda \iota \mu \dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\pi \dot{a}\nu\tau\epsilon \dot{c} \dot{a}\pi \dot{\epsilon}\phi \theta \iota \theta \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon}\sigma \theta \lambda \iota \dot{\epsilon}\tau a \tilde{\iota}\rho \iota$, this reading $\dot{a}\pi \dot{\epsilon}\phi \theta \iota \theta \iota \nu$, as from a theme in $-\theta \omega$ (compare $\dot{a}\mu \dot{\nu}\nu \alpha \theta \upsilon \nu$, p. 22.), has always maintained its ground in the text against $\dot{a}\pi \dot{\epsilon}\phi \theta \iota \theta \epsilon \nu$; 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 $\ddot{\epsilon}\phi \theta \iota \theta \epsilon \nu$. The perf. $\dot{\epsilon}\phi \theta \iota \mu \alpha \iota$ (without σ , and with ι short) is quite sufficient ground for an aorist $\dot{\epsilon}\phi \theta \dot{\iota}\theta \eta \nu$.

Φιλέω, I love, is regular.

The Epic language has from the stem of this verb an aorist in the middle voice with ι long, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda a\tau o$, imperat. $\phi\tilde{\iota}\lambda a\iota$. The analogy of $\tau\dot{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omega$, $\ddot{\epsilon}\tau\bar{\iota}\lambdaa$, 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 $\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\omega\nu\tau a\iota$ corrupted in the text to $\phi\iota\lambda\bar{\epsilon}\nu\tau a\iota$; while in Hymn. Cer. 117. Wolf has restored it from $\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\sigma\nu\tau a\iota$, and v. 487. from $\phi\iota\lambda\bar{\omega}\nu\tau a\iota$.

Φλέγω, I burn, transit. : fut. ϕ λέξω. The aor. 2. pass. is ἐφλέγην : see note under Βλέπω.

Φλέω, *I* am full to overflowing: used only in pres. and imperf. This verb is connected by Onomatopæia with ϕ λύω, *I* overflow; chatter: ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε, II. φ, 361., ϕ λῦσαι, Æschyl. Prom. 504.: which was formed also ϕ λύζω, ϕ λύζαι.* But ϕ λύω, *I* singe, burn, is quite distinct from the above; of which we find περιφλύει in Aristoph.

^{* [}Mavins υπο μυρία φλύζων, Nicand, Alex. 214.- Schneid. Lex.]

Nub. 395. with v long, instead of which Herodotus (5, 77.) has the diphthong $\pi\epsilon\rho_1\pi\epsilon\phi\lambda\epsilon_v\sigma_\mu\epsilon'$

Φοδέω, Iterrify: fut. φοδήσω; aor. 1. ἐφόδησα, &c.; aor. 1. midd. imperat. φόδησαι. Pass. φοδέομαι, I am terrified: [fut. midd. φοδήσομαι and fut. pass. φοδηθήσομαι, without any difference of meaning, Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 19. 3, 3, 30. 6, 7, 15.; aor. 1. pass. ἐφοδήθην; perf. pass. $\pi \in \phi \circ =$ $\delta = 0$

[The perf. pass. has particularly the sense of to be put to flight, to fly, Il. and Herodot. 9, 70. The aor. 1. midd. $i\phi o \xi \eta \sigma \delta \mu \eta \nu$ belongs to the latest and worst period of the language; e.g. Anacr. 3, 11. — Passow.]

Φορέω. See Φέρω.

Φράζω, I say, point out: fut. Φράσω; aor. 1. ἔΦρἄσα; perf. πέΦρακα. Pass. (in Herodotus) I perceive, observe: imperf. ἐΦραζόμην, Herodot. 3, 154.; aor. 1. ἐΦράσθην, part. Φρασθείς, ib. 1, 84. 5, 92. 7, 46. 9, 19.; perf. πέ-Φραδμαι or πέΦρασμαι. Midd. (in the Epic poets) I perceive, observe; also I consider, reflect, consult, plan: fut. Φράσομαι; aor. 1. midd. ἐΦρασάμην.

The active voice has in the Epic poets a reduplicated aorist $\pi \epsilon \phi \rho \check{a} \delta \sigma \nu$ (see $K \acute{a} \mu \nu \omega$), or with the augment $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \phi \rho \check{a} \delta \sigma \nu$ (compare $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \tau \sigma$ under $K \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$), II. κ , 127., particularly used in the 3. sing. $\pi \epsilon \phi \rho \alpha \delta \epsilon$; dual $\pi \epsilon \phi \rho \alpha \delta \epsilon \tau \eta \nu$, Hes. 9, 475.; infin. $\pi \epsilon \phi \rho \alpha \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\pi \epsilon \phi \rho \alpha \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, Od. η , 49. τ , 477.; optat. $\pi \epsilon \phi \rho \acute{a} \delta \sigma \iota$. The part. perf. pass. with a δ , and in a passive sense, occurs in Hes. ϵ , 653. In a fragment in Athen. 11. p. 465. f. $\phi \rho \acute{a} \delta \eta$ is a false reading, instead of which there is a various reading $\phi \rho \acute{a} \sigma \theta \eta$.

[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.]

Φράσσω, Att. Φράττω, (in the later writers Φράγνυμι also), I fill, stop up, place close together, fortify: fut. Φράξω; aor. 1. ἔΦραξα; aor. 1. pass. ἐΦράχθην; aor. 1. midd. ἐΦραξάμην; perf. pass. πέΦραγμαι; aor. 2. pass. (in the compound) ἀπεΦράγην, Lucian. Dial. Mort. 28, 2.

Φρέω, I suffer to pass: fut. Φρήσω. This verb is used

only in composition, e. g. $i \alpha \phi \rho i \omega$, $i \sigma \phi \rho i \omega$, $\delta \iota \alpha \phi \rho i \omega$, I let out, in, through: in addition to which we find a decompound $i \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \phi \rho i \omega$ in Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1267. and Seidl. Eurip. El. 1028.* MIDD. I suffer to pass to myself, take to myself, admit; e. g. $\epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \phi \rho o \delta \mu \eta \nu$, Eurip. Tro. 647., to which belongs the fut. $\epsilon \iota \sigma \phi \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \delta \alpha \iota$, Demosth. Cherson. p. 93, 18.: for the fut. act. ($i \alpha \phi \rho \eta \sigma \omega$, $\epsilon \iota \sigma \phi \rho \eta \sigma \omega$, $\delta \iota \alpha \phi \rho \eta \sigma \omega$, Aristoph. Vesp. 156. 892. Av. 193.) is in common use. The aor. 1. pass. $i \alpha \phi \rho \eta \sigma \theta \eta \nu \alpha \iota$ occurs in Ælian. ap. Suid. in voc.

The Grammarians mention also an imperat. $\epsilon \breve{\iota} \sigma \phi \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, $\breve{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, which belongs to the syncopated formation of $\pi \imath \partial \iota$, $\kappa \lambda \breve{\upsilon} \partial \iota$, $\sigma \chi \acute{\epsilon} \varsigma$, from $\pi \imath \upsilon \omega$, $\kappa \lambda \acute{\upsilon} \omega$, $\breve{\epsilon} \chi \omega$; but we know not any passage where it really occurs. \dagger 'Eξεφρείσμεν in Aristoph. Vesp. 125. is a very singular form. \ddagger Whether the unusual present $\pi \iota \phi \rho \acute{\iota} \nu \iota$ belongs to $\phi \rho \acute{\epsilon} \omega$, by a change of the radical vowel (compare $\delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \acute{\epsilon} \omega$ and $\pi \acute{\iota} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$), is uncertain : see Schneider in 'E $\mu \pi \acute{\iota} \phi \rho \eta \mu \iota$ S, and on Aristot. H. A. 5, 5. Schæf. on Gregor. p. 521. not.

Φρίσσω, Att. Φρίττω, I shudder: fut. Φρίξω; aor. 1. έφριξα; perf. (its pure characteristic letter is \varkappa , as in the subst. Φρīκή) πέφρīκα.

The Doric part. $\pi\epsilon\phi\rho\epsilon\kappa\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma$ (Pind. Pyth. 4, 326.) is either a perfect formed according to the analogy of the present, like $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\gamma\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ under $\kappa\lambda\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, and $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\sigma\tau\iota$ under 'P $\epsilon\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, or it is a present from a form $\pi\epsilon\phi\rho\epsilon\kappa\omega$. Compare also $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\kappa\sigma\sigma\sigma$, Archim., and see Greg. Cor. in Ætol. 56. Maitt. p. 239.

* 'Execoppels is also quoted by Hermann from Eurip. Phaëth. 2, 50.

† 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 $\phi p \epsilon s$ 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 $\xi \kappa \phi \rho \epsilon s$ must have been the original reading in Aristoph. Vesp. 162. instead of $\xi \kappa \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon$, which cannot be the true one. ‡ [Passow has Ἐκφρείω Poet. for Ἐκφρέω.] § [In Schneider's Lexicon we find Ἐμ-

§ [In Schneider's Lexicon we find Έμπίφρημι, like ἐμφράττω, I thrust in, in order to fill up an aperture, Aristot. H. A. 5, 6. ἐμπιφράναι εἰς τὸν μυκτῆρα. But the word is suspicious. – Passow omits it altogether in his Lexicon.]

 $\| \Phi \rho \epsilon \omega$ has been most improperly reckoned among the sister-forms of $\phi \epsilon \rho \omega$: for though it may be wished to class it etymologically with that verb, still its totally distinct meaning requires a grammatical treatment equally distinct.

s 2

 ΦYZ -. See $\Phi \epsilon i \gamma \omega$.

Φυλάσσω, Att. Φυλάττω, I watch: fut. Φυλάξω, &c. -MIDD. I stand on my guard, guard myself against, take heed of.

The imperative Nηον δέ προφύλαχθε (Hymn. Apoll. 538.), in whatever way we explain it, is a very anomalous form. If we suppose it to be the perf. pass. for $\pi\rhoo\pi\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\lambda\alpha\gamma\theta\epsilon$, the immediate context $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\gamma\theta\epsilon$ $\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ $\phi\tilde{\nu}\lambda'$ $d\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$, seems greatly in favour of that supposition, particularly as the imperat. perf. was also in use, e. g. in Hes. ϵ , 795. $\pi\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\lambda\alpha\dot{\xi}\omega$: 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, $\phi v \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, $\pi \rho o \phi v \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma$: 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 $\pi \rho o \phi i \lambda \alpha \chi \theta \varepsilon$ to be a syncopated form of the pres. act. like $\phi \epsilon_{\rho \tau \epsilon}$, consequently for $\pi \rho_0 \phi_0 \lambda \dot{a} \sigma$ σετε, formed from the stem or root ΦΥΛΑΚ-, yet instead of the termination - $\kappa \tau \epsilon$ taking that of - $\chi \theta \epsilon$, like $\ddot{\alpha} \nu \omega \chi \theta \epsilon$.*

 $\Phi'_{\nu\rho\omega}$, I mix, particularly by adding moisture; whence, I knead; and in Homer, I wet, moisten, stain; it has in the older language a fut. φύρσω; aor. 1. έφυρσα, &c.: but in prose it changes to the inflexion of -aw, as fut. Auparw, and in Hippocr. Diæt. 2, 8, 10. φυρήσω; aor. 1. έφύρασα; aor. 1. midd. ¿Duparauny (infin. Dupararban, Aristoph. Nub. 979.); aor. 1. pass. έφυράθην (part. φυραθεΐσα, Plat. Theæt. p. 147. c.); see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 205. In the perf. pass. both $\pi \in \phi' \circ \rho a \mu a$ and $\pi' \in \phi \circ \rho \mu a$, there in use;

3, 49. criticism has declared in favour of $\pi\epsilon\phi u\rho a\mu\epsilon\nu os:$ but the exclusive usage of πεφυρμένοs in succeeding writers, e. g. in Lucian, Plutarch, and others, leads us to

^{*} In Xen. Cyr. 8, 6, 3. διαπεφυλάκασι is a false reading for -λάχασι. † Whether both were used in Attic

prose, is still a question. In Thucyd.

the latter in Homer and Xenophon; compare Od. 1, 397. and Xen. Ages. 2, 14.

Lucian has the aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\nu}\rho\eta\nu$ ($\sigma\nu\nu\alpha\nu\alpha\phi\nu\rho\dot{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, Epist. Saturn. 28.): on the other hand the present $\phi\nu\rho\tilde{\omega}$, $\phi\nu\rho\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ appears not to have been in use, except perhaps among some of the later writers. The formation of $\phi\dot{\nu}\rho\sigma\omega$ always remained in the language of poetry; and Pindar (Nem. 1, 104.) has also the fut. 3. (paullo-post) $\pi\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\rho\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$; which rather confirms than opposes the observation made in my Grammar, "that verbs with λ , μ , ν , or ρ , as their characteristic letter, seldom have a third future, if they are inflected regularly:" for $\phi\dot{\nu}\rho\omega$, by its inflexion in $-\sigma\omega$, no longer preserves its analogy with those verbs.

Φύω, I beget*, is inflected regularly. But the perf. $\pi \dot{\epsilon}$ φυπα and the aor. 2. $\dot{\epsilon}$ φυν, infin. φυπαι, part. φύς (see note p. 53. and note p. 238.) have the immediate meaning of to spring up, be produced or begotten †, to which belong also the pres. pass. φύομαι. and fut. midd. φύσομαι, e. g. Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 32. βάρσος δὲ ἐμφύσεται. Compare Δύω and the statement there made of this verb.

The moods of $\xi\phi\nu\nu$ correspond also with those of $\xi\delta\nu\nu$. The conj. $\phi\dot{\nu}\omega$ (probably with ν long) is found in Xenoph. Hier. 7, 3. $o\bar{i}_{S}\delta^{2}\tilde{a}\nu$ $\dot{\xi}\mu\phi\dot{\nu}\eta\ldots\dot{\xi}\rho\omega\varsigma$. The 3. sing. opt. $\phi\dot{\nu}\eta$ occurs in Theor. 15, 94. If this optative had followed strictly the analogy of verbs in $-\mu\iota$, the optatives in $-\epsilon i\eta\nu$, $-a i\eta\nu$, $-o i\eta\nu$ would have required the corresponding termination to be $\nu i\eta\nu$: but as this diphthong is never found before a consonant, the passive optative could not be $-\nu i\mu\eta\nu$, $-\nu i\tau \sigma$, but became $-\dot{\nu}\mu\eta\nu$, $-\nu\tau\sigma$, and therefore to preserve conformity the active was written $\phi\dot{\nu}\eta\nu$, not $\phi\nu i\eta\nu$. Compare $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\tilde{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\nu i\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$, p. 73., and Buttm. Lexil. p. 425. with note. \ddagger

Beside $\xi\phi\nu\nu$, an aor. 2. pass. was formed with the same sense, viz. $\xi\phi\nu\eta\nu$, conj. $\phi\nu\omega$, infin. $\phi\nu\eta\nu\alpha$, &c., which was in use as early as the time of Hippocrates, and among the later writers became the common form. To this belongs also a fut. $\phi\nu\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha$, of which we find the infin. $\lambda\nu\alpha\phi\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ in Lucian. Jup. Trag. 19.

S

in Porson. Eurip. Phœn. 34. of a mother. — Passow.] † In the later writers φύs, οἱ φύντες, is

conjecture that there were older precedents for this latter. See Valck. ad Schol. Eurip. Phcen. 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 the later writers \$\phi\$s, of \$\phi\$vres, is used in the causative sense; see Bekker on Phot. Bibl. p. 17. a. (Appian.) ‡ [Passow is however of opinion that

 $[\]ddagger$ [Passow is however of opinion that $\phi \upsilon \eta \nu$ still remains very doubtful.] 3

Instead of $\pi\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota$ we find in Homer the Epic $\pi\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\alpha\sigma\iota$, and instead of the part. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\kappa\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $-\dot{\sigma}\tau\sigma\varsigma$, the Epic $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $-\tilde{\omega}\tau\sigma\varsigma$, fem. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\nu\tilde{\omega}$: on the omission of the κ , see $\beta\epsilon\epsilon\delta\alpha\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, p. 37., and on the length of the oblique cases see $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\dot{\omega}\varsigma$, $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\tilde{\omega}\tau\sigma\varsigma$ with note p. 51., or $T\rho\dot{\iota}\zeta\omega$. In the pluperf. Homer always uses the mere reduplication without the augment; while Hesiod (ϵ , 151. α , 76. ϑ , 152. 673.) has in a particular instance restored the augment, and formed a 3. plur. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\phi\bar{\nu}\kappa\sigma\nu$ (for $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\kappa\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$) like the imperf. of a pres. $\pi\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\kappa\omega$: see M $\eta\kappa\dot{\alpha}\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$.

[Parmenides has ventured to use $\phi \tilde{\nu} \nu$ for $\phi \tilde{\nu} \nu a \iota$; but the 3. plur. aor. 2. $\check{\epsilon} \phi \bar{\nu} \nu$ for $\check{\epsilon} \phi \nu \sigma a \nu$ is principally Epic. — Passow.]

Φώσκω. See Φαύσκω.

Х.

Χάζομαι, ἀναχάζομαι*, I retire, retreat: depon. midd.

The prose usage of this verb is known only from Xenophon, who has the imperf. $\dot{a}\nu\epsilon\chi a\zeta \phi\mu\eta\nu$, 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, $\dot{a}\nu a\chi \dot{a}\zeta o\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, Anab. 4, 1, 12. (16.). We find also $\ddot{a}\gamma\chi a\zeta\epsilon$ 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 $\ddot{\epsilon}\chi a\sigma\sigma a\nu$ 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. $\kappa\epsilon\kappa a\delta\sigma\nu$, and in the midd. a. 3. plur. $\kappa\epsilon\kappa a\delta\sigma\nu\tau\sigma$, with a fut. act. $\kappa\epsilon\kappa a\delta\eta\sigma\omega$ formed from it. These forms came by an old. Ionicism (compare $\tau\epsilon\tau\nu\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$) from $\epsilon\chi a\delta\sigma\nu$, which usage has retained in this unchanged shape under the cognate verb $\chi a\nu\delta a\nu\omega$. Hence $\kappa\epsilon\kappa a-\delta\sigma\nu\tau\sigma$ (II. δ , 497.) is precisely the same as $\epsilon\chi a\sigma a\nu\tau\sigma$; but the active forms (II. λ , 334. Od. ϕ , 153.) with the genitive have the sense of to deprive, in which lies the same causative sense as in $a\nu\alpha\chi a\zeta\omega$, I make a person yield or retire from any thing, expressed more simply in Latin by cedere facio. On $\kappa\epsilon\kappa a\delta\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ see K $\eta\delta\omega$.

Χαίνω. See Χάσκω.

Χαίρω, I rejoice: fut. χαιρήσω; aor. 2. (from the passive voice) ἐχάρην; and from this aorist was formed again a perf. κεχάρηκα or κεχάρημαι, with the force of the present increased, I am rejoiced: compare Ανδάνω ἕαδα, Θάλλω τέθηλα, Κήδομαι κέκηδα, Πείθομαι πέποιθα. On the for-

* [There is no instance of the simple $\chi d\zeta \omega$ in the active voice. — Passow.]

mation of the perfect from the aorist see $\dot{\alpha} \varkappa \alpha \chi \eta \sigma \omega$ and note p. 12.

The perfect $\kappa\epsilon\chi\dot{\alpha}\rho\eta\kappa a$ is found in Aristoph. Vesp. 764.; the part. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}c$, rejoiced, is of frequent occurrence in Herodotus, and without the κ ($\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\eta\dot{\sigma}\tau a$, &c.) in the Epic poets: the perf. pass. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\dot{\alpha}\rho\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ occurs likewise in Aristoph. Vesp. 389. and its part. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu_{0}c$ in Hom. Hymn. 6, 10. Both the futures formed with reduplication from these perfects are found also in Homer, e. g. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\eta\sigma\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, Il. o, 98., $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, Od. ψ , 266.

Of the regular inflexion, we find in the poets (from an Epic aor. 1. midd. $i\chi\eta\rho\dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$) the 3. sing. $\chi\dot{\eta}\rho\alpha\tau\sigma$, II. ξ , 270.: compare Jacob. Anthol. Poet. p. 262. and (from a reduplicated aor. 2. midd. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$) the 3. plur. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\dot{a}\rho\rho\nu\tau\sigma$ with the optatives $\kappa\epsilon\chi\dot{a}\rho\sigma\iota\tau\sigma$, $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\sigma\dot{a}\tau\sigma$, II. and Od. The part. perf. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\alpha\rho\mu\dot{e}\nu\sigma\varsigma$, rejoiced, occurs in Eurip. Or. 1122. El. 1077. and other tragedies of the same writer. The verbal adj. is $\chi\alpha\rho\tau\dot{o}\varsigma$.

The aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon}\chi \alpha i \rho \eta \sigma \alpha$ is found in the later writers, e.g. in Plut. Lucull. 25.* The fut. $\chi \alpha \rho \eta \sigma \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ which occurs in the LXX., although formed analogically from $\dot{\epsilon}\chi \dot{\alpha}\rho \eta \nu$, like $\dot{\alpha}\kappa \alpha \chi \dot{\eta}\sigma \omega$ from $\eta \kappa \alpha \chi \rho \nu$ (see note p. 12.), is decidedly a form to be rejected : see Thom. Mag. [The pres. midd. $\chi \alpha i \rho \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ was a notorious barbarism, Aristoph. Fr. 291.: nor were $\chi \alpha \iota \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, $\chi \alpha \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, or $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \omega$ ever in use. — Passow.]

Χαλάω, *I loosen*, *relax*: fut. χαλάσω, Dor. χαλάξω, &c. This verb has a short in the inflexion, and takes σ in the passive; e. g. perf. pass. $\varkappa \in \chi$ άλασμαι.

Xavdávw, I contain: fut. $\chi\epsilon i \sigma o \mu a i$ (Od. σ , 17.); aor. $\xi \chi a \delta o v$; perf. (synonymous with the present) $\kappa \xi \chi a v \delta a$. This future is generally placed by mistake with a theme XEI Ω , although it is evident that $\chi \epsilon i \sigma o \mu a \iota$ bears exactly the same relation to $\xi \chi a \delta o v$ as $\pi \epsilon i \sigma o \mu a \iota$ to $\xi \pi a \theta o v$. It comes therefore from the root XAN Δ -, with a change of the radical vowel. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 181.

Xάσκω, I open (intrans), open my mouth, gape: imperf. ἕχασκον. This verb borrows from χαίνω (which is

* Lobeck (ad Phryn. p. 740.) is wrong in speaking of this reading as suspicious. The expression ob $\chi u \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon s$, " 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 obk $\epsilon \chi d \rho \eta$ would have given a somewhat different meaning. Hence I cannot but think it a question worth considering, whether the earlier writers would not have used the same expression in this case, and whether Plutarch had not some precedent for his use of it.

s 4

not used by any of the older writers) a fut. $\chi \alpha \nu o \tilde{\upsilon} \mu \alpha \iota^*$, an aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi \alpha \nu o \upsilon$, and a perf. (synonymous with the pres.) $\varkappa \dot{\epsilon} \chi \eta \nu \alpha \dagger$, I am open, have my mouth open.

Lucian (Dial. Mort. 6, 3.) is the earliest writer in which we find any instance of the pres. $\chi \alpha i \nu \omega. \ddagger$

In the passage of Aristoph. Ach. 133. $i\mu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}_{c}$ de $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\mathcal{E}\epsilonie\sigma\theta\epsilon$ kai $\kappa\epsilon\chi\dot{\eta}$ rare, Herodian found $\kappa\epsilon\chi\dot{\eta}\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ written (see Cheerobose. in Bekk. Aneed. III. p. 1287. where "Oprivity is a corruption), which he considers to be an inflexion of the indicative for $-a\tau\epsilon$. For that some of the older authors preferred writing the perf. act. of the verb with ϵ , is clear from Apollon. Synt. 1, 10. (p. 37, 9. Be.): see also $\Delta\nu\dot{\eta}\nu\partial\thetaa$ and note, p. 25. In the Attic language, indeed, this inflexion is inadmissible, but for that very reason the reading of Herodian is most probably the true one, misunderstood by the Grammarians above mentioned. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\dot{\eta}\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ is the *imperative*, which mood is most suitable to the context of that passage; and the rarity of its occurrence misled the commentators : see $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\dot{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ under $\kappa\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$.

Χέζω, caco: fut. χεσοῦμαι; perf. κέχοδα; aor. ἔχεσα and ἔχεσον; perf. pass. κέχεσμαι (part. κεχεσμένον, Aristoph. Ach. 1185.)

I have some doubt whether the aor. $\xi\chi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\nu$ be a genuine form; and I may say the same of the infin. $\chi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ 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 confounded, as they are in $\epsilon l\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$ and $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$; compare $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\nu$ and $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\alpha$, and see $\ell\delta\iota\sigma\epsilon\tau\sigma$, pp. 73, 74. Aristophanes (Eccles. 320. Nub. 174.) has the part. aor. 1. $\chi\epsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\iota$; but the form $\chi\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\tau\sigma$ (Equ. 1057.) proves as little in favour of the aor. 1. as it does of the middle voice of this verb, for it is used in that passage in a play on the word.

Χείσομαι. See Χανδάνω.

Χέω, I pour: fut. χέω, χεῖς, χεῖ; fut. midd. χέομαι; aor. 1. ἔχεα (see ἔκηα under Καίω), imper. χέον, χεάτω,

* [Buttmann, in his Lexil, p. 181., supposes another fut. $\chi h \sigma \omega \omega$, of which the 3. sing. $\chi h \sigma \epsilon \tau \omega$ may be read in a corrupted passage of Hom Hymn. Ven. 253.]

+ [According to Ap. Dysc. there was also a perf. $\kappa \epsilon \chi \alpha \gamma \kappa \alpha$. — Passow.] The mention by Chrysoloras in his

‡ The mention by Chrysoloras in his Grammar that $\chi \alpha l \nu \omega$ was not in use, shows that the older Grammarians had before taught the same. conj. χέω, infin. χέαι; aor. 1. midd. ἐχεάμην; perf. κέχὕκα; perf. pass. κέχὕμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐχύθην.* — Midd.

The forms $\chi\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega$, $\xi\chi\epsilon\upsilon\sigmaa$ appear to have never occurred \dagger , but are only supposed to have existed from the derivative $\chi\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\mu a$ and the shortness of the ν in $\kappa\epsilon\chi\nu\kappaa$, &c. That $\chi\epsilon\omega$ is fut. as well as pres. was first remarked by Elmsley, and proved by the following examples: $\kappa\dot{a}\rho a \tau\epsilon$ $\gamma\dot{a}\rho \ \sigma o\nu \ \tilde{\xi}\nu\gamma\chi\dot{\epsilon}\omega \dots \dot{\rho}a\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota} \ \tau\epsilon \dots$, Eurip. Thes. Fr. 1., $o\dot{\nu} \ \kappa a\tau o\rho\dot{\nu}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa a \ \dots \mu\dot{\nu}\rho o\nu \ \dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\chi\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$, Aristoph. Pac. 169., $\dots\pi a\rho a\chi\epsilon\omega\nu\ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\chio\mu a\iota$, Plat. Com. ap. Athen. p. 665. c. To which we may add $\chi\epsilon\dot{\mu}\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu$ (said of pouring out the libation) $\kappa a\dot{\iota} \ \dot{\epsilon}\nu a\gamma\iota\sigma\tilde{\nu}\tau a$, Isæus 6. p. 61.: which passages had been previously explained sometimes as harshness of syntax, at others as harshness of contraction. And thus $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$ 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 $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\dot{\epsilon}\omega$. \ddagger

The Epic language has an aor. $\xi \chi \epsilon \nu a$, conj. $\chi \epsilon \nu \omega (\chi \epsilon \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu, II. \eta, 86.)$, midd. $\xi \chi \epsilon \nu a \mu \eta \nu$; and at Od. β , 222. II. η , 336. we read $\chi \epsilon \nu \omega$, $\chi \epsilon \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$, which may be the conj. aor. supplying in Homer's usage the place of the future, quite as well as the Epic fut. $\chi \epsilon \nu \omega$ answering to the Attic fut. $\chi \epsilon \omega$ (compare $\delta \eta \omega$, $\kappa \epsilon \iota \omega \nu$, $\kappa \epsilon \omega \nu$, $\sigma \omega \omega$); both which views are in syntax fundamentally the same. Again $\delta a \kappa \rho \nu \sigma \iota \chi \epsilon \nu \omega$, Eurip. El. 181. (where I proposed on a former occasion to read the false form $\chi \epsilon \nu \sigma \omega$) is, as far as regards the verb, quite correct. $X \epsilon \nu \omega$ in that passage is not the present (it never occurs as a present even in the Epic language, the metre being satisfied by $\chi \epsilon \iota \omega$: see Od. ι , 10. Hes. ϑ , 83.), but it is the Epic future of Homer which suits the lyric stanza, and may be joined with $\kappa \rho \nu \sigma \omega$ in the preceding verse, without offending against $\mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota$ in the following one.

The Epic language has also the syncop. aor. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\dot{\nu}\mu\eta\nu$, $\ddot{\epsilon}\chi\nu\tau\sigma$, $\chi\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\varsigma$ (to be poured out), formed after the perfect.

* Some verbs change the diphthong ϵv of the radical syllable in the perf, pass. to v; e.g. $\tau \epsilon \dot{v} \chi \omega \tau \epsilon' \tau v \gamma \mu ai$, $\phi \epsilon \dot{v} v \omega \pi \epsilon \phi v - \gamma \mu \epsilon' v os$, $\sigma \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ for $v \mu ai$, $\pi \epsilon \dot{v} \partial c \mu ai$, $\pi \epsilon \dot{v} \partial c \mu ai$, $\pi \dot{e} \partial c \mu ai$, $\pi \dot{e} \sigma \dot{\mu} ai$, $\chi \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, as one of the verbs in $- \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ which take ϵv 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. ‡ Elmsley very correctly compares this future with $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega$, whose fut. $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\omega$, by the Ionic omission of the σ , becomes again $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega$, Attic $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega$; the only difference is, that the shorter word did not admit the contraction in $\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{\omega}$, as it does in the present. But that $\chi\epsilon\omega$, $\chi\epsilon\sigma\omega$ was the original formation is shown by the aorist $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\theta\eta\nu$, which remained in common use to quite a late period: an additional cause for the other formation without the σ , was the coincidence of the fut, and aor. of $\chi\epsilon\omega$ with those of $\chi\epsilon\zeta\omega$. $\mathbf{266}$

On the aor. 1. pass. $i\chi i \theta \eta \nu$, $\chi i \theta \eta \nu \alpha i$, which was very common in the later writers, see the preceding note, and Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 731.

XΛΑΔ-, whence an Ionic perf. κέχλāδa*, of which Pindar (Ol. 9, 3. Pyth. 4, 319.) has the part. κεχλāδώς, gen. κεχλάδοντος, swelling : compare πεφρίκοντας under Φρίσσω. [We find also in Pind. Fr. 48. a perf. infin. κεχλάδειν for κεχλαδέναι.—Passow.]

Xόω, I heap up (generally, a mound of earth): fut. χώσω, &c.; infin. pres. χοῦν, part. χῶν. The passive takes σ, e. g. perf. \varkappa έχωσμαι; aor. 1. ἐχώσθην, infin. χωσθῆναι.

The above formation is frequent in Herodotus, while the pres. $\chi \dot{\omega} \nu$ - $\nu \nu \mu \mu$ belongs to the later writers. $\chi \dot{\omega} \omega \mu \mu$ may be found in its alphabetical place.

Χραισμεῖν, to help, infin. of a defective aorist ἕχραισμον, from which again came a fut. χραισμήσω and aor. 1. ἐχραίσμησα: compare ἀκαχήσω and note p. 12. See also Buttm. Lexil. pp. 541.—548.

Xράω. 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.[†] All have the inflexion with the η , e. g. $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \omega$, &c., and that even in the Doric dialect. The contracted forms take also η as the vowel of contraction, as in $\zeta \dot{\alpha} \omega$, $\varkappa \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, $\sigma \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, &c., while this peculiarity is also to be remarked, that the Ionic dialect here takes $\bar{\alpha}$ as the vowel of contraction, as in $\varkappa \nu \tilde{\alpha} \nu$, $\sigma \mu \tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha \iota$, &c., Herodot. 9, 110. We will now describe five forms which are used in prose.

Χράω, I give an oracle, foretell: fut. χρήσω; aor. 1.
 ἔχρησα. Pass. χράομαι; fut. midd. χρήσομαι; perf. pass.

* If we suppose a present from which to form this perfect, it must be $\chi\lambda\eta\delta\omega$ (like $\pi\lambda\eta\delta\omega$ $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\deltaa$); which is connected with $\chi\lambda\delta\eta$, but not with $\kappa\alpha\chi\lambda\delta\omega$, a term signifying sound; nor is it akin to $\kappa\lambda\delta\omega$, partly because the stem of this latter has $\gamma\gamma$, partly because analogy gives us the change of χ to κ (in $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\delta\omega\omega$ and the like), but not the converse of κ to χ which would be required in this case. [Passow, however, forms this perfect from a present $\chi\lambda\delta\omega$, Dor. $\chi\lambda\eta\omega$, which he makes exactly synonymous with its compound $\kappa\alpha\gamma\chi\lambda\delta\omega$ (Pind. OI. 7, 2. $\kappa\alpha\gamma$ -

 $\chi \lambda d \zeta o \sigma a$), 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 $\chi\rho\omega\omega$, $\epsilon\pi\chi\rho\omega\omega$, $\chi\rho\omega\omega\omega$, and $\chi\rho\omega\omega\omega$, 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 $\chi\epsilon\rho$, $\kappa\rho\delta\sigma$. κέχρησμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐχρήσθην. Thus the passive takes σ . See also χρήζω.

In the Attic tragedians we find the present and imperfect contracted in η ; thus $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}$ is 3. sing. pres. for $\chi\rho\tilde{q}$, Herm. Soph. El. 35., $\xi\xi\epsilon\chi\rho\eta$ is 3. sing. imperf., Soph. Œd. C. 87. On the other hand Herodotus has frequently the 2. sing. $\chi\rho\tilde{q}c$, 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 $\chi\rho\omega\omega$ is sometimes changed to $\chi\rho\omega\omega$, whence the part. pres. $\chi\rho\omega\omega\sigma$, Herodot. 7, 111.; and in the Epic poetry it becomes $\chi\rho\omega\omega$, whence the part. $\chi\rho\varepsilon\omega\nu$, Od. ϑ , 79.

In many passages of Herodotus all the manuscripts have the perfect passive with the σ : in others the σ is wanting: see Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. It is easily seen that uniformity must be preserved by adopting it in all cases; $\kappa \epsilon_{\chi\rho\eta\mu\alpha\iota}$ belongs to $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ 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 $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta a\iota \mu a\nu\tau\epsilon\ell\varphi$, which appears to be exactly the same as $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta a\iota \mu a\nu\tau\iota\kappa\tilde{\eta}$ in Xenophon; sometimes however it stands absolutely, as $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta a\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\tilde{\iota}\pi\sigma\lambda\epsilon\mu\sigma\upsilon$: so that $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$, to foretell, answers correctly to $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta a\iota$, to consult an oracle. See Od. 9, 79. 81. κ , 492.

2. Χράομαι, I use, depon. midd. : fut. χρήσομαι; aor. 1. έχρησάμην; perf. (without σ) κέχρημαι. The present and imperf. are contracted in η instead of the regular α , thus χρῶμαι, χρῆ, χρῆται, infin. χρῆσθαι, &c., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 61. Κέχρημαι is sometimes used in the strict sense of a perfect, e. g. in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 30. (24.) δ πολλάκις αὐτῆ κεχρημένος : but it has generally the sense of the present, as in Xen. Equ. 4, 5. κεχρῆσθαι ταῖς δπλαῖς, and in most instances the force is increased, I am always using and therefore I have.* Verbal adj. χρηστός, χρηστέον, Plat. Gorg. 136.

In the Epic language $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ has the meaning of to be in need of \dagger ; hence in Homer and Hesiod $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\mu\epsilon\nu_{0}$ is used as an adjective in the sense of needy. Tivoc $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$; Theocr. 26, 18. Fut. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, id. 16, 73. Compare $\chi\rho\eta$ and the note under $\chi\rho\eta'\omega$.

6.1

^{*} See 'Ανδάνω ἔαδα, Θάλλω τέθηλα, Κήδομαι κέκηδα, Πείθομαι πέποιθα.

the Epic poets, but there are instances of it in the Attic also, e. g. in Elmsl. Eurip. Heracl. 801.— Passow.]

^{+ [}This meaning properly belongs to

In the unusual case of a passive tense being formed from this middle verb (compare $\beta_{i\dot{\alpha}\zeta o\mu\alpha\iota}$), the aorist has the σ (as in $\chi\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$, *I foretell*), *ai* $\nu\eta\epsilon\varsigma\ldots\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, Herodot. 7, 144., again, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$, to be put to death (from $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\tau\nu\alpha$), Herodot. 9, 120., with which the 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 $\chi\rho\tilde{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota$, $\chi\rho\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\chi\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\omega$, &c.; at other times the α is changed to ϵ in the same forms, as $\chi\rho\epsilon \tau\alpha\iota$, $\chi\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$: in some passages we find $\chi\rho\epsilon\omega\tau\tau\alpha\iota$, in others $\chi\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$.* In the imperative Herodotus (1, 115.) has, according to all the manuscripts, $\chi\rho\epsilon\omega$, while Hippocrates frequently uses $\chi\rho\epsilon\omega$ shortened from $\chi\rho\epsilon\epsilon\sigma$, like $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\sigma$, which see under K $\lambda\epsilon\omega$.

3. Κίχρημι, I lend: fut. χρήσω; aor. 1. ἔχρησα, &c.; infin. pres. κίχραναι. Midd. κίχραμαι, 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 $\chi\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$ never occurs in this sense; we place, therefore, the present $\kappa\dot{\chi}\rho\eta\mu\iota$ 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. $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ was avoided by the Attic writers in this sense: see Antiatt. Bekk. p. 116.

4. Χρή, (oportet) it is necessary; an impersonal verb: opt. χρείη, conj. χρῆ, infin. χρῆναι, part. (τδ) χρεών. Imperf. ἐχρῆν, or in prose χρῆν. Fut. χρήσει.

The indicative of this verb may be considered as the 3. sing of $\chi\rho\dot{a}\omega$ $-\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}$, with the tone or accent shortened. The participle also comes exactly, according to analogy, from $\chi\rho\tilde{a}o\nu$, like $\nu\tilde{a}\delta\varsigma$, Ion. $\nu\eta\delta\varsigma$, Att. $\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ (compare the subst. $\chi\rho\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ and the neut. part. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$): but it has the anomalous accent of $i\omega\nu$ and the Ionic $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu$. It is indeclinable; that is to say, it occurred so seldom in any construction requiring other

* 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 text. Whoever examines the passages and their various readings with the help of Schweighæuser's Lexicon Herodotu, 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 ϵ_0 is much more difficult. There can be, however, no besitation in rejecting from the text of Herodotus such forms as $\chi\rho\eta\bar{a}\sigma au$ and $\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\bar{a}\sigma$. 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, $\tau \tilde{\psi} \chi \rho \epsilon \omega' r$.

In the other three moods (opt., conj., and infin.) this verb follows the formation of verbs in μ_i , retaining, however, the η in the infinitive, and ϵ_i instead of α_i in the optative, as in a similar case under $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu_i$.

We find twice in Euripides (Hecub. 258., Herc. Fur. 828.) $\tau \delta \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$ 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 $\chi \rho \epsilon \omega \nu$, 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 $\mu\iota$, would be $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\rho\eta$: therefore $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$ or $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$ (the only forms ever used) are to be compared with the 3. sing. $\tilde{\eta}\nu$, Ion. $\tilde{\epsilon}\eta\nu$, from $\epsilon i\mu i$. 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. κ , 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. $\delta \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$, of which thou hast need, Cratin. ap. Suid. v. $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$; où $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a$, thou hast no need, Megarensis ap. Aristoph. Acharn. 778.; compare $\Delta \epsilon \omega$. From this verb Herodotus (3, 117.) has a middle voice with a similar meaning in the form $\chi \rho \eta^{\dagger} \sigma \kappa \sigma$ - $\mu \alpha$. Compare $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha$ above, and note on $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \zeta \omega$ below.

5. $A\pi\delta\chi\rho\eta$, is sufficient. This verb has the anomaly of the preceding one in this 3. sing. pres. indic. only, inasmuch as it is shortened from $d\pi\delta\chi\rho\eta$; in all its other forms it follows regularly $\chi\rho\omega\omega$, &c.: thus 3. plur. $d\pi\delta\chi\rho\omega\sigma\iota\nu$; infin. pres. $d\pi\delta\chi\rho\eta\nu$; imperf. $d\pi\xi\chi\rho\eta$; fut. $d\pi\delta\chi\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$; aor. 1. $d\pi\xi\chi\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$, &c. MIDD. $d\pi\delta\chi\rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, *I have enough*; infin. $d\pi\delta\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. In this voice it is inflected like $\chi\rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, 2.

The Ionics have also the regular 3. sing. pres. indic. $\dot{\alpha}\pi o \chi \rho \tilde{\rho}$. In the same or a similar sense Herodotus has other compounds, $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \chi \rho \tilde{\rho}$, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa \chi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon$, $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon$, $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon$.

This verb is not an impersonal, although, like other personal verbs, it

* Perhaps the shorter form $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ had become so general in common life, that

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 $\dot{\alpha}\pi\alpha\chi\rho\bar{\omega}\sigma\iota$: 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. $\epsilon I_S \dot{\epsilon}\gamma \dot{\omega}\nu \dot{\alpha}\pi\alpha\chi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, *I alone am* sufficient. See a similar appearance in $M\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$, 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 $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\chi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau o$ (Herodot. 8, 14.) used impersonally for $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rhoa$; compare $\mu\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\tau a\iota$ for $\mu\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$.*

 $X \rho \eta' \zeta \omega$, *I desire*, wish.⁺ The Attics use it in present and imperfect only.

In the Ionic dialect it is $\chi\rho\eta\dot{\iota}\zeta\omega$: whence the more precise Grammarians write the common form $\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\dot{\zeta}\omega$, like $\ddot{q}\tau\tau\omega$: see Greg. Cor. in Ion. 42. The Ionics have also other tenses, as $\chi\rho\eta\dot{\tau}\sigma\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\dot{\tau}\sigma\alpha$ (Herodot. 7, 38. 5, 20. 65.), because in this form no confusion can possibly be made with the tenses of $\chi\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$. But in the printed text all these are constantly written with η in Herodotus also. $\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\dot{\zeta}\omega$ in the sense of $\chi\rho\ddot{\varrho}\nu$, to foretell, see in Schneid. Lex. \ddagger

Χρίω, *I besmear*, anoint: fut. χρίσω, &c.; perf. pass. *κ*έχρισμαι; but the perf. part. (without the σ) *κ*εχριμένος 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 sense the perfect passive is written $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho i \sigma \theta a \iota$, in the former $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \epsilon \bar{\iota} \sigma \theta a \iota$. In this last incorrect form (although in that writer the diphthong $\epsilon \iota$ is expressly named) we must look for nothing more than the correct form $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \bar{\iota} \sigma \theta a \iota$; and the direction given by Phrynichus must necessarily be extended thus: $\chi \rho i \omega , \tilde{\epsilon} \chi \rho \bar{\iota} \sigma a , \kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \bar{\iota} \sigma \theta a , I$ $anoint: <math>\chi \rho i \omega, \tilde{\epsilon} \chi \rho \bar{\iota} \sigma a$, $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho i \sigma a , \kappa \epsilon \chi \rho i \sigma a , I sting.$

Χρώννυμι or Χρώζω, I colour : fut. χρώσω, &c.

* Such an irregularity could arise only from the original meaning of the expression being entirely forgotten. In these compounds the active $\chi\rho d\omega$ is used exactly in its true sense. The thing supplies us with what we need; in $d\pi\sigma\chi\rho\bar{\eta}$, $d\kappa\chi\rho\bar{\eta}$ it supplies us to the extent of our need; in $d\sigma\tau\chi\rho\bar{\eta}$ 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 derreichen means to reach (any thing) forward, offer; hinreichen, to reach or extend to any certain point, and also to be sufficient.

this meaning arises from those forms of $\chi \rho d\omega$ which have the meaning of I need, in which sense, however, the verb $\chi \rho h \omega$ itself occurs in the later writers only: see Stephan. Thesaur.

t [Schneider quotes χρήζω in this sense from Æschyl. Choeph. 338., Soph. Œd. C. 1246., Eurip. Hel. 523.] In Eurip. Phen. 1619. we find $\chi\rho\omega\zeta\omega$ and in Med. 497. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, 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 $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ belonged to this present only : for according to the analogy of $\zeta\omega\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$ and $\sigma\omega\zeta\omega$, we might expect the perfect passive of $\chi\rho\omega\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$ in the old Attic to be $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, which appears merely as the various reading of $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, e.g. in Aristot. De Color. 3. But in Eth. Nicom. 2, 3. all the manuscripts have $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\sigma\mu\epsilon\nuo\varsigma$.

Χώννυμι. See Χόω.

Χώομαι, I am angry, depon. midd. : fut. χώσομαι; aor. 1. έχωσάμην.

Xωρέω, I yield, go: fut. midd. χωρήσομαι, but sometimes also χωρήσω: see Poppo Obs. Crit. in Thucyd. p. 149. and Buttmann's Notes in the Auctarium ad Plat. Theæt, 117. Ed. 2.

Ψ.

Ψαύω, I touch: fut. ψαύσω, &c.; perf. pass. ἔψαυσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐψαύσθην.

[It is generally joined with the genitive, sometimes with the dative, whether with an accusative depends on Soph. Ant. 858. 962. — Passow.]

Ψάω, *I rub*: fut. ψήσω, &c., like χνάω, σμάω; see also Πεινάω. The passive fluctuates between the formation with and without the σ ; as, perf. ἔψημαι, ἔψησμαι; aor. 1. ἐψήθην, ἐψήσθην.

See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 254. The sister-form $\psi_{\eta\chi\omega}$ (compare $\sigma_{\mu\dot{\alpha}\omega}$, $\sigma_{\mu\dot{\eta}\chi\omega}$) has the more precise sense of to rub down (a horse); to rub in pieces; to the latter of which belongs $\kappa_{\alpha\tau\dot{\epsilon}\psi\eta\kappa\tau\alpha\iota}$ in Soph. Trach. 698.

Ψέγω, I blame, reproach : fut. ψέξω, &c.; perf. ἔψογα; aor. 2. pass. ἐψέγην (see Βλέπω).

Ψεύδω, I deceive, cheat: fut. ψεύσω, &c.; perf. pass. έψευσμαι; aor. 1. pass. έψεύσθην. MIDD. I deceive, lie: οὐκ ἐψεύσαντο τὰς ἀπειλάς, they did not make their threats false, made them good, Herodot. 6, 32. Ψήχω. See Ψάω.

Ψύχω, *I cool*: fut. ψ ύξω; aor. 1. pass. έψύχθην; aor. 2. pass. έψύγην, and έψύχην, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318.

Ω.

'Ωθέω, I push: fut. $\dot{\omega}$ θήσω and $\ddot{\omega}$ σω. All the other tenses are formed from ΩΘΩ, and with the syllabic augment, e. g. imperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}$ θουν; aor. 1. $\ddot{\epsilon}\omega\sigma\alpha$, infin. $\ddot{\omega}\sigma\alpha$; perf. $\ddot{\epsilon}\omega\kappa\alpha$; perf. pass. $\ddot{\epsilon}\omega\sigma\mu\alpha$; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, Pors. Eurip. Med. 336., Plat. Tim. p. 79. e. — MIDD.

'Ωνέομαι, I buy, depon. midd.: fut. ωνήσομαι, &c. This verb has also the syllabic augment, e.g. imperf. ἐωνούμην; aor. 1. ἐωνησάμην, infin. ωνήσασθαι: but instead of this aorist the pure Attic writers used ἐπριάμην, πρίασθαι.

[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. $\dot{\omega}vo\dot{\psi}\mu\epsilon\nu a$, where Heindorf's reading $\dot{\omega}vo\dot{\psi}\mu\epsilon\theta a$ appears to be unnecessary. The pluperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}v\eta\tau\sigma$ occurs in Aristoph. Fr. 1175. On the aor. 1. pass. infin. $\dot{\epsilon}\omega v\eta\tau\theta$ $\theta\eta\nu a\iota$ and $\dot{\omega}v\eta\theta\eta\nu a\iota$ see Markl. Lys. p. 720. Isæus De Philoct. Hered. 19. A part. perf. act. $\dot{\epsilon}\omega v\eta\kappa\omega_{\varsigma}$ is quoted by the Grammarians from 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.

А.	άλήλεκα, 15.	άνασσείασκε, 223.
'Αγέομαι, 7.	άλήλεφα, 14.	άνατέλλω, 235.
άγηλαι, 1.	άληναι, άλήμεναι, 83.	άνατέτραφα, άνατέτρο-
άγημαι, άγημαι, 121.	άληται, 18.	φa, 244. note.
άγήοχα, 6, 7.	άλινδείσθαι, 159.	άναφανήσονται, 249.
άγινεόμενον, 7.	άλίνδω, άλίσω, 160.	άναφυήσεσθαι, 261.
άγνώσσασκε, άγνώσσε-	άλοίην, άλῶ, 16.	άναχάζομαι, άναχάζον-
σκε, 4. 223.	άλοιτο, 18.	τες, 262.
άγοράσω, 152. note.	άλσο, άλτο, 18.	are Eiwr, 42, 43.
άγορεύει, 89.	άμεναι, 36.	άνέγνωσα, 54.
άγχαζε, 262.	άμπεπαλών, 198.	άνειμεν, άνειτε, 115.
άδέσθαι, 24.	άμπίσχω, 113.	ανεξίτητος, 86. note.
άδον, άδήσω, 24.	άμπνυε, άμπνύνθη, 216.	άνέονται, 115.
άεισι, 36.	αμύζειν, 177. note.	ἀνέπλημεν, 209. note.
άϊκες, 11.	άμφέξω, 113.	άνέσαιμι, 117.
αἰρεύμενος, 10.	άμφιέννυμι, 96.	άνέσει, άνεσαν, 25. 117.
αίρω, 10. 250.	άμφιέσω, άμφιῶ, 96.	άνεστάκουσα, 259.
ἀκάχημαι, 9. 12.	άναξέβρυχα, 46.	άνετράπετο, 244.
ἀκάχων, 6. note.	άναβησάμενοι, 38.	άνεχαζόμην, 262.
άκείομαι, 13.	άναβιώσκομαι, 42.	<i>ἀνέχω</i> , &c., 113.
άκήκοα, 13.	άναβράττω, 45. note.	ἀνέφγα, 5. note, 183.
άκήχεμαι, 12.	άναβρόξειεν, 46.	άνέφγμαι, άνέφγον, 183.
άλάλημαι, 9.	άναβροχέν, 46.	άνέωνται, 115.
äλaλκον, 6. note, 15.	αναγιγνώσκω, 54.	ἀνέφξα, ἀνέφχα, 183.
άλασθαι, 18.	άναδράμεται, 247.	åvnbäv, 120.
άλείς, 83.	avadãv, 64.	άνηκεν, 117.
άλέκω, 15.		άνήνηται, 23.
άλεν, άλέν, 83.	note.	åνήνοθα, 6. note, 25.
άλέσθαι, 18.	άναλτος, 14.	άνηρειψάμην, 100.
άλεται, 18.	άναπεπέτασται, 205.	άνήσει, 117.
<i>ἀλήθω</i> , 15.	άναπετῶσαι, 205.	aviei, aviei, 116. note.

INDEX.

		. ,
avíeiv, 116.		άπουρήσουσιν, άπουρίσ-
ανοίγνυμι, ανοίγω, 183.	<i>απέχθομαι</i> , 110.	σουσιν, 34. note.
aνοίσειν, 253. note.	άπεχρέετο, 270.	άποφαίνω, 249.
άντεῖπον, 89.	απέχρη, απέχρησεν, 269.	ἀποχρą, 270. note.
άντέχρησε, 269.	άπεωσθέντος, 6.	άποχρέω, 270.
άντιλέγω, 89.	απήγγειλεν, απήγγε-	ἀπόχρη , 269.
άντιχρą, 270. note.	$\lambda \epsilon \nu, 2.$	άπώμνυ, 188.
ävwya, 6. note.	άπηγγέλη, 3.	άραίρηκα, άραίρημαι, 9.
άνωϊστος, 252.	άπήγγελον, 2, 3.	apápy, 6. note.
άνῷξα, 183.	άπήμθροτον, 20.	άραρον, 30.
άνῷσαι, 252.	$a\pi\eta\xi ac, 7.$	άρείς, άρεισθε, 10.
άνωχθι, 26.	άπηύρων, 34.	άρέσθαι, 10.
10 - 10	άπηχθόμην, 110.	άρεσσα, 31.
άξαι, 7.	άπίκαται, 132.	
<i>ἀξαι</i> , 11.		άρήμεναι, 29.
άξαντο, 5, 7.	$\dot{a}\pi\lambda a\kappa \epsilon i\nu$, 21. note.	άρήρειν, 30.
άξας, άξασθε, 7.	άπλατος, 202.	άρήρεκα, 31.
άξέμεν, άξετε, 6, 7.	αποδεβάναι, 38.	άρήρεμαι, 30.
άξω, 4, 6.	απόβριξας, 46.	άρήρομαι, 32.
άπαγγέλη, άπαγγέλω-		ἄρθεν, 30.
μεν, 2.	άποδιδράσκει, 240.	άρόμην, άροίμην, 10.
άπαγορεύω, 89.	απόδοιντο, 69.	ἀροῦμεν, 10.
άπαλεξήσαιμι, 14.	άποδρᾶναι, 68.	άρσάμενος, 30.
άπαμβλίσκω, 21.	άπόδρας, άποδρασα, 68.	άρῶ, ἄρωμαι, 10.
a πάφων, 6. note.	άποδρύφοι, 71.	άρώμεναι, 33. note.
άπεδέδεκτο, άπεδέχθην,	άποδώσομαι, 211.	άσα, άσασθαι, 1.
58.	άποειπείν, 88.	άσα, 36.
ά πεδόμην, 211.	άποέργει, 92.	<i>а́оорац</i> , 7, 8.
άπέδρα, 240.	άπόερσε, 103.	άσσω, 6.
άπέδρασαν, 68.	άποζεσθείς, 117.	άσσω, άσσω, 11.
άπεζεσμένος, 120.	άποθνήσκω, 127.	άσω, ἀσῶ, 8.
άπειπεῖν, 88.	άποθορόντες, 128.	άτάω, άτέω, 1.
-	άποθρώσκων, 128.	άττω, άττω, 11.
άπεῖπον, 89.	άποκλάγξασα, 149. note.	
άπείργασται, 99.		
	άποκλάς, 150.	avára, 1.
, 91.	άποκρίνομαι, 156.	άφείθην, άφεθείς, 115.
	άπολωλέναι, 187.	αφεικα, 6. note.
157.	άπομύττω, 177.	aφεĩλaι, 9. note.
$a\pi\epsilon\lambda a$, 93.	άπονισόμεθα, 181.	άφεῖναι, 115.
<i>απέπλων</i> , 215.	άποπαρδώ, 205.	αφείνται, 6. note.
άπεροῦμαι, 88.	αποπέφαγκα, 249. note.	
άπέσθην, 225.	αποπλησαι, 210. note.	άφεῖτο, 116.
απέσσουα, απεσσύη, 226.	άποπνίξεις, 216. note.	άφείω, 116.
άπεστέρησα, άπεστερή-	αποσθέσας, 224. note.	άφέλαι, 9. note.
θην, 229.	άπόστα, 134.	άφελουμαι, 9.
άπεστύγησα, 231.	άποστερείσθε, 230.	άφέμενος, 116.
άπευήκασιν, 109.	άποστερέω, 229.	άφες, 115.
άπεφάνθη, 249.	άποτετευγμένος, 239.	άφέσταλκα, 173. note.
άπέφθιθον, 257.	άποτετύχηται, 239. note.	
άπεφράγην, 258.	άπούρας, 34.	άφετος, 116.
mishing they account the	, france of a set	(

274

INDEX.

άφεύω, 109. βωθειν, 44. βώσατο, 44. note. άφέω, 116. αφέωκα, αφέωνται, 6. Buoeode, 43. note, 115. note. βώσομαι, 44. άφιγμαι, 132. άφιείεν, άφιητε, 116. note. άφικνέομαι, 132. άφίοιτε, 116. aφίουν, 115. άφĩχθαι, 132. aφoũ, 116. aφῶ, 115, 116. άχέων, 12. άχομαι, άχνυμαι, 12. ΑΩ, 1. άωρτο, 6. note. В. Βαμες, 38. βάν, 37. βασεύμαι, 37. βᾶτε, βάτην, 38. βέβαα, βέβακται, 37. βέδαμμαι, 39. βεβάρημαι, 40. βεβαρηώς, 37. βεβίηκεν, 40. βέβλαμμαι, 43. βεθόλημαι, 39. βεδρεγμένος, 45. βέβριθα, 46. βέθροχα, βέθρυχα, 46. βέβρωκα, 41. βεβρωμένος, 44. βεξρώς, 37, 38. βείω, 38. 40. βέω, βήη, 38. βιβάσω, 152. note. βιόμεσθα, 40. 42. Biuvar, 42. βλάβεται, 43. βλείμην, 39. βλήεται, βλησθαι, 39. 39. βλημην, $\beta\lambda\tilde{\eta}o,$ note. βλήσομαι, 39. βλώσκω, 39. note.

βρώσομαι, 41.

Г.

Γέγαα, 50, 51. yéyova, 5. note, 49. γέγωνα, 48. γεγωνίσκω, 48. γείνατο, 50. γελοίων, 48. γεναθημεν, 50. γενάμενος, 9. γέντο, 50, 51. γεύμεθα, 51. γρηγορέω, 75.

Δ.

 $\Delta \dot{a} \eta \tau \alpha i, 55.$ δαίρω, 62. δαϊσθείς, 56. δαμάα, 62. δαμάζω, 62. δαμείς, 62. δαμνάω, δάμνημι, 62. δαρήσομαι, 62. δαρθείς, δαρτός, 62. δάσομαι, 55, δαύσω, 56. δέαται, 58. δέγμαι, 63. δέδαα, 56. δεδαίαται, 55. δεδαιγμένος, 56. δεδακρυμένος, 253. note. δέδαρκα, 62. δέδασμαι, 55. δεδαυμένος, 56. δέδεγμαι, 63. δέδεκα, δέδεμαι, 64. δεδέξομαι, δεδέχαται, 63. δέδηα, 5. note, 55. δέδηγμαι, 57. δεδήσομαι, 64. 208. δέδηχα, 57. δέδια, 59. δεδιξάμενος, 58. δέδμηκα, 61, 62.

δέδοικα, 59, 60. δεδόκημαι, 70. δοδοκημένος, 64. δέδομα, 61. δέδομαι, 68. δέδορα, 62. δέδορκα, 62. 81. note. δεδραγμένος, 70. δέδρακα, 67.71. δέδραμαι, 71. δεδράμηκα, 246. δέδραξαι, 70. δέδρασμαι, 71. δέδρομα, 247. δεθήσομαι, 64. δείδεγμαι, 59. 63. δείδια, 59, 60. δειδίσκομαι, 59. note. δείδοικα, 60. δεικανãσθαι, 59. note. δείμομεν, 61. δειν, τό, 65. δείομαι, 61. δείρω, 62. δέκομαι, 63. δέξω, 58. δέομαι, 61. δέον, 64. δεύομαι, 66. δέχαται, 63. δήξομαι, 57. δῆραι, 62. δησεν, 64. δήω, δήεις, 56. διαθέβλησθε, 39. note. διαθύνεται, 47. διαδούμαι, 64. διαειμένος, 87. 115. διάκειμαι, 143. διαλακέω, 164. διαλέγομαι, 165. διατρίψας, 247. διαφαυσκούση, 251. note. διαφθαρέομαι, 256. διαφρέω, διαφρήσω, 259. δίδημι, 64. διδρήσκω, 67. die, 61. διεζωσμένοι, 120.

275

276

INDEX.

διείλεγμαι, 165.	έασιν, έασσα, 84.	έδραμον, 246.
διελέγην, διελέχθην,	έαται, έατο, 118.	έδραν, 67.
165.	čaτε imperf., 85.	έδρασα, 68.
διεπιφώσκω, 251. note.	έάφθη, 29.	έδρην, 67.
διέρσας, 92.	έ6ην, 37.	έδυν, έδύσετο, 73.
δίεσθαι, 61.	έθήσετο, 7, 8. 38.	ΈΔΩ, 131. note.
διεφθάρατο, διεφθαρέατο,		έδων, 68.
256. note.	έ βλά βην, 43.	έειδόμενος, 80.
	č θλην, 39.	έειπον, 88.
διέφθορα, 256.	έβραχον, έβράχην, 45.	έεισάμην, 80. 87.
διηγγέλη, 3.		
διήγγελον, 2.	έξωσα, έξώσθην, 44.	έέλδομαι, 94.
δίημι, 61.	έγγεγύηκα, 74.	έελμαι, έελμένος, 83.
διήξα, 121.	έγγυήσατο, 74.	έέλπομαι, 80. note, 94.
διήρεσα, 100.	έγδούπησα, 70.	έέλσαι, 83.
διοίχηνται, 186.	έγημα, 47.	έελτο, 84.
δίω, δίον, δίομαι, 61.	έγκαθείσατο, 131.	έεργμαι, έέργνυ, ἕεργον,
διωκάθειν, 22. 70.	έγκεκαλινδημένη, 160.	92. 221.
δίωμαι, 61.	έγκεχρωσμένος, 271.	έεργω, 80. note, 92.
δμηθείς, 62.	έγρετο, 75.	ἕερμαι, ἐερμένος, ἕερτο,
δοάσσατο, 58.	έγρήγορα, 5. note, 75.	έερχατο, 92.
δοκείν, τό, 65.	έγρήγορθα, 75, 76. note.	έέσσατο, 118.
δόσκον, 69.	έγχέω, έγχεῶ, 265.	έέσσατο, ἕεστο, 96.
δουν, δουντι, 64.	έδάμην, 62.	έζην, έζων, 119.
δραθι, δραίην, 67.	έδαόμην, 55.	ἕηκα, 115.
δραμούμαι, 246.	έδάρην, 62.	έην, 85.
δράναι, 67.	έδασάμην, 55.	έήνδανον, 24.
δραπών, 71.	έδδεισα, 59.	ἕησθα, 85.
δράσομαι, δράς, 67.	έδέγμην, έδεδέγμην, 63.	
δρατός, 62.	έδέδιμεν, 59.	έθέρην, 124.
δρήσομαι, 67.	έδέθην, 64.	έθηειτο, έθηήσατο, 123.
δρώ, 67.	έδειμα, 61.	έθην, 115.
	έδειρα, 62.	10/ 100
δρώμι, δρώσιμι, 71.	έδεξα, 58.	έθήσατο, 123. "έθορου 128
δύναντα, δύναντος, 74.		έθορον, 128.
δύσατο, δύσετο, 73. note.		ἕθραξα, 234.
δύσεο, 73.	έδεσω, 108.	έθρεξα, 246.
δυσόμενος, 74.	έδεύετο, 66.	εθρεψα, 245.
δύσκεν, 73.	έδεύησα, 64.	ἔθυψα, 248.
δώομεν, δώσι, 69.	έδήδεσμαι, 108.	ἔθωκα, 77.
δώσω, 68.	έδήδοκα, 6. note, 7. 108.	
δώω, δώης, 69.	εδήδομαι, 6. note, 108.	είαται, είατο, 117.
	έδησα, 64.	είατο, είατο, 84.
E.	έδησεν for έδέησεν, 66.	είατο, 95.
"Ea imperf., 85.	έδιζησάμην, 69.	ἕίγμαι, 81, 82. note.
ἕαγα, ἐάγην, 4.	έδικον, έδιξα, 69.	είη, 87.
žadov, 24.	έδιώκαθον, 22. 70.	είην, 115.
έάλην, έάλην, 83.	έδμήθην, 62.	εΐθην, 115.
έάλωκα, έάλων, 16, 17.	έδμητο, 62. note.	είθισμαι, 76.
έαξα, ἕαξε, 4, 5.	έδραθον, 57.	είκα, 81. note
žaç imperf., 85.		είκα, είκειν, 115.
+ /		

είκαθον, 80. είσθα, 86. note. έκράθην, 144. έκρέμω, 155. έικτην, έικτο, έικτον, 81, εισιτητός, 86. note. 82. note. eloo, 116. ἕκρηνα, 154. έκτάθην, 158. εικώς, εικός, 81. είσομαι, 78. 87. ёктака, 53. note, 157. είλα, είλάμην, 9. είστήκειν, 134. εία- έκτάμην, 158. note. είλεγμαι, 89. note. είσφρέω, είσφρες, ἕκταν, ἐκτάνθην, 158. είλει, 84. φρήσεσθαι, 259. είλήλουθα, 106. είτε, είτην, 85. έκτετμήσεσθον, 235. έκτέτμησθον, 39. είλήλουθμεν, 200. Elto, 116. είληφα, 89. note, 162. είχεε, 112. ἕκτονα, 157. είω, είης, είη, 84. έκτόνηκα, 158. ε''ληχα, 89. note, 162. είλιγμαι, 94. eiw for iw, 87. ἕκυθον, 146 είωθα, 6. note, 76. έκφρείω, 259. note. είλινδεισθαι, 159. ἕκφρες, 259. είων, 74. είλκυσα, είλκύσθην, είλέκαθέσθην, 131. κύσμαι, 94. έκφρέω, έκφρήσω, είλξα, 94. έκαθήμην, 118. φρησθήναι, 259. είλον, 9. ёкагог, 139. έκχρą, 270. note. ἕκαον, 139. έκχρήσει, 269. είλοχα, 89. note, 164. έκάρην, 142. έλą, ἕλα, 93. εΐλω, 9. είμαι, είσαι, είται, 95. έκβάλαι, έκδηλαι, 9. έλάqν, 93. είμαι from ίεμαι, 115. έλαθον, 163. note. είμαρται, 89. note. έκβράσσομαι, 45. note. έλαι, 9. είμεν, είμες, 85. έκθωντας, 37. έλάκησα, 164. είμεν, είτε, είσαν, 115. έκγεγάονται, 51. έλαμφθην, 162. είμην, 116. έκδῦμεν, 73. έλαν, έλασα, έλάσω, 93. Elvai, 115. έκεκάσμην, 138. έλαχον, 162. έκεκλόμην, 144. 207. είνυμι, 96. έλάω, 93. είξασι, 82. έκέκραγμεν, 200. έλέγμην, έλεκτο, 165. είοικνίαι, 81. έκέρασα, έκερασάμην, έλειν, 9. είπα, είπον, 9. 144. έλειπτο, 51. 165. είπον, 97. ἕκερσα, ἐκέρθην, 143. έλειψα, 165. είρα, 92. ἕκηα, 139. έλέλικτο, 94. ἕκιξα, 148. είργασμαι, 99. ἕλεξα, έλεξάμην, 165. ειργνυμι, 92. έκιχον, 147. έληλάδατο, 93. είρεῦσαι, 89. έκκέαντες, 140. έλήλαμαι, έλήλασμαι, ειρηκα, ειρημαι, 88. ἕκλαγον, 149. 93. ἕκλαεν, 150. ειρήσομαι, 88. 102. έληλέατο, 93. ειρομαι, 101, 102. ἕκλαξα, 149. έλήλεγχα, έληλεγμαι, είρύμεναι, 105. έκλάπην, 151. 94. είρυνται, είρυντο, 104. έκλελάθοντα, 163. έληλέδατο, 93. είρυτο, 105. ἕκλεο, ἐκλέο, 141. 151. έλήλυμεν, έλήλυτε, 106. είρω, 88. έκλήθανει, 163. έλησάμην, έλήσθην, 163. ἕκλησα, 150. Eïç, 115. έλιπεν, 3. 165. Eloa, 117. έκλίθην, 151. έλισάμην, έλιτόμην, 166. είσάμην, είσατο, 87. έκμαίνω, 169. έλλάμψεσθαι, 163. είσάμην, 131. έκπεπέτασται, 205. έλλισάμην, 166. έκπλήγνυσθαι, 216. έλόευν, 167. είσας, εισάμενος, 117. είσεται, 118. έλσαν, έλσαι, έλσας, 83. έκπλήττω, 215. ἕκραγον, 154. έλύμην, 169. είσεφρούμην, 259. т 3

έκ-

INDEX.

έλυσθηναι, 83. έλῶ, 9. έλῶ, ἕλων, 93. ёµаког, 175. έμαπον, 170. έμβεβῶσι, 38. έμεινα, 175. έμέμηκον, 175. έμεν, έμεναι, 85. έμεν, έτε, έσαν, 115. έμην, 116. έμηνα, 169. έμίηνα, 175. ἕμμεν, ἕμμεναι, 85. έμμορε, 172. έμνήμυκα, 122. έμνησα, 176. έμολον, 39. note, 44. έμπίπληθι, 209. έμπιπρείς, 210. note. έμπίφρημι, 259. έμπλεĩθ', 209. note. έμπλείμην, έμπλήμενος, έξε βλάστησε, 43. 209.е́µvкоv, 178. έμφράττω, 259. note. έμφύη, έμφύσεται, 261. έναλδήνασα, 14. έναρῶ, 95. ένασα, ένασσα, 178. ένδίεσαν, 61. ένδυνέουσι, 74. ένεγγύησα, 74. note. ένεγκεĩν, 6. note, 252. ένείκω, 252. ένειμα, 179. ένειρμένος, 93. ένείχεε, 77. 114. ένεμήθην, ένεμέθην, 179. εοιγμεν, 81, 82. note. ένένιπον, ένένιπτον, 6. εοιδα, 82. note. note, 95. ένένισπον, 95. ένενώμην, 182. ένεουρηκότας, 196. note. εολπα, 5. note. 80, note, ένεπίμπλασαν, 209. ένεπον, 90. ένέπρηθον, 210. ένέπω, 89. ένευσα, 181.

ένεχθήσομαι, 252. ένήνεγμαι, ένήνειγμαι, 252.ένήνοθα, 6. note. ένήνοχα, 6. note, 252. ένηράμην, 95. ένθεῖν, 106. ένίπτω, 90. 95. ένισκήλη, 227. ένισπήσω, 89. ένισπον, 89, 90. 95. ένίσσω, 95. ivitw, 89. έννεπον, 90. έννέπω, 89. έννώσας, 182. έντί, 84. έξαλῖσαι, 160. εξαλιφή, 14. έξαμβλούμεν, 20. έξαπάφησεν, 28. έξεαγείσα, 6. έξεβράσσοντο, 45. note. εξέδραμεν, 68. έξείλοχα, 164. έξείρας, 92. έζεπλάγην, 215. έξερασαι, 98. έξεφρείομεν, 259. έξέχρη, 267. έξέχρησε, 269. έξεώσεις, 6. έξήλικα, 160. έξήμελωσα, 21. εξήραμμαι, 12. note. έξηρήσατο, 9. έξυράμην, έξύρημαι, 182. ё́онка, 80, 81, 82. note. εοιμι, 84. έόλει, έόλητο, 83. 94. čov, imperf., 85. έοντι, 84. έόντων, έόντω, imperat., επηλα, 198. 85.

έόρακα, έόραμαι, 191. έοργα, 80. note, 222. έπάγην, 208. επάην, 199. note. έπαθον, 199. επαινέω, 8. note. έπάλμενος, έπαλτο, 18. έπαρδον, 205. έπαρεί, 10. έπασάμην, 199. έπαύρασθαι, 9. έπαῦρον, 34. έπαφαυάνθην, 35. έπέγεντο, 50. έπέζωσε, 120. 165. έπειλεγμένους, note. έπείνυσθαι, 96. έπειρεόμενος, 103. έπειρήσομαι, 102. έπεισφρέω, 259. επέλησεν, 163. έπέμυξαν, 177. έπενήνοθε, 95. έπεπήγειν, 208. έπέπιθμεν, 200. έπέπλων, 215. επεπύσμην, 221. έπέρασα, επέρασσε, 211. έπερέσθαι, 102. έπεσα, 212. έπεσκέπησαν, 228. επεσον, 7. 212. επέσπον. 97. έπέσποντο, 97. note. έπετάσθην, 205, 206. επετον, 212. έπέτοσσε, 243. έπέτραψε, 244. έπέτρεψε, 244. note. έπεφνον, 207. έπεφόρθειν, 251. έπέφραδον, 258. έπέφυκον, 262. έπέχω, 112. έπηγόμην. 208. επήϊσα, 12. έπηξα, 208.

impiere 94	έπλάσθην, 202.	inhoura 00 100
έπηῦρον, 34.		έρήριπα, 99, 100.
έπήχθην, 208.	$[\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\epsilon, 203.$	έρήρισμαι, 101.
επιάλμενος, 18.	έπλεεν, 214.	έρησάμενος, 102.
έπιδασκέμεν, 38.	έπλεο, επλευ, 203.	έρηται, 98.
έπιδήσειν, 37.	έπλευσα, έπλεύσθην,214.	εριδήσασθαι, 101.
έπιδητον, 38.	$\epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \mu \eta \nu$, 202. 209.	εριζήσασθαι, 101. note.
	ἕπλησα, 208, 209.	έρίπεντι, 100.
note.	$\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\omega\nu$, 215.	έρμένος, 92.
έπιειμαι, επιειμένος, 95.		έρξα, ἕρξα, 91, 92. 221.
έπιέσασθαι, 96.	έπνύνθην, 216.	ἕρξω, 221.
επιθον, επιθόμην, 200.	έπόθην, 210.	έρράγην, 222.
έπικαλέσεται, 141. note.	έπόρομαι, 195.	έρράδαται, έρράδατο,221.
ἐπίκειμαι, 142.	έπορον, 217.	έρρασμαι, 221.
έπικίκοι, 148.	έποτάθην, 207.	έρρεξα, 221.
έπικρησαι, 145.	έπόψατο, 193.	έρρευσα, 222.
έπιλέλαθα, 163.	έπόψομαι, 192.	έρρήθην, 88.
έπιλελεγμένος, 165.note.	έπράθην, 211.	ερρίπτεον, 74. note.
έπιλήθω, 163.	έπραθον, 205.	έρρύηκα, έρρύην, 222.
	έπρεσε, 210.	έρρυσάμην, 104.
σθαι, 172.	έπρήθην, 211.	έρρυτο, 105.
έπιμέλομαι, 173, 174.	έπρησε, 210.	ἕρρωγα, 5. note, 6. 222.
έπινένηται, έπινενήσμε-		ερρωμαι, 223.
ναι, επινενάσμεναι,	1	έρρωμα, 220.
180.	έπτακον, έπτακέναι, 219.	224.
έπινέουσι, 179.	έπτάμην, 206.	έρσα, 92.
έπιον, 210.	έπτηχα, 220.	
2-10, 210.	έπτην, 206.	έρύεσθαι, 105.
έπιόψομαι, 192.		έρυκακέειν, 95. 103.
έπιπλόμενος, 203.	έπτόμην, 97. 206.	έρυτο, 105, 106.
$\epsilon \pi i \pi \lambda \omega_{S}, 215.$	έπωμοσάμην, 188.	έρχαται, έρχατο, 92.
έπίπρωσον, 219.	έπώχατο, 112.	έρχθην, 221.
έπιπωλέομαι, 204.	έπωχατο, 186.	$\epsilon \rho v \omega$, pres. and fut. 103.
έπισα, 210.	έράασθε, 98.	105. note.
έπισπειν, έπίσπου, 97.	ερασσαι, εράσσατο, 98.	έρῶ, 88.
έπίστα, 96.	έραται, 98.	ξς, 115.
έπιστέωμαι, 96. note.	έργω, 91. 221.	έσαγείρατο, 3.
επίστη, 96.	έρδω, 221.	έσαι, 95. 117.
έπιτέλλω, 235.	έρέεσθαι, έρέοντο, 103.	έσαμενος, 117, 118.
έπιτετράφαται, 244. note.		έσαν, 85.
επιτόσσαις, 243.	ἕρεξα, 221.	έσάουν, 233.
έπιτραπέουσι, 159. 244.	έρέριπτο, 100.	έσαπην, 226.
έπιτράψονται, 244.	έρεσσα, 100.	έσας, 117.
έπιτρέψονται, 244. note.	έρεύμενον, 10.	έσάω, έσάωσα, έσαώθην,
έπιφώσκειν, 251. note.	έρεύζομαι, 103.	233.
έπιχεῖς, 265.	έρέω, 88, 89. 103.	έσβαν, 225.
έπιωψατο, 193.	έρηρέδαται, 99.	έσθεσα, 224.
ἕπλαγξα, ἐπλάγχθην,		έσβέσθην, έσβεσμαι, 225.
214.	έρήρεικα, έρήρεισμαι,	έσβηκα, έσβην, 224.
έπλάθην, 202.	ερήρεινται, 99.	έσεισα, 225.
έπλάκην, 214.	έρήριγμαι, έρήριμμαι, 99.	
. ,		

έσέφθην, 225.	στάλθην, εστάλην,	ἕταμον, 235.
εσήλατο, 18. note.	229.	έτανύσθην, 234.
έσημα, 224.	έσταμεν, έστάναι, 136.	
ἕσθαι, 116.		ετάρπην, εταρπόμην,
ἕσθην, 131.	έστείλα, έστειλάμην,	236.
έσθῶ, 131. note.	229.	έτάφην, 122.
έσίναντο, 226.	έστειξα, 229.	έτάχθην, 234.
έσκαμμαι, έσκάφην, 226.		
έσκεδάσθην, έσκέδασμαι,	στέρημαι, 230.	έτεινα, 234.
226.		έτεκόμην, 241.
ёокеµµан, 277.	έστήκω, 135. note.	έτεκον, 240.
έσκέπην, 278.		έτέλεσα, έτέλεσσα, έτε-
έσκεψάμην, 277.	136.	λέσθην, 235.
έσκηλα, 227.		έτελσα, 235.
ἕσκληκα, ἕσκλην, 227.	230.	έτεμον, 235.
έσκον, 85.		έτεξα, 241.
έσκωψα, 228.	έστιβον, έστίβην, 229.	έτερσα, 237.
έσμηξα, έσμησάμην, έ-		έτέρσην, έτέρσηνα, 236.
σμήχθην, 228.		έτερψα, έτέρφθην, 236.
έσομαι, 95. 117.	έστο, 96.	έτετάλμην, 235.
έσοῦμαι, 85.	έστοργα, 229:	έτέτλαμεν, 243.
έσπακα, 228.		έτετμον, έτέτμετο, 237.
έσπάρην, ἕσπαρμαι, 228.	10 000	έτέτρηνα, 241.
έσπασα, έσπάσθην, έ-	έστορήθη, 231. ἕστραμμαι, ἐστράφην,	
σπασμαι, 228.	έστράφθην, έστρέφθην,	
έσπεικα, 229.		έτεύχθην, 239.
έσπειρά, 228.	ἕστροφα, 231. ἕστρωσα, ἐστρώθην, ἕ-	
έσπεισα, έσπεισμαι, 229.		έτμαγον, έτμάγην, 236.
έσπετε, 89.	στρωμαι, 231. ἕστυξα, ἕστυγον, 231.	έτμήθην, 235.
έσπόμην, 97.	έστως, 136.	έτμηξα, 236.
έσπον, 97.	έσύθην, 225.	έτόρησα, έτορον, 243.
έσπορα, 228.	έσύρην, 231.	έτραγον, έτράγην, 248.
έσσα, ἑσσάμην, 95.	έσφάγην, έσφαγμαι, 232.	
έσσαι, 117.		έτρέφθην, 244.
έσσειται, 85.	σφαλμαι, 232.	έτρησα, 241.
έσσέομαι, 122.	έσφαξα, έσφάχθην, 232.	
έσσευα, έσσευάμην, ἕσ-	έσφηλα, 232.	έτρύφην, 128.
		έτύθην, 128.
σευον, έσσευόμην, 225.	1 14 000	1 1
έσσο, 84. έσσο 96	έσχάζοσαν, 232. Έσχιθου 22, 112	έτύχησα, 329.
έσσο, 96.	έσχεθον, 22. 112.	έτύχθην, ἕτυχον, 238. εὕαδον, 24.
έσσομαι, 85.	έσχον, 111.	ебкто, 109.
έσσοῦμαι, 122.	έσχων, 232.	
έσσύθην, έσσυμαι, 225.	έσω, 95.	εύρα, εύράμην, εΰρον, 9. 109.
έσσύμην, 158. note, 225.		
ἕσσω, 95.	έτάγην, 234.	έφαάνθην, 250. Έφανου 108
έσσώθην, 122.	έτάθην, 234.	έφαγον, 108.
έσταλάδατο, έστάλατο,		έφάμην, 254.
229.	έτάλασα, έτάλασσα, 243.	
έσταλκα, έσταλμαι, έ-	εταλθην, 233.	έφειντο, 116.

$\mathbf{280}$

έφερον, 253. έων, 74. ήίσαν, 79. 87. έφεσπόμην, 97. έων, 84. ήка, 7. note. δκα, 121. έφέσσαι, έφεσσαι, 117. έωνηθηναι, 272. έωνηκώς, 272. έφέσσεσθαι, 117. note. ήκα, 115. έφέσσομαι, 117. έωνησαμένην, 6. 272. ήκάμην, 116. έωνησάμην, έφεστάκει, 137. note. έωνουμην, ήκασα, ήκασμαι, 80. έώνητο, 272. έφεστῶσιν, 136. ήκαχόμην, 12. ήκαχον, 6. note, 12. έφηπται, 29. έώρακα, έώραμαι, 191. ἕφθακα, ἕφθαξα, 255. έώργειν, 221. ήκήκοειν, 13. ήκουκα, ήκουσμαι, ήκούέφθαρκα, έφθαρμαι, 256. εώρταζον, 96. έφθασα, έφθάσθην, 255. έώσθην, έωσμαι, 272. σθην, 13. έφθην, 255. ήκροασο, ήκροω, 13. έφθίμην, 159. note. H. ήκω, 121. 132. έφθιον, 256. ⁷H, 116. ήλάθην, 93. ή for ἕφη, 255. ἔφθορα, 5. note, 256. ήλαλκον, 15. έφθός, 114. ή for ήν, 85. ήλάμην, 18. έφιζε, έφίζε, 80. $\frac{1}{\eta}a, 85.$ ήλάσθην, 93. ňa, 86. 106. ήλδανε, 14. έφίσταμαι, 96. έφορᾶν, 192. ήγάασθε, 2. ήλειψα, ήλείφθην, 14. έχαδον, 263. ήλεξάμην, 14. ήyayov, 6. ήλεύατο, 15. έχανον, 264. ήγάσθην, ήγασάμην, έχάρην, 263. ήγάσσατο, 2. ήλήθην, 13. ήλινδημένω, 160. έχασσαν, 262. ήγγειλα, 2. έχεα, 264. ήγγέλης, ήγγέλθης, 3. ήλισκόμην, 16. έχέθην, 266. ήλιτον, 17. ήγγύων, ήγγύησα, 74. έχεισθα, 111. note. ήγειρα, 74. ήλκησα, 94. ἔχεσα, ἔχεσον, 212. 264. ήγείροντο, 3. ήλλάγην, ήλλάχθην, 18. έχηράμην, 263. ήγερέεσθαι, 3. ήλοιφα, 14. ήλόμην, 18. έχρήσθησαν, 268. ήγερέθομαι, ήγερέθονέχύθην, έχύμην, 265. ται, ήγερέθοντο, ήγε- ήλουν, 15. έχωσάμην, 271. ρέθεσθαι, 3. ήλυξα, 19. έχώσθην, 266. ήγηλα, 1. ήλφον, 20. ήλωκα, 16, 17. έψεε, 77. 114. λγμαι, 7. έψευσμαι, έψεύσθην. ήγρόμην, 74. ήλώμην, 13. 271. ήδειν, 77, 78. 82. note. ήλων, 16, 17. έψημαι, έψησμαι, έψήήδεσάμην, 8. ήμελωκα, ήμελωσα, 20. Onv. Ethoonv. 271. ήδεσαν, 79. ήμβροτον, 20. Evoya, 271. ηδέσθην, ήδεσμαι, 8. ήμαι, ήμην, 118. ήδέσθην. 108. ήμην, 84. έψυγην, έψυχην, ¿Vúχθην, 272. ήε, 87. $\eta \mu i, 255.$ ήειδε, ήείδειν, 78, 79. ήμπείχετο, ήμπέσχετο, εω. 84. έωθα, έώθεε, 77. ήείδη, 77. 113. ner, 86. έώθουν, 272. ήμπισχον, ήμπισχόμην, her, 85. 113. έωκα, 272. ήερέθονται, 10. ἕωκα, 6. note, 115. note. ήμπλακον, 21. ήμφιεσάμην, ήην, 85. έψκειν, 80, 81. note, 82. ήμφίεσα, ήμφίεσμαι, 22. 96. ήτημην, 82. note. note. ήμων, 20. *<i>й*ікто, 81. note, 82. note. έώλπειν, 94. hv for εφην, 255. ñiov. 87. έωμεν, έῶμεν, 36.

ήνάλωκα, ήνάλωσα, 23.	ήρύκακον, 95. 103.	θρέψω, 245.
<i>пранака, пранава, 20.</i> <i>прарог</i> , 95.		θύμενος, 128.
ήνδανον, 24.		θύψω, 248.
ήνεγκα, 9. 251.	ήσαν, 78, 79. 82. note.	
ήνεγκαν, 6. note, 9. 252.	ήσας, 121.	I.
		Ίασι, 86.
ήνέθην, 8.		
ήνεικα, ήνείχθην, 252.		ίγμαι, 132. Ιδέω, 77, 78.
ήνειχόμην, 113.	ήσθανόμην, 11.	ίδμεν, ίδμεναι, 77, 78.
<i>п</i> учека, пуче <i>σ</i> а, 8.		
ήνεσχόμην, 113.	ήσθην, ήσθήσομαι, 121.	82. note.
$\eta \nu \epsilon \chi \theta \eta \nu, 252.$		ίδον, 77, 191.
ήνημαι, 8.	ήσθόμην, 11.	ίδνĩα, 78.
ηνηνάμην, 23.	ήσι, 116.	ίε, 87.
<i>ηνησα</i> , 8.	ήσμεν, 78. 82. note.	ίεμαι, 115.
$\bar{\eta}\nu\theta\sigma\nu$, 106.	ήσω, 115.	ΐεμαι, 87.
ήνίπαπε, 95.	ήστε, ήστον, 78.	ίεμαι, ιέμην, 86.
ήνοιξα, ήνοίγην, 183.	ἦσχυμμαι, 12.	ίεν, 87.
ήνον, ήνόμην, 26.		ίεσο (ίεσο), 86.
ήντεον, 25.	ήύγμην, 109.	ίζε, 80.
ήνωγον, ήνωξα, 26, 27.	ηύδα, 33.	ίθύνω, 132.
$\tilde{\eta}\xi a, 11.$	ηδδον, 108.	ίκάνω, 132.
ήξα, 121.	ηὐξάμην, 109.	ξκτο, ίκμενος, 132.
ήξα, ήξε, 4. 7.	ήϋσα, 35.	ίμεν, ίμεναι, 87.
ήξάμην, ήξαν, 7.	ήφασα, 35.	ίόντων, 86.
ήομεν, 87.	ήφείθη, 115.	ίπταμαι, 206.
ήπαφον, 6. note, 28.	ήφευμένος, 109.	ίσαν, 79. 82. note.
hpapor, 6. note, 30.	ήφίειν, 116.	ίσασι, 78. 82. note.
ήρασμαι, ήράσθην, ήρα-	ήφίουν, ήφίεσαν, 115.	ίσθι, 77, 78.
σάμην, ήράσσατο, 98.		ίσι, 87.
ήρατο, 10.	$\frac{1}{3}\chi \alpha, 6, 7.$	ίσμεν, 78. 82. note.
ήραιο, 10.	$\eta \chi \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, 36.	ίστασκε, 134.
ηρείσατο, 99.	ηχθημαι, 110.	ίστέον, 78, 79.
ήρεον, 89. note.	ήχθόμην, 110.	ίστον, 78.
ήρεσα, ήρεσσα, 100.	0	ίσχω, 111.
ήρεσα, ήρεσάμην, ήρε-	θ.	"ίτην, 87.
σμαι, ήρέσθην, 31.	Θαέομαι, θάομαι, 123.	ίτητός, 86.
ήρετο, 102.	θείομαι, 236.	ίτον, ίτων, 86.
ήρηκα, ήρημαι, 9.	θέοιτο, 125.	ίών, 86.
ήρήρειν, 30.	θέρμετο, 124.	
ήρήρειστο, 99.	θεύσω, θεύσομαι, 125.	К.
<i></i> ηρησα, 9.	θηέομαι, 123.	Καθεδούμαι, 130, 131.
ήρθην, 30.	Αησαι, Αησαίατο, Αησά-	
<i>прикоч</i> , 99.	μενος, Ξήσατο, Ξή-	καθελεί, 9.
ήριπον, 99, 100.	σθαι, 123.	καθεσθήσομαι, 131.
ήρίσταμεν, 32.	θόρνυμαι, 128.	κάθημαι, 118.
ήρπάγην, ήρπαξα, 33.	θορούμαι, 128.	καλινδείσθαι, 159.
ήρρηκα, ήρρησα, 103.	θράττω, θραττον, θραξαι,	
ήρσα, 30.	234.	Karabaíves, 38.
ήρυγον, 103.	Ξρέξομαι, 246.	καταβρόξασαι, 41.
		1

καταθρόζειε, 41. 46.	κατέσχετο, 112.	154
καταθρώξασαι, 41.	κατεφθινηκότες, 257.	κέκραγα, 154.
$\kappa a \tau a \gamma \epsilon i \varsigma, 6.$	κατέψηκται, 271.	кекрака, 202. 211.
καταδάρθειν, 57.	κάτημαι, 118.	κεκράξομαι, 154.
καταθρώσκων, 128.	κατηνάλωσα, 24.	κέκραχθι, 200.
		κέκρηκα, 211.
κατακαιέμεν, κατακειέ-	κατθανείν, 127.	κέκρημαι, 145.
μεν, κατακηέμεν, 140.	κανάξαις, 5.	κέκρικα, κέκριμαι, 156.
κατάκειαι, 142. note.	καύσω, 139.	κεκύθω, 146.
κατάκειμαι, 142.	κέαντες, 140.	κένσαι, 144.
κατακηέμεν, 140. κατακλινήναι, 151.	κέαται, 143. note.	κέονται, 143.
	κεδάννυμι, κεδαίω, 226.	κέρα, 145.
κατακλιῶ, 151.		κέραιε, κέραιρε, 145.
κατακνώσασα, κατα-	κέεται, κέεσθαι, 143.	κεράσω, 144.
κνώσσουσα, 152.	κείαι, κειάμενος, 140.	κέρσω, 143.
κατακρημνάμεναι, 155.	κείαντες, 140. note.	κερῶ, 144.
κατακτανέουσιν, 158.	κειέμεν, κείων, 143.	κέρωνται, κερῶντας, 145.
καταλούει, 168.	κείωνται, 142. note.	κέσκετο, 143.
κατάξαντες, 7.	κεκαδησόμεθα, 146. 162.	κέχανδα, 263.
καταπλαγηναι, 215.	κέκαδμαι, 138.	κεχάρηκα, κεχάρημαι,
καταπλήττω, 215.	κέκαδον, 262.	263.
καταπτακών, 219.	κεκάμω, 141.	κεχαρησέμεν, κεχαρήσε-
καταπτήτην, 220.	κέκαρμαι, 143.	ται, 263.
κατάσσω, 6.	κέκασμαι, 138.	κεχαρηώς, 37. 262.
καταστορεσθηναι, 231.	κεκαφηώς, 37. 142.	κεχαρμένος, κεχαρόμην,
κατασχόμενος, 112.	κεκέρασμαι, 144.	263.
κατατρώξαντες, 248.	κεκέρδακα, κεκέρδηκα,	κέχεσμαι, 264.
καταφθινήσας, 257.	κεκέρδαγκα, 145.	κέχηνα, 264.
καταχέσαντι, 264.	κέκηδα, 5. note, 146.	κέχλαδα, 266.
καταχρą, 269.	κέκηφε, 142.	κέχοδα, 264.
καταχρήσθαι, καταχρη-	κέκλαγγα, 149. [note.	κέχρησμαι, κέχρημαι,
σθη̃ναι, 268.	κέκλαμμαι, 151. 244.	267.
κατεαγείς, κατεαγή, 5.	κέκλασμαι, 150.	κέχρωσμαι, 271.
κατεάξαντες, 6.	κεκλέαται, 151.	κέχυκα, κέχυμαι, 265.
κατεάσσω, 6.	κέκλειμαι, κέκλεισμαι,	
κατέαται, 118.		κήαι, κῆον, 140.
κατέβρωξα, 41. note.	κέκλεμμαι, 151. 244.	
κατεγήρα, 52.	κέκληγα, 149.	κιγχανεϊν, 147.
κατεδάρθην, 57.	κεκλήϊμαι, 151.	κίδνημι, 226.
κατεδιήτησα, 67.	κέκληκα, 141.	κίρνημι, 144.
κατείλεγμαι, 165.	κέκλημαι, 150.	κιχείην, κιχηναι, 147.
κατείργειν, 92.	κέκλιμαι, 115.	κίχρημι, 268.
κατεκαύθην, 139.	κεκλόμενος, 144.	$\kappa(\chi\omega, 147.$
κατέκτα, 158.	κέκλοφα, 151.	κλαξώ, 151.
κατένασθε, 178.	κέκλυθι, 152.	κλαύσομαι, 149.
κατενήνοθε, 95.	κέκμηκα, 141.	κληθήσομαι, 141.
κατεπλήγην, 216.	κεκμηώς, 37. 141.	$\kappa \lambda \eta \dot{\tau} \zeta \omega, 150.$
κατεπτακώς, 219.	κεκορηώς, 154.	κληΐω, 150.
катерабан, 98.	κέκοφα, 153.	κλήω, 150.
κατερήρειπτο, 100.	κεκράανται, 154.	κλιῶ, 151.

.4

κολώ, κολώμαι, 152. ληθάνω, 164. κραιαίνω, 154. κρανέεσθαι, 154. κρεμόω, κρεμῶ, 155. κρηήναι, 154. κρηθείς, 145. κρήμνημι, 155. κρηνον, 154. κρύπτασκον, 223. κταίην, κτάμεν, 158. кта́гаг, 53. поte, 158. κτανέοντα, κτανθηναι, κτᾶσθαι, 158. κτέω, κτέωμεν, 158. κτίννυμι, 159. κύθε, 146. Λ . Λαθεῖν, 163. λακήσω, 164. λάμψομαι, 162, 163. λάξομαι, 162. λασεύμαι, 163. λασθημεν, 163. λασῶ, 163. λαψούμαι, λαψεῦμαι, 162.λείπε, 3. λελάβηκα, 162. λέλαθον, 6. note, 163. λέλακα, λελάκοντο, 164. λέλαμμαι, λελάφθαι, 162. λέλαμπα, 163. λέλασμαι, 163. λελάχωσι, 162. λέλεγμαι, 164. λελειχμότες, 166. λέληθα, 163. λέληκα, 164. λέλημμαι, 162. λέλησμαι, 163. λελίημαι, 166. λέλογχα, 162. λέλοιπα, 165. λελύσομαι, 169. 208. λέλυτο, 169. λέξαι, λέξασθαι, 165. λέξεο, λέξο, 7. 165.

λήθω, λήθομαι, 163. λήξομαι, 162. λήσω, λήσομαι, 163. λοέσσομαι, λόε, λóor, 167.λύμην, λύτο, λῦθι, 169. Μ. Μαθήσομαι, 170. μακών, 175. μανήσομαι, 169. μαπέειν, 170. μάσομαι, 172. μεθείμαι, 115. 175. μεθίετο, 116. 175. $\mu\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota, 174.$ μέμαα, 171. 175. μέμαγμαι, 170. μεμακυία, 38. μέμαλε, 174. μέμαμεν, 171. μεμάνημαι, 169. μέμαρπον, 170. μέμαχα, 170. μεμαώς, 171. μέμβλεται, 174. μέμβλωκα, 39. note, 44. μεμέληκε, 174. μεμένηκα, 175. μεμετιμένος, 116. 175. μέμηκα, 175. μέμηλε, 174. μέμηνα, 5. note, 169. μεμίασμαι, 12. note. μέμνημαι, 176. μεμόλυσμαι, 12. note. μέμονα, 175. μεμόρηται, 173. μεμορμένος, 173. μεμυζότε, 166. μέμυκα, 178. μενεαίνω, μενέηνα, 175. μεταθρέξομαι, 246. μεταμέλει, 173. μετασπών, 97. μετείω, 84. μετεκίαθον, 149. μετήσεσθαι, 175.

μετίει, μετίετο, 116.175. μνάομαι, 176, 177. μνασθαι, 177. μνέεται, μνεώμενος, 177. μνήσω, 176. μνώοντο, 177. μολούμαι, 39. note, 44. μῶμαι, 172. N. Νάσσομαι, 178. νεῖαι, νεῖται, 181. νείσεσθε, 181. νένακται, 179. **νένασμαι**, 178. νένημαι, νένησμαι, 179, 180. νένιμμαι, 181. vévopa, 179. note. νένωμαι, 182. νεῦμαι, 181. νεύσομαι, 181. νήεον, 180. νήθω, νήσω, 180. νήχω, νήχομαι, 181. νίσσοντο, 182. νώμενος, νῶντα, νῶσιν, 180. E. Ξυγκατακλινείς, 151. ξυγχέω, 265. ξυλλελεγμένος, 165. note. ξυμβλήμεναι, 39. ξυμέλήτην, 39. ξύμμεικτα, 176. ξύνιε, ξύνιον, 116. \mathbf{O} Οδωδα, 183. οδωδυσται, 183. όζέσω, 183. olda, 78. 82. note. οίήσασθαι, 185. olka, 77. note, 81, 82. note. olµaı, 184. οίσθήσομαι, 252. οίσω, 251. οίχωκα, 112.

ὄκωχα, 112.	πατάσσω, 215.	πέπραχα, 218.
όλέκεσκεν, όλόμενος, 188.	πειν, πείν, 210.	πεπρημένος, 210.
όλωλα, 5. note, 187.	πείσομαι, 199.	πέπρισμαι, 219.
όμοῦντες, 188.	$\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\theta\omega, 203.$	πέπρωμαι, 217.
όμώμοκα, 188.	πέξω, 201.	πέπταμαι, 205. 207.
όνεσθε, όνοσθε, 190.	πεπαθυĩα, 199.	note.
őντων, imperat., 85.	πέπαμμαι, 198. note.	πεπτεώς, 212.
οπύσω, 190.	πεπαρείν, 217.	πέπτηκα, 207.
όπωπα, 192.	πέπασμαι, 199.	πεπτηώς, 37. 207. note,
όπώπεε, 77. 192.	πέπεικα, 200.	220.
όρεῖται, 193, 194.	πεπείρανται, 202. 205.	πέπτω, 205.
όρέοντο, 194.	πεπείραται, 205. note.	πέπτωκα, 6. note, 207.
όρηται, 18. note, 193.	πέπεισθι,πέπεισμαι, 200.	note, 212.
ὄρθαι, ὀρμένος, 193.	πέπεμμαι, 205.	πεπτώς, 212.
όρονται, 194.	πεπεμμένος, 204.	πεπύθοιτο, πέπυσμαι,
ὄρσασκε, 193.	πεπέρασμαι, 205.	220.
όρσεο, 7. 193.	πεπερημένος, 204. 211.	πέπωκα, 210.
όρσευ, 193.		περάω, περάσω, περαγ,
	πέπεφθαι, 205. πέπτρια 5 ποτο 208	
ὄρωρα, 6. note, 193.	π επηγα, 5. note, 208.	περά αν, 211.
ορώρεγμαι, 194.	$π \epsilon π η θ a, 199.$	περιδδείσας, 59.
ορώρεμαι, 194.	πεπίεγμαι, πεπίεσμαι,	περιείπεν, 97.
όρώρυγμαι, 195.	$\pi \epsilon \pi i \epsilon \chi \theta \alpha \iota, 208.$	περιελώ, 9.
οσφραντο, 9. 195.	πέπιθον, 200. 251.	περιέρξαντες, 91. note.
ov, imperat., 116.	πέπλεγμαι, 214.	περιέσπε, 97.
ούλόμενος, 188.	πέπλευκα, πέπλευσμαι,	περιεφθηναι, περιεφθή-
ούνεσθε, 190.	214.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι,
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι,	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97.
οὔνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὅχα, 112.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι,	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121.
οὔνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὅχα, 112.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος,	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246.
ούνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὅχα, 112. ὅχωκα, 112. 186. note.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107.
ούνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὅχα, 112. ὅχωκα, 112. 186. note.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος,	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περινέειν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258.
οὔνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὄχα, 112. ὄχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὄψομαι, 191.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περινέειν, 179.
οὔνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὅχα, 112. ὅχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὅψομαι, 191. Π.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περικέειν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203.
οὔνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὅχα, 112. ὅχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὅψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραξέβαμαι, 37.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλωκα, 214.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέξαι, 246. περικέειν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισπεϊν, 97.
οὔνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὅχα, 112. ὅχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὅψομαι, 191. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραξέβαμαι, 37.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλωκα, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περικέειν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισπεϊν, 97.
ούνεσθε, 190. ὀφλήσω, ὀφλεῖν, 197. ὄχα, 112. ὄχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὄψομαι, 191. Π Π αλτο, 198. παραξέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλωκα, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5. note, 200,	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περιπέφλευσμένος, 258. περιπεφλευσμένος, 203. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισπεΐν, 97. περιφλύει, 257.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. όχα, 112. όχωκα, 112. 186. note. όψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραδέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. note.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλησμαι, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5. note, 200, 201.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περισκέειν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισκείν, 97. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. όχα, 112. όχωκα, 112. 186. note. όψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραδέβαμαι, 37. παραδέβαμαι, 37. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλησμαι, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομαι, 210.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περισκέαιν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισπεΐν, 97. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περῶ, 211. πέρῶ, 212.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. όχα, 112. όχωκα, 112. 186. note. όψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραδέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. note. παράστα, 184.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλωκα, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομαι, 210. πέπομφα, 151. 204.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέξαι, 246. περινέειν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισκείν, 97. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περῶ, 211.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. ὄχα, 112. ὄχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὄψομαι, 191. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραξέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. note. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παραφθαίησι, 255.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλωκα, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομαι, 210. πέπομφα, 151. 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπορδα, 205.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπκόλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περώ, 211. πέσειε, πεσοῦμαι, 212. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. ὄχα, 112. ὄχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὄψομαι, 191. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραξέδαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. note. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραχέων, 265.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλωκα, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομαι, 210. πέπομφα, 151. 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπορδα, 205. πεπορεῖν, 217.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περισκέαιν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισκεΐν, 97. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περῶ, 211. πέρῶ, 212. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206,
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. ὄχα, 112. ὄχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὄψομαι, 191. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραξέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. note. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραχίων, 265. παρδήσομαι, 205.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέπουθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομαι, 210. πέπομαι, 151. 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπορδα, 205. πεπορεῖν, 217. πέπορθα, 205.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέξαι, 246. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπτεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισπεῖν, 97. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περῶ, 211. πέσειε, πεσοῦμαι, 212. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207. πετῶσαι, 207. note. πετῶ, 205.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. ὄχα, 112. ὄχωκα, 112. 186. note. ὄψομαι, 191. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραξέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. note. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παρασχε, 112. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραχέων, 265. παραχίων, 205. παρεκαθέζετο, 130.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλωκα, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομφα, 151. 204. πέπομφα, 151. 204. πέπορδα, 205. πεπορεϊν, 217. πέπορθα, 205. πέποσθε, 76. note. 199.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέξαι, 246. περιπέφλευσμένος, 258. περιπκέν, 179. περιπκέν, 97. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. πέσειε, πεσοῦμαι, 212. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207. πετᾶσαι, 207. note. πετῶ, 205. πεύθομαι, πεύσομαι, 220.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεϊν, 197. όχα, 112. όχωκα, 112. 186. note. όψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραδέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. note. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραχέων, 265. παραχέων, 205. παρεκαθέζετο, 130. παρέπλων, 215.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέπουθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομαι, 210. πέπομαι, 151. 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπορδα, 205. πεπορεῖν, 217. πέπορθα, 205.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περινέειν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περώ, 211. πέρω, 211. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207. πετασαι, 207. note. πετώ, 205. πεύθομαι, πεύσομαι, 220. πέφαγκα, 249.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεϊν, 197. όχα, 112. ύχωκα, 112. 186. note. όψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραξέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. note. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραφθαίησι, 205. παρεκαθέζετο, 130. παρέπλων, 215. παρήγγελε, 2, 3.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγον, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομφα, 151. 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπονδα, 205. πέποσδα, 205. πέποσθα, 205. πέποσθα, 205. πέποσθα, 205. πέποσθα, 205. πέποσθα, 205.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέζαι, 246. περινέειν, 179. περιπκόλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περῶ, 211. πέσειε, πεσοῦμαι, 212. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207. πετῶσαι, 207. note. πετῶ, 205. πετῶσομαι, πεύσομαι, 220. πέφαγκα, 249. πέφαμαι, 208.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεϊν, 197. όχα, 112. ύχωκα, 112. 186. note. όψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραδέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. ποte. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραχίων, 265. παραχίων, 265. παραχίων, 205. παρεκαθέζετο, 130. παρέπλων, 215. παρήγγελε, 2, 3. παριῶμεν, 116. note.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγαν, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέπουθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομα, 151. 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπορδα, 205. πεπορεῖν, 217. πέποσθα, 205. πέποσθα, 205.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέξαι, 246. περινέειν, 179. περιπκφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περιπλόμενος, 203. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περῶ, 211. πέρῶ, 211. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207. πετᾶσαι, 207. note. πετῶ 205. πεύθομαι, πεύσομαι, 220. πέφαγκα, 249. πέφασμαι, 12. 249.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. όχα, 112. όχωκα, 112. 186. note. όψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραδέβαμαι, 37. παρακάλοῦντας, 141. ποte. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παράσχω, 111. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραχέων, 265. παραχίων, 265. παραχίων, 215. παρακαθέζετο, 130. παράγγελε, 2, 3. πορίχομαι, παρώχηκεν,	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγων, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέπουθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομα, 210. πέπομα, 151. 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπορδα, 205. πεποσεῖν, 217. πέποσθε, 76. note. 199. πεπόταμαι, πεπότημαι, 207. πέπραγα, 218. πέπρακα, 202. 211.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέξαι, 246. περινέειν, 179. περιπλόμενος, 203. περιπλόμενος, 203. περιπλόμενος, 203. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περῶ, 211. πέρῶ, 211. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207. πετῶσαι, 207. note. πετῶ, 205. πεύθομαι, πεύσομαι, 220. πέφασμαι, 12. 249. πεφασμένος, 208. 249.
ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεϊν, 197. όχα, 112. ύχωκα, 112. 186. note. όψομαι, 191. Π. Πᾶλτο, 198. παραδέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλοῦντας, 141. ποte. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραχίων, 265. παραχίων, 265. παραχίων, 205. παρεκαθέζετο, 130. παρέπλων, 215. παρήγγελε, 2, 3. παριῶμεν, 116. note.	214. πέπληγα, πέπληγμαι, 215. πέπληγαν, 6. note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέπουθα, 5. note, 200, 201. πέπομα, 151. 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπορδα, 205. πεπορεῖν, 217. πέποσθα, 205. πέποσθα, 205.	σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, 97. περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέξαι, 246. περινέειν, 179. περιπκφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περιπλόμενος, 203. περιφλύει, 257. πέρνημι, 211. περῶ, 211. πέρῶ, 211. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207. πετᾶσαι, 207. note. πετῶ 205. πεύθομαι, πεύσομαι, 220. πέφαγκα, 249. πέφασμαι, 12. 249.

πέφηνα, 5. note, 249.	πλώς, πλῶντος, 215.	προωθέω, 219.
πεφήσομαι, 208. 250.	$\pi\lambda\omega\omega, 214.$	πρόωμαι, 116.
πεφιδήσομαι, πεφιδοίμην,		προῶσαι, πρῶσαι, πρώ-
πεφιδέσθαι, 251.	ποτάομαι, ποτέονται,	σας, 219.
πέφορθα, 251.	207.	πτέσθαι, 97. 206.
πέφραγμαι, 258.	ποτέος, 210.	πτήσομαι, πτόμενος, 206.
πέφραδμαι, πέφρασμαι,		πωλέομαι, 204.
258.	ποτός, 210.	
πέφραδον, 258.	πραθειν, 205.	P. 1
πέφρικα, πεφρίκοντας,		'Ράσσω, 222.
259.	πρίασθαι, 218.	ρεούμενος, 222.
πεφύασι, 262.	πρίω, πρίωμαι, 219.	ρεριφθαι, 223.
πεφυζότες, 166.	πρόβα, προβώντες, 37.	ρεύσομαι, 222.
πεφύρσομαι, 261.	πρόεσθε, προέσθαι, 116.	ρηθήσομαι, 88.
πεφυώς, 262.	προεστέατε, προέστατε,	ρήσσω, 222.
πήλασθαι, 198.	137.	ρητός, 88.
πήξω, 208.	προέωσα, 219.	ροίζασκε, 223.
πήσας, 199.	πρόηται, 116.	ρυήσομαι, 222.
πήσσω, πήττω, 208.	προήκασθε, 116.	ρυσάμην, 104.
πιεισθε, 210.	προύφανες, 250.	
πιέζευν, πιεζεύμενος,	προήχα, 7.	Σ.
11. 74. note.	προθέουσι, 125.	Σαοΐ, σάου, σαοῦσι, 233.
πιεζούντος, 208.	προίει, 116. note.	σαόω, σαώσω, 232, 233.
πιεχθήναι, 208.	προίειν, 116.	σαρόω, 224.
πĩθι, 210.	προΐσσομαι, 142.	σάω, 233.
πίθησω, 200, 201.	προοίσται, 253.	σαώσω, σαώσομαι, 233.
πίλνημι, 203.	προού, 116.	σθέσω, σθήσομαι, 224.
πιν, πίν, 210.	προσαρήσεται, 30.	σεσαρυĩα, 224.
πινεύμενος, 11.	προσδέεται, 65.	σέσεισμαι, 225.
πίομαι, πιούμαι, 210.	προσεικέναι, 81.	$\sigma\epsilon\sigma\eta\pi a$, 5. note, 226.
πιπράσκω, 204.	προσείναι, 87.	σέσηρα, 224.
πίσω, 211.	προσελείν, 84.	σέσιμμαι, 12. note, 226.
πίτνα, πίτναν, πιτνάς,		σέσωμαι, σέσωσμαι, 232.
206.	προσέπεσα, 212.	σεῦται, 226. note.
πιτνάω, πίτνω, πίτνημι,	προσέπλαζε, 203.	σήρας, 224.
206.	προσήϊκται, προσήϊξαι,	σκάλλω, 227.
πιτνέω for πίπτω, 213.	81.	σκίδνημι, 226.
πιφαύσκω, 251.	προσήξαν, 7.	σκλήσομαι, σκλαίην,
πιφράναι, 259.	προσθίζεις, 125. note.	σκληναι, 227.
πλάγξω, 203. 214.	προσκαθιζήσει,131.note.	σόη, σόης, 233.
πλάζω, πλάθω, 203.	προσκεκερδήκασι, 145.	σοῦ, σοῦμαι, σοῦσθαι,
$\pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\eta\nu$, 209.	προσκυνέω, 160.	σοῦσθε, σούσθω, σοῦ-
πλείν, τό, 66.	προσοφλησαι, 197.	σο, 226.
πλεύσομαι, πλευσοῦμαι,		σόωσιν, 233.
214.	προυσελείν, 84.	σπείν, σπείο, σπέο, σπέ-
$\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\nu\nu\mu\iota, 216.$	προυσκέπτετο, 227, 228.	σθαι, σπού, σπών, 97.
πλῆσο, 209. πλήσω, 208.	note.	σταθήσομαι, 134.
πλησω, 208.	προφυλάσσω, προφύλα- χθε, 260.	σταίην, σταϊμεν, 73. 134.
	χυς, 200.	στάσκον, 134.

τέθηλα, 122. στείομεν, 236. στείω, 73. 135. τέθηπα, 123. στεῦται, 230. τεθλαγμένος, 125. στέω, 73. 134. τεθλιμμένη, 126. στηης, 73. 135. τέθναμεν, 126. στήκετε, στήκοντες, 135. τεθνήξω, τεθνήξομαι, 126, 127. note. στήμεν, στήμεναι, 134. τέθορα, 128. τέθραμμαι, 245. στήσω, στήσομαι, 134. στρώννυμι, 231. τέθραφθε, 245. note. συγγνώη, 53, 54. τέθυμμαι, 248. σύγκειται, τέκετο, 241. συγκέηται, 143. τέλλω, 243. note. 74. τέξασθαι, τέξεσθαι, 241. συμβαλλεόμενος, τέξω, τέξομαι, 240. note. συμβεβάναι, 38. τέταγμαι, 234. τεταγών, 233. σύμενος, 225. τέτακα, 233, 234. συμμαχέεται, 171. συναίγδην, συναίκτην, τέταλμαι, 235. 11. τέταμαι, 208. 234. συναναφυρέντες, 261. τετάνυσμαι, 234. τεταρπόμην, 236. συνειδήσεις, 78. τέταφα, 122. συνείλοχα, 164. τέτεγμαι, 241. συνεληλάμενοι, 93. τετέλεσμαι, 235. συνενείκεται, 252. συνερασαι, 98. τέτευγμαι, 239. συνηψας, 114. τετεύξομαι, 238, 239. τέτευχα, 238. συνηχãς, 7. συννέφει, συννένοφεν, τετεύχαται, τετεύχατο, 179. 239. συνοχωκότε, 112. τετεύχατον, τετεύχετον, συσχόμενος, 112. 239. note. σχέ, 112. τετευχησθαι, 237. σχεθείν, σχεθέειν, 22. τέτηκα, 5. note, 240. 112. τετίημαι, τετιημένος, σχειν, 97. 111. 240. σχήσεισθα, 111. note. τετίησθον, 240. τετιηώς, 37. 240. σωπαν, 43. σῶσι, 224. τέτιμαι, τέτισμαι, 242. σώω, 232. τέτληκα, 243. τετληώς, 37. 243. T. τέτμη, 237. Ταλάσσω, 243. τέτμηκα, τέτμημαι, 235. ταρπώμεθα, ταρπηναι, τέτμης, 237. τετμήσομαι, 235. 236.τάρφθη, τάρφθεν, 236. τετμηώς, 37. 235. note. τέθαλα, 122. τέτμον, 237. τέτογμαι, 241. τεθάφθω, 123. τέτοκα, 240. τεθέληκα, 76.

τετορήσω, τέτορον, 243. τέτραμμαι, τέτραπτο, 244. τέτραφα, τετράφαται, τετράφατο, 244. τέτραφθαι, 245. note. τετράφθω, 244. τετραχυμένος, 12. note. τέτρηκα, τέτρημαι, 241. τετρήνω, 241. note. τέτρηχα, 234. τέτριγα, τετριγῶτας, 247. τέτριμμαι, 247. τέτροφα, 151. 243. 245. τετρυχωμένος, 247. τετρωμένος, 241. τέτυγμαι, 238. τετυκείν, τετυκέσθαι, 239. τετύχηκα, 238, 239. τέτυχθαι, 238. τευχθέν, τό, 239. τη, τητε, 233. τιταίνω, 240. note. τιτύσκω, τιτύσκομαι, 240. τλάς, 242. τμήγω, 236. τορεύω, 243. τραπείομεν, 236. τραπέω, 244. τραπέωμεν, 236. τράπω, 244. τραπῶμεν, 236. τραφθείς 244. τράχω, 246. τρείω, 247. τρέσσε, τρέσσαν, 247. τρέσω, 247. τρεφθηναι, 244. τρήσω, 241. τρώσω, 241. τρώω, 242.

Υ. Ύπαλεύεο, 15. ὑπεμνήμυκα, 122. ὑπερβαλλέειν, 74. note. ὑπέρβασαν, 38.

υπερδραμῶ, 246. note. ύπερθορών, 128. ύπεσχόμην, 114. ύπισχνέομαι, 114. υπόεικον, 80. ύποείξομεν, 80. ύποκρίνομαι, 156. υπομόθεντος, 188. ύπομοσθείσης, 188. ύποσχέθητι, 114. ύποσχήσομαι, 113. υποφώσκει, 251. note.

Φ

Φάγω, φάγομαι, 108. φάε, φαείν, φαείνω, 250. φάθι, φαίην, 254. φαίμεν, 255. φάμενος, 254. ¢áv, 255. φάναι, 254, 255. φάουσαι, 250. φάς, φάσθαι, φάσκω, 254. φέρεσκε, φέρησι, φέρτε, 253. φήη, 255. φημί, 89. 254. φη̃ν, 255. φθάς, φθάμενος, φθάξω, Ω, 115. 255. φθαρήσομαι, 256. φθείτο, 256. note. φθέρσω, φθερῶ, 256. $\phi\theta\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota, \phi\theta\tilde{\omega}, 255.$ φιλεύμενοι (false reading), 251. φορέω, 253. $\phi \rho \alpha \delta \eta$ (false reading), 258.

INDEX.

φυράσω, φυρήσω, 260. X. Χαίνω, χανούμαι, 264. χαρήσομαι, 263. χεθήναι, 266. χείσομαι, 263. χεόμενον, fut., 265. χεύω, fut., 265. χεύω aor. 1. conjunct., 265.χήρατο, 263. χράται, χράσθαι, 268. χρέεται, 268. χρείων, 267. χρέω, 268. χρηΐσκομαι, 269. χρώζω, 271. χύμενος, 265. χωσθηναι, 266. χώσομαι, 271. χώσω, 266.

Ψ. Ψύω, 220.

Ω.

ώδυσάμην, 183. ώζεσα, ώζησα, 183. ώήθην, 184. ωιγνυντο, 183. *ὤίξα*, 183. ωιόμην, ωισάμην, σθην, 185. ώλεσα, ώλέσθην, 187. ώλίσθηκα, 187.

ώλόμην, 187. ώμαι, 116. ώμην, 184. ώμμαι, 191. ώμνυε, 188. ώμορξα, 188. ώμοσα, ώμόθην, 188. ώμωξα, 184. ώνάμην, from ονίνημι, 189. ωνάμην, from ὄνομαι, 190. ärnoa, 189. ώνόσθην, ώνοσάμην, 189. ώόμην, 184. ώξα, 183. брьог, 191. ώρετο, 18. note, 193. ώρέχθην, 193. ώρμην, 158. note, 193. ώρνύμην, 193. ώροντο, 194. ώρορε, 6. note, 193. ώρυγμαι, 195. ώρωρει, 193. ώρσα, 53. 193. ώρτο, 18. note, 51. note. ώρων, 191. ώσφρόμην, ώσφράμην, ώσφρησάμην, 195. ώσω, 272. ώφελον, ώφελλον, ώφειλον, 196. ώφθαι, ώφθην, 191. ώτ- ὤφλεε, 77. 114. 197. ώφληκα, ώφλον, 197. ψχημαι, 186. ώλίσθησα, ώχόμην, 185, 186.

THE END.

LONDON : Printed by A. SPOTTISWOODE, New-Street-Square.



