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## PREFACE

The first part of this dissertation is abbreviated from a thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Yale University in the year 1908.

On account of their extremely great number I have refrained from giving a list of abbreviations used. Most of them will be found selfexplanatory, and for the rest, I have tried to follow standard works, being guided particularly by the following: Liddel and Scott's GreekEnglish Lexicon, the Parisian Stephanus, Herwerden's Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum, and Brugmann's Grundriss.

The omission of a general bibliography is due to the fact that an enumeration of each and every work cited would increase too much the already great bulk of the dissertation, while mention of only those works which are written on diminutives particularly, would largely be a repetition of the list given in Brugmann's Grundriss 2. 12 ${ }^{2} 121 \mathrm{f}$. What has been written since then, has mostly appeared in the periodicals, and so can be found without difficulty. I will mention, however, Ribezzo, Die Deminutiva der altindischen Sprache, Naples 1907, and Wrede, Die Dimininutiva im Deutschen, in Deutsche Dialektgeographie 1 p. 73 ff., Marburg 1908.

When not otherwise stated, the references below to modern works are to pages of the work cited. An exception is Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, which is cited by paragraphs.

Ancient authors are cited according to the numbers of the standard editions. In case of the Comic fragments, I refer to volumes and pages of Meineke. References to spurious works of Greek authors are not distinguished from the genuine ones; for it is the usage of the language, and not of the authors, that is of interest for my purposes, and for purposes of chronology not much can be made even of a difference of a century or so in the appearance of a word.

I desire to express my obligations for valuable counsel and suggestions to Professor Karl Brugmann, of Leipzig, who suggested the subject; to Professors E. W. Hopkins and E. P. Morris of Yale University, and particularly to Professor Hanns Oertel of Yale, whose searching criticisms and helpful guidance have been of inestimable value to me.

Walter Petersen.
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## I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

1. The object of this monograph is to trace the development of diminutive and related meanings in case of a suffix which presents the most favorable conditions for such an investigation. For, since the fact that diminutive formatives are usually the same as those forming secondary adjectives ${ }^{1}$ argues that the latter developed into the former, it is of advantage if, as Greek - 00 -, the same suffix is at the same time both a diminutive and a secondary adjective suffix in the same language. No matter whether -to- is held to have developed its diminutive meaning in Indo-European or in Greek times, we can be reasonably certain that the transition-types, which give an insight into the process, are extant.
2. In judging the relations of the different extant meanings we must be careful not to be influenced too much by the theories of both ancient and modern grammarians. Since the former knew nothing of the historical point of view, it is, for instance, of no importance to us that they continually treated the idea of small size as primary, ${ }^{2}$ and considered other meanings as secondary or neglected them altogether. Natural as it is for one looking at the fully developed meanings to view the more tangible idea as most characteristic and therefore primary, this is no criterion for one looking for the origin of a phenomenon. The Greek grammarians, however, erred not only in their theories, but their facts are often quite untrustworthy, partly because they were often describing phenomena which antedated themselves by centuries, and of which they could have no more empirical knowledge than we have, partly because pre-conceived notions obscured their view. Thus they had inherited a certain number of traditional siòn or derivational classes from Dionysius Thrax, which, though not meant to be exhaustive, nevertheless presented themselves to certain later grammarians as a number of pigeon-holes into which every word must fit somehow or other. A glaring example of this is a scholiast to Dionysius, AB. p. 793 f., where, after asserting that -ov derivatives are diminutives, he does not hesitate to give as examples among real
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, K. Vgl. Gr. 337.
${ }^{2}$ Thus cf. Arist. Rhet. 3. 2. 14051) 32; Dionysius Thrax, AB. 6355; Sirholion to Dionysius, AB. 855 f. ; Priscian ap. Keil, Gram. Lat. 2. 101.

 apyópov, äupoov. Even though all gramímarians are not as reckless as this one is (cf. e. g. the scholiast to Dionysius, AB. 856, who justly declares that rexiov, Epxiov, Onpiov, unpiov, ǒruov, and iyviov are not diminutives, and remarks that the adjective $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \alpha$ with Onpiov and rexiov in Homer disproves their diminutive meaning), no faith whatever can be placed in their statement that this or that word is a osoxoptovoxóv. Finally, the confusion of two totally different classes of words, the real diminutives and short forms of proper names, as is shown by Fick-Bechtel, Griech. Personennamen 36, referring to the scholion to Dionysius, AB. 856 f., shows that the term íooxoplotixóv did not always convey to them a distinct meaning. ${ }^{1}$
3. Modern authorities have, in the first place, until recently usually accepted without reserve the opinion transmitted to them from the Greek grammarians through the Romans, that small size is the original of the so-called diminutive meanings. Cf. Schwabe, De Dim. Gr. et Lat. 1 ff. ; Kessler, Die Lat. Dim. 2 ff. ; Stolz, Hist. Gram. 575 ; Polzin, Stud. zur Gesch. des Dim. im Deutsch. 52 ; Brugmann, K. Vgl. Gr. 338 f . Of these Stolz actually mentions Priscian as having already judged correctly the relation of meanings as a whole. While this view may be right for some diminutives, it does not necessarily follow that it is so for all others. On the contrary, the case may be different for each suffix, as becomes particularly evident when we examine the complex mosaic of meanings in case of suffixes like -tov, where we have such a wealth of material before our eyes. The development does not take place in a straight line, but is continually checked or reinforced by other meanings which also branched out from the vague original meaning. Widely different starting-points come to the same end, and meanings which are alike to begin with branch out widely because of the mere accident of different environment of the words. It is, moreover, not true that the usual view of the relation of meanings of dimutive suffixes is $a$ priori the only plausible one; G. Müller, De Ling. Lat. Dim. 13 ff., finds it possible to start from the hypo-

[^0]coristic use; Wrede (see foot-note p. 2) insists that Germanic diminutives developed from 'Koseformen'; Belič, Arch. f. Slav. Phil. 23. 145 f., shows how certain Slavic suffixes which have both diminutivedeteriorative and amplificative-deteriorative ineaning may start from the deteriorative; and finally, deteriorative expressions can become hypocoristic and vice versa without intermediate diminutive meaning. Cf. Wundt, Sprachpsych. $2^{2} .562 \mathrm{f}$. As to various possibilities of the origin of the diminutive meaning cf. § 178 f .; for the deteriorative, § 151 ff . ; the hypocoristic, § 227. Particularly important is the question as to the extent to which faded diminutives should be assumed in order to explain words of non-diminutives meaning but diminutive form, for which cf. $\S 135,219,248$. It has been my purpose to interpret every example on its own merits, and I have not deemed it my duty to do my best to get a word into the diminutive category before allowing a different origin.
4. In the second place, modern grammarians and lexicographers have often confused the formal and the semantic point of view. It is one result of this confusion that nearly every diminutive suffix occurring in any Indo-European language is pushed back to the mother-tongue, as if the faculty of developing diminutives belonged only to that remote antiquity. From the fact that most of the suffixes go back to Indo-European times in some form or other the conclusion can not be drawn that all of their meanings are equally old. Yet this is exactly what Solmsen ${ }^{1}$ is doing when he argues that Greek proper names in - тos, - tus etc. are a counterpart to Slavic diminutives in -ęt-, even though no diminutive force has ever been discovered in Greek words of these endings. Similar is the identification of the
 suffix of O. Icel. kid, 'kid,' fyl, 'foal,' ${ }^{3}$ and of the $x$ of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda(\omega \pi n \xi$ with the common I. E. -ko- suffix. ${ }^{4}$ While words like O. Icel. fyl might be remnants of I. E. diminutive meaning, if that were otherwise established, they never can be brought forth as proof of such meaning; for I. E. semantics must depend upon comparison of the extant meanings in the different languages, and we can not jump at I. E. conclusions from one language and then re-apply these to other languages as though certain. It is another case of confusion of form

[^1]
## Chapter I.

and meaning when dictionaries give words as diminutives of other words simply because they end in suffixes which are found with diminutive force, but not in the word in question. When Liddell and Scott give ypuriov as a diminutive of ypurós, we have no information whatever of the real meaning of the word, it means no more than that it ends in a suffix which may have diminutive force. To avoid confusion here I always use the term semantically: it is to designate a word which either originally or in the consciousness of the person using it, designated a small object or a closely associated or related idea like youth, elegance, nicety, and the like.
5. My material has largely been gathered from Classic Greek Literature, and of this I have perused nearly every available example. I have also made excursions into the post-Classical literature, following up particularly such words as are mentioned by modern authorities. As to the inscriptions, I have not neglected them entirely, particularly the Attic inscriptions, but have not made such extensive collections because their value is chiefly confined to matters of spelling, form, or chronology. Their contents is so formal that a word occurring in them is usually divested of everything except its bare literal meaning. Their value is therefore comparatively small for semantic conclusions when, as in case of diminutives, so much depends upon the emotional tone of the passage or the particular flavor of a word.
6. Geographical names I have used only incidentally, as a particular one seemed well established, er where it is a question of generally accepted principles. Usually their semantics are completely beyond our ken even if their etymology is clear formally. Thus Epóvoov is evidently derived from Opóvos, but what connection there was between the name and its object can only be a matter of conjecture, and often enough one place name is copied from an other, so that, if the prototype is unknown, there is no prospect of getting at the reasons for the name. On the whole, however, it is perfectly clear that they can not have originated from the diminutive use of -tov; for a geographical name necessarily designates something that is high up in the scale of size, and it is very rarely that e. g. a small hill or river or similar feature in the neighborhood was prominent enough to cause the naming of a place near by, or that the diminutive of an apellative should be applied to one particular individual when there were hosts of others like it. Personal names on the other hand present a very simple problem; for the neuter gender of tov points strongly to a diminutive-hypocoristic origin of all of them. Cf. \& 237 b .
7. A valuable source for throwing light on semantic development is, of course, in general, the parallel development of like ideas in different languages. The study of Sanskrit, Latin, Germanic, and Slavic diminutives ought to contribute something to the Greek. There is, however, the difficulty that we known next to nothing of the semantics of Sanskrit diminutives, ${ }^{1}$ while for the other languages it is a question how far they were influenced by translation. Polzin, in his Studien zur Geschichte des Diminutivums im Deutschen, while no doubt exaggerating the influence of the Latin on the Germanic, has nevertheless shown that in many cases Latin 'pseudo-diminutives' have been translated by Germanic diminutives. The question arises whether Latin did not in the same way borrow from the Greek. Very probably ranunculus, 'frogwort,' was a mistaken translation of Gr. $\beta$ arpóx $\mathrm{cov}^{2}{ }^{2}$ Similarly the Slavic in turn may have borrowed from the Greek, Latin, and Germanic. It is by no means more strange than the false translation of Greek grammatical termini into Latin, or the translation of compounds from Greek to Latin to Germanic. ${ }^{3}$ Until this aspect of the diminutives in these three language-groups has been thoroughly investigated, comparison will often be unsafe, and must be used with care.
8. Although the 'diminutive' uses are the center of my' dicussion, it is necessary also to consider all other suffixal meanings of substantives in -lov, not only because a large number of words of the most varied classes have at one time or other been called diminutives, but also because the latter will not appear in proper perspective unless compared with all other meanings of the suffix, and there is a continual interchange of influence between them and attractions of words from one class to the other. The diminutive class, however, and those more closely related to it, i. e. all classes derived from substantives, are treated with more completeness than those derived from adjectives or the verbal abstracts.
9. On the other hand, it would be superfluous continually to bring in such substantivized adjectives as are still in touch with the adjectives themselves, or to quote words of unknown or uncertain etymology, unless they are valuable for showing congeneric attraction.
 and loyiov 'hip-joint.' Moreover, since the diminutive meaning has
${ }^{1}$ Ribezzo, Die Dim. der Altind. Sprach., is based purely on dictionaries.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Weise, Characteristik der Lateinischen Sprache ${ }^{3}$ p. 7.
${ }^{8}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 77.
attached itself exclusively to historic Greek -tov, and not to prehistoric -(i)iom, it would be futile continually to bring in words like
 Only when such words are chronologically important, or when they otherwise help to illustrate the development of historic -oov, will they be mentioned. Similarly words like those in - tnpoov, e. g. סsamvnoripoov, in which the conglutinate has taken upon itself a peculiar meaning quite distinct from that of simple -cov, for the greater part come outside of the scope of our discussion.
10. Since diminutives as well as all other substantives in -tov are formed with the same -to- that is so common in secondary adjectives, it is an important question when and how the different substantive categories cut loose from the adjectives. An examination of the various I. E. languages reveals the fact that -(i)iom is used freely in substantives of a large number of dialects, e. g. Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Germanic, Lithuanian, and it is therefore necessary to assume that such substantives occurred already in I. E., even were it not a priori to be expected that every adjective category produces substantivized neuters. On the other hand -七- was a living adjective suffix all through the history of the Greek language, and continually gave rise to new substantives in -rov. These consequently belong to most widely distant periods, and each semantic group, each meaning the -tov has added to the primitive, must be examined separately, as well as the independence of substantive from adjective formation, and the result compared with other languages, in order to determine its chronology. The question of the time of the origin of the diminutive use is best left until all the different substantive categories have been brought to view. Cf. § 261 ff .
11. As to the manner of substantivation, ${ }^{1}$ words in -ov present nothing peculiar from any other substantivized neuter adjectives. It may take place by ellipsis of a substantive, ${ }^{2}$ by the use of the neuter singular

[^2]as an abstract or collective, or by taking up with the neuter adjective the general idea of a thing. With the exception of the category of abstract nouns, which form a distinct semantic group and have been separated from other words, manner of substantivation can not be my main principle of division, partly because this would do violence to the more important principle of division according to the meaning of the suffix, partly because the different ways of substantivation shade into each other imperceptibly, and when there is no combination of adjective and substantive extant we can not tell whether there originally was ellipsis or not. Moreover, words which are due to ellipsis give rise to other substantives without the intermediate existence of an adjective, and so the distinction breaks down entirely: oxụ̧́ov סér $\pi \varsigma_{5}$ gave rise to oxupoov, and this in turn gave rise to words like roupiov, which can not be classified as substantivized adjectives at all, but simply show that -ov has taken upon itself the new function of forming nouns designating vessels.
12. In arranging and grouping the different shades of meaning I shall have to be largely guided by convenience. The signification of a word-forming element is, of course, not only a product of the inherited meaning of the suffix itself, but is also influenced by the primitive from which it is a derivative, and by the environment of the word, by the whole situation in which it is placed. Consequently nearly every occurrence of a suffix is different from every other in some respect, and it is necessary to select, arbitrarily sometimes perhaps, a few more important points of view for the arrangement. Moreover, the conflicting and overlapping influences which are at work are of varying relative importance, so that it is impossible systematically to adhere to a single point of view as the main principle of grouping. In general, however, I have made the meaning brought in by the suffix itself the main principle of division (cf. however, $\$ 11$ ). In
group in which an adjective with a generic substantive formed a mere circumlocution for the primitive of the adjective. Thus there is $n o$ great probability that the Greeks thought of dénces everytime they heard $\sigma x^{\prime} \varphi \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ ov ( $\left.\$ 120\right)$, nor, with a different relation of primitive and derivative, that they thought of i¿@óv when they heard tò 'A@चєuiooov (§67). Moreover, the fact that such words give rise to analogical formations which never had a corresponding adjective existing, is complete evidence for their substantivation. Even if then, as Delbrück remarks, the finer psychological analysis of such relations is impossible in dead languages, I see no reason for dropping the term sulstantivation altogether for these cases, and would be equally well justified in using it where it does not strictly apply as in refusing it where it belongs.
my subdivisions，on the other hand，I have usually followed the prin－ ciple of grouping con－generic words together；for the linguistic material lies in the mind in such groups of closely related words，while a more minute analysis of the apparent effect of the suffix upon the words is of no psychological interest，because that is due entirely to accidental circumstances which never had any place in the psychic attitude of the speaker．

## II．TREATMENT OF FINAL SUFFIXES OF THE PRIMITIVES TO WHICH－七－IS ADDED．

13．An attempt to present a complete treatment of the formal history of the－o－－suffix would clearly be superfluous for the reason that this has been often enough done before，and the facts are in general quite clear．I may refer to Leo Meyer，Vgl．Gramm． 2. 399 ff．， 440 ff．；Aly，De Nom．－七o－Suffix．op．Form．；Brugmann， Gr．2． $1^{2}$ ． 182 ff ．；for the diminutives particularly to Janson，De Graec．Serm．Nom．Dim．et Ampl．Flex．Forma atque Usu．All I shall attempt is to give a summary and to explain my treatment of a few irregularities．

14．According to Brugmann，op．cit．187，the suffix－（i）io－is a conglutination of the $i$ of i stems or of locatives with the thematic 0 ． It is，then，historically unjustifiable to divide words like $\pi \alpha_{\rho} \delta \dot{\alpha} \lambda .10 v$
 ov．But if such forms caused the transfer of－to－to other than i stems it was interpreted as a single suffix，and was placed on the same footing by the speaker as in consonant stems +-60 ．The two groups therefore belong together semantically，and I have admitted such forms from i stems without comment，so e．g．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota o v: ~ \tilde{\alpha} \lambda u \sigma t$ ，
 ミápঠıı！．

15．The regular phonetic treatment ${ }^{1}$ of the other stem－finals would be as follows：（1）$-0-,-\bar{\alpha}-\left(-\eta_{-}\right)+-6-=-60-$ ；$\sigma$ ooviov：$\sigma \%$ oivos， $\bar{\alpha} v 0 \cdot \rho(\omega)$
 $=-七 0-<-F_{60}$（Cretan $\left.\ddot{\alpha}_{\sigma} \sigma 10 \varsigma: \check{\alpha} \sigma \tau u\right)$ ，or，as usually，the strong form



[^3]process is not clear ${ }^{1}$; xoupsiov : xoupsús, xvaçeiov : xvaọéśs. (4) Locatives in $-\varepsilon t$, $-0 t,-\alpha t+-t 0-=-\varepsilon \iota 0-,-0 t 0-$, $-\alpha \iota 0-$. Cf. Brugmann, Gr.

 as in $\sigma u \beta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota o v: ~ \sigma u \beta$ ónns, but oftener, particularly in later words, $=$
 all other consonants suffered no change. Cf. $\pi \tau \varepsilon p \dot{\prime}$

16. This distribution of the result of combination of $-60-$ with the different stemfinals naturally did not remain intact. In the first place, -sıo- encroached on -to- in certain adjectives derived from names of


 xnро́xsıov : xヘ̃pu'̆. There were so many agent nouns in -eus from which words in -siov with these meanings could be formed, that -sov rather than -tov, which could no longer be recognized in such conglutinates, became their exponent. Conversely, -tov encroached upon -sıov in - $\varepsilon \sigma$ stems. The fact that the realms in which -stov had become productive were such that only very few - $\varepsilon \sigma$ - stems were affected, led to the converse result that the latter changed -stov to - 60 v , which was the easier because they had the same form as the -0 - stems in the Nominative Singular. Thus we find already in Homer Iyvoov: vò '̌yvos,

 тsućyıov: चò चépxyos. In the diminutive, moreover, as well as the deteriorative category -tov was supreme, there being no example either of -stov or any other conglutinate not ending in -tov of two full syllables which had these meanings. This is no doubt due to the fact that the pattern types, e. g. $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$ and $\alpha v \delta \rho i o v$, ended thus.
17. Occasionally -tov appears substituted for another suffix rather than added to it. Leaving out of account the inherited elision of $o^{\prime} \bar{\alpha}$, this occurs principally in case of - $£ \delta-$ stems, e. g. $x \dot{\alpha} \lambda \pi \tau \circ v: x \dot{\alpha} \lambda \pi u \varsigma$,
 pa入is. That these should have been syncopated from forms in -toovv, as Janson (p. 23, 32) assumes for the last two, would be totally contrary to Greek phonetic laws. The substitution rather arose because - -ts and -tov were equivalent in many uses : as diminutive
${ }^{1}$ id. Gr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 181.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Pape, Etym. Wörterb. 97, 69.
suffixes, as suffixes forming names of plants, vessels, boxes, and the like. The resulting feeling of equivalence caused the transfer of words from one class to the other, particularly from the less numerous to the more numerous class. Strictly speaking $\rho_{\text {ocóviov is not a deri- }}$ vate of $\rho \alpha \varphi \alpha v i{ }^{\prime}$, but the two are collateral forms.
18. The substitution of -tov for a stem-suffix in a few cases is hard to explain: oxú خıov 'dog-fish ' (: ox'j入 $\alpha \xi$, 'puppy ') can not be explained in this way because the two words are not equivalent in meaning, unless we assume that $\sigma x \dot{j} \lambda \alpha \xi$ itself was at one time applied to the dog-fish, and then the substitution took place. $\sigma \tau \dot{\sigma}$ urov (: $\sigma \tau \dot{\sigma} \mu \alpha$, 'mouth'), instead of $\sigma \tau o \mu . \dot{\alpha} \tau \circ v$, may have been caused by the resemblance of the Nominative to First Declension nominatives like
 'wretched servant,' in Lys. ap. Poll. 3. 74, is probably a scribe's error; for $\partial s p \alpha \pi o ́ v \tau i o v, ~ w h i c h ~ w o u l d ~ b e ~ r e g u l a r, ~ h a s ~ m a n u s c r i p t ~ a u t h o r-~$ ity also. It is a question, however, whether some of these irregular forms are not due to collateral o| $\bar{\alpha}$ stems which have been lost. Cf.
 apparently from $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha$, but really from $\sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \gamma \mu \dot{\rho} \varsigma$.
19. Of the numerous conglutinates in -tov I have separated from simple -tov all except -otov $<-t(\mathrm{i})$ iom, making the latter exception because the $t$ has from I. E. times had no appreciable influence on the meaning. I have therefore made no comment on words like

 suffix - $\alpha$ otov, which seems to have attained a certain local productivity.

## III. ACCENT OF GREEK NOUNS IN -ıov.

20. Before taking up the different -ov nouns in detail it will be necessary to inquire whether the variation of accentuation of stem and suffix has any relation to the meaning of the words. If not, the question of accent can be neglected after this.
21. The generally accepted rule, both by ancient grammarians and modern authorities, is that polysyllabic diminutives follow the analogy of other polysyllables and retract their accent: cf. $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \sigma \alpha \mu .0 v$, $\delta$ wx $\sigma \sigma$ ท̂pov, לेpviorov, $\sigma \pi \alpha \vartheta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota o v$, etc. But dactylic trisyllabic diminutives, whether the first syllable is long by nature or position, accent the 4
 accent the first syllable, as Opóvov, $\lambda i 0$ rov, or $\pi \tau$ óyov. So for instance it is stated in the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax, AB. 8 8 6: $\tau \grave{\alpha} \gamma^{\alpha} \rho$


 ह́vòs $\bar{\rho} \pi \alpha p \alpha ̀ \tau \widetilde{\propto}$ ©soxpí $\tau \omega$. Cf. also Chandler, Gr. Acc ${ }^{2}$. p. 101 ; Janson, op. cit. 4. This canon for the accentuation of diminutives is in contrast with that of adjectives in -tog, which, with very few exceptions,
 Chandler, op. cit. p. 115 f . Nouns which but recently were substantivized from adjectives of course retain their recessive accent: iovipuov, סéfuov, etc. Other exceptions are explained on the ground of contraction, dactylic words having arisen out of original tetrasyl-

22. If we state the rule as above, as applying to diminutives, it is too narrow; for there are a large number of words which never had any diminutive meaning, old and common words too, which follow the rule. I may mention д̀uviov, $\beta_{1} \beta$ रiov, ioyiov, र्रुía, h̀piov, sipiov (later for sipov), íriov, xnpiov, unpiov, inpiov, iviov, dixiov, $\delta$ axiov, $\pi$ niviov, бyoviov, चstyiov, yopriov, puxiov, y.ఉpiov. For other examples cf. Chandler, op. cit. p. 105 f . All of these here mentioned except $\beta_{1} \beta \lambda i o v$, סixiov, sipiov, oyoviov, ycpiov, possibly ¿uuviov, occur as here accented in Homer, Hesiod, or Archilochus, before the diminutive meaning of -tov had ever been developed. We can not, therefore, satisfy ourselves with Janson (1. c.) that these have followed the analogy of the diminutives. Still less can we join with Chandler and Allinson in trying to modify the meaning of the term 'diminutive' in order to make the rule fit. The latter himself (A. J. of Ph. 12.55) admits that "the term 'diminutive' is unsatisfactory. In addition to the three meanings of 'something small,' 'pretty,' or 'contemptible,' the term is here used as including the idea of 'pertaining to,' 'made of,' or 'connected with.'" Similarly Chandler speaks of the difficulty of applying the rule, "because it is hard to say what constitutes a diminutive of the class in question. It is not the mere external form

 phos, זei\%os, and ypuobs, and yet they are not diminutives. nor is it signification alone; äpxisv is a 'little bear,' but is not paroxytone. In short there are words diminutive in form and signification which are
not paroxytone, while there are others diminutive in form and accent though not in meaning." The above is practically another way of stating that a diminutive is a word which conforms to the above rule for accentuation. Moreover, if we include under the term 'diminutive' the ideas 'pertaining to,' 'made of,' 'connected with,' we have an idea that is practically synonymous with a substantivized secondary adjective, and the word 'diminutive' means nothing. It would even include such words as still have their adjectival origin in the consciousness of the speaker, which, as we have seen $\S 21$, naturally follow the accentuation of the adjective. We must therefore state our rule in a different way: "Trisyllabic substantives in -七ov, if all connection with the adjectival types from which they are derived has faded from the mind, have a tendency to accent the penult if they are dactylic, but the antepenult if they are tribrachs."
23. I have said "have a tendency," for if it is stated as a rule, there are numerous exceptions even as it is here formulated. Chandler, p. 106 f., gives a long list of "Diminutives in Form and Signification, ${ }^{1}$ but not in Accent." i. e., dactylic words accenting the first syllable,
 пpoov, три́ß入ıov, øัpuov. Altogether there are fifty-seven mentioned exclusive of compounds, some of which are found with both accentuations, but most are always accented on the antepenult. We even find
 other hand, there is a number of tribrach 'diminutives' which accent the penult. Cf. Janson, 21 f.; Chandler, 104 f.; Allinson, A. J. of Ph. 12. 55. Chandler quotes some thirty different tribrach words which accent the penult according to some authorities. Most of these are also found with the accent on the antepenult, and so may be false forms, though it is at least equally probable that the accent varied in actual speech. Such words are oupiov, xevviov, $\pi \tau u x i o v, ~ \rho \alpha x i o v$, opupiov. Others may be due to an interchange of -tov with -soov,
 by a large number of passages. The former, however, may have gotten its accent by analogy to xupiov or by influence of oxa@siov, but the one word $\pi \varepsilon \delta i o v$, which is as old as Homer, and practically free from analogical influences, is enough to show that the accent on the penult was not in every case due to the dactylic form of a word.


[^4]distinguish it from $\pi \varepsilon \delta \delta ̀ \iota v$, diminutive of $\pi \varepsilon \delta \delta \eta$ (Janson, op. cit. 10), is utterly incredible, and not warranted by the passage cited (Etym. Mag. 658. 24 ff.).
24. As to the cause of the prevailing accentuation of the -tov nouns, it can not be "that the language strove to accent the first syllable of the diminutive suffix, ${ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ both because of the many nondiminutives that follow the rule and the many diminutives, both polysyllabic and trisyllabic, which do not accent the penult (see § 22 f.). Nor do the words in - troo- ${ }^{2}$ add great probability to the theory; for the invariability with which these are accented on the penult regardless of meaning marks their accent as old and inherited, quite distinct from the wavering of the -tov forms.
25. The latter has often been attributed to the working of Wheeler's "dactylic law," the law that dactylic endings with the accent on the ultima become paroxytone, which in spite of the uncertainty of the precise conditions under which the change occurred, we may accept as a fact. Cf. Wheeler, Der Griechische Nominalaccent 60 ff. ; Brugmann, Gr. $1^{2}$. 963 , Gr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 153 ; for words in -tov Wheeler, op. cit. 95 ; Hirt, Idg. Acc. 27. Just as * $\pi \alpha \chi \cup \lambda$ ós ( $\pi \alpha \not \cup \nu \lambda \omega \varsigma)$ is contrasted
 there is no example of a neuter in -tóv, we do find traces of the law in masculines in -tog, and in adjectives in -tos, -t $\alpha,-$ tov. Thus $\gamma$ o $\mu$ pios, x,
 opposed to devios, $\mu \overline{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{piot}, \pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ ios. ${ }^{4}$ It is, then, beyond doubt that the law must have had its influence on the neuter substantives also, so as to diminish the number of oxytones and increase the number of paroxytones, and thus pave the way for the complete disappearance of the former.
26. It would, however, be a mistake to conclude that the original form was in every case an oxytone or a paroxytone. The three differ-
${ }^{1}$ Allinson, l. c.
${ }^{2}$ Allinson, ib. p. 56. How the accent of words in -ioxo- is to be explained is a question by itself. This much, however, may be said here, that to refer their accentuation to the tendency of diminutives to accent the penult, as is done now again by Hatzidakis, Glotta 1. 124, is trying to explain a regular phenomenon by an irregular one, a frequent by a rare phenomenon, one that is nearly pan-Hellenic by one that is local and dialectic (Hatridak is lets -ioxo- be patterned after -vio- and -ixo- rather than after the obviously intractable -tov).
${ }^{3}$ Chandler, p. 67 f.
${ }^{4}$ id. p. 115 f.
ent types represented by گóvıov, $\pi \varepsilon \delta i o v$, and $\sigma \varphi p x i o v<* \sigma \varphi \eta_{1} x i o ́ v$, or
 European mother-tongue, as is shown by the corresponding variety of accent of the Sanskrit words in -(i)ya-: cf. áçvya- from áçva-, pítryafrom pitì̛-, hrdyà- ( = hrdíya-) from hríd-, hotríya- from hótrā-, somyáfrom sóma-, ksetriyá- from ksétra-. Cf. Hirt, Idg. Acc. 277; Whitney, Skr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 1212, 1214.
27. It would appear then, that the distinction of accent between adjectives, which usually have recessive accent, masculine substantives, which mostly accent the ultima (Chandler 67 f.), and neuter substantives or 'diminutives,' which have a tendency to accent the penult when dactylic, otherwise to have recessive accent, is altogether secondary; for a few adjectives have kept the old accent (see § 25), while on the other hand a number of substantives with no adjective connections retract their accent although dactyls. And to the rule that nondactylic substantives have recessive accent we have the one certain exception $\pi \varepsilon \delta$ iov, which can only be explained by assuming that it inherited the old accent, which was kept because the word was used frequently and had few congeneric words, so as not to be easily subject to analogical influences.
28. It follows from this that the accent will be of no help whatever in discerning the different strata of -oov substantives in their gradual separation from the adjectives. There were the most conflicting analogical influences at work even in later times, as can be seen from the varying accentuation of so many words. How much more then would this be the case at an earlier period when the new tendencies were yet forming? Adding to this the fact that all our knowledge of accent comes from the Alexandrian grammarians and their successors, and that we never can be quite sure how old their accentuation is, I may well be justified in omitting all reference to accent in my treatment of the semantic development of the -oo diminutives.

## IV. -tov FROM ADVERBS AND CASE-FORMS IN -t.

29. The first category of I. E. -(i)io- adjectives mentioned by Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2} .183$, is that in which -(i)io- arose from caseforms and adverbs in -i, which were extended by -0 - for the purpose of adjective formation; cf. Gr. Ǐ甲os 'mighty' : ị!, ג̌vios Lat. antiae
O. H. G. andi endi : Skr. ánti Gr. àvit 'in front of.' Cf. Brugmann, op. cit. 164, Gr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 180. In - $\alpha l o \varsigma ~ w e ~ f i n d ~ \pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota o ́ s: ~ \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \iota ~ ' o l d, ' ~$ cf. Prellwitz, Burs. JB. 106. 72.

To adjectives of this kind a few Greek neuter substantives probably owe their origin. Perhaps àviov ${ }^{1}$ 'liciatorium,' occurring
 belongs to the adjective $\alpha v v i o s$, though the connection of meaning is difficult. More certain is ¿upiov ${ }^{1}$; ¿upí, 'that which is around' the body, i. e. a garment. So Soph. frg. 387, AB. 389. 10, äpupov.
 name,' in the Boeotion inscription of REG. 12.53 ff . (A 28), which originated from the phrase *ę $\pi i$ i $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \circ \dot{\varphi}$. Cf. Solmsen, Rh. Mus. 56. 475.

## V. -tov IN ABSTRACTS WITH VERBAL FORCE.

30. Already in Indo-European times there were in existence a number of adjectives in -(i)io- with verbal force, ${ }^{2}$ and a number of action nouns derived from these by substantivation of the neuter. ${ }^{2}$ Such adjectives with passive meaning are not uncommon in various languages, ${ }^{3}$ cf. e. g. Skr. yájya-s Gr. äyıo-s 'venerandus,' Lat. eximius (: emo), Goth. brūks, 'useful.' That, however, the passive meaning was not the only primitive one, is seen by the large number of verbal abstracts in different languages which presuppose an adjective with active or neutral verbal force. Thus Skr. vídya-m is 'the finding,' vácya-m 'the speaking,' Gr. oب̣ároo-v 'the slaughtering,' Lat. studium 'study,' O. H. G. ga-sprāhhi 'discussion.' In Greek, moreover, we find adjectives like $\sigma \varphi \dot{\alpha} \gamma$ ros 'slaughtering,' with distinct active force.
31. To the adjectives and abstracts of the inherited type like $\sigma \varphi \alpha^{\prime}-$ rov continually new ones were added at every period by the addition
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Prellwitz, Etym. Wörterb ${ }^{2}$. s. v.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 183 ff.
${ }^{3}$ For our purpose it is important merely to determine that the use of -tov in verbals is inherited; whether this -(i)io- was originally primary, or whether the primitive was a root-noun in the pattern types, is a question that does not affect the subsequent history of Gr. -tov in the least. For the latter theory cf. Hirt, Idg. Acc. 275; Brugmann, 1. c. Cf. also the similar development of verbal adjectives and action nouns from historical substantives in § 31.
of denominative -6- to nouns which were themselves either action nouns or agent nouns. As Skr. ksatrá-m 'rule ' gave rise to ksatríya-s 'having to do with ruling,' i. e. 'ruling,' so Gr. póroos 'having to do with delivery,' 'delivering,' goes back to the verbal abstract púrus ' the
 ing the qualities of a helper,' helping.' Dsoupómoov is 'that which is connected with the seer (Əвопро́ло૬),' i. e. 'prophecy.' These diversities of origin will, however, be disregarded after this because the resulting meaning is the same for all of them, and they were undoubtedly soon levelled by the consciousness of the speakers of the language. An action noun would necessarily tend to being referred to the related verb rather than to another noun, since that is the more usual and the simpler relation. As a result new abstracts were sometimes made directly from all kinds of verbal roots, even secondary ones, as in д́ $\mu \dot{\alpha} p \tau t o v ' s i n '$ from the quasi-root seen in $\eta_{\mu} \mu$ uprov, aorist of $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha_{\rho} \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$. The connection of the tov form with the verb would be further facilitated when its primitive becomes concrete, or is lost,

32. According to the form of the primitive the verbal abstracts in -tov comprise the following classes: it may be (1) A verbal root

 if: a present *xéou( (cf. O. Blg. česati 'to comb'), नuб大itiov : नuб$\sigma \tau \varepsilon ́\left(\omega\right.$. (3) A noun ending in I. E. $-\mathrm{t}-,^{1}$ seen in Skr. stutya-s 'to

 I. E. times had no appreciable meaning. (4) A similar noun in $-\delta$-, which was also meaningless ; Arg. $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ \delta ̊ \iota v v$ ‘stadium ' : $\sigma \pi \dot{\alpha} \omega$ (Attic $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \delta \partial \circ \circ v$ by popular etymology, cf. Prellwitz, Etym. Wörterb². s. v.). Cf. § 321. (5) A noun ending in a regular nominal suffix ${ }^{2}$ : póvovv: $\hat{\rho} \dot{\prime}-\sigma t-\varsigma$, नuv-

33. With respect to meaning these verbal abstracts must be distinguished from adjectival abstracts expressing an attribute or state, for which see Chapter VI. Cf. Brugmann, K. Vgl. Gr. 340 ff., Gr. 2. $1^{2} .626 \mathrm{ff}$. The class to be described here comprises those words
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, op. cit. 186 f.
${ }^{2}$ When the primitive is a word in $-o$ - or $-\bar{\alpha}$ - it is often hard to say whether it may not just as well have been a root or root-noun, since these vowels suffer elision in derivation. Here may belong hóyıov : hójos, uúgıov:

which were originally action nouns. Like all abstracts they could become concrete in a variety of manners, and when there is no passage extant in which a given word has either abstract force or shows the transition from abstract to concrete, there may be doubt whether the derivative was not concrete from the beginning. Such words have been placed here when they neither have an extant substantive to which they could be referred, nor have before their -ov a suffix which suggests nominal origin, in which case, unless due to the accident of transmission, the speaker must have referred the substantive to the verb, though even then the concrete meaning may have been original.
34. According to whether the idea of action is still dominant or concrete meanings of various kinds have been developed, the examples can be divided into the following classes, following in the main Brugmann 1. c. The concrete meaning in every case results from an originally accessory and subordinate idea becoming dominant.
A. The idea of action is still dominant : ápúpriov 'transgression,' xuv-h;rov 'the hunting,' 'hunt.' ${ }^{1}$
B. The verbal abstract expresses the result of an action. The action and its result are practically indistinguishable in ideas like that of speaking, where the action of speaking is rarely separated from that which is spoken, the spoken word. So e. g. hórov 'the saying,' 'oracle,' suarréicov 'good tidings.' When the result of an action is a concrete object the difference is more tangible, as in $\chi^{\prime} p \hat{p}_{i} \beta a \alpha$ 'bran':
 result of the action of shaving.
C. The verbal abstract designates anything affected by the action. It may designate the direct or indirect object of an action, as it did the internal object in B. Cf. Eng. wreck, offering, etc., Gr. opx́yov 'the slaughtering,' 'sacrificial victim,' aróroov 'load.' ${ }^{3}$ Not all substantivations of verbal adjectives which seem to belong here have really passed through the abstract stage. From verbal adjectives with passive meaning the neuter could be substantivized by taking up the


 For an excursive group consisting of legal terms of. SBi, note to didixior.




general idea of things, so certainly in case of $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ ©ैva : ढ̈vos 'to be bought,' then 'wares,' 'merchandise,' as Xen. An. 1. 2. 18, of हैx

D. The verbal abstract designates a place affected by the action: үupváatov 'bodily exercises' or 'gymnasium,' नuvépipov 'council' or 'council-chamber.' ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Eng. refuge, both of the action and the place. Place names in -tov which have no abstract meaning extant are probably in most cases concrete from the beginning. Thus $\alpha \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma(\mathrm{\sigma} \gamma \mathrm{ov}$ is 'that which is connected with putting in ( $x \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma(\omega \gamma \dot{n})$,' 'an inn.' Cf. § 61 f .
E. The verbal abstract designates the persons appearing as subject
 posium, ${ }^{2}{ }^{2}$ used of the guests of a drinking party. Only a plurality of persons is designated by -ov forms because of the neuter gender, which does not occur in names denoting single individuals (except diminutives). All words belonging here are then also collectives.
F. The verbal abstract designates a thing appearing as subject or instrument of an action, the former certainly in case of intransitive verbal ideas, for which the conception of instrumentality is impossible. poblov 'wave' can only be 'that which roars,' not 'that with which one roars.' From such words it is only a small step to ripiov 'tomb,' either 'that which covers' or 'that with which one is covered.' Similarly $\alpha^{2} \tau \lambda \lambda_{i o v}$ 'bucket': ${ }^{\alpha} v \tau \lambda \varepsilon \hat{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \omega$ 'draw water' may have been vividly conceived as 'that which draws the water,' or 'that with which the water is drawn,' and so on with all instrument nouns originating as verbal abstracts. Nevertheless direct association between the instrument and the action is at least an equally important factor; for the instrument is but one of the things connected with the action. b'tiviov, originally 'the buying of provisions,' could come to denote that with which the provisions are bought, i. e. provision money, or the provisions themselves by an exactly similar process. Since, then, a thing as subject of an action is often not to be distinguished from an instrument in actual practice, the examples of both will be given together.

Instrument nouns of this type have a totally different history from those directly formed from an abstract primitive by means of the suffixal meaning 'connected with,' and yet can also not always be separated in practice. iठpar( yrov 'aqueduct' is undoubtedly originally 'that which is connected with the bringing of water ( $\delta \delta \rho \alpha \gamma\left(\omega \gamma \gamma^{\prime}\right)$,'

[^5]yet may very well have been referred to the verb $\delta \delta \rho \alpha \gamma\left(\omega \gamma^{\prime}(\omega)\right.$ by the speaker. The instrument nouns of this type are however so much more numerous (cf. $\S 71 \mathrm{ff}$.), and the path to the designation of instrumentality is so much shorter, that it is safer to refer to it any instrument noun with no trace of abstract meaning if a possible nominal primitive is in existence, or if, like in fuć $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ov, the - tov is preceded by a suffix that is common in abstract nouns. Wherever this is not the case, as e. g. in case of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ siq⿴ov, I have classed the word here, although even then the primitive substantive may be accidentally not quotable. ${ }^{1}$
G. The verbal abstract is a collective, it brings under one idea a number of persons or things or both. All of them are mentioned also under some other point of view. A number of persons could be designated by the words under E , a number of things by poovov
 use of the Neuter Singular as a collective representing things is comparatively rare because of the competition of the closely related meaning of the neuter plurals in $-t \alpha$ and the feminine collectives in - c $\alpha$. Since the neuter singular in -ov usually referred to a single object, it was convenient to keep the relation of singular and plural as nearly intact as possible. In contrast is the number of words in -tov designating a number of persons (see sub E ); for, since the neuter singular can hardly refer to a single person, ${ }^{2}$ the plural can not be used of a number of persons, and there thus was no impulse for maintaining the differentiation between the two numbers.
35. Collection of examples. The words are arranged alphabetically, but under each word the different meanings are designated by letters referring to the uses described under the corresponding letters in $\S 34$. A succession of two or more letters denotes that an example is on the border line between the categories represented, or shows the development of meaning from one to the other. Thus an A before an example means that the idea of action is dominant, AC that both the idea of action and the place connected are present, BC that a word is on the border line between result of an action and a thing affected by it.


 qógoov.
${ }^{2}$ Excepting 'diminutives,' which have no influence here.
äy $\omega$, 'the leading,' 'taking,' 'what is taken,' 'load.' C) Xen. Cyr.








 d̀vi $\lambda i o v: ~ \grave{\alpha} v \tau \lambda . \hat{s} \omega$, 'bucket,' cf. § $34 \mathrm{~F} . \mathrm{F}$ ) Ar. and Epilyc. ap. AB.
 C) Xen. Cyn. 6. 6. $\beta \varrho c \gamma \chi i \alpha$ ' gills,' either from a root *gurengh 'to make a noise with the throat,' or: Skr. brmhati 'bellows.' "




 cises,' 'place for exercising' i. e. 'gymnasium,' also designates the youths that attend the training school. A) Pind. frg. 129, xoi voi


${ }^{1}$ It was probably the use of $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta i x \iota o v$ in legal phrases like the latter of the two examples that gave rise to a group of action nouns in -iov which were confined to legal use, mostly, though not always, in certain stereotyped
 रauiov dien, 'a prosecution for failure to marry, for late marriage (i. e. putting off marriage beyond the appointed age),' and 'for an ill marriage,' re-



 In the Nominative ${ }^{\kappa} \nu \delta \varrho o i n \dot{\eta} \psi \iota \nu: \varepsilon i-\lambda r r_{1} \varphi-\alpha$, 'seizure of men' guilty of murdering
 @оис兀 (of. $\mu \propto \varrho \tau$ v́œıov, which is not a legal term), 'false witness,' 'perjury.' Plato Theæt. 148 B, ěvo qos voìs 廿evodoucetv@iots. How keenly the legal character of these words was felt is seen by the irregular analogical formation $\lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\pi}$ $\tau \kappa \xi i o v ~ \gamma \varrho « ч \eta$ ', ' an indictment for leaving one's post,' i. e. for desertion, Dem. 21. 103. Although the first part of the compound has the verbal meaning, yet the resemblance of idea to the other words here discussed led to the attaching of their suffix to the noun at the end.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Prellwitz, Etym. Wörterbuch ${ }^{2}$ s. v.
 cởśva ('during their exercising' or 'in the gymnasium '). D) Eur.



 of wood in contrast to a bed made up on the ground. $\left.{ }^{1} \quad B\right) \approx 599$,





 vessel,' perhaps originally 'the dipping,' but cf. $\S 34 \mathrm{C}$ on $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ävca.

 if the meaning 'that which is inlaid,' 'an emblem,' is certain for
 Aside from this example of the use B ), there are others which would belong to F ). Thus the word designates a hunting net Poll. 5. 35










 sjarreniou. joiov: Skr. $\sqrt[V]{\mathrm{vr}}$ 'to cover,' 'covering,' i. e. 'mound,' 'tomb.' F) $\Psi 126$ : Theocr. 1. 125. ríœюov ${ }^{3}$ : Skr. $V$ và 'to weave, 'the weaving.' C) 'the woven cloth' in Eur. Ion 1420. 「'opriò $\mu$..̇े

## ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Meister, BB. 11. 176.

${ }^{2}$ There is no psychological distinction involved whether e. g. iœcime is considered as the remains of a house resulting from the wreck, or as its parts affected by the wreck.
 id. 1. 7.


 * $\delta \varepsilon \mu, s(i) \lambda \eta$ (cf. $\tau i-\nabla \eta-\mu u)$, 'the founding,' 'foundation.' B) Arist. Phys.






 xax żठixiov. xєбxiov: O. Blg. česati 'to comb,' 'the combings,' 'tow.'
 xovnréns, 'the hunt,' 'hunting party.' A) Eur. Hipp. 224, đi







 saying,' 'response,' 'oracle.' B) Probably in the more general meaning 'saying' Thuc. 2. 8. 2, where the 7.6 ' $1 \alpha$ are contrasted with


[^6] utterance of God and the prophets, e. g. of the precepts of Moses








 Luc. D. Meretr. 13. 5. $\mu о v o \pi \omega ं \nprec \iota v: ~ \pi \omega \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega$, , monopoly.' A) Hyp.


 चที่ร छ̇ตv





 by the ship,' 'the rudder.' C) Soph. ap. Poll. 10. 134. öpyic: : èpr( , originally 'doings,' then 'rites,' 'secret rites.' A) H. Hom. Ceres 273,






${ }^{1}$ In a legal sense the feminine $\mu c \rho$ ovpice seems to have been used exclusively.
${ }^{2}$ While the idea 'part' naturally sometimes takes upon itself the implication of something very slight (cf. the fourth and fifth examples), it ly $n o$ means follows that póptov was a diminutive originally. Were that the case such usage as in the third example from Herodotus, where it is applied to continents, would be impossible. Secondarily, however, with the grammarians, uúoov does seem to have been felt as a diminutive to $\mu$ iogos. Cf. \$ 222.
${ }^{3}$ These examples are on the border line, hecause $\mu$ iopon could be originally interpreted either as cognate accusative or direct object.








 ' broaden,' therefore 'a widening,' i. e. 'rectangle.' B) Thuc. 6.67.1.
 roars or splashes,' i. e. a wave. ${ }^{2}$ A) A loud shout or tumult Eur.





 $\lambda$ nvaitonv. Of the rushing motion of horses Dionys. H. 6. 10, oj̊̊̀̀



${ }^{1}$ Cf. Prellwitz, Etym. Wörterb². s. v.
${ }^{2}$ The use of ¢órtov as referring to a wave does not necessarily in every case go back to the abstract use, but may as well be due to the ellipsis of

${ }^{3}$ By congeneric attraction to @óधtov in the meaning 'wave' aivdóvoov: x $\lambda \dot{v} \delta \omega \nu$, 'wave,' 'billow,' has gotten its suffix. Its meaning does not differ from that of its primitive in the slightest degree, the tendency to metaphorical and collective use being common to both words. That $x i v \delta \omega^{2} \nu \quad$ is a diminutive has been erroneously maintained under citation of Eur. Hec. 48,
 interpret the word as diminutive here would give a truly ridiculous aspect to the passage, and the same is true of its metaphorical use in Aesch. Sept.

 these passages the implication is the very opposite of small size : the effect intended is such that we could translate 'a sea of wrath.' In Thuc. 2. 84. 3, where the word appears as a collective, the idea is also the reverse of a




 deliverance,' also 'what is seized,' i. e. 'booty' or 'pledge.' A) Aesch.

 that which is drawn out,' 'a stade.' B) Hes., $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ \delta \iota o v \cdot \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \delta \iota o v$.
 бицло́бьоv: очцло́тทs, 'a drinking together,' 'symposium,' 'drinkingroom,' 'guests of a drinking party.' A) Theogn. 496, ' $1 \mu . \varepsilon i s \delta^{\prime} \varepsilon^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$











 'guests of a drinking party.' E) Men. frg. 4. 115 (6), 'E $\pi \lambda r_{i}{ }^{\prime}\left(\omega \sigma \varepsilon{ }^{\prime}\right.$
 ' council-chamber,' 'council-board.' A) Plato Protag. 317 D, ouvédpıov




 pagus council) $\delta \iota \alpha \beta \sigma \lambda \dot{n} . \quad \sigma v \sigma \sigma i \tau ı v$ : $\sigma$. ' a common meal,' 'room in which common meals are held,' occasionally with the accessory notion of the people assembled. A) Herod.






 slaughtered,' 'victim,' particularly 'sacrificial victim.' A) Eur. Hee.









 твхиaipouxl，＇sign，＇＇token，＇＇proof，＇cf．$\mu$ aptúpıov．F）Aesch．Choeph．



 то́цьov：тоuŕ，тépva，＇the cutting，＇＇slieing，＇＇what is sliced，＇＇victim．＇

 ＇that which is to be eaten＇or＇is eaten．＇C）Pind．frg．94，$\Delta$ sinvou
 id．Pl． 798 （see § 175）．$\tau \grave{\alpha}$ y९өхі́ ：甲pí $\sigma \sigma \omega$ ，＇shiverings．＇A）Diosc．

 supplying，＇＇supplies，＇also＇training place of a chorus．＇C）Polyb．

 $\alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \eta \tau \omega ั \varsigma ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \rho s \propto \rho \emptyset \mu \varepsilon v o v ; ~ \chi o ́ \varrho \iota o v: ~ S k r . ~ V h r ., ~ ' t h a t ~ w h i c h ~ s u r r o u n d s ' ~ '$ or＇by which something is surrounded，＇i．e．the membrane around the embryo or inside of egg，intestine，leather，etc．F）Arist．Part．



## VI．ADJECTIVAL ABSTRACTS IN－tov EXPRESSING AN ATTRIBUTE OR STATE．

36．Just as the neuter singular of any adjective with verbal mean－ ing can be substantivized into an action noun，so the neuter of an

[^7]adjective expressing an attribute or state can also be used as an ab-









 to their abjectives by the Greeks, for this was a productive method of forming abstracts. It is therefore unnecessary to make an extended collection of examples.
37. The line of distinction between these abstracts and those with verbal force is by no means sharp; for an attribute or characteristic of an object very easily gets the accessory notion of an activity of this characteristic in that to which it belongs. ${ }^{1}$ Thus among -tov nouns to ailuov 'the cause,' with the distinct idea of activity, must have been originally conceived as 'the blame-worthiness' ; for it comes from the adjective $\alpha$ itcos 'blame-worthy.' The meaning 'cause' e.g.



 is derived from $\dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\delta} w o s$, which originally meant 'not according to custom,' and only secondarily became verbal in meaning.
38. Like abstracts with verbal meaning these could become concrete, though in a different way. That to which an attribute belongs is often designated by the attribute designating word itself, ${ }^{2}$ e. g. in Eng. youth, beauty, divinity. So in Greek iò $\delta r_{\mu}$ órov 'the state':




 tò doumóvov 'divinity': $\delta \alpha \mu \mu$ óvos 'divine,' often in the general and vague meaning 'divine power,' which suggests its abstract origin :

[^8]


 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma \mu \alpha \tau^{2}$ ह̇ $\lambda \alpha \dot{j} v n$. From this vague meaning a personal meaning was developed, and $\delta \alpha^{2}$, brvor $^{2}$ was applied also to a single god, ${ }^{1}$ e. g. to Apollo at Delphi in the inscription CB. 2527. 14 (215-212 B. C.),


It is evident that when a word is older than the beginning of the transmission and occurs only in a concrete sense, there may often be a doubt whether it may not have been originally abstract. Thus Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 189, derives oixiov 'house' from an abstract meaning 'Häuslichkeit,' 'Behausung,' yet it may even better be concrete from the beginning (cf. $\S 88$ f.). Since decisive criterions for the individual words are usually lacking, it is best to treat them as originally concrete if possible.
39. Sometimes a substantive which has an appearance of being originally abstract really arose by ellipsis. cò oxó̀ıov'banquet song': $\sigma x 0 \lambda t o \varsigma^{2}$ 'crooked' was not originally 'crookedness,' but came from
 Similarly when substantivation took place by taking up with the adjective the general idea of a thing or things. xєци í九ov 'treasure':



## VII. WORDS IN -七o FROM ADJECTIVE PRIMITIVES.

40. In various languages there exist such pairs of adjectives as
 Skr. usríyas and usrás 'reddish,' in which the -(i)io- seems to be a mere formal extension to the primitive, bringing with it no change of meaning. So also compounds like $\delta \mu, \sigma \pi \alpha ́ \tau p \circ \rho$ and $\delta \mu с \pi \alpha ́ \tau \sigma \rho$ ' from

[^9]the same father,' Lat. bipedius and bipes 'having two feet.' According to Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 193, this use of -10 - is secondary and in the earliest cases only apparent; for, on the one hand the primitive may have been a noun originally, as $\mu \dot{\alpha} x x_{\rho}$, the primitive of $\mu \cdot x$ xápos, originally 'happiness,' but later 'happy'; on the other hand the neuter of the primitive adjective was in many cases conceived as an adjectival abstract (cf. $\S 36$ ), so that the derivative in -cooriginally emphasized the idea of 'having the nature of,' e. g. चò $\mu \varepsilon i \lambda \%$ \%v ' mildness' gave rise to $\mu . \varepsilon \lambda_{i}$ iy.os 'having mildness as his nature. This fine distinction, however, was soon effaced, and for all practical purposes primitive and derivative can be considered as equivalent.

We can distinguish two main classes of such words according to whether they were simple or compound.

## 1. SIMPLE WORDS.

41. In case of the neuter substantives belonging here the development of meaning is such that in the majority of instances they can be traced to the substantivized Neuter of the primitive adjectives, and so they have been mentioned in their proper place with substantive derivatives. $\quad 3 \pi$ rávoov 'kitchen' is the place used for roasting ( $\tau$


 of $\left.\mu . \alpha \lambda \alpha x \delta_{\xi}\right)$. Other -oov derivatives from adjectives are due to congeneric attraction, e. g. $\pi \tau u x \tau i o v: \pi \tau u x \tau o ́ s ~ ' a ~ f o l d e d ~ b o o k, ' ~ ' w r i t i n g ~$ tablet,' has followed words like $\beta$ Briniov and $\pi \operatorname{cosiov}^{2}(\$ 101 \mathrm{C}$ ). Finally,
 appears from Pind. N. 7. 79, 入esipoo $\alpha \mathrm{zv}$ guov. Otherwise it appears completely substantivized, e. g. H. Hom. Ceres 427, Theophr. H. P. 6. 6. 9 .

## 2. COMPOUND WORDS.

42. When the original fine distinction between -6- words and their adjective primitives had become effaced ( $(40)$, the existence of compound adjectives with and without -ts-alongside of each other in the same meaning allowed the former to be referred directly to
${ }^{1}$ This etymology e. g. in Prellwitz ${ }^{2}$ s. v. Hehm, Kulturpfl ${ }^{7}$. 른 und n. 62, believes the word to be borrowed from the Persian laleh. Cf. also ib. p. 258 f .
the separate constituents of the compound, and this in turn caused the suffix to appear merely as the exponent of its adjectival function; in other words, -(i)io- had from I. E. times become associated with the formation of exocentric ${ }^{1}$ or transferred adjective compounds. The decisive criterion to show that this new function had fully developed is the existence of such compound adjectives in -(i)io- as have no corresponding form without it, but are formed directly from their constituents, e. g. Gr. гponuunóסos 'a foot and a half long,' without a corresponding трьприínous.
43. Most frequently, since I. E. times, such compounds were formed from phrases consisting of a preposition and its governed substantive, so e. g. Skr. ádhi-gart-ya-s 'being on the seat of the wagon,' api-kaks-yà-s 'being near the arm-pit,' Gr. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota-\sigma \varphi \varphi_{\rho} p-t o s$ 'around the ankle,' Lat. e-greg-ius 'outside of the herd,' 'extraordinary,' Goth. uf-aip-eis 'under oath'; but the same formation was also used in all other classes of exocentric compounds, so e. g. Av. hu-raiᄋ-ya-' upon a beautiful chariot,' Gr. $\delta \mu 0-\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho-$-os 'from the same father,' $\dot{\gamma} \lambda 10-$ oxómıos 'looking to the sun,' Lat. bi-ped-ius. Cf. Brugman, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 112, 193 ; Wackernagel, Ai. Gr. 2. 106 ff.
44. These adjectives gave rise to a large number of Greek neuter substantives, some arising by the various methods of substantivation (§ 11), others formed analogically to these. Since, moreover, the -tobrought with it no definitive meaning except its adjectival function, the substantivized neuters also could stand in a great variety of relations to their constituents, the only restriction being that the substantives, since derived from the exocentric adjectives, must themselves be exocentric.
45. In course of time the use of this compound forming -60 was extended from exocentric to certain esocentric compounds through a variety of causes. In the first place, the relation between the constituents of an exocentric compound in -to- was sometimes of such a nature that a meaning was attributed to the suffix which was parallel to the meaning of -七0-in simple words and esocentric compounds. $\delta \mu 0-\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho-t o s$ does not owe its meaning 'coming from the same father' to its -to-, but rather to the collocation of the ideas 'same' and 'father,' for $\delta \mu 0-\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \rho$ has exactly the same meaning; yet it was inevitable that the influence of simple words in which -七o- was in reality the exponent of the idea of descent ( $\$ 91 \mathrm{ff}$.)

[^10]should cause the suffix of the compound to be interpreted similarly. In
 would be felt as having the same suffix as $\beta p$ axyóv-cov 'that which belongs to' or 'is around the arm.' In the second place, primitives which were themselves compounds gave rise to -tov derivatives on the same principles as simple words, and yet their form was such that they often looked like exocentric compounds having similar constituents.
 directly from $\pi \varepsilon p i \zeta \omega \mu \mu$ with the idea 'a garment of the $\pi$ spi' $\omega \mu, \alpha$ kind,' while the latter is 'that which is around the ankle,' and is formed directly from its constituents by the compound forming -tov. Similar
 about the house,' formed by the compound forming -tov. As a result of these forces alone, namely, apparent similarity of function in some cases, apparent similarity of form in others, the distinction between -tov in exocentric and the original esocentric compounds, which latter are formed on the same principles as simple words, would tend to break down, and thus bring about full assimilation of meanings.
46. Another important point of contact between exocentric and esocentric compounds results from the fact that the two classes are indistinguishable in verbal adjectives and abstracts. So e. g. $\varepsilon j \alpha \gamma$ -
 'reporting good,' but whether this has received its suffix because its verbal nature was felt, or because it was felt as an exocentric compound, is totally uncertain; for the use of -to- in simple verbal adjectives like opóyros forbids us to assume that the compound forming -ov was responsible for all words of this type.
47. Finally, compounds in -tov sometimes passed from exocentric to esocentric meaning by shift of point of view in the words themselves. Zuvet-xvinuov, originally 'that which is in front of the leg,' was interpreted as 'the front leg,' and so got the subject within its own limits. Similarly $\pi \rho \rho-$-ónuov 'that which is in front of the hair' was more logically felt as 'the front hair'; $\varepsilon \pi \pi-\sigma i x u \alpha$, 'the buildings round about the house' became 'the houses round about'; $\pi p o-\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \sigma v$ ' that which is in front of the city' became 'the front city,' i. e. suburb : mpo-ofuov 'that which comes before the song' became 'the beginning of the song'; $\tilde{y}_{j} \mu-$-xocúicov 'a measure consisting of a cup and a half' became 'a cup and a half'; גxpo-Oivov' that which is at the top of the heap' became 'the top of the heap.' That such change of interpretation really did take place is shown by the large number of eso-
centric compounds beginning with nju- and axpo- in which there never could have been an exocentric interpretation, e. g. njut-xhinpoov
 an art,' i. e. a wretched art, ג̀xp- $\alpha$ छ'oviov 'end of the axle,' גxpoбто́ura 'edge of the lips.'
48. As a result of these different forces -ov in exocentric and esocentric compounds became so thoroughly confused that the suffix seemed a fit means of forming nominal compounds of almost any kind (cf. e. g. 火evo-rג́q̣ov 'an empty tomb,' i. e. cenotaph), and even where the primary impulse of adding the -ov was not the fact that a word was a compound, we may surmise that the frequency of the latter kept old and rare meanings relatively more productive in compounds than in simple words. Thus almost half of the abstract words of $\S 35$ are compounds, and we find such pairs as $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-\mu \mu^{\circ}{ }^{\prime}$ ov:

49. No attempt is made to give a complete list of the numerous neuter substantives belonging here, nor to subdivide the selection of examples given according to the apparent effect of the suffix (§ 45), but merely to give a few representative examples, and to discuss a few excursive groups.

## A. Prepositional Compounds.

 'a panegyric': Errójuos 'belonging to the celebration of the victor.'

 żvróọos 'belonging to burial.' Sim. Ce. 4. 4. हैv-ítviov 'something seen in sleep,' 'a dream ': Ev-útvoos 'in sleep.' § 495 ; Ar. Vesp. 25. $\varepsilon v$-ف́тис 'the wall before the eyes' of him who enters from the court-
 of victory': ᄅ̨muvixıos 'belonging to victory.' Aesch. Ag. 174; Athen. 3 E. ह̇t-ívoov' that which belongs to the hearth,' 'household ': żлíctos 'belonging to the hearth.' Herod. 5. 72. ह̇ли-бч́ソıа 'anklet,' 'greave-holder': ėrıợ'pıos 'over the ankle.' Г 331. $\mu \varepsilon \tau-$ «ixuov 'space between two armies': $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha i y \mu \nu s^{\prime}$ 'between the armies.'



 'suburb': $\pi \rho о \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau 0 ¢$ 'before the city.' Soph. El. 1431; CIA 4. 2.

 ＇under the yoke．＇Thuc．2．3． 3.
b）No adjectives are extant（mostly exocentric）．えेvic－xi＇ifuov＇that which is in front of the leg，＇＇shin．＇Arist．H．A．1．15． 494 a 6. ภんo－лíhov＇toll for passing through the gates．＇id．Oec．2．1348 a 26. $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda$－húx voov＇that which is in the lamp，＇＇wick．＇Herod．2．62．हv－ต́tıor ＇that which is in the ear，＇＇ear－ring．＇Aesch．frg．102．$\varepsilon \pi$－oixuc ＇buildings around the house，＇＇minor buildings．＇Tab．Her．1． 146. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \varphi$－ódıc＇provisions for the journey．＇Herod．4．203；Dem．3． 20. $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha$－тígyıv＇space between two towers．＇Thuc．3．23．1．$\mu \varepsilon \tau$－óexıov ＇space between rows of vines．＇Ar．Pax 568．$\mu \varepsilon \tau$－ю́тtov（cf．$\mu \varepsilon ́ \tau-\omega \pi о \nu)$ ＇that which is between the eyes，＇＇forehead．＇$\Lambda 95$ ；П 739．тcecc－
 594．88．те＠t－х́́отьоv，＇that which is around the wrist，＇＇a bracelet．＇ Poll．5．99．тৎо－גúłっov＇place before a court，＇＇vestibule．＇Poll．1． 77. лৎо－хо́ллоv＇that which is before the breast，＇a robe falling over it． Luc．Pisc．7．тео－хо́иоv＇that which is in front of the hair，＇＇front hair＇of men or horses．Xen．Equ．5． 6 ；also＇that which takes the place of hair，＇＇false hair．＇Ar．frg．2．1078．тео－хш́цою＇＇that which comes before the $\chi \tilde{\omega} \mu \circ$ ，＇＇prelude of a song．＇Pind．N．4．11．íre＠－
 which is under the eyes，＇i．e．a part of the face in M 463，a blow under the eyes in Ar．Vesp．1386．i $\varphi$ ¢－óluov＇that which is under the mortar，＇＇mortar－stand．＇Ar．ap．Poll．10． 114.

51．Among smaller excursive groups of words among those men－ tioned may be named ：（1）Articles of dress or ornament（cf．$\S 260 \mathrm{E}$ ）：





[^11]
## B. Numeral Compounds and Compounds designating a Part of the Simplex..

52. a) Integral numeral compounds. While there was nothing in the original nature of -(i)iom which should make it unfit for integral numeral compounds any more than for any other kinds, this use of the suffix has not been productive in Greek, and remained altogether in exocentric bounds. I have found only the following, ${ }^{1}$ all without
 Anth. P. 9. 581. $\mu$ ovo-tiverov 'a fortress with only one tower.' Procopius Aed. 4. 5. $\delta \iota$-édoıv 'that which has seats for two,' 'a double seat.' Suid. s.v. dc-inuvıov 'that which consists of two lemnisci,' 'a double lemniscus.' Insc. Rhod. CIG. 2525 b 56. t@ı-xגivıov 'a dining room with three couches.' ${ }^{2}$ Theopomp. frg. 2. 816 (2). $\tau \varrho \iota-\mu \alpha ́ \tau \iota o v ~ ' a ~ m e a s u r e ~ o f ~ t h r e e ~ \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \iota$, ' perhaps an adjective: Wilcken
 months.' PK. 1. 73, 77. г@-ло́dıov 'that which has three feet,' 'a tripod,' cf. тpínous. Antiphan. frg. 3. 146 ; Men. frg. 4. 143 ; Insc.
 Schol. Od. $\delta 603$; Aretae Cur. M. Diut. 2. 13. $\pi \varepsilon v \tau$-óquıov ${ }^{3}$ ' a quantity of five $\mathrm{b}^{2} x i \alpha_{1}$. .' Epich. frg. 10. The significance of this small list is further increased by the fact that all of these words, with the exception of $\tau \rho \iota \pi \delta \delta \delta 0 \%$, which was felt as congeneric to other names of vessels in -cov, and perhaps was formed by their influence rather than the compound forming -ov, were very rare words. Moreover, for the Sicilian $\pi$ evvóruov (see note) Italic influence is probable, as

 Lat. bi-sellium). Certain of direct borrowing from Latin we are in case of тpıójruov 'Iz ${ }^{\text {hıcóv. CIG. 8549. The reason for the differ- }}$ ence of attitude to these compounds between Latin and Greek is to be sought in the fact that in Latin the use of -ium forms as collectives, with which integral numeral compounds have a certain similarity, was quite frequent, while in Greek both of these uses were felt as somewhat incongruous with certain other meanings of tov, namely

[^12]＇something like，but not equivalent to the primitive（§ 132 ff ．）＇ and the diminutive meaning．Consequently the feminines in the very common collective suffix $-t \bar{\alpha}$ were preferred for integral numeral com－ pounds also，so e．g．in $\delta t-\omega \beta \varepsilon \lambda i \alpha, \tau p l-\omega \beta \varepsilon \lambda i \alpha, \tau p t-\sigma \tau \iota \% i \alpha$, etc．

53．b）Compounds of $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{L}$－．The very same reason which accounts for the rarity of the words discussed in the last paragraph also ex－ plains the frequency of those beginning with njut－．ं $\mu \mu-\sigma \tau i y$ yov＇ a half line＇was also a short line，and so its suffix could suggest the di－ minutive meaning of－tov，although having nothing to do with it in its formation．inul－$\varepsilon$ र́yvov＇a half art，＇i．e．a wretched art，could suggest the deteriorative use．Oftener the idea＇something like，but not complete＇could be attributed to the suffix，e．g．iju－－çaxipov＇a half，but not a complete sphere，＇र्भu－－xozó̀iov＇a half，but not a full cup．＇For this reason，and because the transition to exocentric mean－ ing was particularly easy in this kind of compound（§47），large numbers of them were formed directly from their constituents，and only in four cases have I found corresponding adjectives：र̀módcov （sc．$\pi \lambda$ oiov）＇a vessel of one and a half banks of oars＇：रंןucó̀cos ＇consisting of a half and a whole．＇Hes．ìuь－хіхлиоv＇semi－circle＇：


 to these four words is the large number of compounds of nju－without corresponding adjective，largely with esocentric meaning or on the border line：ìu－ávঠ＠tov＇a half man，＇＇eunuch．＇cf．そví－avōpos．


 heov＇a half finger＇s breadth．＇Insc．Att．CIG．123．25；Insc．An－ dania Ditt ${ }^{2}$ ．653．21．$\eta_{\mu \iota-\delta \iota \pi \lambda o i \delta \iota o v ' ~ ' a ~ w o m a n ' s ~ d r e s s ~ d o u b l e d ~ o n ~ t o p ~}^{\text {a }}$ so as to fall half－way down the figure．＇Ar．Eccl．318．ijuu－9由＠ixuov ＇half－thorax，＇i．e．front plate of thorax．Plut．2． 596 D．inu－xédıv


 Blemm．236．＇ทuル－хотí九ıor＇＇a half cup．＇Arist．H．A．6．18． 573 a 7.
 Ael．Tact．5．خ̀u－oíyzıov＇half an ounce．＇Epich．ap．AB．98． 33. inue－tódıण＇a half foot．＇Theophr．H．A．7．2．7：Insc．Att．Ditt ${ }^{2}$ ． 537．72．ìuc－т $\lambda$ ivitoov＇a half brick，＇because half as long as wide，
 according to Dittenberger ad loc., a half-grown sheep. Insc. Delph.
 'a hąlf shekel.' Hes. ì $\mu$-бьíxovv 'a half-line.' Tambl. V. P. 162.
 そ̀u-téxvoov 'half an art,' i. e. a wretched art. AB. 651. ท̀u-tívov

 Suid. ŋो $\mu<-\varphi \omega \sigma$ 'िvov 'a half $\varphi \omega \sigma \omega v$,' a kind of garment. Ar. ap. Poll.



 half bricks.' Insc. in Müller Mun. Ath. p. 34. т@--ұиєtóvıov 'three half tones.' Plut. 2. 389 E . т@ь- $\boldsymbol{\mu \iota \omega} \boldsymbol{\beta o ́ \lambda \iota o v ~ ' t h r e e ~ h a l f - o b o l s . ' ~ A r . ~}$ frg. 2. 963 (15).
54. How slight was the feeling of relationship between these substantive compounds of $\eta_{n \mu-}$ and the original adjectival force of their -oov, is further seen from the fact that when a corresponding adjective was wanted, it was not made by simply treating the stem in -to- as an adjectival stem, but by the addition of the denominative suffix -alo-;


 tensively that the conglutinate -tcoo- was abstracted from them and used to form denominative adjectives from such compounds of njur-

 ßoiov. In ípup.pvaxios -tavo- has taken upon itself the function of toin forming an adjective compound directly from its constituents $\tilde{\eta} \mu \mathrm{L}-$ and $\mu \cdot \eta_{v} v$.
55. c) Compounds of ${ }^{2}$ xpo-. The same resemblance to the meaning 'something like, but not equivalent to the primitive,' which caused so many -tov compounds with $\eta_{\mu}$ of the suffix in other compounds which designated a part of the simplex, particularly those beginning with $\dot{\alpha}$ upo-. In none of the following list except $\dot{\alpha}$ xpooivivov (cf. its adjectival use in Aesch. Eum. 834, $\alpha \times p o-$ Oivco Oón . . . Ěyouot) is there any trace of adjectival origin, and al-

[^13]most all are completely esocentric. $\dot{\alpha x \varrho-\alpha \xi o ́ v o v ' ~ ' e n d ~ o f ~ t h e ~ a x l e . ' ~}$
Poll. 1. 145. dxoo- ̧ú of the heap,' i. e. best part, first fruits etc. Pind. N. 7. 41 ; Thuc. 1. 132. 2. áxoo-xıóvıov 'top or capital of pillar.' Philo 2. 147. ảxoox '่ $\iota o v$ 'end of a limb,' 'extremity of body.' Pherecr. frg. 2. 300 (1.14) ; Ar. frg. 2. 945 ; Stratt. frg. 2. 766 (2). áx@-о $\mu$ с́́дıov 'top i. е. middle of navel.' Poll. 2. 169. «̉xळо-ло́бҰเоv 'fore-skin.' id. 2.
 of pole.' id. 1. 146. áxoo-бtry'fıov '(top of) chest.' Arist. Physiogn. 6. 810 b 17. ảx@o-бtóдıov 'gunwale of a ship.' Plut. Dem. 43. áxoo-
 'rounded tip of finger.' Ermerius Anec. Med. p. 15. áx@o-бৎíœıov
 end,' 'end of poem.' Thuc. 2. 17. 1. aंx@o-чíбıov'snout of a pair of bellows.' Soph. ap. AB. 373. 15 ; Hes. ¿¿xюшньov' tip of shoulder.' Arist. H. A. 8. 28. 606 a 16.
56. d) Other compounds designating a part of the simplex. öтьбधo-
 Melamp. palp. p. 493. $\mu \varepsilon \sigma-\alpha i \chi \mu \iota \nu v$ ' middle of spear.' Hes. $\mu \varepsilon \sigma о$ -

 'rump,' 'tail.' Ar. Nub. 158. xvxג-ผ́тıov ' the circle part of the eye,' 'the white round.' Arist. H. A. 4. 8. 533 a 9.
57. Smaller excursive groups of words under B. (1) Articles of



 following compounds in $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \circ-(\S 58) \mu \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon v \tau \varepsilon ́ p \circ \circ v, \mu \varepsilon \sigma \sigma x \alpha ́ p \pi \tau \sigma v, \mu \varepsilon \sigma \circ-$



 those words which are derived from names of vessels, like njulappópıov and $\eta_{\mu} \mu \times \sim$ oúncov, form a special group which could be connected with the simple names of vessels in -七v. Cf. § 260 C .

## C. Miscellaneous Compounds.

58. A special group is composed of a large number of words beginning with $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \sigma-$, which are of a heterogenous semantic character.

The few words which owe their -tov to their designating a part of the simplex are mentioned $\S 56$. A larger number is caused by the use of $\mu \varepsilon \sigma 0-$ in the same sense as the preposition $\mu . \varepsilon \tau \alpha$ 'between,' and is thus a group of exocentric compounds. So $\mu \varepsilon \sigma-\alpha i x \mu \iota \sigma v$ 'space
 Arist. H. A. 1. 16. $495 \mathrm{~b} 32 . \mu \varepsilon \sigma 0$ - $\mathbf{v o v}$ ótıov $=\mu \varepsilon \sigma \sigma$-रóvıov' 'the space between two knots or joints.' Theophr. H. P. 4. 11. 6. $\mu \varepsilon \sigma 0-\mu \dot{\mu} \dot{\xi} \iota o v$ 'space between the breasts.' Diocl. ap. Orib. 109 ed. Mai. $\mu \varepsilon \sigma o-$

 between the buttocks.' Schol. Ar. Plut. 122. $\mu \varepsilon \sigma o-\pi$ ígyov 'space
 'space between two veins.' Gloss. The remaining compounds of $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \circ-$ owe their -tov to the analogy of the other groups; it became the habit to attach the suffix to any compound beginning with $\mu \varepsilon \sigma 0-$ regardless of meaning. In the following list the first member designates simply that the second is in the middle of something, thus $\mu \varepsilon \sigma-o \mu \varphi \alpha \lambda_{\imath} \iota v$ (Poll. 2. 169) is 'the navel that is in the middle' of the body, $\mu \varepsilon \sigma o-\varphi \alpha$ áryıov (Gloss.) is 'the ravine that is in the middle' $^{\text {a }}$ between two hills, etc. All of this group is thus esocentric. Other examples are $\mu \varepsilon \sigma-\alpha v_{\imath} \iota o v$ 'a piece of flute music played in the interval' of the choric song. Eust. 862. 19. нєбo-xivıov 'pastern of a
 middle wing-feathers.' Ael. N. A. 7.17. $\mu \varepsilon \sigma-$ óvøっov 'boundary.' Dion. P. 17.
58. Of other types of compounds in -tov only a very few examples need be mentioned. The final member has verbal force in $\eta^{j} \lambda c o-$

 in everything,' i. e. a combination of wrestling and boxing. Xenophan. 2. 5; Herod. 9. 105. The first member has verbal force in $x \propto \psi$ «détiov 'that which receives the perspiration,' 'sudarium.' Com. ap. Poll. 7. 71. т@vб-ítтtov (: 七ৎíw) 'a mark burned upon a horse superannuated in the public service.' Eupol. frg. 2. 555 (17). The first member is an adjective modifying the final member in the
 'an empty tomb,' 'cenotaph.' Xen. An. 6. 4. 9.

## VIII. -tov AS A SUFFIX OF APPURTENANCE.

59. Whatever the original meaning of the -(i)io- suffix, and whatever its origin, its sphere was extremely large and perplexing already in I. E. times. By abstracting, however, the term of description 'belonging to' or 'connected with' for a large group of uses which are closely related, a convenient starting point for a system of arranging the different meanings presents itself, but it does not follow that this is to be regarded as the real "Grundbedeutung." For, on the one hand, a very narrow concrete meaning still in existence may have given rise to this general meaning; on the other hand, it is highly probable that the suffix itself is of composite origin, and partly a mere conglutination of the - $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{of} \mathrm{i}$ stems and the adjective forming -0 -, in which case there never was a homogeneous sphere of meaning, and any concrete usage may have been adapted from the vague adjectival function of the suffix. Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 187; for the Sanskrit, Whitney, Skr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 1210 a.
60. The meaning 'belonging to,' 'connected with,' is seen in such adjectives as Skr. sénya-s Av. haēnya- 'belonging to the army,' Gr. тoupévio-s 'belonging to the herdsman,' Lat. uxoriu-s 'belonging to the wife,' O. H. G. edeli : adal, 'belonging to the nobility,' O. Blg. člově̌̌ : člověkъ, 'belonging to man,' 'human' (cf. § 108). The Greek substantivized neuters of these are of great number and variety, differing according to the manner of substantivation, the nature of the primitive, and the character of the congeneric words which have been influential in their formation. According to this latter point of view they largely fall into a number of definite groups, according to which they will be classified.

## 1. PLACE NAMES.

61. Since the idea of the place connected can also develop from original action nouns ( $\$ 34 \mathrm{D}$ ), it is sometimes doubtful how a given word originated. So $\sigma 0 v \alpha \operatorname{com}^{\prime}$ rov (§ 35) might have come directly from the abstract noun covarorn' as 'that comnected with the assembling,' répprov' field' may as well have developed from the action noun réprov as have been 'that which belongs to the husbandman ( $\gamma \varepsilon \omega \rho \gamma \delta)_{\text {) }}$, etc.

Place names in tov can be subdivided into several groups of more closely related words.
62. A. The primitive is an action noun. Edoblan: a lost ab-
stract * $\varepsilon \delta \dot{\sigma} \omega \lambda \eta$, 'that which is connected with the sitting,' 'seat,' 'abode.' Aesch. Choeph. 71; Soph. El. 1393; 'rowers' seats' or designates a part of the deck in Soph. Aj. 1277; 'socket of the
 which is connected with the turning in,' 'an inn.' Thuc. 3. 68. 3; Plato Phaedr. 259 A. xגiotov: x入iors, 'that which is used for sleeping,' 'a place for sleeping,' especially for servants ( $\omega$ 208), whence in Attic the idea 'wretched hut,' as Lys. 12. 18. ${ }^{1}$ órt兀'̃́vov 'kitchen':
 Equ. 1033; CIA. 2 add. 834 b 2. 53 (329 B. С.). бтєч $\downarrow \downarrow \pi \lambda$ о́хıк: $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \varphi \alpha m \pi \lambda$ orov, 'that which is connected with the plaiting of wreaths,' the place where wreaths are plaited. Anth. P. 12. 8.
63. B. The primitive is an agent noun, the place being represented as connected with the person. Of this type there are quite a number of examples in spite of the encroachment of -stov (\$ 16).


 occur beside those in -tov where the latter is phonetically justifiable,
 side $\tau \alpha p y \% \pi \omega \lambda_{1 . o v}$; but this must not lead us to assume that -tov is a mere corruption of -stov. This is altogether excluded because those words which have -ov are on the whole those in which it is phonetically justified, and because indisputable inscriptional evidence supports it in this use, so e. g. already in the beginning in the fourth

 occurs in place of expected -tov it is due to later encroachment. Subsequently it became productive in all classes of place names, and



In giving the examples I begin with those derived from compounds of $-\pi \omega^{\prime} \lambda_{\xi}$, but otherwise the list is alphabetical. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda о \pi \bar{\omega} \lambda_{\iota o v}$ 'salt works' : $\dot{\alpha} \lambda, \pi \omega \lambda \lambda_{n}$ 'dealer in salt.' Pap. Ber. 9.1.14, 4. 17. д̌@ıo-



 'fish monger.' Insc. Sarmat. (see above). иv@олш́дıov 'perfumer's

[^14]shop＇：$\mu \nu р о \pi \sigma$ ìns＇perfume seller．＇Lys．24．20；Dem．25．52．т«＠t－




 1．165；Thuc．7．50．2．At Athens vò Ęprópoov was the merchants＇ exchange，so Dem．35．1．цк＠tígov＇：$\mu \alpha_{\rho}$ rup，＇the place in which a martyr＇s relics are preserved，＇＇a martyr＇s shrine．＇CIG．8616．vewî̀－

 who takes care of the ships，＇＇superintendent of the dock－yards．＇
 （see above）．тuбírүıov＇shoe－maker＇s shop＇：đícuryos＇shoe－maker．＇
 frg．4．517．ழ＠ov́œov＇watch－post，＇＇citadel＇$:^{1}$ 甲poupós＇watcher，＇ ＇guard．＇Thuc．7．28． 1 ；Lys．12．40．чœvхтө́＠ıv＇light－house，＇＇bea－ con tower＇：甲pux $\quad$ ©pós＇fire－watcher．＇Plut．Poinp． 24.

64．A spezial group of place names is formed from agent nouns



 Since agent nouns in－rns sometimes existed beside those in－mp， e．g．$\delta$ ox $\alpha \sigma$ ris beside $\delta$ ox $\alpha \sigma$ vip，the place names in－tipoov could be referred to the former，whence new formations like $\dot{\mu}$ оoout ${ }^{\prime} \rho o v$＇audit－
 shop＇：بpovtiotins＇thinker＇（Ar．Nub．94）．

65．C．The primitive is a name of an animal or thing．$\dot{u} \lambda e x-$
 610．$\alpha v^{\prime \prime} \neq \iota 0 v$＇that which belongs to the $\alpha\langle\lambda \dot{n}$ or farm－yard，＇a country house，＇＇stable，＇etc．H．Hom．Merc．102，106，134；Theocr．25． 87. $\chi \varepsilon \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \iota \circ v: \chi \varepsilon ч \mu \dot{\alpha} \varepsilon$, ＇that which is suitable for winter，＇＇winter quarters．＇ Dem．4． 32.

[^15]66. D. Geographical names. Why an extensive study of geographical names in -tov is of no purpose here, has been shown $\S 6$. There is furthermore uncertainty as to how far the Greek is influenced by foreign models. Thus there are in Phrygian a number of words like $\Delta o x i ́ \mu o v$ ' city of $\Delta$ óxupos,' for which cf. Kretschmer, Einl. 183. Nevertheless the derivation of new geographical names in -tov from historical Greek words shows that the meaning 'belonging to ' played a part in native Greek derivation also. So $\Delta \eta \mu \eta_{1} \tau p$ ov was 'the city of $\Delta \eta \mu r_{i} n_{p}{ }^{\prime}$ (cf. Pape, Lex. Gr. Eig. s. v. 4), Пo

 avojoos.' Probably a great many words of this kind either arose by ellipsis or followed others which arose by ellipsis. Thus the town of 'Aprsuifoov is named after the sanctuary of Artemis, which in turn goes back to тò 'Apтєpiotov ispóv (§ 67).
67. E. Sanctuaries of gods and heroes, a special case of the preceding, which in the beginning arose by ellipsis of words like iepóv or $\alpha \chi \lambda \sigma o s$, of which we still have a remainder in the use of the phrase тò ( चйs) 'Aprépuios ispóv (Pape, op. cit. sub 'Aprғuícovv) instead of
 statue of 'A $A \delta \lambda^{\prime} \lambda \omega v$ Kapveĩos. However, the great number of such formations without trace of a substantive modified shows that usually an ellipsis was no longer felt, and the substantivized adjective was sufficient both for the idea 'belonging to' and that of the temple or sanctuary. Of the large number of these words I may mention : iò


 4. 118. 4.
68. Analogically to these words, adjectives in -to- derived from place names and designating a god or hero as connected with the place, could give rise to substantivized neuters designating his sanctuary. The -tov, then, changed its character under the influence of the type
 Athens, Dem. 23. 74; ì̀ $\Delta \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \iota o v, ~ ' t e m p e l ~ o f ~ ' A ~ A ~ \delta ~ \partial \lambda \lambda \omega v ~ \Delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota o \varsigma,{ }^{\prime}{ }^{1}$ Arist. ap. Plut. 2. 254 F ; rò ${ }^{~}$ Ehevaivov : 'Eגsuaivos, 'the temple of the Eleusinian goddess ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{2}$ i. e. of $\Delta$ njuin $\quad$ np. Thuc. 2. 17. 1.

[^16]
## 2. WORDS DESIGNATING GAMES, FESTIVALS, RITES etc.

69. This widely productive type probably originated with the ellipsis of a word like ispó 'rites.' Only a few examples of the different groups will be given.
 departure' of Aphrodite at Eryx: $\alpha \nu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma^{\prime}$ 'departure.' Ael. V. H.

 Poll. 1. 37.
B. The primitive is the name of a god or hero, or person otherwise connected. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} v \vartheta \varepsilon \sigma \varphi \varphi_{0} \rho \iota \alpha$, the festival in honor of Kópn, who





 (cf. $\left.\mu \nu \sigma \tau \tau_{\varsigma}\right)$ 'one initiated.' Herod. 2. 51; Ar. Ran. 887.
C. The primitive is a geographical name. In this case there usually is an intermediate adjective in -to- which designates a god as connected with the place, e. g. Ańдıos applied to Apollo as being particularly connected with Delos. That however the interpretation e. g. of $\tau \dot{\alpha} \Delta \dot{r}_{\lambda \lambda c \alpha}$ (Xen. Mem. 4. 8. 2) was not 'the festival of the Delian god,' but 'the festival at Delos' is shown by the fact that the locality of the festival is always the place designated by the primitive: $\tau \dot{\alpha} \Delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \alpha$ is not the festival of Apollo at any place, but only at Delos, $\tau \grave{\alpha}{ }^{\text {' }}$ E ${ }^{\prime}$ evoiví (Schol. Pind. Ol. 9. 150) is only the festival at Eleusis. So also $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ' ${ }^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime} \neq \mu \alpha$ (Ar. Pax 879) 'the festival at the


## 3. WORDS DESIGNATING FEES, FINES, REWARDS, OR PRIZES.

70. In most cases the primitive is an action noun: $\delta$ oxyóroov is 'that which is connected with transit ( $\left.\delta \Delta x \gamma^{(\omega)} \gamma \gamma_{1}\right)$,' notríprov is 'that which is connected with the $\kappa$ óv $\alpha \beta$ os game,' i. e. its prize. It may, howevever, also be an agent noun, as in case of $\mu$ кecoixiov 'metics tax': $\mu$ réooxos 'metic,' Opsrvipeca 'rewards to the rearer': Upsminp. How
 is impossible to decide, perhaps all of the pattern types arose in this
way．The resulting congeneric group was no doubt associated with certain compounds in－tov which were formed directly from their con－

 to words of either or both of these classes arose cóxiov＇interest，＇ having the same meaning as its primitive toxos．

A．Fees and fines．ひ̉ aućvıov＇fee for delay，＇as if：＊גu $\mu \boldsymbol{o v}$＇de－ lay，＇cf．ג̀vap．oví（Hes．）．Insc．Delph．CB． 2561 A 50，54．дıčárıov：



 （ 4 th cent．B．C．）．$\mu о \iota \chi \alpha ̛ \gamma \varrho \iota \alpha$ ：ä $\gamma \rho \alpha$ ，＇a fine for being caught in
 4．47．3；Poll．9．30．то́xєov＝то́xоя，＇interest＇（see above）．Insc． Delph．CB． 2561 A 57.


 （cf．$\delta \alpha \sigma \mu \sigma_{\varsigma}, \sigma \chi \boxed{\sigma} \mu \dot{\delta}$ ，etc．），a certain＇gift of honor to the priest．＇Insc．

 ＇reward for life saved．＇$\circ 462 ; \Sigma 407$（here close to Opsतrйpıc in
 nurses by the parents or to the parents by the children．H．Hom．
 Arist．Rhet．1．12． 1373 a 23 ；Callipp．frg．4．561；Com．An．frg． 4.
 Antiphan．frg．3． 29.

## 4．INSTRUMENT NOUNS．

71．Besides those instrument nouns in－ov which were originally action nouns，the relation of which to the class here described have been set forth $\S 34 \mathrm{~F}$ ，the earliest stratum is composed of those words in which the suffix originally denoted the instrument as be－ longing to，connected with，or used for a certain action，so e．g． iঠpaү⿳亠⿴囗十丌 water，＇i．e．＇an aqueduct＇；$\gamma p \alpha \varphi i o v: ~ \gamma p \alpha \varphi$＇n，＇that which is used for writing，＇i．e．＇a pencil＇；$\lambda$ oútpoov：$\lambda$ outpóv，＇that which is used for
bathing,' i. e. 'bath-water.' The early age of this class is attested not only by the fact that at least one of these words, viz. $\dot{\alpha}_{\varepsilon}^{e} \cdot \lambda \cdot \lambda 0 \mathrm{v}$, is already Homeric, but also by the comparatively large number without

72. In a few cases the idea of instrumentality is derived from a primitive that is an agent noun, as in $\nabla_{\varepsilon} \lambda x$ riporov: $\nabla_{\varepsilon} \lambda x$ orip, 'that which belongs to the charmer,' 'a means of charming.' Oftener, when an instrument noun is derived from a primitive in - onp, the latter is only formally an agent noun, but semantically an instrument noun; for agent suffixes are often applied to inanimate objects by vividly conceiving them as the actor. So $\pi 0$ trip is literally 'drinker,' but applied to that with which one drinks, i. e. designates a cup. When -tov is added to this word the real meaning is not changed: rocnipoov has gotten its suffix merely by congeneric attraction of other instrument nouns in which it did have a modifying influence.
73. Through the same kind of analogy instrument nouns ending in any suffix could be extended by -tov without change of meaning:
 \%\% $\pi \varepsilon \alpha \varsigma$.
74. It is questionable how far -ov acted or was felt as a primary instrumental suffix. It was, of course, easy at any time to refer a derivative from a verbal abstract to the verb itself, but in case of -tov there are almost no certain indications that this was really done; for we are in only one case obliged to assume that it formed an instrument noun directly from a verb-stem, namely そ̌ávov 'a comb':
 ing-pail? is also verbal; for the abstract $\dot{\alpha} \mu .0 \lambda \gamma^{\prime}$, which might be its primitive, occurs only in the mediæval Eumathius, and so there is no great probability of its existence in Alexandrian times. The conglutinate -rnpov, on the other hand, abstracted from words like $\pi$ oorn-
 stead of to $\pi$ otnip, appears as primary suffix already in Herodotus in
 formations were probably more frequent than would appear at first sight; for in some cases where - tnpov and - tnp exist alongside of each other, the fact that the latter forms occur only in late writers would point to the probability that they were partly due to retrograde derivation from the former, to which the - erpoov would then have been added as a primary suffix. So orpuaverip does not occur until $\Delta$ pollonius of Rhodes, while onjuxverposy is found in Aeschylus: Supuatripoov
is the usual form from Herodotus on, while Oupuctin occurs only in late ecclesiastical writers.
75. As in case of place names ( $\$ 63$ ) - $8 t 0 v$ encroached upon -tov in instrument nouns. ona@̨iov 'a digging-tool,' while derived from oxapsús 'a digger,' could be connected with the abstract oxạn' 'digging.' From such words -sıov was extended to cases like $\lambda 0 \not 1 \beta$ вĩov 'libation cup' : $\lambda o \leftrightarrow \beta \dot{\eta}$, instead of the expected * ${ }^{\prime}$ ooßiov. ${ }^{1}$
 which is connected with the contest,' 'instrument of contest.' $\varphi 62$,

 used for watering,' 'watering-pot.' Poll. 8. 66. रœoчiov : रooфй, 'that which is used for scratching or writing,' 'a pencil.' Hipp. 261. dє́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$ : $\delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \delta_{\varsigma}$, 'that which is used for binding,' 'fetters.' Anth. P.

 ing about,' or 'for surrounding.' ${ }^{2}$. The general meaning 'clothes' occurs Herod. 1. 9; Dem. 27. 10. 'Pieces of cloth' in Herod. 4. 23. Usually specialized into the meaning 'an outer garment' or 'cloak' worn above the $\chi_{\imath} \tau$ ๘ढv : Hippon. 83 ; Herod. 2. 47 ; Xen. Hell. 1. 7. 8; the form sipúztov in Insc. Cos Roehl IA. 395. 2 (5 th cent. B. C.); Insc. Andania Mich. 694. 16 (91 B. C.). גov́totov 'bath-water':入outpóv 'bath.' Ar. Equ. 1401, frg. 2. 1071. Taíyvov perhaps from an abstract noun *Tav$\gamma \sim \dot{\eta}$, 'that which is used for play,' 'a plaything.' Ar. Eccl. 922 ; Plato Legg. 796 B, 803 C. тৎобауө́үөоv: $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \alpha-$ $\gamma \omega \gamma^{\prime}$, a tool used by carpenters for straightening wood. Plato Phileb. 56 C. otviov 'sieve' as if: *own' 'sieving.' Hes., ouviov'

 'that which is used for straining,' 'a strainer.' Schol. Nic. Al. 493.

[^17]पegriov: ழepvi, ${ }^{1}$ 'that which is used for carrying,' 'a fish-basket.' Men. ap. Eustath. 742. 59.
77. B. The primitive, formally considered, is an agent noun in - rnp. A comparatively large part of these are names of vessels (cf. § 129), which are particularly often, though for the most part mistakenly, classed as diminutives. In case of xparipiov and qux-ripoov this interpretation is possible, while it is improbable for $\pi \varepsilon \rho p p o v=r_{i}$ pov, which seems to be a primary formation (§74), and impossible for тoripoov, which is the generic name for all kinds of drinking cups, and for Oupuarípov and hournprov, because modified by $\mu \varepsilon ́ \gamma \alpha_{s}$ and $\mu$ ér $\quad$ tovos in the passages quoted below. Examples (with context when it has bearing on the question of diminutive usage): פvucoc íoov: Ovpuccíp, 'vessel for burning incense,' 'censer'. Herod. 4. 162; CIA. 2. 678 B 31 (378-366 B. C.), Dupua crip $[[]$ ov $\mu \varepsilon ́ \gamma \alpha$. है $\tau \varepsilon p o v ~ V v[\mu][\alpha-$


 xoi चpsic. hovińgov : גoutrip, 'bathing tub,' sometimes a kind of cup.
 (4); Antiphan. frg. 3. 120 (2); Epigenes frg. 3. 539 ; CIA. 2. 678 B 36.




 $03 \%$ ofrés. Other instrument nouns in -tripoov which are not names









78. C. The primitive is itself an instrument noun not ending in -rnp. In this case, as in the preceding, it is sometimes hard to decide whether the -tov form of such a pair of instrument nouns is

[^18]a diminutive. Such are certainly $\tau \varepsilon \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \rho \circ{ }^{\circ}$ 'a little gimlet': тépeтpov, and oqupiov 'a little hammer': oụ́p $\alpha_{2}$ in Theophr. H. P. 5.7.8, as is shown by the contrast with the large hammers: oiov opupiov p.e.v
 $\pi \iota \tau u i t v \alpha_{5}$ สoooṽot\%. In the majority of instances, however, primitive and -tov form do not seem to differ in meaning, as can be seen from the passages quoted. $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \iota o v=\delta \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon \alpha_{p}$ ' means of baiting.' Soph. or Sophron ap. Etym. Mag. 254. 52. ঠৎєт $\alpha v i ́ o v=\delta \rho \varepsilon \pi \alpha ́ v n ~ ' s c y t h e ' ~(c f . ~$
 Emp. M. 10. 149, 153. $\boldsymbol{\lambda \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \delta i o v ~}=\chi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon_{5}$ 'key.' Arist. Mirab. 32. 832 b 23 (of an ordinary house-key, and so not diminutive); CIA. 2. 766. 27 (341 B.C.). $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha ́ d \iota o v=\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha ́ s ~ ' t o r c h ' ~ i n ~ P l a t o ~ R e s p . ~ 328 ~ A . ~ . ~$
 Lebadea Ditt². 540. 119. $\mu о \chi \lambda i o v=\mu$ о́ $\lambda_{\lambda}$ оя 'lever.' Com. ap. Poll.




 ably influenced by $\sigma_{k n \pi}$ д́voov, for it can not itself have been associated

 diminutive $\beta \alpha x$ nnpía here precludes a diminutive notion).
79. A smaller excursive group of late instrument nouns is composed of names of surgeons' tools. These were partly patterned after the instrument nouns of $\S 71 \mathrm{ff}$., partly after $\mu \alpha y \alpha i p o v$ ' $a$ surgeon's knife,' which although it probably got its -tov in a different way ( $\S 150$ ), would naturally exert a strong influences as being the oldest and most frequent of the names of these tools to end in -tov. A list of surgical instruments is given in Cod. Laur. 74. 2 (11 th
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Dittenberger ad loc.
${ }^{2}$ Both $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \vartheta \rho \iota o \nu$ and $\pi \lambda . \bar{\eta}$ 亿 $\rho o \nu$ in the passage quoted can not be right, and so I assume rintooov to be the correct form. The fact that Alcman is mentioned in connection with these words makes Doric origin probable, and so $\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \tau \varrho o \nu$ could come from * $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{F} \varepsilon-\tau \varrho \circ \nu$ : $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \in$, and was conceived as 'that with which one sails.'
${ }^{3}$ The primitive $\sigma x \eta \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta$ occurs only AB. 794 in the meaning 'staff.' The classification of $\sigma x \eta \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu i o \nu$ as a diminutive is erroneous; for it occurs only $N 59$ and $\Omega 247$, in the latter passage applied to Priam's scepter, in the former to Poseidon's trident, for which the designation 'little staff' would be burlesque, not epic poetry.
cent.), which is compared by H. Schoene, Hermes 38. 280 ff., with a similar Latin list (Parisianus 11219) of the ninth century. In these, according to Schoene's reconstruction of the original Greek

 upumávov, $\psi \alpha \lambda i \delta \delta o v$. In some cases one list gives an -ov form and the other the primitive: thus $\alpha_{p}$ ítov occurs beside $\alpha_{p i s}$, povoropivov
 case of vaporixuov the primitive occurs in neither list, though used elsewhere. In no case, however, does one list give both forms, and this vouches for the fact that there was no difference in meaning between them, as does also the mention of words which occur only in the -tov forms, namely, povoonóorov and èmupoúatiov, unless these were influenced by the use of -tov in compounds.

## 5. NAMES OF VESSELS AND UTENSILS THAT ARE NOT INSTRUMENT NOUNS.

80. These really form one congeneric group with words like $\alpha \mu \omega_{0} \lambda-$ foov (§76), $\pi$ ornipoov (§ 77) and various other groups of words designating vessels (§ 260 C ). «̈ $\mu v \iota o v:$ Lat. sanguis, ${ }^{1}$ 'vessel for holding the blood,' i. e. in which the blood of the sacrificial victim was caught. $\gamma 444$. Designates the membrane around the fœetus

 which belongs to the hearth,' 'a pan of coals.' Ar. ap. Poll. 10. 101. inxviov : $\lambda$ óyvos, 'that which belongs to the lamp,' 'lamp-holder.' ${ }^{2}$ Antiphan. frg. 3. 29. Cf. ő $\beta \varepsilon \lambda \iota \pi o-\lambda$ íxvov 'a spit used as lampholder,' Theopomp. Com. frg. 2. 794. '̈ $\gamma x \iota 0 v$ ' casket for arrows or other implements' ( $\varphi 61$ ), if : ơ $\gamma x 0 \varsigma$ 'barb of an arrow,' belongs here,
 seems to be derived from a *payund 'eatables,' and was 'that which belongs to or contains the eatables.'
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Schulze, KZ. 29. 257.
${ }^{2}$ Oftener iuqueiov in the same sense. Cf. $\$ 63$ and note to $\$ 75$.
${ }^{3}$ When $\lambda v \chi \nu i o \nu$ designates the whole lamp it is probably a case of using the part for the whole. So Theocr. 21. 336 ; Lae. Symp. 46 ; Inse. Aread. Ditt ${ }^{2}$. 939. 16. That it should be a diminutive of $\lambda \dot{v} \chi \nu 0$; is clearly unsupported by the passages.

4 See Prellwitz ${ }^{2}$ sub öyzos II.

## 6. WORDS DESIGNATING ORNAMENTS.

81. The formation of names of ornaments from words which designate the part of the body upon which they are worn by means of a suffix of appurtenance is known in various I. E. languages. Thus -īno- occurs in O. H. G. fingerî 'that which belongs to the finger,' 'finger ring,' -(i)io- in Skr. angulīya-m, ${ }^{1}$ also 'ring' : angulī 'finger,'
 Somewhat similar are words like O. H. G. armilo 'sleeve,' 'that which belongs to the arm.' The Gr. masculine in -tos and the Skr. word in -ya- are sufficient proof that such forms originate in a different way than from faded diminutives; for Skr. -ya- in appellatives and Gr. -to- in masculines are not claimed for diminutives by anybody. Moreover, it is a highly improbable development of meaning from 'little finger' to 'finger ring,' since the later bears no resemblance to the former, or from 'little arm' to 'sleeve,' for the latter surrounds the arm and is even a little larger than the arm itself. Neither Kluge ${ }^{2}$ nor Brugmann ${ }^{3}$ offer any explanation for this.
82. Aside from the obviously closely related exocentric compounds like $\pi \varepsilon p \iota \alpha u y$ śvov and $\pi \varepsilon p$ oxápiov ( $\$ 51.1$ ) I have found only three
 'that which belongs to the arm,' 'armlet.' Poll. 5. 99. "' $\sigma$ 'quov : i $\sigma 0$ 省兑, 'that which belongs to the neck,' 'necklace.' $\sigma 300$. More
 ment for the neck. Perhaps its primitive, like $\sigma \tau \dot{\sigma} \mu \nless \circ \circ \varsigma$, originally could also mean 'throat' or 'neck,' in which case it is just like


## 7. PLANT NAMES (see § 257 B ).

## 8. WORDS DESIGNATING HERDS OF DOMESTIC ANIMALS.

83. These are derived from the names of the herdsman. ainóncov: $\alpha i \pi 6$ خ.os 'herd of goats,' was 'that which belongs to the goat-herd,' etc. aiүovóuıov 'herd of goats ' : airovóp.os 'goat-herd.' Hes., aitóiıcx • airo-
 1. 126. ßovxó̀ıov 'herd of cattle ': ßouxó ${ }^{\text {oss 'cow-herd.' Herod. l. c.; }}$ Theocr. 8. 39. ßovчópßıov 'herd of cattle' : ßouqopßós 'cow-herd.'
[^19]Eur. Alc. 1031. тоíuvon' 'herd of sheep ' : तoupriv 'shepherd.' Herod. 2. 2 ; Soph. O. T. 761 ; Arist. H. A. 8. 10. 596 a 19; Theocr. 6. 6. толисróøıи 'herd': тоцд́vep 'herdsman.' Aesch. Pers. 75 (meta-

 363. iogógßıov 'herd of swine' : טоч̣opßós 'swine-herd.' Strabo 197.

## 9. WORDS DESIGNATING A CELL, NEST, OR WEB OF AN INSECT

84. The meaning of the suffix in these words naturally often passes from 'belonging to' to coming from' (cf. § 92, 96).
A. Cells or webs of bees and wasps. xn¢iplov: xnipiv, 'that which






 xiov : $\sigma$ ทัं $\xi$, 'cell of a wasp's nest.' id. ib. 9. 41. 628 a 17, 19, 35 ,

 43.629 b 1. By congeneric attraction to the first three of these words,

 10. $760 \mathrm{~b} 34,4.4 .770 \mathrm{a} 29$ ), has received its $-t 0 v$. Cf. also xnpiov 'that which in made of wax.' and so 'a bee's cell' $(\$ 101 \mathrm{G})$.
B. Webs of insects. ¿ֻóxvoov: appápvn(s), 'that which belongs to

${ }^{1}$ I translate 'drone-cells' here also. Any attempt to rescue the diminutive character of the word in this one place by supplying iv ois yivortae with $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ x |  | $\eta^{\prime} v c c$, and thus translating the latter 'drone-grub,' is unallowable |
| ---: | :--- | for several reasons. In the first place, this would be the only example where a diminutive was used to designate an insect previous to its metamorphosis (cf. §95). Then, too, in the very same sentence the cells are referred to with respect to the working-bees and queens themselves, and why this sudden change of point of view to the grubs when it comes to the drones?

 doubtful passage, when twice below in the same paragraph it must necessarily be a drone-cell, while there is no good authority for the meaning 'drone-grub' in any place.
the spider,' 'spider's webs.' $0.280, \pi 35$; Plato Com. frg. 2. 620 ; Arist. H. A. 5. 8. 542 a 13 ; Theocr. 16. 96. Metaphorically of a certain web-like parasitic growth upon olive trees, Theophr. H. P. 4.

 id. ib 5. 27. 555 b 13.

## 10. WORDS DESIGNATING A PART of the primitive.

85. In this group also the meaning of the suffix sometimes shades into designating origin (cf. § 92,96 ), while for other words, e. g. poví $\alpha$, the interpretation 'belonging to' is the only possible one. Although the precise motive of formation is not in every case clear, so e. g. $\delta \omega \mu \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota o v$, it was on the whole a particularly prominent part of an object, one which was intimately associated with its name, which could be designated in this way. Thus the nostrils are the only part of the nose which would ordinarily be noticed apart from the nose itself, and the term poví 'that which belongs to the nose' is perfectly clear. Since these words do not form a particularly homogeneous group, the examples are arranged alphabetically without
 Eccl. 8, frg. 2. 957 ; Lys. 1. 24 ; Plato Resp. 3. 390 C. $x \alpha \lambda \nu \mu-$ $\mu \dot{\alpha} \iota \iota v: ~ х व ́ \lambda \imath \mu \mu \alpha, ~ ' t h a t ~ w h i c h ~ b e l o n g s ~ t o ~ t h e ~ c o v e r i n g ~ i . ~ e . ~ c e i l i n g, ' ~ '$ one of the pannels of a ceiling. Ar. frg. 2. 979 (20). xorxízıov : rovxjinn, 'that which belongs to or comes from a mollusk,' 'a mol-
 b 17, De Plant. 2. 829 a 19, H. A. 3. 15.519 b 21. x@crióv : x $\alpha_{p \alpha v o v, ~}^{\text {, }}$ 'that which belongs to the head,' 'the upper part of the head,' 'skull.' $\Theta 84$; Pind. I. 3. 72 ; Arist. H. A. 1. 7. 491 a 31. The frequent Attic use of xpaviov for the whole head is due to synecdoche (cf.
 (1. 23); Anaxil. frg. 3. 347 ; Eubul. frg. 3. 234, 258 (1.4); Amphis frg. 3. 307. £ovió : pis, 'that which belongs to the nose, ${ }^{1}$ 'the nostrils.' Arist. Physiogn. 3. 808 a 34. бทंлєov: $\begin{array}{r}\boldsymbol{\eta} \pi i \alpha, ~ ' t h a t ~ w h i c h ~\end{array}$ belongs to or comes from the cuttle-fish,' its bone. id. H. A. 4. 1. 524 b 24 . oidıov: oiin, 'that which belongs to or comes from the pomegranate,' 'pomegranate peel.' Ar. Nub. 881 ; Alciphr. 3. 60.
[^20]бтciभuiov：$\sigma \tau \alpha 0 \cdot \mu . \sigma_{5}$ ，＇that which belongs to the balance，＇＇weight of
 which belongs to or comes from the tortoise，＇＇tortoise shell＇（cf． noryóncov）．Arist．Part．An．3．9． 671 a 32.

## 11．MISCELLANEOUS．


 ßג́⿱⿰㇒一大口o人vos，＇that which has to do with a malignant person，＇＇a charm against malignancy．＇Ar．ap．Poll．7．108．v̀̀ ßeórұıє ：ßpóry\％s，＇that which belongs to the trachea，＇＇the bronchial tubes．＇Hipp． 386. $\delta \not \subset \delta i i^{2}: \delta \dot{\alpha}, 5$ ，＇that which belongs to the fire－brand，＇＇material for
 is connected with the teacher，＇＇a lesson．＇Herod．5．58．ह́ $\mu \pi \dot{\rho} \varrho \boldsymbol{\prime}$ ： épropos，that which belongs to or comes from the merchant，＇ ＇merchandise．＇Xen．Vect．1．7．iotiov ：ícoós，＇that which belongs to the mast，＇＇a sail．＇${ }^{3}$ A $480 \mathrm{f}$. ； $\mathrm{O} 627 ; \delta 578 ;$ H．Hom．Apoll．

 бסomtópos，＇that which belongs to the traveller，＇＇provisions for the journey．＇○ 506．rcudiov ：$\pi x i \xi$, a certain childrens＇disease．Hipp． 281．${ }^{4}$ inviov：$\pi$ rivn，$\pi$ ñvos，＇that which belongs to the web，＇＇the bobbin．＇Y $762^{5}$ ；Theophr．H．P．6．4．5；Anth．P．6．288．тегии （sc．$\delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \dot{\alpha}): \pi \rho \nu \mu \nu \dot{\gamma} \sigma \iota \sigma, \pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \mu \nu m$ ，＇the ropes belonging to the stern，＇
 belongs to the foal，＇i．e．the membrane around the foal in the uterus． Arist．H．A．8．24． 605 a 6．біо́иоv：$\sigma=0$ о́ $\alpha$ ，＇that which belongs to
${ }^{1}$ That words of this type were not felt as standing in any relation to the diminutives，is shown by the use of the conglutinate $-\varepsilon ו 0 \nu$ ，which never has diminutive meaning（§ 16），in the word $\chi$ encos ：$\chi$ zins，originally＇tor－ toise shell，＇then also＇crab＇s shell，＇because of its similarity，in Aratus 494.
${ }^{2}$ Only in the passage cited，where Bentley substituted Scadian or sceicur for the unmetrical $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \omega \nu$ of the manuscripts．
${ }^{3}$ The general meaning＇cloth＇found in LXX（Exod．27．9，15）is merely． a generalization from＇sail，＇＇sail－cloth．＇

4 Fäsi＇s conjecture racuixoò for rcuion is due merely to the common de－ sire to get rid of as many non－diminutive - onv words as pussible．
${ }^{5}$ Perhaps $\pi$ quiov here designates the woof．This meaning has probably given rise to the analogical formation ot $\eta \boldsymbol{\mu}$ óvov＇warp；＝ri，ucur．So Arist．Pol．2．6． 1265 b 20.
the mouth,' 'bit.' Herod. 1. 215, 4. 72; Aesch. Prom. 1009; Soph. El. 1462. $\sigma \omega \mu \dot{\alpha} \iota \iota \alpha$ : $\sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$, 'that which is around the body,' padding used by the actors. Plato Com. ap. Photius 563. 22.

## 12. PLURALS IN -єє WITH INDEFINITE MEANING.

87. It is by no means uncommon for neuter plural adjectives to become substantivized by taking up into themselves the idea of things in general in a sense closely approaching that of collectives. ${ }^{1}$ 㸚 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha}$ is 'the good things,' $\tau \dot{\alpha} x \alpha x \dot{\alpha}$ 'the evil things,' $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \varphi{ }^{\varphi} \dot{\alpha} \gamma<\alpha$ may designate the aggregate of everything connected with the slaughtering, i. e. the whole ceremony and its concrete belongings. Such words in -tov have usually been mentioned in their place according to the function of the suffix, but I have reserved for this section a special group in which this indefinite force of the Plural was the most important semantic factor. There are certain ideas in case of which the substantivized Neuter Plural of an adjective of appurtenance is practically equivalent to the Singular of the primitive. Thus $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ oixeix ' everything belonging to the house' may be entirely synonymous with olxos 'house,' in as much as the latter by itself will often suggest everything connected with the house in addition to the house itself. In this way the meaning 'belonging to' could cease to be connected with the adjectival suffix, and the original distinction between primitive and derivative became lost entirely. Finally, such a plural, since it might designate a plurality of concepts as well as a single concept, could become hypostasized and give rise to a corresponding singular, so that the derivative has completely lapsed back into the meaning of the primitive in both numbers. In this way there arose a number of words in -tov which, since they fail to show any distinction from their primitives, have often been forced into the diminutive pigeon-hole, but of which the prevailing use of the Plural number ${ }^{2}$ really shows their true origin.
88. The whole development of meaning is best illustrated by oixiov, which, though as old as Homer, is always found in the Plural till Alexandrian times. iò oixice was 'everything belonging to the house,' 'the whole household' (cf. ₹̀े oixeĩ and the original col-
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 645.
${ }^{2}$ It is also the exclusive use of the plural tì oixice in Classical times which militates against Brugmann's assumption that it was originally abstract. Cf. § 38 (end).
lective $\dot{n}$ oixix $)$. Sometimes, just as the German Gehöft designates a large estate as composed of a complex of different plots of ground, so $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ oixio implied the idea 'a complex of buildings.' It was consequently a most fitting term to apply to particularly large or elegant houses, and so we find it in Homer and Herodotus as a frequent designation of the palaces of gods, kings, and rich men. So it is


 palace $\mu 4$, 'Hoüs njpureveins Oixio. Of kings or rich men: Z 15 ;

 $\alpha v \alpha \sigma \sigma \sigma \omega$. Particularly often of the palace of Odysseus : $\beta 335 ; \delta$ 555 ;


 palace of Cleomenes) ; 8.35 (of the palace of Xerxes). While $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ oixix was thus particularly well adapted for designating palaces, it could from the beginning also be applied to any house whatever; for even a small house is complex enough to suggest the notion 'everything belonging to the house.' So च oixic is used of a shoemaker's dwel-





 $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ ợ́peral $z_{s} \tau \dot{\alpha}$ oixio. Frequent usage and failure of the hearer to grasp what was in the speaker's mind when it was practically indifferent whether the latter used $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ cixix or oixos (cf. e. g. خे̀ $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ dixix, Herod. 5. 51, either 'he went back to his palace' or 'to his house' or simply 'home ') caused the original fine distinction between the two to become lost entirely, so that $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ oixix, having become simply 'house' or 'home,' could be applied even to the haunts and dens of animals, where a notion of complexity is usually out of the question, as when the nest of a bird is so designated (M 221 ).
89. In all of the examples so far quoted the plural -x cixix denotes a single concept. It could, however, at any time also designate a plurality of concepts; for the accustomed force of the plural number would necessarily make itself felt just as soon as its origimal indefinite
meaning in-this word had faded. This process was further assisted by .phrases with $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ oixí and a plural subject, which would sometimes leave it undecided whether different individuals are connected with one house, or each with his own. In M 168, $̄ \varsigma ~ \tau \varepsilon ~ \sigma \varphi \tilde{\eta} \chi \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma o v ~ \alpha i o ́ \lambda i o t ~$ そेंठ̀े $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota$ Oixía $\pi o \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega v \tau \alpha t$, it is impossible to say whether the poet thought of a single swarm of wasps or bees building a single nest, or of different ones each building its own nest. On the other hand, a plurality of houses is undoubtedly in mind in the following pas-





 once definitely interpreted as a plural referring to a number of separate houses, and so put on a line with of olxot and ci oixicu, it was easy to form a corresponding singular, as was done in Alexandrian times: Call. frg. 198; Anth. P. 6. 203.
90. Below are the remaining words which attained to the meaning of the primitive in the manner described, or had a tendency to do so. Under each word. when the different stages are extant, I divide the examples as follows: a) plural referring to a single concept; b) plural referring to a plurality of concepts ; c) singular.
 people,' 'the commonwealth,' ' public property.' Ar. Vesp. 554, 'Eu-
 §quóбoov 'the state' is probably originally an abstract (§38); for it is earlier and much more frequent than the Plural, and so not derived from it.


'ixvo : '̌yvos, 'foot-steps,' 'tracks.' While the two words are synonymous from the beginning of the transmission, we may surmise that the primitive was at one time a verbal abstract with the meaning 'the stepping,' 'going,' 'gait,' and secondarily came to designate the foot-prints, just like the original English abstract foot-step and the German Fufstritt. $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ '̌yvec was 'everything connected with the walking,' not only the foot-prints, but also the manner of walking, the gait. This general meaning is extant in N 71, where Ebeling trans-

 came fixed exclusively，because they were the most conspicuous feature connected with the gait of a person．Examples：a）$\Sigma 321$ ；Под入えे








uпрio ：$\mu$ мро＇s，＇the parts belonging to or coming from the thigh＇
 a whole，as in case of the human thigh，he would use urposs（cf．
 he thought of the thighs of animals as they were cut up into parts for sacrifice，or of their fat and bones that were burnt upon the altar，he would use 〒ò $\mu$ npíx．Cf．Ebeling，Lex．Hom．s．v．Examples ：



 Callinus 2，unpí ка人入̀ $\beta$ 人ळ̃v．Theocr．17．126．c）only Posidonius
 $\beta \alpha v e v$.
ócı ：öpıos，öpos，＇what belongs to the boundary，＇i．e．boundaries，





öрхєа：óproos，öpxos，＇the things belonging to the oath，＇i．e．the offerings，rites，treaties，etc．，which were naturally soon confounded

 reminiscence of this more concrete meaning in the phrase bipues rápusev（B124；Г 105），which originally referred to the slaying of the victims，${ }^{1}$ but was later understood as designating the whole ceremony．
[^21]The latter or the oath itself was in the mind from the beginning in









 id. 7. 132, हैгवu.0ン 厄ैpriov.


 बtaүóvic.

وootía : ̣ópros, 'the things belonging to the load,' i. e. the things which constitute the load, wares, merchandise, etc. The original difference, that the singular primitive represented the load more as an entirety, while the plural in -t called attention to its parts, naturally soon became effaced. a) Hes. Op. 643, N $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime}$ b $\lambda i \gamma \eta \nu$ aiveiv, $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \gamma^{\alpha} \lambda \eta$




 $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha v \varepsilon \varepsilon \varsigma . ~ i d .4 .196$. c) In contrast to the loads of ships and wagons, which would appear as something complex, and would therefore be fittingly designated by the Plural, the load of a single man would usually be viewed as something of such unity that the Singular would be used, i. e. just a soon as the fading of the original meaning of the Plural would allow the creation of a corresponding Singular; for before this any -ov was inadmissable. So Ar. Ach. 214, ̣épovv



$\chi \omega \rho i \alpha: \chi$ м $\omega \rho \varsigma, \chi^{\omega} \rho \alpha$. While in case of the other words grouped here the theory that the Plural was the original number has received strong support from the fact that in the earliest writers in which they occurred they were either altogether or at least in the overwhelming
majority of instances used in the Plural, such support can not be claimed for $\chi^{\omega \rho i o v}$, which frequently occurs in both numbers as soon as it appears. But since we can distinguish the same three semantic groups as for the other words, and since $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ yopíc in Herodotus quite frequently occurs in the meaning 'regions,' without being a distinct plural to \% (шiov, we may surmise that the same grammatical transfiguration has taken place here also, though before its first appearance in literature, i. e. before the time of Herodotus, to whom I will consequently confine my examples, particularly since there is in him as yet no trace of the later tendency to specialize the word into the meaning 'strong-hold,' 'fortress.' ${ }^{1}$ a) $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi \chi^{(\omega)} \dot{i} \dot{\alpha} \alpha$ 'what belongs to a particular space or country,' 'the regions.' 1.57, चov riveiruvio (sc.









 the mind of the writer. Transition from a) to b) e. g. 1. 142, cyัच





 кхi $\Lambda \tilde{r}_{j} \mu \mathrm{vov}$. c) The singular $\chi$ (opiov, referring to a particular place.






${ }^{1}$ This fact makes the attempt of some lexicons to make $\chi$ weior a diminutive with the original meaning 'a small piece of ground' appear as diametrically opposed to the transmission, which shows that the supporsed wiginal use is really the latest of all.




## IX．－tov IN THE MEANING＂COMING FROM．＂

91．The use of the suffix（－i）io－in adjectives of parentage and origin is also already an Indo－European development．Not only does the Greek Tèдúóvos Ǎ̌as＇Ajax son of Telamon＇have its counter－ part in such patronymics as Skr．Túgrya－s＇descendant of Tugra，＇ or in the Latin and Oscan gentiles like Decimius，originally＇son，＇ later＇descendant of Decimus，＇${ }^{1}$ but also in adjectives derived from appellatives is this force of the suffix occasionally apparent：cf．Skr． abhríya－s＇from the clouds＇（：abhrá－m），Gr．àr，o̊ovios vópos＇song coming from the nightingale＇（Ar．Ran．684），Lat．uxorius imber ＇tears caused by the wife＇on account of her death（Statius Silvae 5．1．31）．

92．The ease with which this group of ideas can in nearly every case be derived from＇belonging to，＇would point to the conclusion that the former developed from the latter merely by the change of point of view of the speaker or by change of some external circum－ stance．Thus Teiapúvocos Aǐas was＇Ajax who belongs to the family of Telamon，＇but，since the head of the family was also the father of the children，Teixu．．́vos could be interpreted as meaning＇descended from Telamon，＇and so－to－could become a patronymic suffix．That this interpretation was actually made in some sections，is shown by the regular use of the conglutinate－sio－to form patronymics in the Aeolic dialects ：for which cf．Hoffmann，Griech．Dial．2．588．On the other hand，the meaning＇belonging to＇can become＇coming from＇through change of position of the object referred to．Kopiv－ Vros referring to a man at Corinth would be＇belonging to Corinth，＇ but when applied to a Corinthian abroad it at once became＇coming from Corinth．＇The same development takes place in neuter sub－
 tree＇$(\chi \varepsilon \rho \alpha \sigma \delta \varsigma))^{2}$ when growing on the tree，but when picked it was
${ }^{1}$ Cf．Deecke，Die Falisker 275 ff．
${ }^{2}$ Altogether different is the neuter «̈л七ov＇pear＇：＂̈тьos＇pear tree．＇The ending－tov is accidental，being due entirely to the fact that the Masculine had－七os（probably＜－七бoৎ，ef．Prellwitz ${ }^{2}$ s．«̈ $\boldsymbol{\pi} \iota o \varsigma$ ）．In various Indo－European languages fruits are sometimes designated by a neuter with the same stem
'that which comes from the cherry-tree'; ;îtov 'pomegranate peel,' when thought of as a part of the intact fruit, was 'that which belongs to the pomegranate ( $i(i \delta \eta$ ), ' but when the peel apart from the fruit was referred to, it was 'that which comes from the pomegranate'; xory'sicov (: xory'sin) would be 'that which belongs to the mollusk' when thought of as a part of the living animal, but 'that which comes from the mollusk' when the empty shell was seen.
93. The neuter substantives belonging here can be divided into two main classes according to whether they designate an animal or thing. In the former case the suffix implies that the animal designated by the derivative is descended from that denoted by the primitive, in the latter it calls attention to the origin of a thing.

## 1. - $o ㇒$ AS A SUFFIX OF DESCENT.

94. The notion of descent as applied to animals usually carries with it the idea of youth; for it is comparatively rarely in ordinary speech that there is occasion for indicating the descent of an adult animal. In this way patronymic suffixes in general have a tendency to become productive in words designating the young of animals, and
 young viper' Arist. H. A. 5. 34. 558 a 29, 兀ix ỏvi'tıov : ǒpves, 'a young bird' in Arist. H. A. 4. 9. 536 b 14, xai







 young sparrows (when fed).' Cf. also the conglutinate -(t)Soov in expioioov,

95. From the use of a suffix to denote the young of animals a diminutive meaning may easily develop; for the young are at the same

[^22]${ }^{1}$ Var. lect. for éxidec.
time small, and the notion of small size, though at first accessory, might become dominant. In this way the Germanic diminutives in -īna- largely or entirely orginated. ${ }^{1}$ 'For Greek -tov, however, even granting that a word of this kind may have been formed here and there with the idea 'coming from' in the mind of the speaker, yet for the mass of diminutives this origin is impossible; for there is not one word designating a young of an animal in which the idea of descent must have been uppermost. In case of insects, whose offspring has at first a different shape from the parents', and reaches it only after subsequent metamorphosis, the caterpillars and grubs are never designated by diminutives in -oov (for rnọivivov see § 84 A note). On the contrary, Aristotle, on whose scientific writings the burden of proof must rest in such questions, is careful always to use


 3. 9. 758 b 18). On the other hand the use of the adjective $\mu u x p$ ós in half the examples quoted above shows how prominent the idea of small size was to the mind of the Greek in the very cases which seem to be on the border line. And finally, for such a widely productive class as the diminutive we should expect to find pattern types that were constantly in the mouth of everybody, and not a few rare words or rare uses of words which were practically confined to special circles such as the scientific investigators. The young of the most common domestic animals were for the most designated by totally different stems than of the words designating the adults ; cf. $\pi \omega ึ \lambda 05$


## 2. - $\iota$ TO DESIGNATE ORIGIN.

96. By far the larger number of examples can also be interpreted as 'belonging to,' and have been discussed under that heading. Thus the idea 'coming from' might be present with more or less distinctness in the following words besides those mentioned in § 92: (1) Words designating cells, nests, or webs of insects (§ 84) : $\mu \varepsilon$ -
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Kluge, Nom. Stammb ${ }^{2}$. 29; Polzin, Stud. z. Gesch. des Dim. im Deutsch. 2 ff. Wrede, Die Dim. im Deutschen, p. 140 ff. et al., unaccountably assumes that the diminutive meaning must always have come about through the hypocoristic, instead of allowing direct development from the idea of descent.
$\lambda_{i \tau \tau u}$, 'honey-comb,' 'that which belongs to or comes from the bee,' similarly oppriov (but not enopiviov; for the drone, of course, does not
 (2) Words designating a part of the primitive (§ 85) : xoyrýucov 'mollusk's shell,' 'that which belongs to or comes from the mollusk,'
 which is connected with or comes from the foot-steps' (§ 90), $\mu r_{\mathrm{p}}^{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{i}$ ix 'the parts belonging to or coming from the thigh' (§ 90). Like x\&@ciotov (Diph. Siphn. ap. Athen. 51 A) 'cherry' (cf. § 92) is
 chestnut tree,' 'chestnut,' Galen. 6. 426. A group of words with the idea ' coming from ' uppermost consists of derivatives of geographical names and personal names: xvídı sc. хро́ $\mu \mu \nu \alpha$, a species of onions 'coming from Cnidus.' Theophr. H. P. 7. 4. 7. цvvváxua : Móvvaxos, a kind of shoe 'coming from, i. e. made by Mórvaxoc.' Poll. 7. 89. $\sigma \alpha x \alpha ́ \delta \iota o v: \Sigma \alpha \chi \alpha ́ \delta \bar{\alpha} \varsigma,{ }^{1}$ a musical instrument 'coming from, i. e. invented
 хро́цила, a species of onions 'coming from Samothrace.' Theophr. l. c. бќथдı兀 sc. хро́puцд, a species of onions 'coming from Sardis.' id. l. c. The singular oćodiov as well as the plural is used of a precious stone, 'that which comes from Sardis,' 'the Sardian stone.' ${ }^{2}$ Plato Phaedo 110 D ; CIA. 2. 708.7 (after 340 B. C.), 835 c-l 13 (320-317 B. C.).
 Poll. 7.93. Other words in which -tov expresses origin are : $\sigma \varepsilon \lambda \dot{\eta}$ иoov : reinim, 'that which comes from the moon,' 'moonlight.' Arist. Mir.
 coming from the neck,' then 'scraps,' 'offal.' Ar. Vesp. 968 ; Pherecr. frg. 2. 275.

## X. - $o v$ IN THE MEANING "MADE OF" OR "CONSISTING OF."

97. Formatives designating material are usually identical with those designating origin. This is true e. g. of the genitive and alllative case endings as well as of many adjectives of material. Thus, to take an example in -(i)io-, Skr. udaníya-s 'consisting of water" suggests abhríya-s 'coming from the clouds,' which had not yet the

[^23]idea of material present．There are also certain traces of this usage for Greek－七o－，even though its place in later times was in most dialects taken by－七vo－，－so－，and the conglutinate－sio－，since the sphere of meaning of these suffixes was more unified and less varied and complex than of $-t 0-$ ，and thus allowed the signification＇made of＇to become more vividly attached to themselves．－tov，however， occurs in certain adjectives of material in the Aeolic dialects，e．g． ypúros＇golden，＇$\chi \dot{\alpha} \lambda x$ xos＇of bronze，＇$\lambda i 0$ wos＇of stone，＇for which cf． Hoffmann，Griech．Dial．2．317，385．In Alcman，frg．75，we find
 further be raised how far－so－and－8七0－in adjectives of material in the Homeric poems were substituted for－to－in the course of trans－ mission by the scribes，to whom this use of the latter suffix had become a stumbling－block，because otherwise unknown to them．It must be born in mind that－so－and－to－are metrically equivalent， while for－sio－－to－can often be substituted by making slight textual
 （ $\Lambda$ 639）．

98．That neuter substantives in－tov which appear to be derived from adjectives of material are much more numerous than the ad－ jectives themselves，is in this light not surprising．The pattern types belong to an early period when the suffix was still productive in the adjectives，and they remained and gave rise to analogical formations long after the latter had dissappeared．

99．Brugmann，Gr．2． $1^{2}$ ．665，divides adjectives of material into two classes：either the material is something homogeneous as stone or wood，or it is complex，as in Lat．caprīnus Gr．a＇revios vupós＇cheese made of goats＇milk．＇In the latter case the conception was more likely to remain＇coming from＇the goat，and only after the meaning＇made of＇had become firmly established in other words，could the inter－ pretation of material find a place in those of this type．The tran－ sition from one meaning to the other is due to words in which change of point of view could cause change of interpretation．Thus oyoviov ＇rope，＇＇that which is made of reeds（ $\sigma$ yoivot），＇may have been＇that which comes from the reeds＇as long as these were thought of as they grew in their natural state；but the speaker would soon think of them rather as they were cut and prepared for rope－making，i．e． as raw material from which the finished product was made；for the

[^24]latter would preferably suggest them in this way. It was then almost inevitable to interpret the already existing word as 'made of reed.' Similarly $\mu$ rracovov 'juice of the poppy' could have been felt as 'that which comes from ' or 'is made of the poppy ' according to whether the association was with the natural plant or the process of manufacture.
100. Derivatives with the material idea are particularly often partial synonyms of their primitives, the latter then usually including the meaning of the derivative as well as other meanings. In most cases the cause of this is not the development of the -ov form so much as the common metonymy of designating a thing by the material out of which it is made. Just as the English sheep-skin is applied to the finished parchment no less than to the raw skin, so Greek乃i $\beta \lambda$ os 'papyrus' came to designate the papyrus roll made of it, and so became synonymous with $\beta$ ß $\beta \lambda i$ iov 'that which is made of papyrus,' i. e. 'papyrus roll' from the beginning. Similar is the relation of apyúpiov and äprupos, ypuoiov and ypuoós, sippo and sipos, muiiov and $\pi i \lambda o s$, outia and $\sigma i \tau o s$, oxoviov and oxoivos.
101. Collection of examples. I subdivide according to congeneric groups of associated words.
A. Words derived from names of metals. áprúpor: äp apos, that which is made of silver,' 'wrought silver,' 'silver money,' then 'money' in general. a) 'Wrought silver.' Thuc. 2. 13. 4, $\chi$ ( $\omega$ pis $\delta$ ถ̀
 section 3. b) On the border line between 'wrought silver' and

 àprupiou. id. 7. 28 ; Timocr. 1. 6. c) 'Silver money' e. g. Ar. Equu. 472, ờ च' ap in general Herod. 7. 214 ; Insc. Buent CB. 488. 72 (223-197 B. C.). e) Of a single piece of money Xen. Oec. 19.16. f) 'A small ain,' if we can trust the grammarian of AB. 1.442.10, 'Apróplov xaì -oे
 very well have misinterpreted the Aristophanic passage he cites. Cf. § 2. $\mu 0 \lambda \dot{\beta} \delta \delta \iota v$ : $\mu \dot{\delta} \lambda \cup \beta \bar{\delta} о \varsigma$, 'that which is made of leall,' 'a leaden
 ' an iron implement or tool.' Herod. 7. 18, 9. 37 (of a knife); Thuc.


 Poll. 16. 66 ; CIA. 2. 678 B 28, 41 ( $378-366$ B. C.), ib. 2. 659. 2
(ab. 350 B. C.). b) 'A cymbal.' Theocr. 2. 36. c) 'A copper coin.'

 39. 10, 久ovoiov: ұpuбós, 'that which is made of gold' (cf. the Aeolic adjective $\chi_{p}$ óroos). a) 'Wrought gold' ${ }^{1}$ in general, 'gold plate,' etc., almost synonymous with $\chi$ ¡ưós. Herod. 3. 95, 97, 4. 166; CIA. 2. 652 A 26 (398 B. C.) ; Insc. Aeol. CB. 213. 13 (ab. 390 B. C.); Insc. Delos Mich. 833. 40. b) 'Gold coin,' 'gold money.' Eur. Cycl. 161 ; Ar. Equ. 472 ; Plato Resp. 336 E. c) 'A golden vessel.' Insc. Delos Mich. 833. 38. d) For the hypocoristic use of the word ef. § 251.

Of these words ג́prupiov and ypuaiov form a particularly closely associated pair as being both derived from names of precious metals and as designating kinds of money. In this latter meaning these words influenced the use of $\chi^{\alpha} \lambda$ xiov for a copper coin, and, conversely, ypuriov as applied to a gold vessel was due to the influence of $\chi \alpha \lambda x i o v$ 'a copper vessel.'
B. Vessels made of earthen ware. The earliest and most frequent of names of vessels in -tov derived from the material out of which they are made is xє@ćquov : रغ́pגuo૬, 'that which is made of potter's clay,' i. e. 'an earthen vessel.' Herod. 3. 6; Arist. Categ. 15. 15 b 24 ; Insc. Att. Ditt ${ }^{2}$. 587. 13, 204 (329-328 B. C.). This word probably served as pattern type both for yaxxiov (see A end) and อ̉бт@ćzıov, which designates an earthen vessel in Arist. H. A. 8. 4.
 'potter's clay,' but always designates something made of it or of some similar substance, e. g. vessels, tiles, or castanets, it is probable that the meaning 'made of ' was never connected with its suffix, which was in that case due to the direct attraction of $\varepsilon \varepsilon \rho \alpha \alpha^{\mu}, 0 \%$.
C. Books, writing tablets, and the like. $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i o v(\beta \cup \beta \lambda i o v): ~ \beta i \beta \lambda \lambda o s$ ( $\beta \cup \beta \lambda_{0} \circ$ ), 'that which is made of papyrus-bark.' In Herodotus it designates a letter, ${ }^{2}$ e. g. 1. 125, 3. 128, 8. 128. It means 'book' e. g. in Plato Com. frg. 2. 672 (1. 2); Xen. Mem. 1. 6. 14 ; Plato Apol. 26 D . It does not at all follow from the usage of Herodotus that the word was originally a diminutive; for there is no evidence anywhere that any idea of small size was ever connected with it. The difference between him and the Attic writers was probably dialectical rather than chronological. xn¢iov : xnoós, 'that which is made

[^25] which is made of flat wood,' 'a small wooden tablet, plate, or dish' (cf. oxviठiov). Later the word became generalized so as to include the same objects when made of different material. a) 'A writing tablet,' put to legal uses of diverse kinds. Ar. Vesp. 167, Av. 450 ; Dem. 8. 28, 39. 12 ; Plato Legg. 753 C; Arist. Pol. 2. 8. 1268 a 2. b) 'A tablet for painting upon.' Isocr. 15.2; Theophr. H. P. 3.9.7. c) 'A plate' or 'dish.'1 Epict. 1. 19.4; CIA. 2. 766. 10, 17; ib. 2. $835 \mathrm{c}-122$ ( $320-317$ B. C.) ; ib. 2. 652 B 7 (after 307 B. C.). $\pi v$ 'siov : $\pi \pi^{\prime} \xi 0 \xi$, 'that which is made of box-wood,' 'writing-tablet' or 'tablet for painting.' Ar. and Anaxandr. ap. Poll. 10. 59; Luc. Indoct. 15. oavidıov: oavis, 'that which is made of flat wood' (ef. $\pi$ uváxiov). a) 'A tablet used for recording,' 'a register.' Lys. 16. 6; Aeschin. 3. 200 f.; Insc. Att. Ditt². 439. 124 (ab. 360 B. C.). b) 'A plate' or 'trencher.' ${ }^{1}$ Ar Pax 202; Men. frg. 4. 127; CIA. 2. 835 c-1 85, 87 (320-317 B. B.). yıдíoov' : pıд $\dot{p} \alpha$, 'that which is made of linden wood,' 'a tablet of linden wood.' Ael. V. H. 14. 12.

By congeneric attraction to these words arose the following ones in which there is no idea of material present: $\delta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \tau i o v$, completely equivalent to its primitive ס́̇iर̃os 'tablet.' Herod. 7. 239. ảßćxıov shows the source of its suffix by the fact that in its first occurrence it designates a reckoning board or tablet covered with sand and used by mathematicians ${ }^{2}$ (Alex. frg. 3. 389, also Plut. Cato. Min. 70), while the primitive $\chi_{\alpha} \beta \alpha \xi$ occurs not only in this meaning, but has a wider sphere of usage. Nevertheless, because the two words were equivalent in this one use, the general feeling of equivalence resulted, and by the process of semantic syncretism ${ }^{3}$ ¿ ${ }^{\beta} \dot{\alpha} x$ uov could probably take the place of its primitive in any of its meanings. At any rate it is used of a sort of table or side-board in an inscription from Smyrna ( Ditt $^{2} \cdot 2.583 .11$ ) of the beginning of our era. Trvxiov ${ }^{4}$

[^26]＇a folded tablet＇is the result of the influence of its congeners upon the phrase $\pi \tau u x \tau o ̀ s ~ \pi i v a \xi$ with the same meaning．The suffix actually has taken up into itself the implication of＇tablet．＇

D．Things made of cloth，particularly articles of dress．xavváßıov ： xávvaßus，＇that which is made of hemp，＇a kind of women＇s shoe．Poll． 7．94．rı入iov：$\pi \tilde{\imath} \lambda o s$, ＇that which is made of felt，＇＇a felt cap．＇Di－ minutive interpretation is originally impossible；for the word is used in a general statement in Arist．frg．226． 1519 a 14，$\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi i \lambda i \alpha \alpha$ D $\tilde{\alpha} \tau \tau 0 v$
 which is made of linen．＇a）＇A linen cloth．＇Ar．frg．2． 989 ；CIA． 2．708． 6 （after 340 B．C．）．b）＇Linen bandages．＇Ar．Ach． 1171. c）＇Sail－cloths＇（in plural）．Dem．47．20．$\sigma \alpha(x) x i o v: \sigma \alpha x(x) \sigma$ ，＇that which is made of $\sigma \alpha_{x} x(x) \circ \varsigma$ ，＇which is a coarse cloth of hair．$\sigma x x i o v$ accordingly is＇mourners＇sack－cloth＇in Men．frg．4．102，though
 which is made of sindon，＇a curtain or garment made of a fine kind of cloth．Poll．7．73．блєœ＠iov，＇that which is made of $\sigma \pi \varepsilon i \rho o v ~(a ~ k i n d ~$ of cloth），＇＇a light summer garment．＇Xen．Heli．4．5．4．ч由бб由́vıov ： p$\omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，＇that which is made of coarse cloth，＇＇a coarse towel．＇ Luc．Lex． 2.

By congeneric attraction to Bobvov in the meaning＇linen band－ ages＇arose $\sigma \pi \lambda$ クviov（Philem．frg．4． 42 ［25 b］）＇bandages for wounds＇
 for bandaging，＇Hipp．595，813， 837.

E．Juices of plants，flowers，or fruits．$\beta ⿲ \lambda \alpha$ ćvov：$\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha v o s$, ＇that which is made of acorns，＇＇a decoction to cure drunkenness．＇Nico－
 3．100．хœоивiov ：хр $\alpha \mu \beta \geqslant$ ，‘a decoction of cabbage．＇Galen．Lex．Hipp．
 ＇poppy juice．＇Hipp． 407 ；Arist．H．A．7．10． 587 a 31 （metaphor－
 oüxov，＇a decoction of figs．＇Hipp．470．yéxoov ：̣́́xo૬，＇a decoction of lentils．＇Hipp． 474.

A remarkable case of congeneric attraction by a word of this group is öтtov＇poppy juice，＇＇opium，＇：$\langle\pi$＇s＇juice＇of any plant．It has been assimilated to $\mu$ 久xéviov＇poppy juice＇both in form and meaning． So Alex．Trall．2． 159.

 a cake made of the finest kind of meal．Evangelus frg．4． 572 （8）；

Arist. Probl. 4. 21. 879 a 10. $\gamma \subset \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha x \iota \iota}$ : $\gamma^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha$, 'a dish made of milk.' Alciphr. frg. 10. $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho i o v: \gamma \alpha \sigma=\eta_{p}$, 'that which is made of the paunch,' 'the paunch stuffed with mince-meat,' 'sausage.' Anthenion frg. 4.558 (28). Probably felt as diminutive-hypocoristic in Nicustratus frg. 3. 279; Com. Anon. frg. 4. 608 (27 b), for which cf. $\$ 224$. xúpıov : xj́pog, 'that which consists of cubes,' 'the flesh

 - that which is made of honey.' ठео́ $\beta \iota o v$, 'meal made of the ǒpopos (a kind of pulse).' Hipp. 576. лvớvov : $\pi \dot{\sigma} \alpha v o s$, 'that which is made of beans,' a dish of various kinds of pulse cooked sweet. Sosib. ap.
 ortos, 'that which is made of grain,' originally 'bread,' as in Herod.

 Later the word became generalized so as to mean 'food' or 'provisions ' in general, so e.g. Herod. 1. 192, гоїஎt жuסì $\pi p \circ \sigma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \tau \alpha ́ y \varepsilon \tau \circ$


 $\alpha^{\circ} \sigma \tau p \alpha \gamma \gamma \lambda \lambda$ оs 'that which is made of knuckle-bones,' 'dice'. CIA. 2. 766. 32. do@́ctıov ${ }^{1}$ : $\delta o p \dot{\alpha}$, 'that which is made of hide,' 'a bag.' Xen. An. 6. 4. 23. Eiơov, ệ८ov : sipos, 'that which is made of wool,' i. e. woolen thread, cloth, etc., finally, by semantic syncretism with its primitive, even sheared wool. a) Singular: M $434 ; \delta 124$; Herod. 1. 203, 4. 162. b) Plural (cf. Lat. lanae) : Г 388 ; $\sigma 3 \mathrm{I} 6: \% 423$. In Herod. 3. 47, 106, it is used of cotton. x noiov : xropos, 'that which is made of bees-wax,' 'honey-comb,' ${ }^{2}$ naturally usually in the Plural because composed of different cells: Hes. Theng. 597; Herod. 5. 114. With distinct notion of individual cells in Arist. H. A. 9. 40. 623 b 33 ,
 19. 2. oxouviov : $\sigma y$ oivos, 'that which is made of rushes,' 'a rush rope.' That it is not a diminutive of its primitive, which sometimes occurs

[^27]in the same sense, is shown by the fact that Herodotus (1.26) uses it of a rope seven stades long, and that it constantly designates the cables of ships, sometimes modified by adjectives indicating great thick-

 $\tau \omega \delta \dot{\alpha} x \tau \nu \lambda \alpha$ IIII, छ$\xi<\alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \tau \cup \lambda \alpha$ IIII. ib. a 114. Other occurrences, all without trace of diminutive meaning, are Herod. 5. 85 ; Ar. Ach. 22 ; Arist. Mir. 137. 844 b 5. Methaphorically Pind. frg. 248, סuбọópov $\sigma$ yoviov
 'rouge.' Luc. Hist. Consc. 8.
 taining the upper end of the hunting net' in Xen. Cyn. 6. 9. The borrowed word $\psi u \mu(\mu) v v^{\prime} \not \iota o v ~ ' w h i t e ~ l e a d, ' ~ u s e d ~ a s ~ a n ~ a r t i c l e ~ o f ~ c o s-~$ metics, probably followed cuxiov, if the late appearance of the latter in this sense is due merely to the accident of transmission. ${ }^{1}$ The former occurs already in Ar. Eccl. 878, Plut. 1064 ; Plato Lys. 217 D.

## XI. -tov AS A SUFFIX OF POSSESSION.

102. By 'possession' I mean here not only personal ownership, as e. g. in oupávos 'inhabiting or owning heaven' when applied to the gods (Aesch. Pr. 164, סג́upvarat oùpavíav $\gamma$ révvav), but also 'furnished with,' 'provided with,' and the like, as in the adjectives $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau$ épos
 Pind. N. 9. 43), or in substantives like b$\sigma \tau p \alpha x \times o v$ 'the animal which is provided with a shell (ǒ otpoxov),' i. e. a mollusk, or in Arm. katin 'oak,' 'that which is provided with acorns (katin).' Cf. also Lith. masculines like plùnksnis 'he who is adorned with feathers (plùnksna).'
103. The rarity of Greek words in which this meaning is altogether predominant, indicates either that it was a mere remnant of an old inherited usage, or an offshoot from other meanings, and more probably the latter, because the use of the suffix in this sense is at least as rare in most other languages. ${ }^{2}$

[^28]104. Of the functions of -to- so far discussed there are two particularly that have points of contact with the idea of possession, namely, its use in the meaning 'belonging to ' or 'connected with,' and 'made of.' Whether a suffix in a given word should be interpreted as 'belonging to' or 'having,' depends largely upon whether the idea suggested by the primitive or derivative is the central one to the hearer. In case of some words or phrases there is, of course, no doubt possible. oujpávoos à $\sigma$ vip (Pind. P. 3. 135) was interpreted 'the star which belongs to heaven'; 'the star having heaven' could hardly occur to any one. On the other hand, it would be manifestly absurd to interpret sérico đ̈vepió (Arist. Probl. 26. 7. 940 b 33 ) as 'the winds that belong to the rain ( $£ \varepsilon \tau$ ós)' rather than 'the winds that are provided with' i. e. 'bring rain.' In some words, however, the interpretation of the suffix may vary according to which object is the central one in the mind. Thus in Goth. hairdeis 'herdsman,' 'he who belongs to the herd,' and Gr. ßouxóziov: ßouxónos, 'that which belongs to the herdsman,' 'herd,' the same suffix expresses directly opposite points of view of the same relation, and we might as well translate $\beta$ ourótiov as 'that which is provided with a herdsman.' Also on the border line are words like oupávoos when applied to the gods. of oupávot could be either 'those who belong to heaven' or 'those who have,' 'dwell in,' or 'inhabit heaven.' In the oldest examples of this kind appurtenance was no doubt the original notion, but it could give way to the idea of possession whenever the concept represented or modified by the derivative happened to be the central one in the hearer's mind rather than the concept of the primitive as in the speaker's mind.
105. More important for the appellative neuters in -tov is the connection of meaning between possession and material. A word meaning 'made of' a certain thing can be interpreted 'provided with' it if it is only partly composed of the material in question. Thus, while there can be no doubt in the interpretation of words
 of ypuós,' since the articles so designated, respectively a papyrus roll, a felt cap, a golden vessel, are either altogether or practically so composed of the material in question, there is a possibility of double interpretation in certain words designating articles of food, as $\mu, \varepsilon_{\text {hitiov }}$
 of $\mu \bar{z}$ hiciov, nor is mjovos the only ingredient of $\pi$ maxuov. This possibility becomes still greater when the primitive is not necessarily considered as the one important constitucnt. We can not be certain how
racrpiov was conceived, whether it was 'a dish made of the paunch' or 'a dish which has a paunch' on the outside of it. In certain words of this kind the material idea must have given way to the possessive idea, as can be seen by comparing $\tau \grave{\alpha} \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda_{\mu} . \alpha$ 'salted provisions,' which could only have been conceived as 'that which is provided with salt'; for from the stand-point of mass salt is by no means one of the important constituents so as to allow the interpretation ' made of salt.' A similar transition perhaps in iviov 'neck' : ives 'sinews.' While most naturally interpreted as 'that which has sinews' i. e. particularly strong sinews, it may have been originally conceived as 'that which is made of sinews,' since the latter as representing the great power of the neck may have suggested themselves as its principal constituent.
106. Like other formatives denoting possession ${ }^{1}$-to- could occasionally be used in a pregnant sense, so that we can translate 'full of,' 'rich in,' and the like. So e. g. "Apros ímाios (Pind. I. 7. 17) ' Argos rich in horses,' with which we may compare the geographical

 which is well provided with streams ( $\left.\lambda_{\varphi} \beta \dot{\alpha} \delta \delta_{s}\right) .{ }^{\prime}$
107. Collection of examples. A. Appellatives. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \mu \boldsymbol{\lambda} \alpha$ 'salted provisions': «̌дun 'brine.' Men. frg. 4. 206 (5). iviov 'neck' : ives

 which is covered with reeds,' 'a thicket of reeds.' Thesaur. Paris. жфотіоv : харло́ц, 'that which has the fruit upon it,' 'branch.' Hes.,




 shell,' ' shell-fish.' Arist. Part. An. 1. 4. 644 b 10 (only Z, other

B. Geographical names. Aǐ̀ıov : aì', 'goat city,' in Achaea (B 574),


[^29]- that which is provided with (or consists of) shining rock,' a mountain in Euboea. Men. ap. Photius 247. 24. Iथлиúgoo: : $\lambda \lambda$ ŕpupx, 'that which has many floods' or 'is frequented by floods,' a promontory in Sicily. Thuc. 7. 4. 4. Teixiov : veřyos, 'that which has a (good) wall' or is 'well walled,' a city in Aetolia. Thuc. 3. 96. 2. For
 probably 'that which is rich in lentils.' Thuc. 4. 78. 5.


## XII. - $\frac{1}{}$ IN THE MEANING "BELONGING TO THE CATEGORY OR IDEA OF," "HAVING THE NATURE OF."

108. The transition from the meaning 'belonging to' in a physical sense to 'belonging to the category or idea of,' 'having the nature of,' is so natural and easy that both meanings are usually found side by side in the same formatives and same languages. Thus the latter meaning occurs in the following -(i)io- words of different Indo-European languages: Skr. nárya-s 'manly ': nr-- man,' dāívya-s 'divine ': dēvá-s

 Ar. Av. 1099), $\delta \alpha \mu \mu_{\text {óvos }}^{:} \delta \alpha^{\prime} \mu(\omega v$, in the meaning 'wonderful,' Lat. nefarius 'impious' : nefas, Goth. wilpeis O. H. G. wildi ' wild ' : O. H. G. wild 'wild animals,' O. Blg. člově̌̌ $\leftarrow$ 'human : člověkъ 'man.'
109. In Greek adjectives of this kind the use of $-6-$, just as in adjectives of material (§97) and various others ( $\$ 16$ ), was already in early times restricted by the encroachment of the conglutinate -soin the same sense. By analogy to words like $\dot{\alpha} \sigma=\varepsilon \pi \rho \varsigma ~ ' u r b a n e ~ ': ~$
 like': oinos. The neuter substantives on the other hand are extremely numerous at all periods of the language, and this is to he explained by the fact that substantivized adjectives of this type on account of their concrete nature very easily cease to be connected in the mind with the adjectival uses of the suffix. Thus supposing an adjective * $\pi$ repójros 'wing-like' had given rise to the neuter substantive $\pi$ тesp'syov 'that which is wing-like,' i. e. 'a fin of a fish,' the latter word would soon be interpreted rather as 'a sort of wing' and thus lose all connection with the adjective. In this way -tov was used to form other substantives without intervening adjectives, and became primarily a substantive formative, as can best be seen by comparing such uses
as are derived from 'having the nature of,' namely the deteriorative and diminutive meanings, which have no corresponding adjectival uses at all. The pattern types of the neuter substantives, however, go back to a time when -8to- and -to- in adjectives were used promiscuously in all inherited meanings of the latter. Finally a division of labor resulted : -to- had its principal realm in the meaning 'belonging to,' 'connected with,' while -sto- encroached upon it in most other adjectives.
110. The prerequisite of the development of the meaning 'belonging to the category of ' or 'idea of ' from 'belonging to' is simply that the speaker should become conscious of the word itself rather than the object it represents. If we can translate 'belonging to,' the object designated by the primitive is suggested in its objective reality ; $\pi \alpha \tau p i \alpha$ ǒ $\sigma \sigma \alpha$, Pind. O. 6. 106, is the voice which actually belongs to the father, 'the father's voice.' If, on the other hand, we can translate 'belonging to the category of ' or 'idea of,' the primitive is viewed as a logical or grammatical abstraction; so e. g. ₹̀̀ bpvioux is "the animals belonging to the notion "bird.'"
111. This transition is facilitated by words of which the primitive always represents an idea or action rather than a physical object, i. e. by certain abstract nouns, in which case there may be no difference involved whether we translate one way or the other. $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\jmath} \lambda \iota c \alpha(\theta) 108)$
 different actions belonging to the notion $\alpha \approx \otimes \cdot \lambda .0 \leqslant$ (prize contest)' or as

 belong to and so compose the $\partial s \sigma \mu o i$ ' or 'the different rules that

112. The idea 'having the nature of,' which passes over into 'being like,' is in part naturally derived from 'belonging to the category of,' in as much as the former is always implied by the latter, and the two ideas are only two sides of the same thing. For instance sò Ompiov 'that which belongs to the category of beast (Omp)' is no less 'that which has the nature of a beast.' This becomes particularly evident, so as to almost force a change of interpretation, when a word is used in an unusual or metaphorical sense, as e. g. Ompiov when applied to a human being. ©̈ $\delta \varepsilon \iota \lambda$ ofarov oì onpiov (Ar. Plut. 438) 'O you coward who really belong to the category of beast!' is exactly the same as saying ' $O$ you beastly coward!' There are

[^30]also direct points of contact between the meaning 'having the nature of ' and 'belonging to,' 'coming from,' 'made of.' An adjective meaning 'belonging to' can be applied to something that does not physically belong to the object designated by the primitive, but merely is a characteristic belonging to it. Thus Anacreon frg. $4,{ }^{\circ} \Omega \pi x \tilde{u}$
 to a maiden' i. e. 'a look belonging to the characteristics of a maiden,' in other words ' O boy who hast a maiden-like look.' Sometimes again the idea of descent, origin, or material will pass over into 'having the nature of'; for it is but natural to attribute a characteristic to inheritance, or to consider it as clinging to an object from its place of origin or from the material out of which it is made. This development occurs in the adjective $\delta$ oupóvos, which is 'belonging to,' 'coming from,' or 'like a divinity' (cf. $\delta$ aupóvoov चśp $\alpha$ ¢, Soph. Ant. 376, which is either 'a prodigy coming from a divinity' or 'a prodigy having the characteristics of a divinity,' i. e. terrible, wonderful). Similarly words derived from proper adjectives may develop the notion of a characteristic. $\sum \alpha_{\rho} \delta \iota \alpha$ sc. $x_{\rho} \dot{o} \mu \mu \nu \alpha$ 'onions coming from Sardis' can get the accessory notion 'of the Sardian kind,' which becomes dominant when the plant is grown in other places besides that from which its name is derived. This development must have been very frequent in case of articles of commerce. The idea of material, moreover, passes over into 'having the nature of,' 'being like,' by means of certain metaphorical and poetic conceptions, in which something that has the characteristics of an other object is conceived as made of it. Cf. ©ै ypuriov 'my golden pet' ( $\stackrel{( }{5} 251$ ). Similar are certain color terms like Lat. niveus : nix, 'snowy,' i. e. 'white,' Gr. xuóveos 'dark as xj́xvos,' originally 'made of x'j́xvos.' Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2} .666 \mathrm{f}$.
113. In dealing with a group of meanings of such complex nature and origin it would be futile to try to follow out exactly the different threads of development; for the whole body of usages must have been completely confused in consciousness, particularly in case of adjectives, which, because of their use with a great rariety of sulhstantives, depend so largely upon their context for exact interpretation. But since an implication of a suffix, though accidental and unconscious in the adjective, becomes crystallized, as it were, in case of substantivation, it is possible roughly to divide the neuter substantives into two groups: The dominant (not exclusive) idea is (1) 'belonging to the category of,' (2) 'having the nature of." ' being like.' The
latter, i. e. the one in which rov has become the exponent of the similarity of the derivative to the primitive, will be discussed in the next chapter. The first group can be subdivided into two minor groups according to whether the -tov derivative was felt as a true substantive from the beginning or whether it was at first rather conceived adjectivally. A substantive is, of course, directly associated in the mind with the object it designates. When we hear the word 'dog' we at once think of the animal that bears that name without the interposition of the general notion 'animal' or of any other idea. In case of a word, however, which is felt as a substantivized adjective, some substantival notion must be suggested by the adjective, and the substantival notion in turn will call to mind the concept which the speaker desires to impart. When we hear some one speak of the 'right' we must first think of the concept 'hand,' and then the whole idea 'right hand' will be understood. It is this distinction which has given rise to two classes of words in which -tov was an exponent of the idea 'belonging to the category of.' Substantival from the beginning was e. g. noryojinov: xory'jin, 'that which belongs to the category of mollusk,' "a member of the genus 'mollusk'". There is here no thought of a substantive that might have been originally modified by the -tov word, nor is there the general idea of a thing present. The use of the pronoun 'that' in my translation of such words is merely a necessity to bring in the idea of 'belonging to the category '; in many cases we come nearer to a true translation by saying e. g. 'a kind of mollusk,' or, as above, " a member of the genus 'mollusk,'" for there is then no suggestion of adjectival force. Since, then, roryóncov was a true substantive from the beginning, it suggested its object directly without understanding e. g. the notion 'animal' or the like. It follows, in applying to it the translation 'belonging to the category,' that there are only two terms of classification: the single individual mollusk designated by the derivative and the category or genus 'mollusk' which is suggested for the stem of the primitive by the suffix -tov. The derivative, in as much as it represents an individual or species as belonging to a certain category or genus which is suggested by the stem of the primitive, causes the latter to be viewed as a generic term, whence I apply the word 'generalizing' to this use of -cov. It must be born in mind, however, that this name as well as 'specializing', as used below, refer to the point of view from which the primitive is viewed, and have nothing to do with the derivative. From the stand-point of the latter both
this and the following group are subordinating; for the very idea of designating an object or notion as belonging to a certain category implies that it is regarded as a more specific term than the category to which it belongs. Coming now to the second subdivision, the derivative must have been originally felt in an adjectival manner in words like O. H. G. swīn ${ }^{1}$ (a substantivized neuter of an adjective corresponding to Lat. suīnus : sūs) 'a being belonging to the category of pig,' i. e. 'a pig.' The adjectival nature of the word originally required the interposition of some general idea like 'being' or 'animal' between the word and its object, and as a result there are three terms of classification involved : (1) the vague general notion of 'being' or 'animal' due to the substantivation of the adjective, (2) the class 'pig' suggested by the stem of the primitive, (3) the individual pig designated by the finished derivative. The same development is more tangible and more frequent when the -tov word arose by ellipsis. Thus in the phrase oxúq̣ov $\delta$ śr $\pi \alpha_{5}$, 'a vessel belonging to the category oxjuos,' which becomes oxuopiov without change of semantic content, the three terms were: (1) the genus 'cup' originally expressed in the modified substantive $\delta$ én $\pi ⿷$, but embodied in the suffix -tov after substantivation, (2) the species oxjopos suggested by the stem of the primitive, (3) the individual oxúpos designated by the finished derivative. It is to be noticed that in each case the most general notion is the one suggested by the arjectival nature of the word, while the primitive is indeed a more general idea than the derivative, but is itself subordinate to the more general one implied by the substantivation, e. g. 'cup' is the genus and $\sigma x{ }^{\prime}$ 'pos the species. The effect of the suffix accordingly is to represent the primitive as a specific term, and I designate this as the 'specializing' use of -七\%.

## 1. - $\iota \nu$ WITH GENERALIZING MEANING.

114. In its simplest form and the one in which it is closest to the idea of appurtenance, generalizing -tov is found when it designates an individual or number of individuals as belonging to a genus, e.g. nory'intov "that which belongs to the category or genus 'mollusk,?" noryosics a certain number of animals "belonging to the genus 'mollusk.'" The only distinction between primitive and derivative is that the speaker, in using the latter, is thinking of the animal as one of a

[^31]certain type, but when he uses the former he is usually thinking of a concrete example. It is evident that this slight distinction could very easily become effaced; for in most cases it would be totally indifferent whether an animal is designated as belonging to a genus or not, and the hearer would consequently often fail to follow the speaker's interpretation. In this way $\varphi \alpha \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma<\circ \nu$, originally an animal 'belonging to the genus $\varphi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \gamma \xi \xi$ ', became completely equivalent to its primitive, and even became the preferred form because it had the more familiar declensional ending.
115. A derivative formed with generalizing -七ov may not only refer to an individual or number of individuals, but may itself be viewed as a generic term subordinate to the still more general idea of the primitive. By the common metonymy of representing a class by an individual rorféniov can be not only an "individual" but also a "species belonging to the genus 'mollusk.'" Similar is $\delta$ ©́vōpıov in
 frg. 44) 'plant no other kind of tree before the vine.' This idea of ' a species or kind of ' became so definitely attached to the suffix that a word in -tov could even designate a single individual or number of individuals of a species of the genus designated by the primitive. Just as in English we may ask "What kind of an animal is this?" when we see a single specimen before us, so we find e.g. in Herod.
 what kind of an animal (i. e. of one of what kind of an animal) he was eating the flesh.' This use was, of course, not separated in consciousness from that in which the species as a whole was referred to, and often no distinction in this respect can be made at all. In
 ¿vopónou, there is no distinction whether we translate 'by every species of animal' or 'by animals of every species.'
116. A particularly frequent use of generalizing -ov is the one, usually in combination with the generic article or some adjective of totality, in which is designated the sum-total of individuals or species belonging to a genus. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\alpha} \not j^{\prime} v \alpha$ denotes all the individuals or all the species "belonging to the genus 'spider.'" Since the important point in this case is merely to include everything belonging to the category, there will usually be no distinction made as to whether the different species or individuals are had in view, and it would be futile to try to classify all of the examples on this principle.
117. Sometimes the use of generalizing -tov gave rise to a deriv-
ative with a sphere of application enlarged beyond that of the primitive, so e. g. Ompiov 'any animal': Donp 'wild beast.' In as far as this is not due to causes affecting the single word, its origin is to be sought in the influence of the meaning 'having the nature of 'etc. If Ompiov was at any time interpreted as 'something having the nature of a wild beast,' there would be implied a comparison with the primitive in some respects, but not in all. Since now the qualities compared, e.g. life, locomotion, etc., are shared by other animals besides those that could be designated by orp, the former could just as well be included in the designation Onpiov, 'that which has the nature of O'np,' as the latter.
118. Collection of examples. I divide: A. animals, B. plants, C. things. Under each word the examples are classified as follows: a) Plural, usually with generic article, to designate the sum-total of species or individuals belonging to a genus; b) the idea 'a kind of' or 'species of' is prominent ; c) individuals are designated as belonging to a class or genus, though this meaning is often faded, and the derivative is then completely equivalent to the primitive.
 'spider.'" All certain examples belong to a) Arist H. A.5. 27.555 a 27,





 members of the genus $\beta \dot{\beta} \mu \beta \cup \underset{y}{ }{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ a) Arist. H. A. 5. 24. 555 a 1?,
 Iroiov, 'animal species,' 'animal of any kind': Orip 'wild beast.'







${ }^{1}$ Since $\tau \grave{c} \beta \boldsymbol{\beta} \mu \beta \dot{\sim} x c_{c}$ in its only occurrence designates the moth, we must assume that its primitive could also designate the moth as well as the silkworm, even though the latter is the only meaning extant.














 (notice plural lyoviev correlative with Onpiov). Sotades frg. 3. 586 (1.







[^32]('animals of the kind that develop in the hives') c) Herod. 6. 44,




 xorxíhıov : xory'j2n, 'a species or kind of mollusk' etc. a) Arist. frg.





 тои́тоц૬. ib. 5. 15. 547 b 7, $\delta \iota \alpha \tau \rho u \pi \tilde{\alpha}$ (sc. $\hat{\eta} \tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma ~ \pi о р \varphi \cup \cup p \alpha \varsigma ~ \gamma \lambda \tilde{\omega} \tau \tau \alpha) ~ \tau \hat{\alpha}$
 $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha x o s$, cf. § 41), the animals ' of the soft kind,' cf. the German



 of bird,' 'member of the bird family,' etc. a) Herod. 2. 77, ठpviD(ov)

 of the bird tribe.' Arist. H. A. 9. 49. 633 b 6 , ǐiov $\delta$ ' हvious $\sigma \mu \mu-$








have assumed an original diminutive force of the suffix, in spite of the fact that it is much more frequently applied to large beasts, particularly in its earliest occurrences-it designates a deer and is modified by $\mu$ i $\gamma$ c in the only Homeric examples (see above). This method of procedure needs no refutation. For apparent cases of deteriorative use see $\$ 173$.
${ }^{1}$ See foot-note 2 on p. 80.
 and the other nouns are in apposition. The dictionaries are consequently wrong in taking royuointo as a 'small kind of mollusk.'

 $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \delta \alpha \lambda \iota \varsigma$, "the members of the genus spanther.'" a) Arist. H. A.


 species of the cartilaginous fishes ' ${ }^{1}$ etc. a) Athen $318 \mathrm{~F}, \mu \alpha \lambda \alpha_{\alpha} \times 1 \alpha$
 $\tau \widetilde{\omega} \nu \delta \grave{~}$


 grub ' (usually diminutive). b) Arist. H. A. 5. 32. 557 b 13, દ̌ $\sigma \tau \iota \downarrow$

 members of the genus 'sparrow.'" Arist. H. A. 9. 7. 613 a 29, 33,














B. Plants. The comparative rarity of these may be due to the fact that -tov was so productive in ordinary plant names in which it had other functions than the 'generalizing' (\$ 255 ff.$)$. dérdeıv: סévopov, 'a kind or species of tree.' b) Alcaeus 44 , see $\S 115$. Athen.


[^33]
 ס̈бтроs（Hes．），＇the members of the pulse family＇etc．a）Plato








 weed family，＇a wider term than gưxos，which is distinguished from Bpóov Arist．H．A．8． 20.603 a 17，Theophr．H．P．4．6．2．a）Theophr．


 ̣uxía vépovial．
 and dopátıo：סópu，＇everything in the nature of a javelin，＇Herod． 1.



 in the nature of a shell＇of a crustacean or shell－fish．a）Arist．H．


 category＇box＇＂（below combined with the idea of small size）．a）Arist．




 pícouatv．xu入ixuov：xú入u多，＇a kind of cup．＇b）Epicr．frg．3． 372 （2．1），



${ }^{1}$ The fact that the tree referred to is said to be no smaller than an elm or fir－tree，makes impossible the common interpretation of diaferov as a diminutive．

 hand to all this great array of different kinds of dishes＇）．${ }^{1}$ дол $\alpha$ d́ıov ： $\lambda_{0} \pi \alpha \alpha^{5}$ ，＇a kind of plate．＇b）Poll．10．107，$\chi \alpha \grave{~} \pi \alpha \tau \alpha ́ v \eta ~ \chi \alpha \grave{~} \pi \alpha \tau \alpha ́ v i o v ~ \tau o ̀ ~$
 $\mu$ úsıov ：$\mu . \ddot{\mathrm{c}}$ ¢ $\alpha$ ，＇a kind of barley－bread．＇b）Athen． 646 C，EIIIDAI－
 ＇a kind of sweet－meats or cake．＇b）Athen．645 E，EГKPIDEL $\pi \varepsilon \mu$－
 Oos，＇the different kinds of brick－ware．＇b）Thuc．6．88．6，xג̀ $\tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$







## 2．－七o WITH SPECIALIZING MEANING．

119．As was pointed out $\S 113$ ，the use of＇specializing＇－tov largely had its roots in adjectival phrases in which a denominative adjective with a suffix meaning＇belonging to the category of＇was used with a generic substantive to distinguish one kind of a general con－ ception from other kinds．Such a phrase，as well as the adjective after substantivation，refers to the very same object as the primitive， the only difference being that the phrase or substantivized adjective represents the object as belonging to a certain category of the general idea，and this slight distinction，as in case of the generalizing use， and fur the same reasons（ $\$ 114$ ），could easily become effaced and leave a derivative substantive that does not differ from its primitive in any respect．This development is not a peculiarity of－tov，but is also found in various other I．E．denominative adjectives．O．H．G． swīn，with I．E．－inno－，was mentioned § 113，but most frequently this seems to take place in words with a－k－suffix．Thus in Greek
 Пapoivveñ̃ हैxuĩa veriviò，＂like to a young woman belonging to the category of＇maiden，＇＂i．e．＇like to a maiden，＇vธగ̃ves being the generic name for a young woman，whether married or unmarried． After the ellipsis of the accompanying substantive $\pi \alpha p ⿴ 囗 s v i x i n$ is used

[^34]with no distinction from its primitive, so e. g. $\lambda$ 39, ПарPevvx<í $\tau^{\prime}$
 be a regular device for making derivative nouns of the same meaning as their primitives, ${ }^{1}$ e. g. ástaka-m 'home' $=$ ásta-m.
120. Since the modified substantive in the original adjectival phrase is usually quite superfluous, it is not surprising that substantivation of the adjective should take place most rapidly in the speech of every-day life, which is always averse to such cumbrous expressions, although poets might keep on using them for stylistic reasons. As a result it was very rarely that these short-lived combinations happened to be imbedded in literature before substantivation had taken place, so that we may expect large classes of substantives of this origin without direct trace of corresponding adjectives in contrast to a few sporadic occurrences of the adjectival phrases. Nevertheless, that such combinations with words in -to- also did actually occur, is not only made plausible by such related poetic circumlocutions as Bin Hp $\alpha x \lambda \varepsilon$ in (Hes. Theog. 332), but there is at least one passage which directly proves their existence: Stesich. 7, इxúporv² ${ }^{2}$ ঠ̀ $\lambda \alpha \beta \omega \omega ้$
 quoting this passage, explains oxúqıov by oxuqosıס́śs, showing that even the later Greeks sometimes felt oxúpov and words like it in an adjectival manner, and not necessarily as diminutives ; for, if the latter were the case, the explanation of Athenaeus would be impossible, and he would have conceived of oxúp̣ov as in apposition with $\delta \delta \varepsilon \pi \alpha \varsigma$. Proof that names of vessels were substantivized from adjectives meaning 'of the kind of' is further gained by analogous examples of the conglutinate -stov, which here as elsewhere encroached upon -tov, and consequently always affords the presumption, when occurring in a certain use, that -ov must in earlier times have shared the same meaning. In case of $x \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \leqslant \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota o v$, which is equivalent to its primitive $\chi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \beta \eta$, we have before our eyes the steps of its substantivation in two passages from Antimachus of Colophon quoted by Athenaeus

 in as much as it is contrasted with the adjective ypursoos: 'golden cups ' are contrasted with 'a cup of the $x \in \lambda \varepsilon \hat{\beta}^{\prime} r$, kind.' In the preceding quotation, however, the substantivation is complete : $\grave{\alpha}-\dot{x}_{p} \dot{\alpha} \mu q \dot{q} i-$


[^35]of these words we may also compare Өnpixisoos sc. x'j̀ı气 (Athen. 470 E ff.), though the -sıo- here had a different meaning. We may, then, assume with safety that when we find a group of words in -tov which from the very beginning do not seem to differ from their primitives, but are related as designating particular kinds of a genus, and when alongside of them we find a neuter generic noun which may have suffered ellipsis in the pattern types, that substantivation of an original adjective in the manner described above has played a part. Thus we


121. Between the time of substantivation-no matter whether it is due to ellipsis or to taking up with the adjective a vague general notion-and the time of complete equivalence of primitive and derivative there was a period when the adjectival, i. e. 'specializing' nature of the word in -tov was still felt. As has been indicated above, the practical value of the 'specializing' use was to distinguish one kind of a generic conception from other kinds, and consequently the feeling for this meaning of the suffix must have been alive when the context makes it clear that the writer wished to contrast the species designated by the primitive either with the generic term suggested by the substantivized adjective, or with an other species of the same genus. Though we may not be certain in every individual instance, since the force of the suffix may have completely faded before the writing of a passage, and the situation in which the word is there placed may have been accidental, yet it is safe to say that in passages like the following the 'specializing' use of -tov was originally


 child is prepared for the banquet is compared with the usual way of preparing $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ ompíc, "beings that belong to the category of 'wild beasts,'" i. e. 'game.' Similar is the contrast between man


 \%ु $\sigma x \omega \lambda$ nncoov-the larva state of an insect is contrasted with its grub state: "as long as it is an animal that belongs to the category of 'grub,'" i. e. as long as it is in the grub state. In the same work


the two kinds of spiders are contrasted with other kinds of insects: "insects of the $\varphi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \gamma_{\xi}$ and $\alpha_{p} \alpha_{\chi} \times \eta(s)$ kind." In $\Lambda 265-{ }^{~} E_{\gamma / s t}$ :
 weapons can suggest an interpretation like the following: 'with spear and sword and large weapons of the stone ( $\overline{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{\rho} \mu \dot{x}_{\mathrm{s}}$ ) kind.' In Herodotus 7.61 ff. the fact that he is continually describing the armor of different contingents of the army of Xerxes causes the mind to center on the idea 'weapon' etc., and consequently allows ¿xóvtiov (: дँ xov) to be interpreted as 'a weapon or missile of the javelin kind' whenever it occurs. Particularly instructive is Thuc. 4. 120. 2,



 clause the comparison of the trireme with the smaller boat suggests the general idea of 'vessel,' and so $\begin{aligned} & \text { enritiov was felt as 'a vessel of }\end{aligned}$ the $x \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \bar{s}$ type.' The use of $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} v$ and $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ shows that the two kinds of vessels were strongly associated and contrasted in the mind of the writer. Just below, however, when this antithesis is not sought for,

 $\pi v \dot{\alpha} x v i \alpha$, 'Cnidian vessels of potters' clay, Sicilian vessels of the $\beta \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{\sim} n$ type, Megarian vessels of the $\pi v 0 \dot{\alpha} x m$ type.' Dionys. H. 10. 17 ,


122. When there was no contrast between different species of the same genus, the 'specializing' or adjectival nature of the -tov word quickly ceased to be appreciated; for even if the speaker still had it in mind, he would not often be followed by the hearer, since the distinction between primitive and derivative had lost all its practical value. Primitive and derivative then became totally equiralent: ¿xóviov 'a missile of the javelin kind' became simply 'a javelin.' After one or more substantives with this meaningless -ov had once come into existence, others of congeneric meaning could be attracted without themselves going through the same process : mpr, $36 i \lambda i o v$ followed ¿xóvctov, orauviov followed oxựiov or some word like it, etc. In most cases it will be impossible to say whether a word in meaningless -tov ever had a 'specializing' meaning, or whether is is merely a product of congeneric attraction. In this way -tov, like Skr. -ka- might have become a regular conscious device of poets to coin new words of the same meaning with their primitives. were it not for the fact that all
distinctly secondary derivatives in -tov seem in later Classical times to have had a rather vulgar or at least undignified flavor, which probably spread to the other classes from the deterioratives and diminutives (§ 274). As a result this class of words became confined to the language of every-day life and to prose, while serious poetry avoided them most sedulously.
123. This is, of course, only one of many ways in which a primitive and derivative can become identical in meaning. Besides the numerous cases of congeneric attraction in which a word took a meaningless -tov because attracted by some other word in which it did have a meaning ( $\$ 252 \mathrm{ff}$.), there are words of the oixiov type ( $\S 87 \mathrm{ff}$.), those derived from adjectives of material ( $\S 100$ ), those in which -ov has generalizing meaning (§ 114), or is exponent of the similarity of the derivative to the primitive (§ 139), and faded deterioratives (§ 165), diminutives ( $\$ 217 \mathrm{ff}$. ), and hypocorisms (§ 246 ff .). When a word is never found except in the very same meaning as its primitive, we may consequently often be in doubt as to how the identity of meaning has come about, and sometimes several different causes no doubt contributed, as we can say with certainty for $\lambda 0 \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \circ \frac{}{}=\lambda 0 \pi \alpha_{5}$, 'plate,' which was in use both with the 'generalizing' and 'specializing' meaning. For practical purposes, however, it is best to place here all cases of identity of primitive and derivative of which the cause is unknown.
124. Sometimes the influence of congeneric words produced a distinction between an -oov word and its primitive in as much as the latter had diverse meanings, while the former had only the one which is related to the words which have attracted it. Thus roju.n is not only a certain kind of cup or bowl, but also a knap-sack, wallet, or boat, while $x_{0} \mu$.iov always designates a kind of cup, evidently being influenced by $\pi$ otripoov, oxupiov, etc. Similarly the frequency of -tov words which designate ornaments gave rise to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\lambda} \sigma$ ov 'a chain' used as an ornament: $\alpha \lambda u \sigma \iota_{s}$ 'a chain' of any kind. Since the derivative in such a case is the more precise expression for the object it can designate, it easily becomes the preferred form, and the primitive may become very rare or even obsolete in the same sense. In this case the suffix would apparently have the force of expressing similarity ( $\S 132 \mathrm{ff}$.), even though the development of meaning is quite different from those words in which the suffix actually brought with it this meaning from the beginning. So xoupiov, which became the current Attic word in the meaning 'cup,' may have been reinter-


125. In case both primitive and derivative existed alongside of each other with equal right, as e. g. xunixuov and $x \dot{u} \lambda \iota \xi$, they were likely to become differentiated so that the -tov form was considered a diminutive (cf. $\$ 221 \mathrm{ff}$.). There is often, of course, no way of telling whether the latter ever had any other than the diminutive meaning. Thus, while we may be quite sure that the diminutive use of xulixiov was secondary, ب̣́ć $\lambda \iota o v$ may very well have been 'a little cup' from the beginning. It is impossible to separate diminutives from nondiminutives with certainty in every case; for when diminutives are applied to such things as cups, the idea of small size enters in its most objective manner, and will not often reveal itself by deteriorative or hypocoristic effects. A little help is given by inscriptions containing inventories of treasures in temples, as in Delos or the temple of Asclepius at Athens, where the weight of many individual objects is given. It is in this way that we learn that pocincov was carefully distinguished from pot $\alpha \lambda \eta$; yet this can not be conclusive evidence for
 cup' in the inscriptions may have been merely a technical trade regulation, just as in modern articles of commerce or scientific nomenclature distinctions unrecognized in ordinary speech are established or maintained, e. g. the difference between tornado and cyclone. That many words wavered between diminutive and non-diminutive interpretation, is shown e. g. by xu入ixiov, $\lambda \varepsilon x \alpha{ }^{2} v o v, ~ a n d ~ \lambda \varepsilon \beta \dot{\eta}$ tiov. It is, then. futile to try to reach certain conclusions for every word and every example, but in general one thing is clear: there are enough certain examples where the -tov word can not possibly have been a diminutive to throw utter discredit on the dictionaries and many grammatical authorities who invariably classify all of these words as diminutives. When an -tov word occurs in a context which is not decisive as to its meaning, there should not be the least presumption that is was diminutive.
126. The examples are divided, as usually, into congeneric groups, a division which in this case coincides with a division according to the generic idea which underlay the 'specializing' use of the suffix. Since the original meaning is apparent in only a small fraction of the passages, and since the more important of these have already been quoted above ( $\S$ 121), a mere citation will suffice in the list of examples below, unless I either quote a passage which conclusively proves non-diminutive usage, or give reasons for taking a word as
non-diminutive. The list will no doubt contain something that can not be classified with certainty, but indubitable diminutives belonging to these congeneric groups have been mentioned with all the other diminutives (§ 198 ff .).
127. A. Words designating missiles. Probably an ellipsis of $\beta$ हौlos 'missile' is at the basis of this group, a word which in the Homeric poems can designate darts, arrows, spears, or stones. dxóvutov : àx $\omega v$, 'a missile of the javelin kind,' 'a javelin.' The derivative completely displaced the primitive except in poetry because the suffix -ove- was an unusual one in words designating things, while -cov brought it into the favorite declension. There is not the slightest indication that $\dot{\alpha} x$ óvelov was ever a diminutive, in fact in the very $^{2}$ first passage in which it occurs (H. Hom. Merc. 460), the translation 'a little javelin' would be ridiculous: for the great god Apollo is giving an oath by his дxxóvztov: Nai $\mu \dot{\alpha}$ 兀óds xpavéivov axóvztov. Other examples: Herod. 7.72 ff., Ar. Lys. 563 ; Thuc. 4. 34, 5. 65 ; Xen. Cyn. 9. 2 ; Antiph. $3 \beta 4$; Plato Legg. 7. 794 C. do@útıov: ©ópu, 'a missile of the spear kind,' 'a spear.' While also found in the 'generalizing' meaning ( $\S 118 \mathrm{C}$ ) and as a diminutive ( $\$ 185$ ), it was probably 'specializing' and certainly not diminutive in Ar. Pax 553 and Mnesimachus ap. Athen. 421 C , passages which refer to the instruments of war in general. It seems to be completely equivalent to its primitive in Thuc. 7. 84. 3. тюово́дıov 'a missile of the $\pi \rho \sigma$ ' ßonos kind,' 'a hunting spear.' Xen. Cyn. 10. 3: Hyp. frg. 170 (ap. Harpocr.). $\chi \varepsilon \varrho \mu$ ádov 'a missile of the $\chi \varepsilon \rho \mu \dot{\alpha}$ s kind,' ${ }^{1}$ a stone used as a missile. Diminutive origin and usage is clearly out of the question, not only because the word occurs in Homer, who does not yet know any diminutives in tov, but because the context usually shows that it designated particularly large stones: $\Lambda 265, \mu \varepsilon \gamma^{\alpha} \lambda$ ouoi




128. B. Words designating boats. An ellipsis of $\pi$ 入oĩov may have caused the existence of these words. We may compare i $i \pi \pi \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma$ oi


[^36] uf oars' (\$53), which is undoubtedly derived from the adjective ryuózucs. The only words which belong here are axáciov (Thuc. 1.
 53. 1, 4. 120. 2) 'a boat of the xélñs type.' The primitive itself in both cases designates a small kind of vessel. That similar derivatives are not found from names of the larger kind of vessels is probably merely accidental, in as much as these are very rare words, and their transmission rather than of others was due merely to the fact that Thucydides had used them. It is, however, not impossible that the influence of diminutives prevented -tov words designating larger vessels from gaining currency.
129. C. Words designating cups, vases, vessels, etc. The origin of oxuẹiov out of the phrase oxj́qov $\delta$ śrac, as attested by Stesichorus (cf. $\varsigma 120$ ), makes it highly probable that many other names of ressels in -tov arose in a similar way, and that neuter generic words
 existence. This does not, however, mean that all names of vessels in -tov which do not differ from their primitives in meaning arose in this way; for in a large number of those that differ from their primitives the suffix had various other meanings than the 'specializing' (cf. $\$ 260 \mathrm{C}$ ), and it will usually be impossible to decide which of the numerous heterogeneous models a word of the same meaning as the primitive has followed. For practical reasons it is best to group all of these words here, particularly since the 'specializing' use itself most easily resulted in a meaningless suffix, and so was undoubtedly the most potent factor in attracting congeneric words.
a) With primitive in existence. $\beta \alpha \pi \alpha ́ v o v$ 'a vessel of the $\beta \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} n$ kind,' probably $<\pi \alpha \tau \alpha \alpha^{2}$ vov. ${ }^{1}$ Antiphan. frg. 3. 51; Alexis frg. 3. 394;
 a kind of cup. Philemon ap. Athen. 497 F. xaxх́́ßıo' 'a vessel of
 'a vessel of the xúouos type,' a kind of cup. Pherecr. ap. Poll. 6. 105. xvußiov 'a cup of the xúp.ßn or xúp,jos type.' a small boat-


 might be drawn from this, namely, that xupfiov was originally cun-

[^37]ceived as 'that which is like a boat' rather than 'a cup of the $x \dot{j} \mu \cdot \beta_{n}$ type,' is not at all a probable one; for $x \dot{j} \mu \beta \eta$ itself occurs in the meaning 'cup' as well as 'boat' (cf. Athen. 483 A ), and the former is shown to be the older meaning by the related Skr. kumbhá-s 'jar,' 'funeral urn,' etc. That $\quad$ oupioiov designated a small kind of cup is attested by inscriptions no less than by Athenaeus, so e. g. in the Delian one of Michel 833, where (1. 107) four $\kappa u \mu \beta i \alpha$ weigh 158
 ب̧́ćnat each weigh 100 dr . or more. Similarly in CIA. 2. $835 \mathrm{c}-164$ a xupuiov of eight drachmas and four obols is mentioned. This does not, however, imply that it was originally a diminutive formation, for xúu.jn when used of cups also designated a small kind, as we know from the fact that Hesychius explains it by $3 \xi<\beta \alpha, \rho o v$. Moreover, the subsequent quotations of Athenaeus show that usage was not at all fixed, and Dionysius of Samos used it as synonymous with x to which Athenaeus objects that the latter was not a small cup; for in the passage referred to ( 1346 ) it designates the cup given by Odysseus to the monster Cyclops, and by three doses even he is overcome. xupiov seems to also suggest a large quantity in Anaxandr.

 frg. 3. 383 ; Epigenes frg. 3. 539 : Philemon frg. 4. 29 ; Hipparch. Com. frg. 4. 431 ; Dem. 21. 158; CIA. 2. 766. 15 (after 344 B.C.). $\lambda \varepsilon \beta \eta_{\tau} \iota o v$ 'a vessel of the $\lambda \varepsilon \beta \beta_{\zeta}$ type,' the basin into which the purifying water was poured; given as a diminutive by Michaël Syngelus ap. Cram. Anec. 4. 273.11 (cf. § 125), but that was probably not

 465 (1); CIA. 4. 2. 700 b 29, $\mu \mathrm{x}]]_{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \beta \beta \dot{\eta} \tau \tau[\alpha]$ III, $\mu \varepsilon[\gamma \dot{\lambda} \lambda \alpha$. ib. 2 add. 682 c 16 (ab. 356 B. C.) ; Insc. Delos Mich. 833. 124 (279 B. C.) ; Insc. Delos Ditt². 588.167 (ab. 180 B. C.). גexávoov 'a vessel of the $\lambda \varepsilon x \alpha \dot{x} m$ type.' So Polyzelus ap. Poll. 10. 76, Ar. Ach. 1110. дotádıov 'a vessel of the $\lambda o \pi \dot{\alpha} s$ kind,' 'a flat earthen vessel,' 'a plate.' Ar. Plut. 812 ; Alexis frg. 3. 470 (1. 7), 430 (1. 22); Axionicus frg. 3. 535 (3) ; Eubul. frg. 3. 207 (1. 3), 223 ; Men. frg. 4. 206.
 223, 228. $\pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \iota o v ~ ' a ~ v e s s e l ~ o f ~ t h e ~ \pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon ่ \lambda \lambda \alpha ~(<~ L a t . ~ p a t e l l a) ~ t y p e . ' ~$


[^38]
 $\dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi \rho \rho s \tilde{\sigma} \sigma$ ठuoiv $\lambda \varepsilon u x \dot{\eta}$. Since this is a catalogue of naval stores, $\dot{\delta} \pi \alpha-$ houn' is 'grease,' not 'ointment.' That this should have been kept in particularly 'little jars' is, of course, not to be thought of. oxaciov 'a vessel of the oxápn type.' Since its primitive oxápn could also designate a boat, there is the possibility, as in case of rupiov, that oxapiov was conceived as 'that which is like a boat.' A living diminutive function of the -tov is not to be sought for, since oxapiov has almost completely displaced its primitive in Attic inscriptions. Nevertheless the vessels so designated, like the $\chi \nu \mu \beta i \alpha$, were often small ones. In the Delos inscription of Ditt ${ }^{2} .588$ there are mentioned e. g. six oxapix of 60 dr . each ( 1.64 ff .). Two in 1.28 weigh 90 dr ., and one in CIA. 2. $836 \mathrm{c}-\mathrm{k} 27$ weighs 51 dr . Other examples in which oxxpiov designates a bowl, basin, or chamber pot are: Ar. Thesm. 633; Eupol. frg. 2. 441 ; Theophr. C.P. 4. 16. 3; Lycophr. ap. Athen. 501 E ; Athen. 142 D ; Poll. 10. 45 ; Insc. Att. Ditt². 588. 99,145 . It is used metaphorically of the skull in Ar. frg. 2. 1182 (24); of a certain fashion of hair-cutting Ar. Av. 806, Thesm. 836. бxipiov 'a cup of the oxípos kind.' Athen. 477 F . бтаилiov 'a vessel of the $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ voc type,' 'a wine jar.' Ar. Lys. 196, 199; Men. frg. 4. 108 (3. 2): Plato Ep. 13. 361 A. גvteidıov 'a vessel of the Xuгpís kind,' 'a pot.' Ar. Ach. 1175; Alexis frg. 3. 494; Arist.
 variant reading of the Bodleian Msc. for yutpi̊̀ov in Ar. Ach. 1175. Hesychius has yutpiou roú xpaviou, with which of. oxopiov in the same sense.
b) -ov takes the place of an other suffix. The fact that such a multitude of names of vessels end in -tov, and that the suffix originally had a variety of different meanings in different words of this congeneric group, brought about the result that it lost most of the color it had when the words were formed, and appeared merely a suffix for names of vessels, so that new words of this kind would be formed merely by analogy to the older ones without regard to the relation of primitive and derivative. As a formal indication that this stage had been reached, there exist, in the first place, a few words in which -ov has displaced -tס- instead of being added to it. Buth suffixes could form names of vessels and were therefore felt as equivalent in this use ( $\S 17$ ). Consequently the more frequent one encroached upon the less frequent, and so we find idvutióiov (Crat.

Jun．ap．Athen． 469 C：CIA．2． 836 c－k 35 （270－262 B．C．）in－
 （Athen． 498 A ）instead of $\sigma x \alpha \lambda i s$ dres not belong here，but rather comes from a primitive $\sigma x \alpha \lambda \lambda \sigma^{v}$ ，which is found in Hesychius；or otherwise we must assume a by－form $\sigma \alpha \alpha \lambda \lambda i s$ with double $\lambda$ ．
c）Words without primitive in existence．There is still further evidence of－tov as a vessel－designating suffix in the existence of a number of such words of unknown etymology．${ }^{2}$ Some of these，of course，may have had a primitive which is accidentally not quotable， but there are too many of them to attribute all to this cause，and some have a decidedly un－Greek appearance，and were undoubtedly foreign words，which were fitted out with－tov because that suffix would inevitably suggest itself as the ending to take the place of the un－ familiar foreign ending in words semantically related to such a large group of Greek words．That the suffix here should have had diminutive meaning is out of the question；for there is nothing to diminish when the form without the－lov never made its way into the Greek language． The oldest of these words，moreover，are much older than the di－ minutive use of－tov，xıб⿱宀⿻三丨口𧰨丶ov already occurring in the Odyssey，and
 Athen． 475 A ；Callix．ib． 474 E．xavxiov（onomatopœetic），Schol．
 Athen． 477 E．xı $\quad$ ov́pıov，a kind of rustic cup made of wood．© 346 ； $\xi 78: \pi 52$ ；Theocr．1．27．xœatávıov，Polemon ap．Athen． 479 F ． $\lambda \alpha \beta \varrho \omega ́ v \iota o v$, also－to૬－，－t $\alpha$ ，originally an adjective（sc．xj́入ı乡 etc．）．Men． ap．Athen． 484 C．reí ${ }^{\prime} \iota \boldsymbol{\iota}$ v，Ar．Equ．905，Av． 361 ；Crat．frg． 2. 235 （2）；Eubul．frg．3． 223 ；Axionicus frg．3． 535 （3）．

130．D．Words designating articles of dress or ornament．What has been said of the diverse origin of the words in－tov designating vessels，may be said of this group also．There is the same variety of cause of formation，the same wavering between diminutive and non－diminutive meaning，and consequently the same uncertainty as to the origin and meaning of many a word．But we may safely as－ sume that the same principles of ellipsis and subsequent attraction of

[^39]congeneric words were at work here also，and so refer many an－tov word designating a garment to the ellipsis of generic words like cipu，气̌oorpu，or ifúziov；or those designating foot－wear to the ellipsis of ósíinjuc．We may further conclude that the existence of congeneric words like ipx́ecov，axpooчúprov，etc．，with an－tov of originally different meaning，was a powerful factor in the spread of the suffix in the group； and finally，we may cite the formation of words of unknown etymology like $\beta \varepsilon p \beta$ épov and their early occurence as proof that the class did not originate as diminutive．
a）Garments，robes．dioveridiov＇a garment of the $\alpha$ 人 oupris kind，＇ ＇a purple robe．＇Insc．Att．CIG．155．56．ஷُ $\mu \pi \varepsilon \chi$ до́vov＇a robe or



 kind，＇＇a light summer garment．＇Eubul．frg．3． 254 （8）；Theocr． 15．69．хœохө́тьоv＇＇a garment of the хрох（нtós kind，＇＇a saffron－colored robe，＇mentioned as equivalent to its primitive by Poll．7．48．ińdıor

 Aŕóovv tò тpßßávoov．Mévavōpos．Clearch．ap．Athen． 256 F；Machon ib． 582 D ；CIA．2． 756.23 （346－343 B．C．）．えє́tıov＇＇a garment of the $\lambda(\omega \pi n$ kind，＇＇a cloak．＇Aristotle expressly states that it is equiv－ alent to $\dot{\mu} \dot{\alpha}$ ctov，and thus shows that it is not a diminutive：Topic． 1．7． 103 a 10，6．11． 149 a 4，Metaphys．3．4． 1006 b 26 ，兀oũचo $\gamma \dot{\alpha} p$
 Insc．Epidaurus Ditt ${ }^{2}$ ．803．127．$\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha \lambda o v \rho \gamma i d \iota v$＇a garment of the $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda$ oup ${ }^{\prime}$ is kind，＇＇a robe tinged with purple．＇${ }^{1}$ CIA．2．7556． 31.
 Dionys．H．10．17．£વ́xıov＇＇a garment of the ¢́́xos kind．＇Both prim－ itive and derivative designate a ragged，tattered garment．${ }^{3}$ It is there－ fore not impossible that $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ ucov was a deteriorative in origin，although an examination of the passages in which it occurs will not show that the deteriorative element was any more conspicuous than in the
${ }^{1}$ The primitive in this meaning Poll．7． 56.
${ }^{2}$ The primitive in this meaning Polyb，6．25． 3.
${ }^{3}$ I refer here only to the literary Attic，for the reason that the－oo forms which I have found occur in Attic literature，and must be judged from the literary Attic primitive．Dialectically and in Attic inseriptions prixos is sometimes without any deteriorative shade of meaning．
primitive. It is also possible that $\rho \dot{\alpha} x$ rov was conceived as a garment 'made of rags '; for $\rho \dot{\alpha}$ zos can designate a rag of any kind, not only a ragged garment. It occurs Ar. Ach. 412, Vesp. 128, Pax 740,
 garment,' 'a coarse cloak.' As in case of póxcov there is a deteriorative element, which may have been emphasized by the suffix, but more probably comes entirely from the primitive. Ar. Vesp. 33, 116, Plut. 714, 897, 935 ; Men. frg. 4. 96 (2) ; Lys. 32. 16; CIA. 2. 754 22 (349--344 B. C.). ழaıvózıov 'a mantle of the بawvó̀ทs kind,' 'paenula.' Oxyr. Pap. 3. 531. 14. $\chi^{\lambda \alpha \mu u ́ d \iota o v ~ ' a ~ r o b e ~ o f ~ t h e ~} \chi^{\lambda \alpha \mu u \dot{s}}$ kind,' a short kind of mantle. Antidotus frg. 3. 528 (1); Men. frg. 4. 200 ; Plut. Rom. 8. xגavíiov 'a garment of the $\chi^{\lambda \alpha v i s}$ kind,' 'a woolen mantle.' Herod. 1. 195; Eur. Or. 42, Suppl. 110 ; Chaeremon frg. 14. 9; Trag. Adespot. 7; Ar. Lys. 1190. The fact that Euripides twice uses the word in his serious dramas, while on the whole the tragic poets are zealously on their guard, not only against real diminutives, but also against words like onpiov which seem to have had a slight colloquial flavor because of their suffix, shows how remote a diminutive idea must have been to him. The attempt to rescue the diminutive by declaring it is usually used of women's mantles, is also not born out by fact; for in the first three of the six passages cited it certainly refers to men's garments.
b) Foot-wear. Buvxidiov 'a shoe of the $\beta$ auxis kind,' a kind of

 kind.' Ar. Equ. 889; Aristod. ap. Athen. 338 A. éußव́dıov 'a shoe of the $\varepsilon \mu \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} s$ kind.' Ar. Vesp. 600, Plut. 847, 941. $\sigma \dot{\alpha} v \delta \alpha \lambda_{\iota} v$ : $\sigma \dot{\alpha} v \delta \alpha \lambda 0 v$, 'a shoe of the sandal kind,' 'a sandal.' That it was not a diminutive is shown by Herod. 2. 91 ( $\sigma \alpha v \delta \alpha \hat{\lambda}$ ıóv $\tau \varepsilon \ldots$. होov vò $\mu \cdot \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \alpha \dot{\gamma} \cdot \mathrm{os} \delta\left(i \pi r \gamma_{0}\right)$, where the $\sigma \alpha v \delta \dot{\alpha} \lambda . o v$ is two cubits long, and by Poll.
 term. It also occurs in Cratinus, Cephisodorus, and Menander ap. Poll. 7. 86 f. : Theopomp. Com. ib. 10. 49 ; Antiphan. frg. 3. 103; Insc. Pergam. Ditt ${ }^{2}$. 754. 6.
c) Miscellaneous. The words in -ov which designate smaller articles of dress or ornaments are particularly perplexing; for, on the one hand, it is hard to find neuter generic words the ellipsis of which could have caused the original -to- adjective to become substantivized, on the other hand it is particularly difficult to separate diminutives and hypocoristic words from non-diminutives; for the idea
of nicety，prettiness，and the like is continually associated with ornaments even without any diminutive suffix，and could easily be emphasized by the addition of－tov．Nevertheless the existence of words without primitive，like $\psi$ ćliov＇bracelet，＇shows that the whole category was not diminutive in origin，nor felt as diminutive at the time of its formation．It is probable that the－tov spread from larger articles of dress，such as robes and shawls，to smaller ones，such as girdles，and from these it is a small step to necklaces，bracelets，etc．， and finally even to small ornaments like rings and jewels．The whole group，accordingly，arose by congeneric attraction，and a living ＇specializing＇use of the suffix is not to be sought．cidvítov： ǎhuars，＇a chain．＇Men．frg．4． 145 （3）；Philipp．frg．4． 477 ；CIA． 2． $835 \mathrm{c}-\mathrm{l} 18$（320－317 B．C．）．乌由́vıov ：乌ढَvท，‘girdle．＇Ar．Lys．72； Arist．Mirab．32． 832 b 23 （of the girdle of a wine－merchant）．
 B．C．）．$\pi \lambda$ óxıov ：$\pi \lambda$ óxos，＇necklace．＇Plut．2． 141 D ；Poll．5． 98. бт＠óyıov：бтрọ́о૬，＇a band worn by women around the breast．＇ Pherecr．frg．2． 296 （1）；Ar．Thesm．251，638，frg．2． 1078 （6）； Insc．Att．Ditt ${ }^{2}$ ． 586.19 （beginning of fourth century B．C．）．бч＠ayidıov： $\sigma \varphi p \alpha \gamma^{i}$ ，＇seal－ring．＇Insc．Delos Mich．833．43， 49 f．；CIA．2．766． 26. oبp $\alpha$ yisiov may be a diminutive CIA．2． 835 c－1 72，where it is
 oчp $\alpha$ үis $[\check{\alpha}] \sigma \eta \mu \nu s ~ \chi \alpha \tau \varepsilon \alpha[\gamma \sim i ̃ \alpha$ ．For a case of deteriorative use see
 （after 340 B．C．）．In addition there are at least two words of unknown origin：$\lambda$ uryoveov，a kind of stone．${ }^{1}$ Theophr．Lap．31；CIA．2． 835 e－1 69 （ $320-317$ B．C．）；Insc．Delos Mich．833．49．廿धえर（र） $10 v$ ， ＇bracelet＇or＇anklet．＇Herod．4．168，9． 80 ；Xen．An．1．2． 27.

131．E．Miscellaneous．All other words which might be supposed to be an outgrowth of the＇specializing＇use of tov are more or less doubtful，since any word which is equivalent to its primitive may have received its suffix by attraction of some other word which is lost or has escaped notice．Most could be said for the assumption that two names of musical instruments，híoov（Ar．Ran．1304）${ }^{2}=$ $\lambda u ́ p \alpha$, ＇lyre，＇and govixıov（Arist．Probl．19．14． 918 b 8，Jiò ti $\lambda \alpha v$－

${ }^{1}$ Cf．BCH．1882，p． 123.
${ }_{2}$ The word is put into the mouth of Aeschylus，and so can hardly be a diminutive，since Aristophanes otherwise represents him as grandiloquent and even bombastic．
$\tau \widetilde{\varphi} \alpha \nu 0 \rho \rho\left(\omega \pi \omega()^{1}=\varphi \sim \tau v \xi\right.$, are due to the ellipsis of the generic word ópravov '(musical) instrument.' It is nevertheless equally probable that these words received their suffix by the influence of some instrument noun in -tov ( $\$ 71 \mathrm{ff}$.). Totally uncertain are certain names of bags, sacks, baskets, or boxes, which may have been felt as congeneric to names of vessels, and so received their suffix. So perhaps бaxiov 'sack,' which may have been equivalent to ox́xos in Ar. frg.
 be interpreted as a diminutive here as elsewhere (§ 185). Similar is áбxiov (Hipp. 403, 424, 427, 491): え̀ $\sigma x \delta_{5}$, for which the context is perfectly insufficient to decide whether it was always or sometimes or never a diminutive. Since, however, it seems to be a deteriorative in Plut. Artax. 12, it seems safer to refer the uncertain examples to the diminutive use. Certainly equivalent to their prim-

 Plut. 711 f.; Xen. An. 7. 5. 14; Arist. Metaphys. 7. 2. 1042 b 18 ; Theophr. H. P. 5. 7. 5. The last may, however, be due to a fading of the 'generalizing' meaning as well as to the analogy of names of vessels (§ 118 C ). Finally, the question may be asked how far such plant names in -tov as are equivalent to their primitives (§ 258) are due to the ellipsis of some generic word like yutóv 'plant.'

## XIII. -ov IN THE MEANING "THAT WHICH IS LIKE, BUT NOT EQUIVALENT TO THE PRIMITIVE."

132. When a derivative designates an object as belonging to a certain category, there is the implication that the primitive, which designates the category, can be applied to the very same object as the derivative, which designates an object as belonging to that category : rory.5icov " an animal belonging to the category 'mollusk' " is applied to the very same animal as xory'jin 'a mollusk,' the only difference being one of point of view. When, however, an object is designated as being like another object, it follows that the speaker does not conceive of the same word as being applicable to both; for then there would be no sense in making a comparison. He is necessarily

[^40]puinting out one or more phases of similarity between objects which to him have also very important points of dissimilarity. When now a derivative in -ov is used to designate one object as having a certain amount of similarity with another object designated by the primitive, the necessary conclusion is that the speaker considered that the primitive, though having points of similarity, could not be applied to the same object as the derivative. Stating the same thing in a different way, we may say that whenever -tov can be translated as - that which is like' the primitive, the speaker must have felt both a certain amount of similarity and dissimilarity of the two objects compared, there was a negative as well as a positive side to the meaning of the suffix.
133. Although both of these aspects of the meaning of -tov must always be present to a certain degree, yet one or the other could be particularly prominent according to whether the speaker was most impressed by the similarity or dissimilarity between the two objects compared. In general we may say that when they are very dissimilar on the whole, or belong to widely different categories, -tov would call attention to some particular point of resemblance, and the similarity would then be the more important psychological factor, since the similarity in this one point is, consciously or unconsciously, contrasted with the general dissimilarity. ${ }^{1}$ Thus, when $\tau p \alpha \pi \varepsilon$ évov is used of a geometrical figure (trapezium), the attention is called to the fact that the figure is shaped like a table ( $\tau \rho \alpha \alpha_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \alpha$ ), because the feature of likeness of shape in objects otherwise not comparable was that which impressed the speaker and which he wanted to communicate. Similarly, in $\pi \varepsilon \delta \delta o v$ 'a plain' the suffix calls attention to the fact that the plain is like the ground ( $\pi \varepsilon \delta \delta o v$ ) in one respect, that is, its flatness, though otherwise the two ideas would hardly suffer direct comparison. So $\pi \lambda$ ioviov, used e. g. of the market place of Tegea, designates its shape as being like a brick ( $\pi \lambda$ ( $v 0 \cdot \circ \varsigma)$, though otherwise a market place and a brick are as unlike as possible. In all such words there is, then, a certain contrast between likeness in some respects and general unlikeness. On the other hand, however, the idea of likeness can also be contrasted with complete identity

[^41]rather than with unlikeness; an object can be designated by -tov as being merely like its primitive, but not the same, and in this case it is the point of difference between objects otherwise alike by which the speaker is impressed. Thus $\chi$ ぃróvov, 'a woman's shift' worn under the $\chi_{1} \tau \omega \mathrm{\omega}$, differed but slightly from its primitive and doubtless was at one time called by the same name; but whoever coined the -ov word felt that the difference was such that $\chi \iota \tau \omega v$ would hardly be applicable, and so called it a garment 'like a $\chi_{\iota} \iota \omega \mathrm{\omega}$,' but ' not a real yıróv.' Similarly $\mu$ uxyaipov 'a surgeon's knife' was essentially the same instrument as that ordinarily designated by $\mu \dot{\alpha} \nless \alpha<\rho \alpha$, yet the emphasis of the differences caused the formation of the -tov word: 'not a real dagger,' but 'something that is merely like a dagger.' It is in the development of the deteriorative (§ 155) and diminutive (§ 180 ff .) meanings that this emphasis of the negative side of the idea of similarity has been most productive.
134. In case of many words it will not be possible to follow the mind of the speaker as to whether the positive or negative element was uppermost, and often no doubt both ideas were nearly equally prominent. We may waver as to his attitude in case of xopxivov: xaprivos, 'an animal that is only half-ways a crab'; $\sigma \alpha p x i o v: \sigma \alpha p \xi$, applied to the fleshy parts of the $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho t$ plant; $\sigma \tau \dot{\prime} \mu \nu o v: \sigma \tau \delta \mu \alpha$, applied to the mouth of a cave.
135. It is evident that -tov in the meaning 'that which is like' the primitive can become the exponent of metaphorical use, and might then imply that the speaker felt as though the metaphor he used was scarcely legitimate and needed apology, just as the English phrase 'a kind of' may be an apology for using a word in a novel sense. So, besides the above named $\pi \lambda$ icvoriov, which may refer to the market place of Tegea, the oblong formation of an army, the squares into which the augurs divided the sky, or the squares of checkered cloth, we find e. g. तupínivov 'button': $\pi$ upíiv 'fruit-stone,'
 ' wing,' ßoбтрúyıov ' vine-tendril' : ßó⿱трuyos 'lock of hair.' The same use is also found in other 'diminutive' suffixes, e. g. -toxo- in words
 sting.' This is also frequent for Lat. -culo-, e. g. denticulus 'toothlike ornament upon a pillar': dens 'tooth,' geniculus 'elbow of a water pipe': genu 'knee.' In all of these words there is no idea of a diminutive force of the suffixes; for the object designated by the derivative is either the larger of the two, as $\pi \lambda .20$ oion, or there is no
essential difference of size, as between $\pi$ uphiv and $\pi$ uppivos. On the other hand, the use of these 'diminutive' suffixes to designate an object like its primitive is so easily and naturally derived from the idea 'belonging to the category of' and other more primitive meanings ( $\S 112$ ), that there is no justification for trying to rescue the diminutive character of these words by devices like that of Kessler, op. cit. 4, who translates denticulus 'kleine Verzierung an den Säulen,' although the ornament in question was certainly not small in comparison to a tooth. Moreover, the widely prevalent notion that the application of a diminutive to a metaphorical use should have caused the fading of the diminutive meaning, ${ }^{1}$ explains nothing; for how can a word meaning 'little brick' be applied to a large market place as long as the idea 'little' is connected with the suffix? It would be necessary to assume that the -tov word was first established as a diminutive, that the diminutive meaning then faded, and that subsequently it was applied metaphorically. But this theory not only assumes a complicated development which does not find support in the transmission, but it is also unable to explain why the metaphorical meaning should regularly have been connected with the word in -lov rather than the primitive. This latter fact points with certainty to the suffix as exponent of the idea of similarity.
136. To the examples given above there may be added a larger number of words in which -tov is also the exponent of metaphorical use, but at the same time designates something smaller than the primitive. I may mention áxd́vorov 'prickle on a certain fish': व̈xavod
 'bulbous root of lotus ': xópon 'head,' $\pi \tau \varepsilon \rho \dot{\rho}$ 人́co 'fins of fish,' 'feelers of cuttle-fish': $\pi \tau \varepsilon$ ह́pug ' wing,' $\rho \alpha \beta \delta i$ í 'tendrils in the mouth of certain

 'cloud.' Since the use of -tov to express similarity was the one that gave rise to the diminutive meaning ( $\$ 180 \mathrm{ff}$.), it was older than the latter, and we may consequently conclude that these words, which appear to be on the border line, belong historically with the $\pi \lambda$ ivoiov type. After the diminutive meaning, however, had become well established, new words of this kind could be formed with the idea of small size uppermost, and old ones could be reinterpreted as diminutives, or at any rate the diminutive idea could be combined with the notion of
${ }^{1}$ So latest Brugmann, Gr. 2. 13. 673.
similarity. Originally, however, no conscious distinction at all was made between the different offshoots of the meaning 'belonging to the category of '; 'generalizing' and 'specializing' -tov, -七ov as an exponent of similarity, deteriorative, and diminutive -tov were for a while all included in a general interpretation which may be paraphrased by 'a sort of ' or 'a kind of.' All the more special meanings were in the beginning entirely due to the situation, and were not definitely connected with the suffix. Only when in particular words like $\pi \lambda . v 0$ iov, avopiov, or uxidiov the situation had caused the suffix to be charged with the special meanings through the habitual use of certain words in such a shade, did interpretations such as 'like to,' 'despicable,' or 'little' gain a place in consciousness, and even then the competition of the different meanings as well as those cases where no special interpretation was called for, must have caused the old vague interpretation to have been retained part of the time.
137. The motive which in many cases caused the addition of tov, namely, the doubt whether the primitive could properly be applied to a certain object, is naturally often quite subjective; one individual may extend the use of a certain word without compunction, another may waver as to the propriety of the extension. Thus $\pi \alpha i \bar{s}$ 'child' was used for a baby in Homeric Greek when an occasion arose, but later some one must have felt that a baby was really so unlike to what is ordinarily understood by 'child,' that he added an -tov and designated it as something 'like a child,' but 'not a real child.' Similarly one individual might still be in touch with an obsolete meaning of a word while another had no longer any idea of it. So $\mu \varepsilon \tau \sim \alpha \xi$, while originally designating both a boy and a girl in the middle teens, had come to be confined to the latter. In the meanwhile there was a time when some persons would still have unhesitatingly applied $\mu \varepsilon i \rho \alpha \xi$ to a boy, while others felt that the word was not applicable and coined $\mu . \varepsilon \uparrow \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \circ v$, a person ' of the same age as a $\mu \varepsilon \tilde{p} \rho \alpha \xi$.'
138. The points of comparison between primitive and derivative can be of the greatest variety, without necessarily indicating a difference of psychological attitude. Thus there is complete similarity (real or supposed) of shape in the words which designate a statue or image
 of a serpent,' $x \varepsilon \varphi \dot{c} \lambda \lambda 10 v$ 'image of a head.' There is similarity as to shape in general or in some point or other in an extremely large number of words, e. g. $\delta \rho \alpha x$ óvtov 'a serpent-shaped fish': $\delta \rho \alpha ́ x(\omega)$,

$\pi \tau$ épu's' 'wing,' xópotov ('head-like ') 'bulb of of lotus root,' $\pi$ hurviov (-brick-shaped') 'market place of Tegea.' There is similarity of color in चéppov 'an ash-colored ointment': चéppo 'ashes,' $\pi \dot{\alpha}$ рঠıov - giraffe ': $\pi \dot{x} \boldsymbol{p} \delta o s$ 'leopard,' because of the spots in the skin. There is similarity of smell in $\tau \rho \alpha \dot{\gamma}$ rov 'goat-plant': $\tau p \alpha ́ \gamma o s(\S 257 \mathrm{E}$ ), similarity of relative position in ve¢Ę..ov 'a spot on the finger-nail': veçéin 'cloud'; $\gamma$ 亿cuxiov, a sort of water bird, got its name because it had eyes like an owl ( $\left.\gamma \lambda \alpha 0^{\prime} \xi\right)$, $\mu s \iota \rho \alpha ́ x \iota o v ~ d i f f e r s ~ f r o m ~ \mu \varepsilon \tilde{i} \rho \alpha \xi$ according to sex, $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v ~ f r o m ~ \pi \alpha \tilde{s}$ according to size and age, and $\dot{\alpha} \delta \delta_{p} i o v$ (deteriorative) from $\alpha v v_{p} p$ accoording to quality.
139. Words in -tov which designate something like their primitives sometimes become equivalent to the latter, because any word naturally may extend its sphere of usage or can be used metaphorically without formal characterization. So $\pi \tau$ ह́pu's 'wing' is applied to the flap at the bottom of a coat of armor or to the fins of fish, and becomes a synonym of $\pi$ repórov; xnois, originally 'ballot box', becomes also 'dice box' and synonymous with knoiocoo. Similarly $\sigma$ ón. $\alpha$ becomes equivalent to $\sigma$ róprov. From this partial similarity there sometimes results more complete similarity of meaning through the tendency to semantic syncretism, that is, the identity of meaning of primitive and derivative in some respects causes the latter to take upon itself the original meaning of the primitive also: $\pi \tau$ spúpoov becomes simply

140. Sometimes the idea of similarity seems to be combined with that of possession, e. g. in the above named $\gamma \lambda$ ouxiov, as though 'having eyes like an owl,' or छıoiov, a plant 'having leaves like a sword ( $\xi$ (ivos).' This, however, does not mean that the idea of possession was really connected with the suffix, but the phenomenon rather rests upon the same psychological principle as the exocentric compounds.
141. As an exponent of similarity -oov came into conflict with other suffixes of the same meaning, particularly -tio, -toxo-, and -ivo-. Of these -troo- was most productive in the meaning here disclissed, and consequently there seems to have resulted a tendency to division of labor, -tov having as its particular function the formation of real diminutives and deterioratives, while as a suffix to denote similarity it lost ground to -tono-, with its more numerous words of this type, and to -ivo-, which had practically no diminutive function, and thus was a suffix of more unified meaning.

## 1. NAMES OF ANIMALS.

 star,' a kind of spider. Nicander Th. 725. $\beta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma v ; \beta \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \rho \alpha$, probably 'an animal like a fox.' It only occurs Herod. 4. 192, and there in an enumeration of fierce wild beasts, so that it can not be a diminutive, but must rather have designated a particularly large kind of fox, to which the term $\beta \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha$ seemed hardly applicable. $\gamma^{\lambda \alpha v v i o v ~: ~}$ $\gamma \lambda \alpha 0 \xi$, 'a bird that is somewhat like an owl,' i. e. 'has gray eyes like an owl,' a certain water-bird. Athenaeus (395 C) states that it is only a little smaller than a duck, and so the word can not be a
 like a dragon or serpent,' a kind of fish in Hipp. 543, a kind of worm in Plut. 2. 733 B. xa@xivov : xapxivos, 'an animal somewhat like a crab' or 'which is only half-ways a crab.' Cf. Arist. H. A. 4. 4. 529 b 20. $\lambda v \gamma x i o v: \lambda \dot{\prime} \gamma \xi$, probably 'an animal that is like a lynx,' though it may be a diminutive. Callix. ap. Athen. 201 C. ли́œ́дıov : $\pi \dot{\alpha} р \delta о \varsigma, ~ ' a n ~ a n i m a l ~ t h a t ~ i s ~ s o m e w h a t ~ l i k e ~ a ~ l e o p a r d, ' ~ p r o b-~$ ably a giraffe, because of its spots. Arist. H. A. 2. 1. 498 b 33. бutv́œov: : ¿ácupos, 'an animal like a satyr,' a certain water rodent. Arist. H. A. 8. 5. 594 b 31. бxúııov : $\sigma x \cup 1 \lambda \xi \xi,{ }^{1}$ ' an animal like a dog,' 'a dog-fish.' Arist. H. A. 6. 10. 565 a 26 . To these words may be added, if Ahrends' conjecture to Epich. frg. 42 should be correct, xтย́vıv : x $\varepsilon$ eic, 'a comb-shaped animal,' a kind of mollusk.

## 2. NAMES OF PLANTS (see $\S 257 \mathrm{E}$ ).

## 3. PARTS OF PLANTS AND ANIMALS.

143. The derivative in -tov usually designates a smaller object than the primitive, and could therefore in later times often be felt
 of the prickles of certain fish. Arist. H. A. 3. 7. 516 b 19 , ̌̌ठ̀ıv $\delta \grave{\Sigma}$

 'a vine-tendril.' Arist. H. A. 5. 12. $544 \mathrm{a} 9,18.549 \mathrm{~b} 33$. रovátıov: rovi, 'that which is like a knee,' 'a knot or joint of a reed.' Tzetz.
[^42]Hist. 7. 741. Эvoivaov: Ovíavos, 'that which is like a tassel,' the
 is shaped like a horn.' a) 'The antennae of the $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \beta$ og.' Arist. H. A. 4. 2. 526 a 7 . b) 'The tentacles of certain crustaceans and mollusks.' id. ib. 4. 4. $528 \mathrm{~b} 24,529 \mathrm{a} 27$. c) 'The curved end of the womb of mammals,' 'tubae Fallopii.' Arist. H. A. 3. 1. 510 b 19. xóoбוov : xópon, 'that which is shaped like a head,' 'the bulbous root of the Egyptian lotus.' Theophr. H. P. 4. 8. 11. лгє@úqıov : $\pi \tau$ épuگ́, 'that which is like a wing.' a) 'The fins of fish.' Arist. H.A. 2. 13. 504 b 33, Part. An. 4. 13. 695 b 21, 23, ib. 12. 694 b 10. b) 'Finlike appendages on the tails of crustaceans.' Arist. An. Gen. 1. 14. 720 b 12, H. A. 1. 5. 490 a 3, 4. 2. 525 b 27 ff. c) 'Fin-like appendages of mollusks.' Arist. H. A. 4. 1.523 b 25, Part. An. 4. 9 .685 b 16. d) 'Feelers of the cuttle-fish.' Alexis frg. 3. 416, 471 (3. 3); Sotad. frg. 3. 585 (1.16). e) 'Horns of the horned owl.' Arist. H. A. 8. 12.597 b 22, frg. 276. 1527 b 31. f) By semantic syncretism (cf. § 139) with its primitive $\pi \tau \varepsilon p$ órov became simply 'wing.' So
 'that which is like a rod,' the tendrils in the mouth of certain fishes. Arist. H. A. 9. 37. 620 b 32 . $\sigma \propto \varrho x i \alpha \alpha: \sigma \alpha_{0} \xi$, 'the fleshy parts' of the ox́pt plant. Theophr. H. P. 4. 8. 5.

## 4. CUPS, VESSELS, BOXES.

 of its shape (cf. Athen. 782 F , AKATOS $\pi$ othipov हैowòs $\pi \lambda$ ofi()), or on account of its small size compared to other cups (Epicr. frg. 3.
 axvosuov, probably a 'flowery' vessel, i. e. a vessel decorated with
 x $\eta_{\text {qidion, xintov }}$ : xnois, 'that which is like a ballot box,' 'a dice box.' Hermipp. frg. 2. 391 (6) ; Athen. 477 D : Poll. 10. 150. ఢुобхи́gıov: бxúpos, 'a oxúpos-like cup which is shaped like an egg,' the -ov being no less a result of the feeling that oxípos would strictly be inapplicable, than of the word being a compound. It is described Athen. 503 E .
${ }^{1}$ The form zn'soo was probably due to retrograde derivation from $x \eta$ idiov. The suffixes tov and -idion were interchangenble in many uses, and this could lead to the substitution of either one for the other, even when, as here, the -to- of -wion really belonged to the stem of the primitive.

## 5. ARTICLES OF DRESS AND ORNAMENT.

145. A. Garments and shoes. éxútıov : x̌xavo5, 'that which is like a boat,' a kind of women's shoe. Ar. ap. Poll. 7. 93. лteœúrıov : $\pi \tau$ épu多, 'that which is like a wing,' the flap or skirt at the bottom


 'a women's shift worn under the $\chi_{\mathrm{i} \tau} \quad \mathrm{\omega} v$. . Ar. Lys. 48, 150, Eccl. 268, 374, Plut. 984, frg. 2. 1084 (14), 1194 ; Plato Ep. 13. 363 A; Theocr. 15. 31 ; CIA. 2. 754.51 (349-344 B. C.), 757. 24 (335 B.C.).
B. Ornaments. There are a number of words in tov which designate ornaments and are named after some plant or animal or other
 just what kind of an ornament most of these names represent, ${ }^{1}$ and since some of them are known only from a mere mention of Pollux, we can not always be certain about the relation of primitive and derivative in such words. But since we know e. g. that golden cicadas were worn in the hair, since words like oैoprs 'snake' are used without addition of a suffix to designate some ornaments (so Nicostr. frg. 3. 289 [7]), we may surmise e. g. that $\pi$ eptr $\begin{gathered}\text { épov was so named because }\end{gathered}$ it had some resemblance, either in part or as a whole, to a dove or part of a dove, and the suffix could thus be translated 'like to' or 'having something like to' (cf. § 140). Similarly with all other ornaments the names of which are derived in this way. For the sake of brevity I translate e. g. ßoupó $\lambda$ cov as 'that which is like an antelope,' but of course do not mean that the whole bracelet looked like an antelope, but merely that it had something about it somewhere that suggested an antelope or part of an antelope, or perhaps was composed of a chain of little images of antelopes, as is suggested by the
 ${ }^{2} \approx \cup 0 p \alpha \xi$, 'that which is like charcoal,' a kind of jewel. Theophr. Lap. 30,33 . $\beta$ ov $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota o v: ~ \beta o \cup ́ \beta \alpha \lambda \iota \varsigma$, 'that which is like an antelope,' a kind of bracelets. Nicostr. frg. 3. 289 (7); Diph. frg. 4. 402. ілтохо́цлєоv : iлло́ххило૬, 'that which is like a sea-horse' (?), a kind of

[^43]ealr-ring. Poll. 5. 97. גoryıov : خ. 6 y/n, 'that which is shaped like a spear-head,' in 'ृpp.os дoryi(ovy 'a necklace of spear-heads.' Cf. BCH. 6. 123. orvexov: ơvé, 'that which is like a nail,' 'a gem streaked

 dove.' Poll. 5. 101. Tveŋ́voov : תupquv, 'that which is like a fruit-stone,' 'a button.' Insc. Delos Mich. 833. 116 (279 B. C.) : Insc. Boeot. CB. 714. 6 ff . ( $\pi$ oupsivov). $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha ́ x \iota o v: \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \xi$, 'that which is like a rush mat'(?), a term of derision (?). Poll. 5. 101. бוбф́øıv' 'that
 'that which is like or suggests the oirupppov plant.' Poll. 5. 101.

 cone,' a kind of ear-ring. Poll. 5. 97. ழúxєov : ¢ưxos, 'that which is like a sea-weed,' a kind of ornament. ${ }^{1}$ Insc. Delos Mich. 833. 42,




## 6. STATUES AND DEDICATORY IMAGES.

146. We may translate e. g. 'Aprepícoov 'a likeness of Artemis,' रs $\varphi \dot{\alpha}$ 'icov 'image of a head.' Since most of these images were smaller than the object they represent, these words could also be interpreted as diminutives, and the more easily because the primitive itself could be used to designate its image without formal characterization, as the well-known Athenian 'Equail 'busts of Hermes.' When both primitive and -tov derivative existed alongside of each other as a designation for the image, the usual diminutive relation of such pairs could make itself felt, and could lead, by a kind of proportional analogy, to the reinterpretation of the derivative as a diminutive.
A. Images of Gods or Men. 'Aptquiotov' 'a likeness (statue) of


${ }^{1}$ Homolle, BCH. 6. 125, would interpret the word as 'rouge-box,' but the slight weight of the articles enumerated, especially since they were of gold, would make this meaning impossible. Moreover, the fact that quxura is in the first passage mentioned just between the shield-shaped ornaments and necklaces would point to a word of congeneric meaning, and for the manner of derivation in the sense in which I have taken it there are the




 'a likeness (statue) of П ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \varsigma . '$ Herod. 4. 189 ; Ar. Ach. 547 ; CIA. 2. 652 B 17, 678 B 66 ( $378-366$ B. C.). More uncertain is 'Exácıov 'a likeness (statue) of 'Exáon.' In the obviously corrupt form $\tau \dot{\alpha} \times \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau o v$ it occurs in Ar. Lys. 64, to which the scholiast notes: $\dot{\alpha x \dot{c} \tau \iota v . ~ \tau o ̀ ~ ' E x \alpha ́ r n s ~ \xi b a v o v . ~ A c c o r d i n g l y ~ t h e ~ t e x t ~ i s ~ e m e n d e d ~ t o ~}$ Ooỏxávsıov (= тò 'Exácsıv), the -st- being required by the meter and occurring Ar. Vesp. 804. The reading of the scholion, however, would point to the existence of a form with -t- somewhere, though not in Aristophanes. $\Phi_{\iota \lambda}$ ćxıov (CIA. 2. 836 c-k 43 (270-262 B. C.), бஸ̃ц. $\alpha$, $\Phi \iota \lambda \dot{\alpha} x \iota o v \cdot \vdash \cdot)$ is the only probable example I have found of similar images of men. It is however, quite doubtful, on the one hand, because the extremely small weight of the image would point to its being felt as a real diminutive, on the other hand $\sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ © $\Phi \lambda \alpha \alpha^{x}$ ov may be an ad-
 (l. 82).
B. Images of Animals. סৎcxóvtıov: $\delta \rho \alpha \dot{x} \omega v$, 'an image of a serpent.' CIA. 2. 836 c-k 15, 73, 99 (270-262 B. C.). xe@qviov : xépyvm, 'an
 'an image of a hare.' Insc. Delos Ditt ${ }^{2}$. 588. 207.
 2. 733 A 21 (ab. 306 B. C.), 836 c--k 3 (270-262 B. C.). х $л \iota \mu \dot{\alpha}-$ uov : $\chi \lambda \pi \mu \mu \xi$, 'an image of a ladder.' Insc. Delos Mich. 833. 35,
 $\lambda \sigma_{\gamma} \gamma \eta$, probably 'an image of a spear.' CIA. 2 add. 682 с 17




$\alpha \alpha^{2} \lambda \lambda_{0} \sigma \tau \varepsilon \varphi q^{\alpha} v v_{0}$. That the diminutive meaning was not prominent in this word is shown by the use of $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \varphi \alpha^{\prime} v o v$ as equivalent to $\sigma$ épocvos in the example quoted, and by the fact that when the weight of such articles is given, no distinction is made between primitive and derivative. Homolle, BCH .6 .120 , calls attention to three $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \varphi \dot{q} \mathrm{v}^{\prime}<\alpha$ which weigh 63 drachmas, while a crown of two obols is called $\sigma \tau \varepsilon-$ $\varphi$ بvoc. $\sigma \tau v \varrho(1 x \iota o v: ~ \sigma \tau u ́ p \alpha \xi$, 'an image of the spike' at the end of the

of the breast,' among the offerings in the temple of Asclepius in CIA.



## 7. WORDS REFERRING TO BUILDING AND ARCHITECTURE.

147. While in most of the preceding groups the derivative usually designated a smaller object than the primitive, the reverse is true here: $\pi \tau \varepsilon p$ úrov 'the battlements of a building' refers to a larger object than $\pi \tau \varepsilon ́ p u \xi{ }^{\prime}$ 'wing,' and so can not be its diminutive ; ¿uvópuov 'Hlower pattern on a column' can not be a diminutive to $\alpha^{2} v 0 \cdot \varepsilon \mu o v$ ' flower.'
 like a flower,' the honey-suckle pattern on a column. Insc. Att.


 'an ornament in the shape of an ox-head.' Insc. Magnes. Ditt ${ }^{2} .552$.

 xüuc, 'that which is like a wave,' 'a wave-pattern.' Insc. Att. Ditt². 587. 186, 187 (329 B. С.).
B. Miscellaneous. ixøıa, according to Bezzenberger, BB. 27. 162, : Russ. ikrá 'calf of leg,' and would then be 'that which is like the leg,' i. e. the planks of a ship, either the deck or ribs. Bezzenberger compares the use of Gr. xvíun and French jambe in a similar sense.
 is like a wing,' either 'a turret' or 'the battlements' or 'a pointed roof.' Gosp. Luk. 4. 9. тeıxiov: тeǐ०s. The primitive designated a city wall ${ }^{2}$ par excellence, and seemed inapplicable to the walls of houses or other private walls, for which was coined the derivative
 Original diminutive meaning is excluded; for it occurs already in Homer, and modified by the adjective $\mu \varepsilon ́ \gamma \alpha^{3}: \pi 165=343$, 'Ex $\delta^{\prime}$ ri $\lambda$ -


${ }^{2}$ For. the distinction between $\tau \varepsilon i \chi o s$ and $\tau \varepsilon \not x$ ioy of. Schol. ad Dionys. AB. 856 .
 ing the Homeric passage.

 Ditt ${ }^{2}$. 531. 17, 19 (third cent. B. C.).
C. By congeneric attraction to zelyiov were formed the following words meaning 'wall,' both of which are equivalent to their primitives:
 IGSI. 894.

## 8. WORDS MEANING 'YOUTH.'

148. The commonest of these words, and the one after which the others were patterned, is $\mu \varepsilon \iota \varrho \alpha ́ x \iota o v ~ ' a ~ b o y ' ~ o f ~ a b o u t ~ f o u r t e e n ~ y e a r s: ~$ $\mu \varepsilon i ̃ \rho \alpha \xi$ 'a girl' of the same age. The -tov of the derivative either conveys the notion ' of the same age as a $\mu \varepsilon \pi \rho \alpha \xi$,' or goes back to an
 prehistoric times when $\mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\rho} \rho \alpha$ could refer to boys as well as girls, and of which the Neuter was later substantivized under the influence
 minutive, is impossible for several reasons. To call a boy of fourteen years 'a litte girl' of the same age is, of course, too absurd to be attempted by anybody, but the diminutive character of $\mu \varepsilon \iota \rho$ óxiov has been maintained on the grounds that $\mu s i \rho \alpha \xi$ could refer to a boy as well as a girl, and the diminutive was formed with reference to the former meaning. This assumption, however, is squarely opposed to the statement of Philetaerus Vat. (Cohn Rh. Mus. 1888 p. 415),



 absolutely in harmony with the transmission. The few late passages where $\mu \varepsilon \tilde{i} \rho \alpha \xi$ is applied to a male are so obviously devices for scoffing by giving a female name to him, that it is correct to say that there is no authority whatever for it in the bona fide meaning 'boy.' Even though comparison of the Skr. maryaká-s 'mannikin' would point to it for prehistoric times, this is of no importance for the Classical period, since $\mu \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\rho} \alpha ́ x i o v ~ d o e s ~ n o t ~ o c c u r ~ u n t i l ~ A r i s t o p h a n e s, ~ i . ~ e . ~ l o n g ~$ after $\mu \varepsilon \tilde{i} \rho \alpha \xi$ had ceased being applied to boys. But, even if we assume that this is due to the accident of transmission, there remains the greater difficulty of explaining why in this one case the diminutive of a word of common gender should have been limited to the male
sex, although otherwise it is always the female which usurps the diminutive designations. And finally, leaving out of account a few apparent cases of deteriorative usage, which, however, are entirely due to the situation ( $\$ 171$ ), there is no indication in the use of the word that any 'diminutive' idea was connected with it, no tendency to confine it to hypocoristic situations. It is from the beginning a mere objective designation for a boy of a certain age, as becomes particularly evident by comparing phrases lihe $\varepsilon \chi \kappa \mu \varepsilon \varphi \alpha x i o u$
 general statements which apply to all lads, e. g. Ar. Equ. 556,
 §è por ib. 990, Plut. 88 ; Theopomp. Com. frg. 2. 803 ; Ephipp. frg. 3. 336,
 páxıov ทั้ тoùs ג́́pous ท̀̀र́ouv. Xen. An. 2.6.16; Ant. $3 \propto 1$ : Andoc.




By congeneric attraction to $\mu \varepsilon \iota \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ ov or the diminutive $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v ~ a r o s e$ $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \iota \iota v=\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \xi,{ }^{\prime}$ boy ' (Plato Com. ap. Poll. 2. 9; Eustath. 1419. $50, \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \varkappa \alpha$. . . oi $\pi \alpha i \delta \varepsilon \varsigma)$, and кv@бiov. ${ }^{1} \mu \varepsilon \iota \rho \alpha ́ \alpha \iota o v ~ H e s . ~ W e ~ a r e ~$ ignorant of the precise aspect of its primitive, which can not have been oxupo $\alpha \xi$ or oxupóàivos, since the loss of initial $\sigma$ - on Greek soil is inexplicable. It is necessary either to derive it from a lost primitive *xuporos, *xupoós, or to assume that it was shortened from xupoд́vos through the attraction of $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v$.

## 9. PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY.

149. jovócoov : Yóv, that which is like the knee,' 'the hip-joint.'
 gation of the uvula.' Hipp. 868. тлع@úиov : $\pi \tau$ épu'̧, that which is like a wing.' a) A part of the shoulder-blade. Poll. 2. 177 (Plural). b) 'The parts of the ear adjoining the temples.' id. 2.85. c) 'The parts of the nose adjoining the cheeks.' id. 2. 80 (Plural). ofucoiov: opaipx, 'that which is like a ball,' 'the tip of the nose.' Poll. 2. 80. дov ¢oiov : そóvסроৎ, 'that which is like groats,' 'cartilage.' Hipp. 810.
${ }^{2}$ The $\sigma<\vartheta$ shows the word to be Laconian.

## 10．MISCELLANEOUS．

 flower pattern＇in Xen．An．5．4．32，where the Mossynoeci are said
 haps＇that which is tube－like，＇though it may be a mere extension of the meaning＇house，＇＇cottage＇（§ 65）．Soph．Phil．19， $4 i$
 a hole，＇a kind of ulcer（cf．oupírүrov）．Hipp．427．rovyviidıov： roryunis，＇that which is like a（little）turnip，＇explained by Gal．Lex．
 Opspu $\alpha$ ，＇a sort of nursling，but not a real nursling，＇applied to slaves which were reared in the house．Insc．Calymna Ditt ${ }^{2} .865$ ． $15,866,2,868.18$ ．For the incidental deteriorative shade of mean－ ing cf．$\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v$ below．xи $\beta \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} \iota o v: x \neq \omega \tau \sigma$ ，＇that which is like a box，＇ ＇the treasury of the temple at Delphi．＇Insc．Delph．CB．2516． 7. xo八дv́œov ：xo $\lambda \lambda \dot{\rho} \rho \alpha$ ，＇that which is like a cake，＇＇eye－salve，＇because put up in small cakes．Hipp．609．xíлৎっоv（ $:$ xо́троя）seems to be a substantivized neuter of an adjective rómpos＇filthy＇（cf．xómpsıos in the same sense），and thus to have been conceived as＇the filthy stuff．＇So Hipp．176，though otherwise also deteriorative（§ 166）． жтย́vıc ：$\chi \tau \varepsilon \dot{1}$ ，that which is like a comb，＇＇the horns of a lyre．＇Hes．，
 ＇that which is like a box，＇＇a bee－hive．＇Arist．H．A．9． 40.627 b 2. Later（Plut．2． 601 C ）the primitive occurs in the same sense． $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \dot{\alpha} \delta_{\imath} \nu v: \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha_{5}$ ，＇that which is like a torch．＇a）＇A bandage for wounds＇（cf．$\lambda \cup \not \vee \vee \omega \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$, Schol．Ar．Ach．1177，in the same sense）． Ar．Ach．1177．b）＇Braid of Theban women．＇Dicaearch． 313 ed． Fuhr．$\mu \alpha \chi \alpha i \varrho \iota o v: ~ \mu \dot{\alpha} \nless \alpha \iota \rho \alpha$, ＇a sort of dagger，but not a real dagger．＇ a）A kind of dagger of the Chalybes．Xen．An．4．7．16，$\mu$ čaxipoov
 1061 a 4，Eth．M．2．11． 1209 a 23，Gen．An．5．8． 789 b 13．veчと $\lambda_{l o v}$ ：veqé $\lambda \eta$, ＇that which is cloudy．＇a）Clouds in the urine．＇Hipp．

 son，＇i．e．either a bastard or a son born of a foreign wife；for the latter were called vóoor＇bastards＇at Athens and apparently at Cos． From the latter is found an inscription（CB．3624）in which these

[^44]vópor, in contrast to the full citizens and foreigners, were designated as $\pi \alpha: \delta \delta \alpha$. Cf. CB. 3. 1 p. 345. For the incidental deteriorative
 ground' i. e. •flat as the ground,' 'a plain.' B $465 ;$ Z $2 ; \delta 602$; Xen. An. 1. 2. 11. $\pi \lambda w$ fion' $: \pi \lambda$ ivoros, 'that which is like a brick.' a) 'The market place of Tegea.' Pausan. 8. 48. 1. b) 'The oblong formation of an army.' Plut. Crass. 23. c) The square into which the augurs divided the sky with the lituus.' Plut. Rom. 22. d) A kind of chess board. Poll. 9. 98. e) 'Squares on cloth.' Diod. 5. 30.

 бтoryiov : $\sigma$ то $\gamma \gamma{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$, 'that which is like a sponge,' 'a spongy substance.'
 a spongy substance (\$ 139), and this partial equivalence caused semantic syncretism, so that any sponge could be designated by the
 is like a mouth,' the primitive being thought of as the mouth of men or animals. The primitive itself being frequently used in an extended meaning, it was largely equivalent to the derivative. a) 'Mouth of a ressel.' Aesch. ap. Athen. 476 C; Arist. Probl. 25. 2. 938 a 9. b) 'Mouth of a cave' used as grave. Soph. Ant. 1217. c) 'A cave,' as the entrance to the lower world. Plato Resp. 10. 615 D, F. d) 'Opening' in general. Arist. H. A. 9. 39. 623 a 4. e) 'End
 f) $=\sigma$ ớux, by semantic syncretism (§ 139). Posid. frg. 4. 521
 oveiryıov : $\sigma \dot{j} \boldsymbol{p} \gamma \xi$, 'that which is like a pipe.' a) A kind of sore or ulcer (cf. $\beta$ oupiov). Hipp. 1201. b) 'The hole in a wheel.' Hes..
 -that which is like a ball.' a) 'A cotton-like ball' on certain trees. Theophr. H. P. 3. 7. 4. b) 'A globe or ball of flowers.' Diose. ap. Gloss. vÉy@ıv: téop $\alpha$, 'that which is ash-colored,' an ointment.
 'a trapezium.' Arist. Probl. 25. 4. 911 a 7.

## XIV. -ov AS A DETERIORATIVE SUFFIX.

151. It has been the all but universally accepted theory that when a certain 'diminutive' suffix was also used to express contempt, i. e.
when diminutive and deteriorative meaning occurred alongside of each other in the same suffix, the deteriorative meaning was in every case a secondary phenomenon to the diminutive, ${ }^{1}$ and due to the contempt which is naturally associated with small size or kindred ideas in case of objects which are less valuable or in any way inferior when small. Thus in a martial community, in which bodily strength is the highest ideal, a small man is naturally an object of disdain because he is thought of as lacking one of the qualities a man ought to have. It can not be disputed that any diminutive suffix may occasionally get an accessory deteriorative notion in this way, and that it is at least a possibility that the fully developed deteriorative meaning of some suffixes arose through this accessory idea becoming dominant. For Greek tov I may mention the following examples in which the contempt which is associated with the suffix is directed against an object because of its small size, youth, and the like. The quality of sheepishness is considered as still greater in a little lamb that in a full grown sheep, and this has led to the diminutive áqviov 'little lamb' getting the additional implication of cowardice in Philipp. frg. 4. 476 (7),
 тepos. Since a child is both little and below the adult in intelligence, the diminutive roudion 'little child' could get the accessory idea of stupidity, and so become deteriorative : Eupolis frg. 2.521 (2), ${ }^{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{H}^{\prime} \alpha \dot{\alpha}-$


 itants of great cities like Athens it naturally seemed something contemptible to belong to a little city, whence the deteriorative shade



 of deteriorative and diminutive meaning in certain words ending in conglutinates of -tov, e. g. к $\omega$ i位ov (§ 315. X. A), oixioicov (§ 315.
 from passages like the above it is very probable that those cases of deteriorative meaning in which we can translate the suffix 'insignificant' are largely offshoots of the diminutive meaning; for small size often carries with it that idea, e. g. 'a small affair,' 'a little piece

[^45]of work,' etc. So Gr. лৎсүис́цıov 'an insignificant little affair.' Ar.









152. From the fact that diminutive meaning can develop into deteriorative meaning, the conclusion can not be drawn that the latter is always to be derived from the former, since other methods of origin are also possible. Leaving out of account those cases in which deteriorative meaning is shifted from the stem to the ending (cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 683), a method of development which is out of the question for -tov, there is the possibility that its deteriorative meaning developed from its use to designate similarity and from its hypocoristic meaning. The latter is certainly the case when a term of endearment is applied to a person of such diginity that the hypocorism is an expression of undue familiarity, and so causes endearment to turn into contempt. So dov́ৎю́tıov 'a dear little chap' has an ironical ring as applied to the hero Menelaus in Eur. Cycl. 185 (§ 237 a). тatéoov, the German 'Väterchen,' is really a term of derision when the dignified blind old seer Tiresias is so addressed in Lucian Menipp. 21 (§ 236a).. A somewhat similar ironical turn is given to a hypocorism when it is applied to a person of huge or uncouth appearance, so that this use of the suffix comes into contlict with the meaning 'small,' 'neat,' 'pretty,' etc. Although the speaker need not always feel such incongruousness, there will come times when some one while hearing an expression of endearment will think of the diminutive use of the same suffix, and so think of the hypocorism as ironical. Thus when Silanus is beseeching the one-eyed monster Polyphemus in Eur.
 the immense size and uncouth form of the Cyclops, and the term of endearment becomes a term of derision. Occasionally the idea of luxuriousness, which is derived either from the diminutive or hypocoristic meaning of the suffix (§ 211 D ), may result in deteriorative meaning; for luxury is viewed either with admiration or contempt according to the individual's taste or circumstances. So besides
oixnux́ziov, 'luxuriantly decorated chamber" (§ 161), the conglutinate -apoov in oxucápoov: oxさ̃тos 'leather' etc. Anaxil. frg. 3. 345 (1.6),

153. Since, then, various ways of origin of the deteriorative use of -tov are not only possible, but have actual support for a small number of passages, it will be necessary to examine on its own merits and without prejudice the proposition that the diminutive meaning is the sole or the preponderingly paramount origin of the deteriorative usage. The only reason which seems to be advanced is that of Schwabe (op. cit. 48), namely, that the diminutive idea is concrete, while the deteriorative as well as the hypocoristic meanings are abstract, and consequently the latter must have been developed from the former; for abstract ideas are undoubtedly later than concrete ideas. This proposition, however, is glaringly at fault in two respects. In the first place, contempt and endearment are not to be contrasted with concrete ideas as being abstract, but they are emotions and are to be contrasted with intellectual ideas like small size. Since, now, emotional expressions antedate intellectual ones, we would have the better right to conclude that the diminutive meaning must needs be secondary to the deteriorative and hypocoristic meanings. But we have no right to interpret a number of individual phenomena by a-prioristically applying general statements of any kind. No matter how similar these phenomena may be, there is dissimilarity underneath, and every suffix must be examined on its own merits. Only if it were proven that all 'diminutives developed in Indo-European times, and that at this early date either no abstract or no intellectual ideas had as yet been developed, would it be allowable to reason from general statements like the above to single instances. A glance, however, e. g. over Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. $582-685$, will convince anyone that abstract ideas as well as concrete, intellectual as well as emotional ideas, were completely developed in Indo-European times. Transition from abstract to concrete meaning is as well authenticated as the reverse at all periods which have come under linguistic observation, and we must give up all attempts to decide individual questions by reference to general tendencies.
154. The assumption that the deteriorative meaning of -oov is mainly an offshoot of the diminutive, is further weakened by the fact that combinations of the two are really very rare compared to the numerous passages in which the deteriorative meaning is altogether independent of any idea of small size, as can be seen by examining the collection of examples in the different parts of this chapter.

Moreover, there are in existence some words, e.g. ¿uvoioiov and そepóvitov, which are found only in deteriorative, but never in diminutive meaning.
155. I have already referred to the fact that the deteriorative as well as diminutive meanings are easily explained as specializations of -ov as an exponent of similarity ( $\$ 136$ ) i. e. of that kind of similarity which is contrasted with complete identity and which emphasizes its negative side (§ 133). In the pattern types of the -tov deterioratives the speaker intimated that a certain object was lacking in some quality or qualities which a perfect specimen of its kind should have. Thus $2 v \delta \delta_{i o v}$ was 'something like a man, but not a real man,' because the speaker felt that a perfect man must be brave, honest, and good, while a coward, a dishonest, or wicked man was not one that really deserved the name $\alpha^{2} \dot{m}_{p}$, honorable address as it was among the Greeks. Similarly $\tau$ '́jum ' a trade ' really brought with it the idea of usefulness and dignity. When an undignified, useless, or debased trade like that of the panderer or parasite was to be designated, some one coined $\tau \varepsilon \neq v i o v ' n o t ~ a ~ r e a l ~ t r a d e, ~ b u t ~$ only something like a trade,' 'a poor excuse for a trade.' A part of the idea of poxpuxzov 'a remedy' was its effectiveness, and when the inefficient drugs of some quack or amateur called for a special designation, there resulted pappúxuov 'not a real remedy, only a poor excuse for a remedy,' i. e. 'a worthless drug.' Similarly xóouov 'something like an ornament, but no real ornament,' 'an ornament that isn't worth the name,' 'a wretched trinket.' The whole development may be compared with that of the German prefix un- in words like Unmensch, or the Skr. -ka- in rājaká-s • kingling,' 'not a real king. ${ }^{11}$ Though in all of these examples there is no need of the development being assisted by the idea of small size, it might occasionally happen that littleness was one of the points of inferiority of the primitive and derivative, e. g. ¿uvopiov might be 'a little wretch,' etc. In such cases the two ideas grew up side by side, and there is no justification for saying that one is secondary to the other.
156. The principal reason for believing that the mass of deterioratives in tov arose in this way rather than from the diminutive meaning, is the fact that both are erfuidistant from the older meaning of similarity, and that certain words with the latter meaning of the suffix, e. g. $\pi$ coioiov in the meaning 'bastard son' ( $(5150)$. ummistak-

[^46]ably point to the possibility of deterioratives developing on these lines. It is highly improbable that this short, straight cut to the idea of contempt should have been passed over, and that subsequently the circuitous path over diminutive or even hypocoristic usage should have been followed exclusively. It is also of importance that at least two of the words mentioned above, namely duvoioiov and $\tau \varepsilon y v i o v$, were doubtless common words in every-day speech, and so well fitted to give rise to a larger category, though doubtless those in which the deteriorative meaning arises out of the diminutive also had their influence.
157. The gender of words in -tov must also have been a strong factor in the development of deteriorative meaning in personal names. Brugmann, Gr. 2, $1^{2} .670$, points out that the Neuter was particularly well fitted for diminutives of living beings, because it represents them as being lifeless and rather thing-like (cf. 'the little thing,' German 'das kleine Ding,' as a designation of a very small child). Often, however, the designation of a human being by a word of the Neuter gender causes a deteriorative shade of meaning: for the reason for representing a person as a lifeless creature would frequently be some thrust at his want of intelligence, cold-heartedness, or other feature which he is thought of as sharing with inanimate things. Very probably the secondary deteriorative shade of words like the German 'das Mensch' and 'das Weib' was largely due to the gradual assertion of the force of the gender, and the same may be said of Gr. cò Yóvcıov 'woman,' which was evidently substantivized from the adjective róvalos in historical times. Since the conglutinate -avov did not take part in the development of diminutive and deteriorative meanings (cf. § 16, end), there was no idea of contempt in the word when first formed, as can be seen by the following passages



 teriorative meaning is already developed in Plato Theaet. 171 E, si סó







## 1. THE PATTERN TYPES.

155. The words which were the earliest deterioratives must have been of such a nature that the idea of inferiority to the primitive is in their case most easily derived from the older idea 'that which is like the primitive, but not the same.' The four best examples have already been mentioned above ( $\S 155$ ). Less certain is àvpósiocov, perhaps originally just like àvopiov 'a poor excuse for a man,' and so 'a paltry fellow,' 'knave,' 'wretch.' It is, however, at least equally probable that this word merely followed $\alpha v \delta \rho i o v ;$ for its primitive $\alpha^{\alpha} v$ טp(o) Tos, in contrast to àvip, and like the German Mensch opposed to Mann, could itself be used with a shade of contempt, and if the originator of the derivative happened to think of the primitive in this light, he could not have thought of $\alpha v o p \omega \pi o s$ as not really applicable, but rather as the very best word for the occasion, and the suffix then merely emphasized the contempt. We may still further reduce the number of probable patterns by considering that xófurov is only a very late word, and that papuáxuov was evidently a rare word, being found in a deteriorative sense only in Plato. This leaves avopiov and reyviov as the earliest and most influential of the deterioratives in -10 v , the patterns of most of the group.
156. Collection of examples. ảvooiov : àmp, Eupol. frg. 2. 554















${ }^{1}$ At first thought cevdoiov might here seem to be a diminutive; for cevSoiorat is placed between rationa and ävociar, but the following imepritanor etc. shows the climax to be that of manliness, not of size. The poet is playing upon the double nature of the suffix.










## 2. THE DETERIORATIVE REPRESENTS AN OBJEOT AS DESPICABLE COMPARED TO OTHERS OF ITS KIND.

160. The deteriorative meaning has developed a step further when the -tov represents an object as a despicable one of its kind, without the implication that the primitive would really be inapplicable. This is a natural extension of meaning which can not exactly be separated from the preceding group; the different attitudes of the speaker shade into each other imperceptibly, and there was no doubt a wavering attitude to many a word. The interpretation 'a poor excuse for,' 'a kind of, but not worth the name,' etc., while it could only originate in a few ideas where it could naturally and easily be derived from the notion of similarity, can be extended to words in which it could not have originated. Thus $\sigma \omega \mu \dot{\alpha}$ coov 'a weak body' could still be felt as 'a poor excuse for a body,' since it is lacking in something which it is very desirable for a body to have ; yet it can not very well have been a pattern type of the deteriorative use, because no one would ordinarily think of strength as a necessary attribute of a body in the same way as manliness is a necessary attribute of duvip. Similarly $\imath_{s p \alpha ́ \pi i o v ~ ' i g n o b l e ~ s e r v a n t ' ~ c a n ~ o n l y ~ h a v e ~ f o l l o w e d ~ w o r d s ~}^{\text {and }}$ like devopiov if interpreted 'a poor excuse for a servant'; for the idea of nobleness, no matter how desirable, is not something that necessarily enters into the later Greek conception of $\nabla_{\varepsilon} \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi(\omega v$. This
 repóvacov, used of a drowsy or forgetful old man; for costliness is certainly no essential characteristic of a shield, nor is wakefulness or a strong memory considered especially characteristic of old age. Just when and where the change from the old to the new interpretation was made, is totally indifferent, because it was made again

[^47]and again by different persons and at different times; but it is of importance merely to determine that the increasing freedom with which deterioratives of this type were formed, shows that sometimes and by some persons the old interpretation 'a poor excuse for' etc. gave way to the simpler one 'despicable,' 'wretched,' and the like.
161. Collection of examples. え̀блiঠıov: $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi i \varsigma, ~ ' w o r t h l e s s ~ s h i e l d . ' ~$







入ov repóvacov 'r $\pi$ óx $\omega$ ¢ov. Com. Anon. frg. 4. 614 (43), Nú $\sigma \tau \alpha \lambda o v$














 because watery. Lycophron ap. Athen. $420 \mathrm{~B}, x^{\prime} \lambda$ íxov ${ }^{\top} 1 \delta x p$ 's $\delta \pi \alpha i ̃ s$


 fitted out with contemptible luxury' ( $\$ 152$, end). Plut. 2. 145 A ,


${ }_{1}$ The manuscript F here has $\mathfrak{\text { Эequenóvtion. }}$
${ }^{2}$ This, the only metrically possible msce. reading, is often changed to

 £ $\uparrow \mu \alpha ́ \iota \iota o v: ~ \oint \tilde{\eta} \mu \mu$, , 'worthless phrasicles,' ' empty words.' Ar. Pax 534, o兀







 $\pi \rho o े \varsigma ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ حడ̃v $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha ́ z \omega v$. Very doubtful is Arist. Probl. 24. 14. 937 a 36 , where it is said of water which has been warmed in the
 weak bodies shiver, or is the derivative here equivalent to the primitive for some obscure reason? ra@íxıv: : qúpyos, 'a wretched piece






## 3. THE DETERIORATIVE REPRESENTS AN OBJECT AS ONE OF A DESPICABLE CLASS OR REFERS TO THE CLASS ITSELF.

162. When the meaning of the -ov suffix had once developed so far that it was interpreted simply 'despicable' and the like, and no feeling for the original 'that which is like' the primitive, 'a sort' or 'kind of ' remained, it was a very easy step to extend the use of the suffix to cases where it did not limit the application of the primitive by representing an object as despicable in comparison with others of its kind, but referred to the whole class as despicable. ${ }^{1}$ Just as we do not feel any real difference in the use of the adjective 'wretched' whether we speak of a 'wretched man,' meaning one that is despicable compared to his fellowmen, or whether we speak of 'wretched trinkets,' with the idea either that all trinkets are despicable, or those before us as representing a despicable class, so the Greek would not notice any great difference between the use of -tov in $\sigma u \gamma \gamma p \alpha \mu \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ as used above of the compositions of Herodotus, with the thrust that

[^48]they were particularly poor ones, and its use in coprgux́rov in a


 Paras. 43). Here the 'worthless sophistries' are contrasted with such worthy pursuits as fighting a Spartan warrior, but the idea is by no means that the sophistries of Socrates were any worse than those of other people, the contrast applies to all sophistries.
163. The use of deterioratives referring to a class is absolutely conclusive evidence that the old interpretation 'a poor excuse for' such or such an object, but ' not the real thing', has completely faded from the mind for some of the words of the last section; for with a psychological attitude of this kind there is always an implied comparison with the normal or ideal of the class below which the deteriorative concept falls: but any such comparison is clearly out of the question when the deteriorative refers to the whole class, and consequently is not contrasted with its primitive, but with totally different objects.
164. The occasion for the use of deterioratives referring to a class is, of course, to begin with, purely individual and subjective, depending entirely upon the situation in which a given idea is placed. Thus



 orative $\pi \rho \circ \beta о \cup \lambda \varepsilon \cup \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \alpha$ not because they are something contemptible under all circumstances, but rather because they appeared to him an unworthy occupation for loudly shouting orators who, when the test came, would not go into the field, but chose rather to skulk behind the walls and give good advice to the others.
165. There are only very few things that are so habitually looked upon with contempt in so many different circumstances that the use of a deteriorative becomes habitual and an always applicable designation, as happens so much more frequently in case of diminutives ( $\S 217 \mathrm{ff}$.) and hypocoristic words ( $\S 246 \mathrm{ff}$.). Yet when the circumstances are farorable, this is altogether possible, and then the deteriorative force may easily weaken and fade out like all other frequently used emotional expressions. A certain example of this is re@óvtoov, deteriorative to $\gamma^{\text {sfocov 'old man.' Old men so frequently }}$ got into situations which appeared contemptible to the Athenians, that
rspóvtiov became a regular part of the vocabulary of many people, particularly young men and subordinates, who, of course, delighted in speaking of their superiors in a mocking and contemptuous tone. Just as the employed now frequently speak of the employer as 'the old man,' German 'der Alte,' so in Theocr. 4. 58 one shepherd speaking to another of the owner of the flock calls the latter repóv-

 the deteriorative soon took the place of the primitive, and the only remnant of the original contempt connected with the word was a


 'slave' is an example; for slaves are frequently enough the object of the ire and contempt of their masters to allow the use of a deteriorative to become habitual. There is, however, no extant passage in which it is used with living deteriorative force. Aside from the mere mention of the word by Pollux 3. 77 as used by Hyperides, it occurs equivalent to its primitive in Diph. frg. 4. 414, where one speaker mentions a list of outlandish cup names, and the other does not appear to under-
 It is also totally uncertain whether Iqriov: On's, 'servulus,' mentioned by Athen. 175 C as the title of a play, is a faded deteriorative or an originally hypocoristic word.
166. Examples of deterioratives referring to a class. $\gamma$ @óvı七ov:





 Ovidaxiov 'Ev roiss iau.jsiotor. 'You let any old thing, a contemptible




 гобжv $\lambda \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \propto$ as if : *хо́бхv $\mu \mu$, 'wretched scraps of leather.' • Ar. Equ.

[^49]













 out of wretched saucers, and clay ones too.' bequ'voov: ǒprog, 'cowardly quail.' Antiphan. frg. 3. 4 (3), ' $\varrho_{\xi}$ סウ̀̀ où đí Howĩ̀ סuváu.svos











 бóouqua, 'worthless sophistry.' Luc. Paras. 43, see § 162 . roct

 'wretched anchovy.' Alex. frg. 3. 455 (2.3), K $\alpha \grave{i}$ тoùc $\alpha$ ג heśxร sis тò
 дג̀̀ بpux

## 4. $-\iota \nu$ IN THE MEANING 'MERELY,' 'NOTHIN(\% BUT.'

167. When a deteriorative refers to a class, the uppermost element to begin with is, of course, an emotional one : contempt for the
class designated by the primitive. Since contempt for one class implies a judgment of inferiority of that class to other classes or a certain other class, there is present in the deteriorative also a certain intellectual element, namely the belief that the object for which the contempt is expressed is inferior in some way to other categories associated with the primitive. Thus in the word bpróyoov 'cowardly quail' is contained the judgment that a quail is more cowardly than most other animals; in rpyifiov 'wretched anchovy' there is the implication that other kinds of fish are more desirable as articles of food than the anchovy. Though this feature of the meaning of deterioratives is in the beginning strictly incidental and subordinate, it may in course of time become the dominant and even exclusive meaning of the suffix, while the original emotional element of contempt has dissappeared, and we may then translate the -tov by 'merely,' 'nothing but,' etc., but not 'despicable' or in any way that would suggest the emotion of disdain. There are, of course, all kinds of gradations as to the relative prominence of the two elements, and often we may waver as to which was uppermost. Thus in the passage quoted under ioyćdov in the last paragraph I have translated 'paltry figs' because I supposed that the idea of playwrights throwing out to the audience a few eatables and expecting to be rewarded with laughter filled the poet with disgust, and that he gave vent to his disdain through the deteriorative ioxódov. If, on the other hand, he is conceived as calmly giving to the audience a lecture as to what is right and proper, we must rather translate 'by merely throwing out to the audience some figs' etc. When the play was presented everything, of course, depended on the actor's expression. A similar


 hetaera adds disdain to her complaint we can translate 'he sends wretched garlands and roses '; if, on the other hand, there is no disdain, but only plaintiveness in the passage, she only meant 'he sends nothing but garlands and roses.' We can be certain that the emotional element is very slight or altogether absent in the following passages: ¿̌riov 'merely a bag,' i. e. something empty, in Crates frg. 2. 235,
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 defend,' in contrast to more dangerous activities) $\delta q u .0 p i(m s s ~ \omega v, ~ i v x$










 oncuetv;
168. The same development of the suffix to the meaning 'merely" also occasionally results from its diminutive meaning (cf. § 216). It is often not possible, therefore, to distinguish between original diminutives and deterioratives, and really not necessary; for the two grew up side by side, and sometimes no doubt both elements were present in one and the same word, and so not separated in the consciousness of the speaker.

## 5. SECOND $A$ RY DETERIORATIVES.

169. By this I mean words in which -ov is originally attached with a meaning totally different from the deteriorative, but which in certain situations or combinations with other words have for the time being taken upon themselves a deteriorative character. This reinterpretation is made possible by the same mental process by which is recognized the precise meaning of any suffix of extended application. Thus the English suffix -y has a variety of meanings like 'full of,' 'like,' and is also a hypocoristic ending. ${ }^{1}$ But when we hear it in connected discourse, we can at once grasp its shade of meaning either by the stem to which it is attached or by the context. When we

[^51]hear the $\check{1}$ sound at the end of Johnny we immediately recognize it as an expression of endearment. When it is heard in 'starry' it is impossible to decide until after hearing further portions of its environment, but then it at once becomes clear. The 'starry sky' is the sky that is abounding in stars, the 'starry light' is the light coming from the stars, 'starry eyes' are eyes that shine like stars. Similarly Greek tov has a tangible meaning only in the individual word or even in a particular environment of a certain word. Thus $\beta$ ouwó $\lambda .00$ 'herd of cows' is 'that which belongs to' the cow-herd, xnpiov is 'that which is made of wax, avopiov is a deteriorative, $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$ usually a diminutive. On the other hand, $\sigma \omega \mu \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ov had a variety of meanings. The comedian Plato ( $\$ 86$ ) used it in the plural of the padding of the actors, and it was then 'that which is around' the body. Aristotle (§ 194 a) applies it to the body of cuttle-fish, and thus causes diminutive interpretation, while Isocrates so designated his own body because of its weakness (§ 161), and consequently requires deteriorative interpretation.
170. It is by an exactly similar process that suffixal meanings which do not belong to a given word at all can be temporarily suggested by it in a certain environment or situation. Thus $-\iota \bar{\alpha}$ is an abstract or collective suffix, and the fact that by $3 \lambda . \gamma \alpha p y i \alpha$ and $\delta \eta_{\mu} 0 x_{p} \alpha \sim i x$ forms of government are designated is merely incidental. Yet in Thuc. 8. 47. 2 there occurs the following sentence: ह $\pi^{\prime}$ ' $3 \lambda \imath \gamma \alpha p y i \alpha, ~ \beta o \dot{j} \lambda \varepsilon \tau \alpha!$ (sc.

 the $-t \alpha$ of $\pi$ ompio suggests a form of government merely on account of the contrast and rhyme with $3 \lambda_{0}$ apoyí , although by itself $\pi$ ounpix is an ordinary abstract noun with the meaning 'wickedness.'
171. In this manner -tov words of all kinds may for the time being be reinterpreted as deterioratives. There are several different factors which may or must be present if such revaluation takes place. In the first place, the situation must always be one of contempt; for that is, of course, the prerequisite of intelligibility of any deteriorative, whether original or secondary. A probable instance in which this factor alone was strong enough to cause reinterpretation is the use of $\pi w$ cozoov



 is one of contempt, which is centered on the muváxic in the latter part,
the reader is in a receptive mood for a deteriorative ending; for contempt and the suffix -tov are closely associated with one another, and one may suggest the other. No matter whether the effect was intended or not, a certain number of readers or hearers would become conscious of the fact that $\pi$ movoxoov, though by itself having no relation to any deteriorative force of -七ov, has the same ending so often associated witn contempt. In spoken language this would be much easier than in writing ; for the proper constellation of thought or feeling can be produced by a mere gesture or facial expression or intonation of the voice, so that almost any denominative -tov word could thus be suggested as a deteriorative. Such interpretation, however, would never be certain for everybody that listens; one might be in the proper mood and the other not, the speaker may intend such an effect and never be understood at all, and conversely, he may not have intended it, and still the hearer interpreted it in that way. It would, therefore, be futile to be dogmatic about this or that example and to say there was or was not deteriorative force imputed to the -rov. I can only mention such passages as seem to me to allow the possibility









172. When a word in -ov as well as its primitive designates something that is in itself of inferior worth, it is hardly possible to say whether the suffix had to begin with a deteriorative meaning which was worn off by frequent use, or whether the passages where contempt is prominent are of the same character as those last mentioned. Thus £ózoov is always a ragged or tattered garment in the Attic, and qeıpiovor is a coarse or shabby cloak, but both of these words are equivalent to their primitives. Most probably the -ovv arose through the influence of other words of this ending which designated articles of dress ( $\S 130$ ), but where the situation called forth particular contempt for these objects, that could be casily attributed to the suffix. So Ar. Ran. 1063, AIE. Прत̃tov p.èv Tois $\beta x \sigma t-$





173. There is a particular kind of situation when a word in -tov is used metaphorically in such a way that the object to which the word is transferred is represented as despicable by the comparison. Thus although 9 noiov is not at all a deteriorative in itself, yet when it is applied to a human being, contempt is the very reason for the comparison. The -tov, however, has nothing to do with the application of the word in this sense ; for words without deteriorative ending (cf. Engl. 'beast ') can be used in the same way. Nevertheless the speaker or hearer may have occasionally become conscious of the fact that this word had the same -tov which is elsewhere deteriorative, particularly when, as in Dem. 25. 95, the orator's resources of expression could rein-



174. In addition to these wholly semantic factors there may be certain external ones, which can make the reinterpretation of a word as a deteriorative more certain, though even then there would be something of the same variety of attitude possible. In the first place, certain adjectives like $\pi$ ompós, ழaঠ̃̉os, and $火 \alpha x o ́ s$ are so frequently used with -ov derivatives to emphasize or modify the idea of contempt, that there is created an association between deteriorative ideas and the combination of one of these adjectives with -ov words. When the same collocation occurs where the -oov has no such function historically, it may nevertheless easily be attributed to it; for of the four elements in question, viz. contemptuous tone of passage, deteriorative adjective, -cov form, and deteriorative meaning of $-t 0 \mathrm{v}$, all but the last are already present, and that will be associated with com-




 $\chi \alpha \lambda x i ́ o$, see § 101 A, s. v. c).
175. Finally, the revaluation of an -cov word as a deteriorative may be caused or helped by collocation with other words in which it is a genuine deteriorative suffix. This would be particularly easy
when the real deteriorative precedes, as in Ar. Plut. 798 (§ 166),
 sible when the real deteriorative follows, as in Lys. frg. 50, M $\varepsilon$ 子
 be in the momory when the second one comes. A nother example of the latter is $\beta \iota \beta$ hiov in Plato Phaedr. 286 C (§ 159), where $\varphi$ po$\mu \times x i 0 t s$ assists in giving a contemptuous ring to $\beta, \beta \lambda i c o$.
176. In one case, at least, a deteriorative adjective and collocation with a real deteriorative in -ov combine to cause the reinterpretation of another word. In Luc. Merc. Cond. 37 (§ 161) $\chi \iota \tau \notin \nu \iota o v$ gets a deteriorative force from the neighborhood of z$\varphi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \rho i \delta i o v$ as well as from the adjective $\delta \pi \delta \sigma \sigma 0 \cdot p o v$. The same could be said of fúx ciov in Dem. 24. 114 ( $\$ 166$ ), where the neighborhood of $\lambda$ núvorov as well
 valution of $\{\mu \dot{\alpha}$ ctov.
177. These words can obviously often not be separated from those in which a speaker produced an tov word with the conscious intention of producing a deteriorative to a certain primitive, but without thinking of the fact that the same word already existed in other meanings. Certain words like $\lambda$ névorov and opporiôoov, which I have placed among the real deterioratives, with the understanding that they originated in this way, may just as well have arisen by the process of revaluation.

## XV. -tov AS DIMINUTIVE SUFFIX.

178. Of the various ways of origin which at different times have been suggested for the diminutive meaning of suffixes, most are clearly impossible for -cov. Thus the old idea that diminutive suffixes meant 'little' from the beginning, or were perhaps originally independent words with that meaning, is untenable for Indo-European diminutives because their suffixes are identical with the secondary adjective suffixes (cf. § 1). That the diminutive meaning of -oov could hardly have been derived from the meaning 'descended from,' has been shown § 95. It is furthermore incredible that -ov diminutives should be in the main derived from the deteriorative or hypocoristic use ${ }^{1}$ of the
${ }^{1}$ Wrede, Die Dim. im Deutschen, 132 ff., supports his contention that Germanic diminutives originated from 'Kose-formen' by the fart that proper names in diminutive suffixes appear before appellatives. It is to he noticed that for Greek -cov this condition is reversed, and that proper i. e. persomal names appear only secondarily, and then for a while not with great freedon.
suffix ; for neither of these is nearer to its original adjectival meaning than the diminutive use. Altogether impossible for all diminutives is the idea suggested by Ribezzo for the Sanskrit -ka- diminutives, namely, that words which designated small objects and accidentally ended in a certain suffix, could cause the latter to become charged with the diminutive meaning by the same shifting of semantic elements as is seen e. g. in the genesis of the inchoative verb suffix -sko-. The idea of small size is not an absolute but a relative idea, and the consciousness of the small size of an object does not, therefore, follow up a word in all situations. Only when there is comparison implied between objects of the same or different classes, will any one think of anything as small. In order that this comparison may be transmitted from the speaker to the hearer, there is need of some linguistic means with which this idea of minuteness is associated. Ribezzo's view consequently presupposes the existence of one of these means, to account for which is the very object of his theory. Its impossibility becomes still more evident by taking a concrete example. Because a few English words in -er, like finger or washer, designate small objects, would it be possible for -er to become a diminutive suffix ?
179. There remains only one probable way in which tov diminutives can have developed, the one mentioned $\S 136$, and suggested for I. E. -ko- by Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 504, namely, that the diminutive, like the deteriorative ( $\S 155$ ) use of -tov, is derived from its function of designating 'something like, but not the same' as the primitive. If it is possible to determine the exact process and to find suitable pattern types, in which this transition of meaning could take place naturally, there will be no doubt that -tov diminutives actually did originate in this way.

## 1. THE PATTERN TYPES.

180. The pattern types of the diminutives must be words in which the principal reason for designating an object as ' not quite the same as the primitive, though like it' is inferiority of size. Those words in which the prime motive of comparison is something else than size, but inferiority of size of the derivative is a mere incident, can not have given rise to the diminutive category. Thus $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon \varepsilon p \alpha \alpha ^ { \tau } \alpha \alpha \text { 'the an- }}$ tennae of the $\alpha_{\alpha} \rho \alpha \beta o \xi$ ' does indeed designate objects that are smaller Cf. § 237 b. The neuters in - cov were not used in proper names till the diminutive-hypocoristic use had been firmly established in the appellatives.
than horns ( $x \varepsilon \operatorname{c} \rho \alpha \tau \alpha$ ), but the reason for the comparison is the similarity of shape or position. As long as there were no other real diminutives which could cause reinterpretation of such words by analogy, there is no prospect of the incidental inferiority of size taking the place of the real motive of comparison, particularly since the proportion of size between primitive and derivative was reversed in other words of the same kind (§ 135).
181. When one object which is substantially like another except in being smaller is spoken of as 'like' the latter, but 'not the same,' the speaker implies that the element of size is to him an important quality of the object to which the smaller one is compared, i. e. if diminutives actually originate from the idea of similarity, there must be words which by some of the persons using them are considered to be strictly applicable only to an object which reaches a certain normal of size, while other objects, which are in every other respect similar, but fall below this normal, can not really be so designated. That size can really be such an important element in the meaning of a word, can be seen e. g. by the English 'mountain,' which designates an elevation upon the earth's surface of immense size, while a smaller elevation of exactly the same kind is not a 'mountain,' but a 'hill,' and a still smaller one is a 'hillock,' 'mound,' etc. Similar is the difference between 'lake' and 'pond,' 'river' and 'creek,' 'city' and 'village,' 'spear' and 'javelin,' 'flute' and 'piccolo.' It matters little that these relations are often judged differently by different individuals and nations; thus the German 'Berg' is colloquially applied to a small artificial mound of less than twenty feet height as well as to the highest mountain. The important thing is merely that there are words which in the view of some of the community using them have the idea of size as a very important constituent of their meaning.
182. For similar cases in Greek the -tov which designated 'something like' the primitive was a very convenient resource when the speaker felt and wished to indicate the similarity between the larger and the smaller object, and yet was aware that he could not use the primitive for the latter without violating usage. Here too individuals would naturally vary in the conception of many a word (cf. § 137 for $\pi \alpha \delta_{i} \delta v$ ) without affecting the principle as a whole. Words in which -ov may with more or less probability have been added with this motive are e. g. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha} \dot{\xi} \leqslant 0$ ' a little wagon.' originally 'that which is like, but not the same as a äpaç $\alpha$, the latter term being applied
only to heavy wagons ${ }^{1}$; $\delta$ op $\alpha$ ciov: $\delta$ ópu, 'that which is like a spear, but no real spear,' 'a peltast's spear,' because it was too light for the designation סópu, which carried with it the implication of such size and weight as those of the hoplites had; xapxivov: xapxivos, 'that which is like a crab, but not a real crab,' a very small species of hermit-crab to which xapxivos seemed inapplicable; $\pi$ т $\lambda \iota \sigma \mu$ árov: $\pi \sigma^{2} \lambda \sigma \sigma \mu$, 'that which is like a city, but hardly large enough for such a designation,' a little fortified place; $\sigma \alpha x i o v: \sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime}$ os, 'that which is like a sack, but not a real sack,' a little bag tied around horses' feet;
 one,' because part of a javelin and not of a spear; ̣̂éß 'that which is like a vein, but not a real vein,' i. e. a smaller bloodvessel than was ordinarily denoted by the word phí́ $\psi$. Any or all of these words which existed before the diminutive meaning was established, ${ }^{2}$ may very well have assisted in causing the idea of small size to be connected with their suffix, and have been of influence in causing the spread of this usage to their own congeners, but they are all comparatively rare words, and we may conclude that all of them together were a slight force in comparison with the one word noidiov, which became the regular word for 'baby,' and so was incessantly in the mouth of every speaker of the language, and consequently afforded immense opportunities for the spread of the diminutive meaning. To assume that $\pi \alpha \delta^{\circ} i o v$ was the chief pattern type of this category presupposes that it was derived from $\pi \alpha \tilde{s}$ with the original conception 'that which is like a child, ${ }^{3}$ but not a real child,' because a baby was too small and too young to be properly called $\pi \alpha i \check{ }$. It is no objection to this view that the primitive itself could occasionally designate an infant even when there is no reference to descent, as e. g. H. Hom. Ceres 141, K $\alpha i$ रev $\pi \alpha i ̃ \delta \alpha$ veo xoivnotv ě $\%$ ou $\alpha \mathrm{K} \alpha \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ cionvoiunv, where Demeter is speaking in the character of a nurse, or in Herod. 1. 109. Aside from the fact that different individuals must have differed in their conception of the same word (cf. § 137), it is of importance to consider that the designation of an infant as $\pi \alpha i$ is was only an occasional one, and very

[^52]rare in comparison with the number of instances in which an older child is so designated. In situations which did not distinctly point that way, no Greek upon hearing $\pi \alpha i \bar{s}$ would think of a baby any more than we do upon hearing 'child.' 'He is a mere child' means that he is not old enough to be called a young man, but would never imply that he was yet an infant, and yet 'child' could be used in such a situation that it really did refer to a baby. That consequently the feeling of a number of individuals should have induced them to believe that $\pi \alpha i \leqslant$ ought really not to be applied to an infant, and so to form for it $\pi$ cioiov 'that which is like a child, but not a real child,' is not at all remarkable. That this was really the original attitude to the suffix is made all the more probable by the fact that Herodotus, when the exact meaning of $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v ~ c a n ~ b e ~ d e t e r m i n e d, ~$ almost always refers to a baby, and to a little child beyond the infant age in only two instances: 4. 187, where children of four years are called $\pi \alpha \delta^{\circ} i \alpha$, and 5.51 , where it designates the eight year old daughter of the king of Sparta. After $\pi$ aidiov had once taken root, it spread with great rapidity over nearly the whole of Greece for the reason that its creation filled a gap similar to the one existing in German at the present day. Just as there is no native German word corresponding to English 'baby ' (words like 'Säugling' are, of course, not conversational words), so the Homeric Greek had nothing except words of such wide meaning as $\pi \alpha i{ }^{\circ} s$ and $\tau$ texvov. ${ }^{1}$ The new $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v ~ w a s ~ t h e r e f o r e ~ a ~ d i s t i n c t ~ l i n g u i s t i c ~ g a i n, ~ a n d ~ b e c a m e ~ a ~ h o u s e-~$ hold word in a short time.
183. In addition to the words so far mentioned there may have been among the pattern types of the -ov diminutives some of the words designating the young of animals (cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 504 , for the same possibility for I. E. -ko-). Thus one of the characteristics often associated with the idea 'bird' is the capability of flying, and consequently a young bird (opviorov), which has not yet learned that accomplishment, may have been thought of as 'not a real bird' as yet, but 'something like a bird,' or 'something which is yet to become a bird.' Similarly a hare is associated with swift running, and one of its young, which was as yet deficient in this respect, could be designated $\lambda \dot{\alpha}$ रrov 'not a real hare yet.' The sum-total of the influence of all of such words also must, however, have been comparatively slight, since there do not seem to be among them words of frequent occurrence in this meaning (cf. § 94 f .).

[^53]184. Besides the idea of similarity the Neuter gender may also have had its influence in the development of diminutive meaning of -tov in words designating living beings. Cf. § 157.
185. Collection of examples (except of words designating the young of animals, for which see § 94). The most conclusive example to show how similar was the feeling for the diminutive use and for the meaning 'a sort of,' 'a kind of' is Arist. H. A. 3. 3.



 as a diminutive and then in the generalizing sense in virtually the same breath can only be explained by assuming that the two uses of the suffix appeared so similar to the writer, that he was not conscious of using the word in two different meanings. In the first sentence 'a sort of vein' was a 'vein-like thing' that was not large enough to be called 'vein,' in the second 'a sort of vein' had its literal signification, without addition of secondary elements. The remaining examples will be arranged as usually. $\alpha^{\alpha} \mu \alpha \xi \iota 0 v$. Arist. De
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 'baby' is derived on the one hand 'human embryo' (Arist. H. A.
 the other hand the application of $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v ~ t o ~ t h e ~ y o u n g ~ o f ~ a n i m a l s ~$ (id. An. Gen. 5. 1. 778 b 21, ठ̋ $\tau \alpha v ~ \gamma \varepsilon ́ v \omega v \tau \alpha \iota ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \iota \delta i \alpha \alpha ~ \pi \alpha ́ v \tau \omega v ~ s c . ~ \tau \omega ̃ v ~$

















## 2. THE DIMINUTIVE REPRESENTS AN OBJECT AS SMALL COMPARED TO OTHERS OF ITS KIND.

186. It was a very easy matter e. g. for the conception of $\pi \alpha$. Siov as 'that which is like a child, but not a real child' to give way to the simpler one 'a little" or 'young child,' since inferiority of size and age was the very point of the comparison from the beginning. Whenever a situation occurred in which the small size of the derivative was particularly vividly contrasted with the larger size of the primitive, the new interpretation was virtually thrust upon the word, so e. g. in Andoc. 1. 127, where, after a baby had been repeatedly called $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$, occurs the sentence: $\tau \delta \nu \geqslant \alpha \pi \delta \alpha \gamma_{1} \delta \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ \gamma \alpha v$ ơv $\sigma \alpha$ عi $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \gamma \varepsilon \iota$ عig Kŕpuxac. Similar is the contrast between phét and phє́poov in Arist. De Spir. 5. 483 b 29 ( $\$ 185$ ). The change of interpretation must also have been helped by the different conception of the same primitive by different individuals (\$ 137). Thus when
the speaker used $\pi \alpha \delta^{\prime} \delta$ iov ' $^{\prime}$ that which is like a child etc.' with the feeling that $\pi \alpha$ uis was really inapplicable, the hearer might have no such feeling about the primitive at all, and, if the situation nevertheless made it clear that $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$ designated a baby, he could not interpret it otherwise than 'a little or young child.' Moreover, sometimes the primitive could suffer universal extension of usage in course of time, and then the interpretation 'a kind of' but ' not the same as' would be impossible for everybody.
187. After this change of interpretation had once gained an actual foothold, the diminutive development was complete. That this stage had actually been reached, in other words, that the formation of diminutives had gained complete independence of the idea of similarity, is shown by the formation of new diminutives in which the latter is impossible because size is not a constituent of the meaning of the primitive. Thus ouráonp 'daughter' is a concept that has to do with descent only, and the idea of size has no place in it. A newly born babe is the daughter of its parents as truly as an adult person, and therefore Ourćcpoov must have been from the beginning 'a little daughter,' not 'no real daughter.' Similar is vnoiov 'a little island '; for vึ̈бos 'an island' designates any piece of land surrounded by water, and it must not necessarily be of a certain size. On the contrary, the smaller islands which are readily perceived as enclosed by water are the ones to which the name must have been first applied, and only with the increase of geographical knowledge would a large island like Euboea be thought of as surrounded by water.
188. As in case of the corresponding change of interpretation of the deterioratives, the old interpretation here did not at once or altogether give way to the new one, but cropped out again and again at different times and with different individuals (cf. $\$ 160$ ). As was seen from the first example of $\S 185$, even as late a writer as Aristotle could still feel the relation of the diminutive to the generalizing meaning. This is as may be expected, since the development of a new meaning never in itself means that it takes the place of the old, but is rather an additional one.
189. In § 136 it was pointed out that words of the xepáciov type, though originally non-diminutive, could be interpreted as diminutives or not according to circumstances and individuals. Since words of this kind which were formed after the diminutive meaning had been established, could be formed indifferently with the idea of small size uppermost or the idea of similarity, it is evident that no sharp line
of distinction between diminutives and words in which -ov is an exponent of the similarity of a smaller to a larger object can be drawn. Though the continually increasing number of indisputable diminutives probably caused the diminutive interpretation of these words gradually to become the usual one, nothing definite can often be maintained about the single words, and there must have been all kinds of gradations of the relative prominence of the two ideas.
190. In determining the causes of the sudden productivity of -ov as a diminutive suffix there are at least three things to be considered : (1) the extremely frequent use of the pattern $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v ~(\S 182$, end) and its consequent influence upon new formations ; (2) the number of words like रepáziov, which could be easily reinterpreted as diminutives as soon as a pattern existed; (3) the clearness with which any suffixal meaning like the diminutive is perceived, and consequently allows new words to be formed without the influence of congeneric words. We may set it down as a rule that the vaguer and more indistinct the force of a suffix is, the less easily will it be transferred to other words because of its meaning, and the more readily will it yield to the process of congeneric attraction or mechanical assimilation to the suffixes of related words. Thus the vague adjectival meanings of -tov, e. g. 'belonging to,' 'made of,' are usually not so vividly appreciated, and consequently words with these original meanings usually form one unanalyzed concept, and so often attract congeners either with or without the same suffixal meaning (cf. $\$ 252 \mathrm{ff}$.), but there are comparatively few isolated words which have gotten the suffix because of the undoubted perception of these meanings. The diminutive meaning, on the other hand, is almost as vividly perceived as a separate word; for the idea 'little' is as definite and concrete an idea whether it is found in an adjective or in a suffix. The speaker, therefore, often formed an -tov word with the conscious intention of designating a small object of the same kind as the primitive designates. There was, therefore, continual analysis of the -cov word, continual reference to the primitive, continual appreciation of the definite meaning of the suffix. As a result, diminutires could be formed ad libitum as occasion demanded, and often one word would be coined independently by different speakers, in as much as each one formed it with reference to its primitive, and did not know whether he was using an established word. In this light, then, the rapid spread of diminutive -ov is no more remarkable than the sudden appearance of many a common individual word.
191. The precise shading of the diminutive idea depends largely upon the nature of the primitive ; a diminutive of a name of an animal is different from one of a thing, a diminutive of an abstract noun different from one of a concrete noun, a diminutive of an indefinite idea different from one of a definite idea. I consequently divide my examples, as usually, into congeneric groups, which will largely bring out these differences. Variations of meaning, however, which are not conveniently discussed under these headings, are reserved for a future section.
192. A. Names of persons. These were in the main modelled upon $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v$, and consequently the idea of small size was combined with that of youth (except in case of $\alpha v 0 \rho(\dot{\omega} \pi \iota \sigma v)$ from the beginning, without our being justified in saying that the latter is secondary to the former, since $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$ was no less a creature that was too young to be called $\pi \alpha i \varsigma s$ than one that was too small (§ 182). àv $\ddagger \varrho \omega \prime \pi \iota v$ :


 Ourárnp, 'little daughter,' 'infant daughter.' Ar. Thesm. 565, O38'
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 who was called $3 \lambda i \gamma o s$ tus к$ّ \mathrm{pos}$ a few lines above. b) 'little servant
${ }^{1}$ When rocodicy designates a child that is much beyond the infant age, the idea 'not a real child' is no longer possible.
 pép(ov. Insc. Att. Ditt ${ }^{2}$. 38. 27 (414-413 B. C.), in a list of confiscations, HF H| $\Delta \Delta$ トHF K



193. B. Names of animals. As in case of diminutives of personal names, the idea of youth is sometimes combined with that of small size: for when animals of the same species are compared, the small ones are also the young ones, and the two ideas were no doubt often present from the beginning, as in the pattern type $\pi \alpha \delta_{i o v}$. In addition the notion of descent, whether original and the cause of the diminutive meaning, or secondary to the latter (cf. § 95), may have played a part in words designating the young of animals. From the idea of youth again is derived the idea of deliciousness or tenderness as articles of food; for the younger animals are naturally more esteemed for these qualities. This is present as an accessory notion in passages
 qunu.Evov. The idea of deliciousness, on the other hand, has become the dominant if not the exclusive element in the meaning of ievitidiov

 is evident that this use of the suffix borders closely upon the hypocoristic use, and under that heading are placed those examples in which the idea of daintiness has proceded so far that it is found in words where it could not originate ( $(231)$. In the names of animals, however, this use is so closely associated with the real diminutive use, that it is inpracticable to separate the two. The examples are divided according to whether the animal is thought of as an article of food and so allows the notion of deliciousness to be connected with the diminutive.




 ěviova, 'a little or young viper.' See § 94. rupidior': xapis, 'a small crustacean,' 'shrimp.' Arist. H. A. 5. 15. 547 b 17, see § 185
${ }^{1}$ This meaning comes from the tendency to use ruis of a servant boy particularly.
sub zapxivov. za@zivov: xapxivos, 'a little crab.' Hipp. 472, ९ús

 $\hat{\eta} \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \omega v . \mu \alpha \iota v i \delta \iota o v: \mu \alpha i v i \varsigma, ~ ' a ~ l i t t l e ~ s p r a t . ' ~ A r i s t . ~ H . ~ A . ~ 6 . ~$








 or young purple-fish.' See § 94. т@овс́тьov : тро́ $\beta \alpha \tau о v$, ' a little sheep.'.





 бтpouóós, 'a little or young sparrow.' Ephipp. frg. 3. 326, see § 94.
b) The animal is thought of as an article of food. à $\lambda \varepsilon \alpha \tau \varrho v o ́ v o v: ~$
 entire because of its many words of this kind: 'A $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \alpha \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \alpha \sigma o v ~ \varepsilon \delta\left\langle\tau \lambda \omega \varsigma^{\circ}\right.$






 roүхiov: xó $\gamma, \eta$, 'a little muscle.' Antiphan. frg. 3. 39 (1), see beginning of paragraph. $\lambda \alpha \beta \varrho \alpha ́ z \iota \nu v ~ ' a ~ l i t t l e ~ \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta p \alpha \xi$ (fish).' Antiphan.




${ }^{1}$ That the diminutive refers to small size, is made evident by the small price, a full-grown sheep being worth twenty drachmas. Cf. Böckh, Staatshaushalt ${ }^{3}$. 1. 96.





 щаıví̊ıov. $\pi \varepsilon \varrho \delta i ́ x ı o v: \pi \varepsilon ́ p \delta \iota \xi, '$ 'a little partridge.' Eubul. frg. 3. 268

 ผ้ $\lambda \lambda \alpha ~ \alpha ̈ \tau \tau ~ \grave{\alpha} \nu ~ \varepsilon ̀ \pi \iota \tau u ́ y n s . ~ E p h i p p . ~ f r g . ~ 3 . ~ 334, ~ s e e ~ s u b ~ \grave{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon x \tau p u o ́ v t o v . ~$





 бтivov: oxivos, 'a little siskin(?).' Eubul. frg. 3. 268 (14), see sub
 164, see sub $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \sigma$ épıov. tevifidıov: चevoíc, 'a little cuttle-fish.' Pherecr. frg. 2. 316, see beginning of paragraph. Eubul. frg. 3. 25̃ ,



194. C. The body or parts of the body. For the parts of animals the same distinction can be made as for the names of the animals themselves: they can be thought of as articles of food $\mathrm{m}^{\circ}$ not, and if so, the idea of tenderness, deliciousness, etc., may be present or even dominant. I consequently divide: a) the human body or its parts, or of animals when not thought of as articles of food: b) the latter conceived of as food.
a) öцияtıov : ǒ $\mu \mu \alpha$, 'a little eye.' Arist. Physiogn. 3. 807 b 29,






 'a little snout.' Ar. Ach. 744 (the Megarian to his two little girls.

$\sigma \omega \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \nu>$ : $\sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu, \alpha$, 'a little body.' Hipp. 261, of a baby's body. Arist.







b) $\dot{\eta} \pi \alpha ́ c t o v: ~ \tilde{\eta} \pi \alpha_{\rho}$, 'delicious (little) liver,' the idea of small size being entirely subordinate, if present at all. Ar. frg. 2. 1151 (9),





 polyp's arm.' Eubul. frg. 3. 258, see § 193 b sub 兀evoíiov.





195. D. Plants or parts of plants. The accessory elements in the meaning of the suffix are largely the same as for names of animals. A small plant or part of a plant is also usually young and tender, and consequently these two ideas may be combined with that of small size. The adjective véos in the first example quoted shows that 'young' may be the dominant idea in the use of the diminutive.






 While the diminutive sometimes refers to the whole class (§ 208 D ), it seems to designate particularly young or tender shoots in the fol-
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 $\beta \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta \delta o s$, 'a little twig.' Theophr. H. P. 3. 15. 2, кג̀ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ v u$




 मे $\beta \alpha \varphi \alpha v i \delta \iota \circ$."
196. E. Natural phenomena, geographical conceptions, etc. The diminutive idea is comparatively free from accessory notions. Aefviov, however, 'a little pond,' being applied to one not larger than a shield, nay have been interpreted as ' not a real pond,' but only 'like a pond.' жŋлiov: xr̈rtos, 'a little garden.' Insc. Halicarnassus Ditt². 11. 15


 i九uviov: $\lambda i ́ \mu \nu \nu$, 'a little lake or pond.' Arist. Mirab. 112. 840 b 33,







 'little pieces of flat land,' or else a plural like $\tau \alpha$ oixia (§ 87 ff .).
 Plato Resp. 2. 370 D , Téx ठृ,






 Arist. Mirab. 29. 832 b 4. vóútıov: © $\delta \omega \omega$ p, 'a little stream.' Plato





197. F. Words designating statues. The diminutive refers to small size exclusively. ${ }^{2} \gamma \alpha i \mu \alpha ́ \alpha \iota o \nu: ~ व َ \gamma \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha$, , 'a little statue.' Luc. Somn.

 statue.' Insc. Delos Mich. 833. 119 (279 B. C.), $\Delta$ ax
 image.' Polemon ap. Athen. 574 D , xai tò Kovtivas $\delta$ è $\tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma ~ \varepsilon \tau \alpha i p \alpha \varsigma ~$

 image.' Insc. Anaphe CB. 3430.12. тvлiov : 兀úno૬, 'a little image.' CIA. 2. 836 c--k 15 (270-262 B. C), тutiov xג̀̀ $\delta \rho \alpha \times o ́ v \tau \iota \alpha ~ \tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \tau \alpha \rho \alpha ~ \Delta-~ . ~$

 Mich. 833. 119, тumiov ג́pyupoั̃v, $\delta \lambda x \grave{i v}$ ㅏㅏ.
198. G. Vases, vessels, bags, boxes, etc. As in the two preceding groups the diminutive refers to size exlusively. As was remarked § 125, it is extremely difficult to separate diminutives of this group from congeneric words which are equivalent to their primitives. With more or less probability the following words seem to be diminutives:

 xıov : 0 ט́ $\lambda \alpha \times 0 \varsigma$, probably a 'little bag' in Herod. 3. 105, because filled



${ }^{1}$ Cf. § 200, note to $\gamma$ equpiov.
${ }^{2}$ The plural here because the stream is thought of as a mass of water. though the diminutive logically requires the singular when applied to a single stream. In other words, $\tau \grave{c}$ v́détcce arose by contamination of tic $\ddot{v} \delta i c t:=$ and tò ídéctov.
 minutive，as is possible in the following passages because it seems to refer to small specimens：Dem．25．61，v̈ $\sigma \tau \varepsilon p o v ~ \delta '$ éfíícncuat tò $\gamma p \alpha \mu$－ $\mu$ кะeĩv हैv xıß

 xaì $\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} x \tau \rho o v$. Insc．Delos Ditt${ }^{2}$ ．588． 187 （180 B．C．），ypuoiov è $\gamma$ к๒ß






 $\mu \dot{\alpha}$ conos，＇a little pouch．＇Apollodorus Carystus ap．Poll．10．152，
 is nothing to show whether the word is a diminutive in Arist．Mir． 33． 832 b 26 ，but a comparison of the weight of the pócica and the ptán $\alpha$ in in inscriptions shows that the former word designates the smaller vessels．Thus in Mich． 833 the poć⿱亠乂 $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \alpha$ are registered as follows： 70 dr．（1．25）， 146 dr．（28），two of 142 dr ．each（28）， 140 dr ．（29）， 139 dr ．（29）， $149 \mathrm{dr} .(29), 138 \mathrm{dr}$（29）， 202 dr ．（30）， 204 dr ．（30）， 195 dr．（30）， 193 （30）， 201 dr．（30）， 196 dr．（30）， 201 dr．（30）， 100
 2519 dr ．The píci入ca on the other hand do not weigh over 55 dr ． （1．31），while two weigh onily 28 dr ．$(27,31)$ ，and another 50 dr ．（31）． Cf．also the compound futoọ文入ıov，CIA． 836 c－k 10 （270－262 B．C．）．

199．H．Instruments and similar utensils．It is sometimes dif－ ficult to distinguish between diminutives of this kind and instrument nouns which are equivalent to their primitives（ $\S 77 \mathrm{ff}$ ．）．The following，however，are with more or less certainty diminutives：

 $\mu x \not$ aipıov．CIA．2． 678 B 66 （ $378-366$ B．C．）．Sigpión＇：sippos，＇a





i. e. one that is slender in structure, though not necessarily short



 @ıv : $\mu \dot{\alpha} \nsucceq \alpha \iota \rho \alpha$, 'a little dagger.' Men. frg. 4. 284 (227), see sub д̀ $\sigma \pi i \delta \iota o v . \pi \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \iota \sigma v: \pi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \mu \alpha$, 'a little plait.' Arist. Part. An. 4.


 little scraper.' CIA. 2. $836 \mathrm{c}-\mathrm{k} 22$ (270-262 B. C.), $[\sigma] \tau \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \gamma i \delta i o v$ хрибоũv $\Delta$ пијобтра́тоu HFll. бчvœiov: бч̣úpa, 'a little hammer.' Theophr. H. P. 5. 7. 8, see § 78. тє@є́tœıov : тє́pєчроv, 'a little gimlet. id.


200. I. Words applying to building or architecture. reyígov:




 purpose of ridiculing him Euripides is reported to have used the ex-
 Dıós). Ǵvıov: Oúpa, 'a little door.' Ar. Nub. 92, 'Opã́s vò Oúprov
 dwelling.' Insc. Att. Ditt². 834. 11 (Macedonian age), xà тò oixr-

 @ $\sigma \sigma \alpha \alpha \delta_{\iota} \boldsymbol{v}: \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \kappa$, 'a little pillar.' Insc. Att. Ditt². 537. 70
 Эiov: $\pi \lambda i$ ívoos, perhaps ' a little brick' in CIA. 2. 656. 3-4, дpuoíí $\alpha$
 Scott $\pi \lambda .6$ rior is also a diminutive in Xen. Cyr. 7. 1. 24, $\omega \sigma \pi s p$

 ceived as placed within the other, shows that it was 'not a real

[^55]brick,' but only 'something like a brick,' i. e. a box or square (cf. § 150 s. v.).
201. J. Miscellaneous concrete objects. $\beta \omega \lambda i$ iov : $\beta \tilde{\lambda} \lambda \mathbf{\circ}$, 'a little



 breast-plate' in CIA. 2. 826. 17. жікбни́tıov: $x \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mu$, 'a little
 щécıov : vóurб $\mu$, 'a little coin,' i. e. one of slight value as well as of small size (§ 211 I). Schol. Ar. Vesp. 213, boovv $\sigma \tau i \lambda \eta v \cdot{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \tau$




 utive meaning is intimately associated with the idea of similarity ( $\$ 150$ s. v.), but the former seems to be dominant in Plato Ep. 2. 312 D and in Arist. De An. 1. 4. 409a 12, where it is used of the



 тœœixıov : тג́pıyos, 'a little dried fish.' Pherecr. frg. 2. 263 (4), ous-




202. K. Diminutives of words designating a material or any indeterminate mass. The diminutive in this case designates a small piece or quantity of the mass. ${ }^{1}$ This usage must have arisen when the primitive itself was viewed as designating a piece of the material or something consisting of it. Thus $\delta$ épux is not only 'skin' as a general indeterminate idea, but also may refer to a particular piece of skin. With the latter meaning in mind there is nothing unusual in forming the diminutive $\delta \varepsilon \rho \mu \alpha^{z} \tau \sigma v$ 'a little piece of skin.' $\sigma \alpha_{p} \xi$ 'flesh' was already in Homer ( $\tau 450$ ) used of a particular muscle, and so could be thought of as 'a piece of flesh,' whence later oxpxiov 'a little piece of tlesh,' i. e. sometimes 'a small quantity
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Kessler, Die lat. Dim. p. 1.
of flesh.' Since these diminutives could be referred equally well to the primitive in its usual indetermined sense, it became possible by analogy to such patterns to form new diminutives of this kind without reference to the previous existence of the primitive in a determined sense; $\sigma \tau \varepsilon$ óriov 'a little bit of dough,' could be formed from $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \alpha p$ 'dough' without thinking of the latter as 'a piece of dough.' Examples: $\delta \varepsilon \varrho \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota o v: ~ \delta \delta ́ p p \alpha, ~ ' a ~ l i t t l e ~ p i e c e ~ o f ~ s k i n . ' ~ P l a t o ~$


 bit of a piece either of barley bread or gourd.' $\mu \alpha \alpha^{\text {Siov}}: ~ \mu \tilde{\alpha} \zeta \alpha$, ' a little bit of barley bread.' id. 1. c. $\pi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \iota o v: \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \alpha, ~ ' a ~ l i t t l e ~$
 $\chi_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{v} \sigma \tilde{\alpha}$ (of some articles of dress). $\pi v \varrho i o v: \pi \check{\rho} \rho$, 'a little fire.' Cf. the use of the Engl. 'fire' either to designate the phenomenon in general or a particular manifestation of it. Xenophanes ap. Plut.














 $\lambda_{\varepsilon \cup \sigma \alpha}$. tveiov: tupós, probably ‘a little cheese.' Telecl. frg. 2. 368 (3),


[^56]

203. L. Diminutives of abstract nouns. The Greeks did not. at least in the classical times, form diminutives of abstract nouns unless they were distinctly sensualized. There is no counterpart to the Latin animula 'a little courage' as found in Cicero ad Att. 9. 7. 1: "Attulit uberrimas tuas litteras; quae mihi quiddam quasi animulae instillarunt." When diminutive -ov was added to a noun that was originally abstract, the latter seems always to have been conceived in a concrete aspect. Thus $\delta \rho \alpha \mu \mu$ 'ciov is not 'a little action,' but 'a little drama'; puviov is not 'a little sounding,' but 'a slender sound.' Even those cases which seem to be closest to a diminution of abstract ideas, are not so when more carefully considered. $\theta$ (oxzu$\mu . \dot{\alpha}$ tov 'a little piece of flattery' is shown by the context to refer to the concrete donations with which the sausage maker cajoled Demos.
 like every other word of speaking, have a concrete as well as an abstract aspect. The same can be said ${ }^{\bullet}$ of names of diseases like voonux́riov 'a little disease,' nupétiov 'a little spell of fever,' ßryyiov 'a little coughing fit.' A disease always has its external features, and it is these which were grasped by the speaker in using the diminutives. That this was actually the case, can be seen from the fact that Bnyiov is best translated as 'a (little) coughing fit,' and Tupériov as 'a (little) fever spell,' i. e. these words refer to the length of the individual outward manifestations of the diseases. If the speaker had really thought of the diseases in the abstract way when using the diminutives, the latter could mean nothing else than 'a slight cough ' or 'a slight fever,' referring to the vehemence or duration of the whole disease. Very similar also is iopocitov 'a partial sweat,' not 'a slight sweat.' The words included in this paragraph are, then, those of which the primitive may be conceived either in an abstract or concrete manner, but since the diminutive is always formed with the latter point of view, there really is no different principle involved than in the formation of a diminutive of which the primitive is always concrete. The examples may be divided into the following groups :
a) Words designating spoken or written utterances or compositions. The diminutive signifies that the utterance is short, i. e. requires little time: $\pi o m \mu \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ov diminutive of $\pi$ oinux, can be nothing else than 'a short poem,' unless there are deteriorative or hypocoristic elements present. $\tilde{q} \sigma \mu u \hat{c} \tau \iota o v: ~ \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \mu \alpha$, perhaps 'a short seng.' Plato Com. ap.











 559 （31），Ei̋ ＇a little piece of raillery．＇Ar．ap．Arist．Rhet．3．2． 1405 b 32. Since there is no context，the word may just as well be a deteriorative．








b）Diseases．$\beta \eta \chi_{i o v}$ ：$\beta$ r＇$\xi$ ，＇a little cough，＇i．e．＇a coughing spell．＇
 inquiov ：$\lambda$ ŕun，＇a little humour＇in the eye．Hipp．153，xà tò тàs
 vooŋuććıov ：vóonu．, perhaps＇a slight disease，＇but since it only occurs once（Ar．ap．Arist．Rhet．3．2． 1405 b 32）and without context，it may just as well be a deteriorative．лv＠érıov ：$\pi$ рретós，＇a fever spell．＇



 idé́tıov ：iठpós，＇a little sweat，＇i．e．＇a partial sweat．＇Hipp．1210，
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 - Hatulence.' Damoxen. frg. 4. $\overline{51}$ (26). ч由viov : 甲ovín, 'a thin slender


3. THE DIMINUTIVE DESIGNATES AN OBJECT AS BELONGING TO

A SMALL CLASS, OR REFERS TO THE CLASS ITSELF.
204. When a diminutive refers to a whole class as small in comparison with other classes, the final step in the development of the diminutive meaning has been taken. While the use of diminutives to designate an object as smaller than the normal of its class is divided from the function of the suffix to designate similarity by a neutral belt, and the two interpretations shade into each other imperceptibly and with many variations between individuals ( $\S 186 \mathrm{ff}$.), the interpretation of -ov as 'that which is like the primitive' is ab-
 not always one which is smaller than other foals, but small compared to a full grown horse. Small size and youth are the very essence of the meaning of a word for 'foal,' and the smaller or younger an individual foal, the more in point is the meaning of the primitive, so that even when a particularly young foal should be referred to by the diminutive $\pi \omega \lambda i o v$, the interpretation ' like a foal, but not a real foal' is out of the question. Similarly $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v ~ ' a ~ l i t t l e ~ c h i l d, ' ~ w h e n ~ t h e ~ i d e a ~ ' l i t t l e ' ~$ is not limiting but descriptive, i. e. when a little child is not contrasted with a larger child, but when any child as being little is contrasted with adults, can not be thought of as 'not a real child,' since in the situation in which the idea 'child' is placed when thus contrasted, small size or youth is considered as the distinguishing characteristic of everything which belongs to the class 'child.' So $\pi \alpha i \delta i \alpha \quad$ 'little children' are contrasted to répovess 'old men' in the Rhodian Swallow Song 20, Oj $\gamma \grave{\alpha} p \gamma \varepsilon_{\rho} \rho o v \tau \varepsilon ́ s ~ z \varepsilon \sigma \mu \varepsilon v, ~ \grave{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \iota \delta i \alpha, ~ ' w e$ are not old men but little (i. e. mere) children.'
205. Since 'little' and 'large' are altogether relative terms, the use of a diminutive referring to a class must always imply comparison with other things which do not belong to that class. Sometimes it refers to objects which are so very much smaller than the large
majority of things which come under observation, that the general comparison with this average is sufficient to suggest small size, without conscious comparison with any distinct individual concepts. This is the case with German words like Spänchen 'chip,' Spinnlein, poetical for 'spider,' or Körnchen 'granule.' With the latter may be compared Gr. oneppúciov 'seed.' Sometimes, on the other hand, any concept, no matter how far above the average in size, can be thought of as small by comparison with certain other definite objects. Thus while a man would not by any means seem a small affair under ordinary circumstances, he does appear so in contrast to a monster like the giant Polyphemus, and the latter in Euripides Cycl. 316 therefore addresses Odysseus as $\dot{\alpha} v 0 \cdot \rho \omega \pi i \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ 'mannikin,' not meaning, of course, that Odysseus was a particularly small man, but that he considered any human being as small and insignificant compared to his own size and power. Analagous is the situation of $\pi \alpha \alpha_{i} i \alpha$ in the passage quoted $\S 204$, where children are thought of as small or young in comparison with old men, while at other times a child is considered as large compared to a baby, which was designated $\pi \alpha t-$ Siov because too small to be called $\pi \alpha \tilde{c} \varsigma(\$ 182)$. Sometimes again an occasion for the use of a diminutive may be given by a word which contains within itself a suggestion of relative small size or youth. The Engl. 'lamb' contains a comparison with the greater size and age of a full grown sheep, and the diminutive 'lambkin' only emphasizes this relation. Similar is the German 'Lämmlein' or the
 little nestling,' in comparison with bpves 'bird'; $\pi \omega \lambda$ iov 'a little foal,'
 larger kinds of coin ; $x \lambda$ (cuviov 'a little twig,' contrasted with ǒ'os 'branch.'
206. When it comes to applying these principles in detail, and to determining which words actually got their -tov in this way, we are beset with great difficulties. On the one hand, the speaker or writer may have had in mind a contrast as to size between different ideas even when there is no linguistic indication of it; on the other hand, a word which was formed as a diminutive of this kind may become equivalent to its primitive secondarily ( $\S 220$ ), and it is then often impossible to distinguish these from other cases of equivalence of primitive and -tov derivative. To judge correctly all of the different words would require a most intimate knowledge of the mental habits of the ordinary Greek people. It would be necessary to determine which objects could appear to them as relatively small, or with
which other objects a certain object was habitually associated, so that the contrast of the two ideas with respect to size could give rise to a diminutive. When, therefore, some one insists that all names of vessels or of articles of dress and ornament which end in -ov are diminutives referring to a class, it is evident that we can not for every word disprove his theory any more than he can prove it. On the whole, however, it is perfectly clear that this is the wrong method of procedure. Since there are over a half-dozen ways in which an -ov derivative can become equivalent to its primitive, and since the suffix had, roughly speaking, at least a dozen living functions, it is manifestly unsafe to classify all possible cases as diminutives, and when there does not seem to be a difference in usage between primitive and derivative, the burden of proof rests upon him who claims diminutive origin. He must be able at least to suggest a plausible association between a comparatively large and small object, in order that the latter may call to mind its relatively small size by comparison with the other. That it will be impossible to find such a point of view, from which most names of vessels and the larger articles of dress in -tov are diminutives, is self-evident.
207. Diminutives referring to a class naturally presuppose an attitude of the speaker which is as different from that to diminutives designating an object as small in comparison with others of the same class, as the attitude to a descriptive adjective is different from that to a limiting adjective. The hearer, however, and still more the reader, will often not be able to follow what was in the mind of the speaker or writer, and consequently the two classes of diminutives can not always be sharply distinguished in actual interpretation. This is particularly true for those words of which the primitives may contain within themselves a comparison as to size with a larger class ( $\$ 205$, end). We can not always tell whether the speaker had in mind a particularly small calf when using $\mu .0 \sigma \sigma_{i}(0 v$, or a particularly small child when using $\pi \alpha<\delta i o v$; oxùd́xuov designates a particularly young puppy, i. e. one just born, in two passages, and yet we can not be sure of the attitude of the writer, since this may be merely incidental, and he may just as well and better have compared them with full grown dogs as with larger puppies.
208. Collection of examples. The different letters under which these are classified refer to the same congeneric classes as in the second section, with the understanding that the precise shading and the accessory ideas are exactly parallel. There are among diminutives
referring to a class no words of which the primitive designates an indeterminate mass, since size or extent can never be a characteristic of one such class in comparison with another.
A. Tcudiov: $\pi \alpha \tilde{\varrho} \varsigma$, 'a (little) child.' Ar. Pax 50 (in contrast to avōpiov and $\alpha$ wrip), see § 159 sub Zuvopiov. id. Plut. 1104 (in con-







 $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \alpha ı \delta i \omega \nu \quad \alpha \lambda \lambda ’ \lambda^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \omega \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \varepsilon \beta \eta \mu \alpha$. id. Apol. 34 D (in contrast to

 § 204.




 ápvós (Gen.), 'a (little) lamb,' in contrast to the large price charged




 'a (little) nestling.' Ar. Av. 547, 767, $\pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \delta \delta \iota \xi ~ \gamma \varepsilon v \varepsilon ́ \sigma \vartheta \omega, ~ \tau о \tilde{O} \pi \alpha \tau \rho \grave{\varsigma}$


 ह̇x
 for the yolk of eggs. So Diph. frg. 4. 427 (40), ' $\varrho^{\prime} \omega ั ้ \delta^{\prime}$ हvv $\alpha u n ท ั ̃$



${ }^{1}$ The diminutive perhaps because of the petty raids in which the soldiers were engaged, and consequently with a deteriorative shade.
 гої́ $\pi \rho \circ \beta \alpha$ ríses. Straton frg. 4. 545 (22), "M





 $-\dot{x} \pi \omega \lambda i \alpha$. $\sigma x \nu i \dot{\alpha} \not \approx \iota o v: \sigma x \dot{j} \lambda \alpha \xi$, 'a (little) puppy.' Xen. Cyn. 7. 3,






 रoroiov : үoĩpos, 'a (little) pigling,' 'a porker.' Ar. Ach. 740 ff., Hepí-











 éeigıov : éprọos, 'a (little) kid.' Athenion frg. 4. 558 (30), 'Epigiov

 zooiov. Antiphan. frg. 3. 100, youpiov ¿xéhn xamíp'.





${ }^{1}$ The idea of small size has here given way altogether to that of deliciousness.
 $\lambda \varepsilon ̇ \pi u p o v, ~ ' a ~(l i t t l e) ~ p e e l ~ o r ~ h u s k . ' ~ H i p p . ~ 242, ~ \delta х о ́ \tau \alpha v ~ \delta \grave{~ x \alpha ́ \tau \omega ~} \beta \varepsilon \beta \alpha i \omega \varsigma$


 $\sigma \pi \varepsilon ̂ p \mu \alpha$, 'a (little) seed.' Theophr. ap. Athen. 66 E , चò $\mu . \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{v}}$ (sc. रévos



E. 廿azódıov: $\psi \alpha x \alpha ́ s, ~ ' a ~(s l i g h t) ~ d r i p p i n g ~ r a i n . ' ~ P o l i o c h u s ~ f r g . ~$


 to the greater size of chairs and the like. Ar. Ran. 121. бжıило́dıov: oxíunous, 'a (little) pallet bed,' in contrast to the larger and higher









 contrast to larger values. Aristeas de LXX Interpr. p. 241, हौxoot
 coins. Men. Her.26, xepux́ ap. Poll. 9. 88. 之єлtiov 'a (little) $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \sigma v$,' in contrast to larger coins.





## 4. ASSOCIATED AND ACCESSORY DIMINUTIVE NOTIONS

209. The term 'diminutive,' even as used here, does not designate an absolutely homogenous body of usages, but it is the most

[^58]frequent and representative use which has given rise to the name, while other related meanings are frequently combined with the idea of small size or even take its place. These are partly present from the very beginning, because the pattern types had other elements in their meaning in addition to that of small size. So the idea of youth came from the pattern $\pi \alpha \delta^{\circ} i_{i o v}(\S 192$ ) or words designating the young of animals ( $\$ 183$ ), and in the same way other associated diminutive ideas may be derived from other pattern types, even though the latter should happen to be lost, and thus do not allow us to judge with certainty whether a given shade of meaning was present from the beginning or was secondary. Other variations of the diminutive meaning are due to the influence of the stem meanings of certain words upon the idea of small size ( $\$ 191$ ). Thus a little poem is a short one, i. e. one that requires a short space of time for perusal. a small coin is one of slight value, a little roast chicken is one that is tender and delicious, etc. These accessory elements may then be transferred with the idea of small size to words where they could not originate, or after the accessory element becomes dominant, it may develop further on independent lines without the slightest reference to the original diminutive notion. So $\not \approx v \alpha \mu \mu \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{z o v}$ 'a delicious (little) slice,' although a little slice is not in itself more delicious than a large one; $\pi \varepsilon p$ oxo $\mu \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ гıov 'delicious mince-meat'; etc.
210. Other variations of the diminutive idea arise by semantic syncretism. In the first place the older diminutive suffix -toxo- probably thrust upon the later -tov some of its own uses: but which they were is totally uncertain, because the same uses may in every case be due to the independent development of -ov itself. As a designation of small size or youth -tov was also equivalent to certain adjectives meaning 'small' or 'young,' notably $\mu \mu x \rho \dot{\rho} \varsigma$; $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \sigma \varsigma$, and véoc. In addition there was a formal bond of association between such adjectives and diminutive suffixes, since the former often modified diminutives in order to emphasize or direct their meaning. The resulting feeling of equivalence allowed any meaning of these adjectives to be transferred to the diminutive suffix, even when the latter could not have developed the same meaning independently. For $\mu x \rho^{\prime} o s$ and véos this is of less importance, because their meaning is quite narrow, and their development of accessory notions was not different from those through which the diminutive suffix must have passed on its own accord. The adjective $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \sigma \delta$, on the other hand, had a much wider sphere of meaning than can be expressed by the trans-
lation 'little.' Originally it was 'peeled,' husked,' and 'little' was only one of the many secondary developments, though the very one which caused the feeling of equivalence with the diminutive suffix. The latter consequently took upon itself such divergent uses as in

 thin ladder' (§ 199). So also the conglutinate -tঠ̊ov in $\pi u p i \delta \partial \iota \alpha ~ \lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \dot{\alpha}$ 'fine wheat' (§ 315. XI. 3 C).
211. Below is given a sketch of the principal associated and accessory diminutive notions without paying attention to the distinction as to whether the diminutive refers to an individual or to a class, since this is unimportant from our present point of view. Such variations of meaning as have been treated in the discussion of the different congeneric groups (§ 191), will receive mere mention here.
A. The idea of descent, probably derived from the diminutive meaning in words designating the young of animals, though otherwise a much older meaning than the diminutive ( $\S 94 \mathrm{f}$.).
B. The idea of youth, inherent in the beginning in some of the pattern types ( $\S 182 \mathrm{f}$.), and productive in names of animals and plants (§ 193 ff .).
C. 'Tender,' 'delicious,' derived from the use of young animals and plants as articles of diet ( $\$ 193 \mathrm{ff}$.), productive not only in words designating these, but other articles of diet as well ( $\$ 231$ ).
D. 'Soft,' 'delicate,' 'luxuriant,' 'elegant'; due partly to the development of hypocoristic notions ( $\$ 240$ ), partly perhaps to the use of -tov in the meaning 'thin,' 'slender' (E), partly to the influence of the adjective $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \sigma \varsigma(\S 210)$. Examples: $\delta \alpha \pi i \delta \iota o v: \delta \dot{\alpha} \pi \iota \varsigma$, 'a soft, luxuriant carpet.' Hipparch. frg. 4. 431 (3), $\delta \alpha \pi i \delta \imath \iota v ~ ह ̂ v ~$






 dining-room' (? see § 52). Theopomp. Com. frg. 2. 816 (2), 'Emívousv
 трǐш $\mu, \alpha$, 'a soft luxurious growth of hair.' Arist. Physiogn. 3. 807 b 5,


E. 'Thin,' 'slender'; due to the nature of the object to which the diminutive is applied, and to the adjective $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \delta \delta$. For $x \lambda \mu \mu \dot{\alpha} x, o v$ see § 199. Similarly $\sigma \pi \propto \varrho \tau i o v: \sigma \pi \alpha ́ p \tau o v, ~ ' a ~ t h i n ~ r o p e, ' ~ ' c h o r d . ' ~$ Ar. Pax. 1247 ; Arist. Probl. 7. 9. 888 a 21, Mech. 2. 850 a 3. More uncertain is reixiov : Opi $\xi$, which, if it belongs here at all, must refer to hair in general ; for it is applied to curly hair (Arist. Prob. 33.

 particular characteristic.
F. 'Short,' i. e. requiring little time, or taking up little space on paper, the natural development of the diminutive meaning in names of poems etc. ( $\$ 203 \mathrm{a}$ ). Similarly $\beta$ nxiov 'a coughing fit may be thought of as 'a short cough,' $\pi u p$ étiov 'a fever-spell' as 'a short fever' ( $\S 203 \mathrm{~b}$ ).
G. The diminutive designates a part of a larger phenomenon, due entirely to the nature of the primitive. So $\beta$ nyiov 'a coughing fit' and $\pi u p$ ériov 'a fever spell' ( $\S 203 \mathrm{~b}$ ); also $โ$ iop $\omega$ चiov 'a partial sweat' (§ 203 c ).
H. 'Small in quantity,' when the primitive designates a material or an indeterminate mass ( $\S 202$ ).
I. 'Of little value,' due to the application of diminutives to words designating coins. vopuซцúriov, originally 'a little coin,' was usually also one of small value. When the latter idea became dominant. the word could designate a coin of little value even if it was made of base metal, and so larger in size than more valuable gold coins. Similarly $\delta \rho \alpha \not \mu^{\prime} i o v, ~ \chi \varepsilon p \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau i o v$, and $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau i o v(§ 208 \mathrm{~J}$ ).
J. 'Thin,' 'slender,' referring to sound, in $\varphi$ ouviov ( 203 c). It is due entirely to the influence of the adjective $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \delta_{5}(\$ 210)$.
212. Combinations of deteriorative and diminutive meaning, which may result either from a secondary deteriorative shade in diminutives, or from a pattern type in which the idea 'that which is like the primitive' had reference both to inferiority of size and other qualities. are mentioned § 151, 168, and 213. The development of the hypocoristic use will be discussed in the next chapter. There remain a few modifications of the diminutive meaning which are caused not by a single word or group of words, but by the general situation which belongs to the whole sentence.
213. In the first place, a speaker will often represent something with which he himself is connected as a little thing in order to give the impression of modesty, and the same motive frequently causes
the use of a diminutive. Just as in English people speak of their 'little home' or their 'little city'' so the Greek could use a diminutive in the same situation. As long as the object referred to really is a small one, the impression of modesty gained by the use of the diminutive is quite secondary, so e. g. in the use of $\pi 0 \lambda i \neq v o c o v \tilde{n}_{j}, \widetilde{\omega} v$
 Menander (§ 199). It becomes the primary factor, however, when the object is not in itself comparatively small, but the speaker uses the diminutive to represent it as small in his own estimation. In this case he may sometimes profess a slight contempt for the object mentioned, ${ }^{1}$ which seems, however, to be altogether incidental and secondary to the diminutive idea. Cf. the Latin judiciolum nostrum 'our humble judgment.' Of Greek -tov in this use I have found the following examples: ä $\gamma \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha ́ \tau \iota o \nu: \ddot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha$, 'a little gift.' Theopomp.






 may impart to them a little business affair of mine '). 仓 $\eta \mu$ ćtovv:



214. Such expressions with a show of modesty may become habitual, and consequently lose their original meaning. After the last suggestion of this is effaced, such a word can also be used by the speaker to refer to something belonging to a different person, and then the diminutive differs from the primitive only in having a certain colloquial flavor, which clings to it from the original idea. So pıó⿱ov, (: ßiocos), doubtless originally 'this scant means of sustenance' of mine, has become a mere colloquialism for $\beta$ iovos in Ar. Plut. 1165,




[^59]215. Closely related to the use of a diminutive because of modesty is the use of one designating an object of which the speaker asks that it shall be given to him. This is already repeatedly mentioned by the (ireek grammarians, e. g. in the scholia to Dionysius Thrax AB. 855 ,




 understood by the Greek grammarians, was the desire to appear modest in asking. This is, however, combined with a certain hypocoristic element, which may partly be secondary to the diminutive, in as much as a situation in which one asks for a favor is necessarily me in which a coaxing tone is employed, and this endearment may easily become centered upon the diminutive as designating the object of the entreaty, and so the most important word in the sentence. Sometimes, on the other hand, the hypocorism may be due to the use of -ov as an exponent of the mood of the speaker, without necessarily being attached to the word which is the logical object of the endearment ( $\$ 244 \mathrm{f}$.), and then the hypocoristic is the principal element. So certainly in the second example of onupioiov (below), where the speaker is not asking for a basket, but for something to put into the basket he already has. The best examples occur in the begging scene of Ar. Ach. 404 ff , where are found the following diminutives of this kind: $\beta \alpha x \tau i \varrho \varrho o v: ~ \beta \alpha x=n p i \alpha, ~ ' a ~ l i t t l e ~ b e g g a r ' s ~ s t a f f ' ~(1 . ~ 448, ~$







 onorriov). In the same passage occur two words ending in conglit

216. A diminutive referring to a class, when there is a particularly vivid comparison between the relative size or extent of the oblject designated by the diminutive and other objects, may sometimes
${ }^{1}$ Perhaps the apparent diminutive force of pici(o) is merely accidental: for it is oftener used with non-diminutive force ( 8180 a ).
be translated 'nothing greater than,' 'merely,' and the like. This may or may not be combined with a judgment of inferiority, and in the latter case the development is totally independent of the deteriorative use of the suffix. Thus there is no idea of intimating that life is an undesirable thing in the use of $\pi \nu \varepsilon \nu_{\mu} \mu$ ćtov : $\pi v \varepsilon \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$, 'mere






 $\mu \varepsilon v o s \quad z x \beta \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega}$. When there is a judgment of inferiority combined with the diminutive idea, there is no way of telling whether the notion ' merely' originated from that of small size as above, or from the deteriorative use of the suffix ( $\$ 167 \mathrm{f}$.$) . An example in which the two have$ coalesced so as to be undistinguishable is $\pi \lambda \alpha z o v v_{\tau} \iota o v: \pi \lambda \alpha x o u ̈ s$,





## 5. FADED DIMINUTIVES.

217. Diminutives properly so called can lose their character in two different ways. When they designate an object as smaller than others of its class, the meaning can fade only if the diminutive designates something which comes to be looked upon as a different
 of as 'a little child,' there was involved a reference to the primitive which necessarily kept the diminutive force intact; but, since the idea 'baby' is one of a series referring to ages, $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$ could stand for the conception of a person of the requisite size and age without reference to the primitive, i. e. without any analysis at all, just as répouv designates an old man and yet is one unanalyzed idea. When a word is thus interpreted as a whole, the suffixal meaning has faded, at least for the time being. Frequent usage is all that is

[^60]needed to convert this into permanent obliteration of the diminutive meaning. Similar fading of the idea of small size may take place in words like बçupiov ' a small kind of hammer,' and đepétpoov 'a small kind of gimlet' (§ 199); for the carpenter may think of the larger and smaller kinds of the same instruments as quite distinct from each other, just as a musician thinks of a flute and piccolo as different. So $\pi \alpha p \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \delta \iota o v ~ ' a ~ s m a l l ~ k i n d ~ o f ~ p i l l a r ' ~(§ ~ 200) ~ w a s ~ p r o b a b l y ~$ a different architectural concept than its primitive, and O'poov 'a little door,' 'wicket' different from Ovipa 'a door' of the ordinary size.
218. When the idea of small size in a particular word has once faded, it does not by any means follow that all speakers at all times will henceforth lose sight of its diminutive character. The latter may crop out again and again as long as there are no such phonetic or semantic changes developed that connection of the diminutive with the primitive can not occur spontaneously. ${ }^{1}$ Thus the German Plättchen 'cooky,' originally 'little plate,' is usually thought of without analysis, because the concept suggested by the diminutive is of such a distinct nature that no reference to the more general Platte 'plate' would ordinarily be made; yet situations occur in which e. g. the analogy of other diminutives can bring back the consciousness of the structure of the word to the speaker's mind. On the whole it may be said that the oftener a word is used, the less likely will it be to suffer analysis, and words like $\pi \alpha_{1} \delta i o v$, which were in daily or hourly use, would be analysed most rarely and fade most easily.
219. A particular kind of fading of diminutive meaning may occur when the diminutive is used metaphorically, i. e. is applied to an object different from the primitive in addition to being smaller, ${ }^{2}$ e. g. Ound́xiov 'little bag' applied to a seed capsule, or the German Schneeglöckchen. When the supposed diminutive of this kind designates a larger object than the primitive, this view can not be maintained ( $\S 135$, end); but for some words like the above mentioned Ou$\lambda$ duxov it is not impossible that the speaker formed them with no other idea than 'little,' while its metaphorical use was merely in-
${ }^{1}$ One of these developments may be the loss of the primitive, in which case the diminutive meaning must necessarily be lost forever. It must be born in mind, however, that the loss of the primitive can not be the efficient cause of the fading of diminutives, but merely the cause of the permanency of such fading. If the primitive to a living diminutive is lost, the diminutive is also lost, because it has no word to which it can be referred.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 1². 673.

cidental．The extent，however，to which this process is assumed is certainly not justifiable；the whole $\begin{gathered} \\ p \alpha \alpha ⿱ 宀 ⿻ 三 丨 口 o 幺 v ~ t y p e ~ h a s ~ i t s ~ r o o t ~ i n ~ t h e ~\end{gathered}$ function of－tov to designate similarity（ $\$ 136$ ），which was an older use than the diminutive，and so furnished the models for most of these words．Absolutely beyond the realm of possibility is a number of words which are supposed to be faded diminutives of this kind by Janson，op．cit．p． 24 ff ．It contains even words like $\alpha_{\text {dpuṕpov and }}$ y $\alpha$ 入xiov，in which the－tov meant＇made of，＇and which do not show the slightest suggestion of diminutive meaning．
220．The second method by which diminutives can lose their character concerns those which refer to a class．Unless the situation points to a very strong contrast of size between the diminutive and other classes，there is continual probability that the hearer will not coincide with the speaker．Thus when the latter used $\pi$ cuisiov＇a little child，＇he may have referred even to a child of twelve or fourteen years of age，because he thought of the size of any child as small com－ pared to that of an adult．The hearer，however，when there were no strong indications of this in the situation，would usually not be able to follow the speaker，and would perceive $\pi \alpha \delta_{i}$ ov as used exactly like $\tau \alpha u \check{ }$ ．He could then himself go on and use the diminutive in place of the primitive without qualification．It is evident that any diminutive referring to a class and suffering a more than occasional usage，may fade in this manner；the difficulty is merely to determine which words were diminutives to begin with（cf．§ 206），and when the diminutive meaning has ceased to be felt．Examples for the probable fading of this kind of diminutive may be found under most words of § 208．I may mention $\pi \rho \circ \beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau}$

 ү．au．śviov $=\chi \alpha u, z^{\prime} m$＇pallet bed．＇Most easily those words become equivalent to their primitive，of which the root part already carried with it the idea of small size or youth as compared to something else．Since $\pi \omega$ itiov＇a（little）foal＇does not contrast its size and age with a full－grown horse merely by means of its suffix，but the primitive $\pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda 0 \leqslant$ contains within itself the same suggestion，the suffix －tov had from the beginning no other function than to emphasize this relation，and only frequent usage of the diminutive was required to efface this slight difference．

## 6. SECONDARY DIMINUTIVES.

221 . In order that a given -tov word of non-diminutive meaning should be reinterpreted as a diminutive, there must be stronger inHuences at work than the mere incidental application of the word to a small object. Large and small things are ever present to the eye, and oftener than not we refer to something without thinking anything about its size. When, therefore, ompiov, the generic term for 'animal.' is used of a small animal like an insect ( $\$ 118 \mathrm{~A}$. second note to ompiov), it does not by any means follow that it was actually interpreted as a diminutive. This is only possible when there is something to show that the idea of small size was really a part of the conception of the speaker.
222. The prime requisite for the reinterpretation of an old -tov word as a diminutive is that it should not differ materially from the primitive in meaning, so that there exists a pair of a word with and one without -tov which are virtually equivalent. The suffix then. because not charged with any definite meaning, is ready to receive a new interpretation. Since the diminutive relation is by far the most frequent for such words, other pairs which are not preempted by other distinct meanings of cov can be attracted so as to be in the same relation to each other. The less often an tov word of this kind is used, the less definite and strong its semantic picture exists in the mind, the more easily can the diminutive meaning be thrust upon it. More or less probable examples are ג̀própov: a ápزupos, originally 'anything made of silver,' 'silver money,' but once perhaps 'a little silver coin' ( $\$ 101 \mathrm{~A}$ sub appúpoov, last example): $\delta$ xúóvov: $\delta$ xíus, originally an adjectival abstract with the meaning 'divinity,' then equivalent to its primitive, and finally limited to the lesser divinities (§ 38. last note); ఘuxtiplov: \$uxtrip, 'wine-cooler.' originally identical with primitive, but apparently a diminutive twice ( $\$ 77$ ). The influence of the diminutives also seems to have caused


 esteróvic. A most striking example of the influence of diminutives, probably a case of intentional regulation by the grammarians,
 designating prefixes and the suffixed particle - $\delta \varepsilon$ in contrast to $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho 0$ द 'a part of speech' in the Etymologicum Magnum, and so considered



 д $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu_{\text {.ópıov. }}$
223. Occasion for the reinterpretation of -tov words as diminutives can also be given by certain external iufluences, just as in case of the corresponding deterioratives ( $\S 174 \mathrm{ff}$.). In the first place, the frequent use of adjectives like $\mu \mathrm{u} \rho \rho \circ$ s and $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau$ ós with -tov diminutives could cause non-diminutives in -tov to become interpreted as diminutives if modified by the same adjectives; for the adjective will then call attention to the small size of an object and allows ${ }^{1}$ the suffix to be connected with that idea, and so to be recognized as the same which is so often a diminutive suffix. The best example of this is



 of $\S 77$.
224. In the second place, the collocation of a non-diminutive -60 word with real diminutives may call attention to the fact that the former has the same suffix as the latter, and so cause it to be reinterpreted as a diminutive. So ázóvciov (§ 127) in Thuc. 2. 4. 3, бтирахị dxovtiou. raбт@iov (§ 101 F ) in Nicostratus frg. 3. 279, Eir'


 viঠiou סúo.
225. In how far these processes were really operative in causing the reinterpretation of -tov words as diminutives in post-Classical times, can not, of course, be determined except by extended research in the late literature. For the Classical period, however, there are no indications that this has taken place to any very great extent, not even for words which might be taken as diminutives referring to a class, e. g. Zxóvtiov 'javelin,' which, as designating a missile of small size compared to a spear, might be supposed to have taken upon itself a diminutive meaning with this relation in view, which would be all the easier because any diminutive referring to a class has exactly the

[^61]same breadth of application as the primitive, and consequently, when a word is thus reinterpreted, no change in its sphere of application results. Aside from the fact, however, that there is scarcely any indication that such words secondarily came to be felt that way, many of the same type, e. g. those designating the larger vessels and articles of dress, were kept from reinterpretation by the same limitations which prevent our presuming them to be diminutives at their first formation (§ 205 f.). On the other hand, words in -tov which designated something 'like' their primitive, but smaller, were very probably largely reinterpreted as diminutives $(\$ 136,189)$.
226. As in case of deterioratives (§ 177), words which have been reinterpreted as diminutives can not be separated sharply from those of which the diminutive meaning is rather due to reformation, i. e. the speaker consciously coins a new diminutive, but is unconscious, at least for the time being, of the fact that the same word already exists in a non-diminutive meaning. The latter process is not different from the formation of any other new diminutives, and words which seemed to me probably to have gotten their diminutive meaning in this way, have been placed among the original diminutives,


## XVI. -tov AS A HYPOCORISTIC SUFFIX.

227. Whereas the deteriorative use of -cov was, as we have seen, as old as the diminutive, and not derived from it, its hypocoristic function must rather have taken its origin from its diminutive use. Not that this is the only possible way by which endearment can be connected with a suffix, but rather because it is the only one which meets the conditions presupposed by -tov particularly. That other sources of this meaning are also possible, can be seen from the existence of hypocoristic suffixes which are uncombined with diminutive meaning, e. g. the English -y in personal names like Willy and Johnny, or in names of animals in the nursery, such as 'doggy ' or 'horsy.' ${ }^{1}$ These words have no tendency whatever to be restricted to particularly small dogs or horses, but are used of all sizes indifferently while speaking to children in a coaxing or endearing tone (cf. § 244). Another example of a hypeoristic suffix which is not at
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Cent. Dict. and Cycl. sub -y.
the same time a diminutive suffix is the so-called diminutive -l- of the Gothic bible, which is used for translating the Greek -ov only in hypocoristic address, not when it refers to small size; $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v ~ i s ~$ translated barn except in the Vocative, which is barnilo. ${ }^{1}$ It is, then, possible that the hypocoristic use of a suffix arises differently than from the idea of small size, e. g. directly from the meaning 'descended from.' Just as the words child, son, and daughter may have an affectionate ring in address, so a suffix of descent may develop into a hypocoristic suffix without interposition of diminutive meaning, and it is highly probable that the Germanic $-1-,^{2}$ if not I. E. -lo-, came to its function in this manner. For Greek -tov, however, this is impossible for the same reason that its diminutive use can not have originated in this way (\$95). namely, that its use in the meaning 'descended from' was limited to so few and rare words that it could hardly have given rise to as frequent functions as those of designating small size and endearment. Moreover, the majority of these words designate animals of such a kind that no one could think of them with affection: a young viper (zyisivov), a young polyp ( $\pi 0$ $\lambda u \pi \sigma \delta \delta o v$ ), a young purple-fish ( $\quad 0 p$ coúpov). Since there also is no evidence that the hypocoristic use of -tov could have developed from the deteriorative use ( $\$ 3$ ), we must look for its origin in diminutive cov.
228. The whole mass of hypocoristic words may be roughly divided into two groups. In the one the idea is 'dainty,' 'nice,' 'elegant,' and this largely originated in the use of diminutives designating young animals or plants when used as articles of food ( $\$ 193 \mathrm{ff}$.). After the originally accessory idea of deliciousness had once become dominant in some of these words, the new meaning was extended to other words where it could not originate, i. e. to words in which the idea of daintiness never could have been associated with small size or youth,

229. In the second group the suffix is an exponent of endearment, and expresses affection for a person or object. The overwhelming majority of examples of this kind refer to living beings, particularly to human beings, and it is in designations of such that the origin of the use is to be sought. The ease with which endearment is associated with small size in case of a child or pet animal is too

[^62]familiar in all languages to need illustration. The English adjective ' little' has proceeded so far in this respect that it is used by some persons even where there is no idea of small size, as when the lover speaks of his 'little girl' even when she is six feet tall. In case of Greek -tov this development of the diminutive idea may have been assisted by another factor. The most frequent of diminutives, namely $\pi x i \delta i o v$, in as much as it could mean 'little son or daughter,' i. e. could refer to descent as well as size and age, contained within its root part the germs of a hypocoristic development (cf. \$227), and this could easily emphasize and hasten the tendency of the endearment to connect itself with the suffix; for $\pi x i \delta i o v$ 'dear little son' could be analyzed so that the idea 'dear' as well as 'little' was lodged in the suffix.
230. The examples will be divided into the two groups just mentioned, without paying attention to the distinction whether the hypocorism is directed to an individual or a class. Since these meanings are an off-shoot of the fully developed diminutive meaning, and since there never could have existed the idea of similarity in a hypocoristically used suffix, the distinction is of no historical value here. As a matter of fact, it may be said that when the meaning is 'dainty'; 'elegant,' etc., the hypocorism may be directed either to an individual or a class, but real endearment is necessarily nearly always addressed to concrete individuals, and not to abstract classes.

## 1. THE SUFFIX EXPRESSES THE IDEA OF DAINTINESS, ELEGANCE, OR NICETY.

231. By far the larger number of examples designate articles of food, and of these those which are names of animals or plants or their parts have already been mentioned ( $\varsigma 193 \mathrm{ff}$.). It remains to give the words which could not themselves have been instrumental in the develonment of this meaning. סєилviov : סzinvov. 'delicions dimner.'






${ }^{1}$ The text is sometimes emended to $\delta \delta \iota \pi \nu$ i $i \varphi$.


 (I quote a longer passage as a good example of how freely such hypocorisms were used by some persons. It is a description of the













 тiors. ${ }^{2}$ Athenion frg. $4.558(31)$, see $\S 208 \mathrm{Bb}$ sub हррịюov. бк@xiov:













${ }^{1}$ These words may also have a true diminutive element in them, in as much as the suffix may have carried with it the idea 'ground fine,' another case of the influence of the adjective lemris (§ 210).
${ }^{2}$ Here the force of the suffix seems to have faded, unless the purpose of the hypocorism was to raise a laugh on account of its ridiculous incongruity with the situation.
${ }^{2}$ Here perhaps 'generalizing.' Cf. жctčсобuítuov (§ 118 C ).

 see sub そ́סuбuátiov．$\chi v \mu i o v: \chi u \mu$ ós，＇fine sauce．＇Sotad．frg．3． 585 （1．19），see sub трчциа́тьov．

232．Closely related to the above words are those in which－ov means＇soft，＇＇delicate，＇＇luxuriant，＇＇olegant＇（§ 211 D ）．It must be by the extension of these ideas or the meaning＇delicious＇or both ${ }^{1}$ that hypocoristic－tov has come to be added to a few originally ab－ stract words：¿xouन $\mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota ⿱ ⿻ 土 ㇒ 日 幺 十 ~ ' e l e g a n t ~(l i t t l e) ~ s t r a i n ~ o f ~ m u s i c, ' ~ \beta o u \lambda \varepsilon u-~$
 last，however，the idea of endearment also may have had its influence， in as much as the words were thought of as used for coaxing some one into aquiescence（cf．§ 242）．We may translate＇pet phrases，＇ ＇coaxing words，＇or the like．Examples：$\alpha^{3} \nsim 0 v \sigma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \iota o v: ~ \alpha ้ x о ч \sigma \mu \alpha . ~ L u c . ~$







 K גі̀ Sıаvoíaıs $\chi \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \circ \xi ̧ \varepsilon u ́ \sigma \omega . ~$

## 2．THE SUFFIX EXPRESSES ENDEARMENT．

233．As an example of the combination of diminutive and hypo－ coristic meaning，which is presupposed to have existed if the latter is derived from the former，I may mention Durátpoo＇dear little

 can occur at any time when $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$ is used hypocoristically；for a speaker may always think of any child as small at the same time when he is using $\pi$ aidiov with endearment．Since this word also allows such a development particularly easily because of its root meaning （§ 229），and since it was the most frequent of all hypocoristic words in－七ov，we may conclude that it was the principal pattern for this group of hypocoristic words，just as it was for the diminutives
${ }^{1}$ It is also not impossible that this is due to semantie syncretism of $-1 / 1$ with－七бxo－．Cf．Alcman frg．65，＂$\Omega_{s}$ ciuès toे xciòv $\mu$ ehiaxov．
( $\varsigma 182$ ), and this all the more so because it is generally true that endearment is oftenest and must evidently associated with small size in case of children.
234. This accessory notion of endearment could gradually become dominant over that of small size in any word, but most easily this took place when the diminutive referred to a class. If the speaker used $\pi$ cuioiov 'dear little child ' because thinking of a child as small in comparison with adults, the hearer would usually not follow him and perceive only the hypocorism, which always reveals itself easily in the spoken language. After the diminutive idea had altogether faded from certain words in certain situations, it became pussible to use words like Kux入ítıov 'dear Cyclops,' and Ezputiòıov 'dear Euripides' (§ 236 b ).
235. By far the larger number of occasions for endearing expressions arise in address of the second person : the mother to her child, the lover to his love, etc. As a result the large majority of examples of the hypocoristic use of -tov words are in the Vocative case. This fact has born fruit in new formations on the basis of the Vocative in several instances. Thus $\pi \alpha \tau$ éplov 'dear father' shows its hypocoristic origin by the strong stem $\pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon \rho-$, which occurs in the Vocative of its primitive ( $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \rho$ ), while otherwise the weak stem $\pi \alpha \tau \rho-$ is used as the basis of derivation and composition. From the relation of the vocatives $\pi \alpha \tilde{i}: \pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v ~ t h e ~ s u f f i x ~-\delta ı o v ~ w a s ~ a b s t r a c t e d, ~ e . ~ g . ~ i n ~ \beta o u ́ \delta i o v ~$ (§ 304).
236. Examples of hypocorisms in address, mostly the Vocative case. I will subdivide : a) the term of endearment is an appellative designating a person, b) a proper name, c) a name of an animal hypocoristically used of a person, d) a name of an animal referring to an animal.










[^63]





 21 (to the blind seer Teiresias, after the latter had declared that he must not answer the speaker's request for information), Mrioxuãs,

 $\mu \gamma \delta \varepsilon ो \varsigma ~ \pi \lambda \alpha \nu \alpha ́ \tau \omega ~ \delta \mu \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma$.





 $\pi \iota o v$ as if: $\Lambda \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \nless \pi \pi \sigma \rho$, , but really acting as a humorous 'diminutive '





c) Butıov, an uncertain hypocristic word for which Bentley sub-



 little bee.' Ar. Vesp. 367, XOP. 'A $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ xגi vĩv éx
 - lear little golden beetle.' Ar. Vesp. 1342, 'Avá’aıve ถєũpo, y.̂ugo-队. rinonóvorov.

[^64]
 «à̀ Kúnpov.
237. When a person expresses his feeling of endearment for a third person, and particularly for someone who is not present, the intensity of his feeling is naturally usually less than in the contrary case, and will diminish in accordance with the remoteness of his connection with the person. In this way the use of hypocorisms can descend step by step to a condition in which such a slight degree of emotion is felt that the -tov derivative is virtually equivalent to the primitive, a state of affairs which is further hastened by the many cases in which the hearer can not understand the speaker's endearment. Although this latter factor often makes it still more difficult for us, who are so far removed from the Greek manner of thought, to judge with certainty whether a certain word could have been used hypocoristically, there are enough certain passages to show that this use of -tov was not confined to the second person. The examples are arranged as in the last paragraph.














b) While the proper names of $\S 236 \mathrm{~b}$ were occasional formations which were used in affectionate address only, and alongside of them the primitives were in regular use for the very same individuals, all extant examples which belong here are of such a nature as to show that the hypocoristic force of the suffix has faded; for the -tov form has taken the place of its primitive as the regular name of

[^65]certain women, particularly hetaerae. These proper names in -ov. became very frequent in later times, and seem then to have been confined to women, while in the time of the Old Comedy, when the hypocoristic force of the suffix was yet living, they could just as well be used in endearing address to men (cf. the examples of $\$ 236 \mathrm{~b}$ ). A longer list of these permanent names in -tov has been collected by Zimmerman, Die Griech. Personennamen auf oov und ihre Entsprechungen im Lateinischen, Philol. 64. 499 ff. Many examples are also scattered through Bechtel, Die Attischen Frauennamen. Here will be given only a few words from the Middle Comedy, in order to show that already at that time (but not earlier) such names in -oov had become permanently attached to certain individuals; for they occur as their ordinary names alongside of names of other individuals without hýpocoristic suffixes. Nóvvıov: Návva, Amphis frg. 3. 310,





 see sub Náviov.




238. It is quite common in rarious languages, e. g. Latin and Middle High German, to use hypocorisms for everything connected with the person of ones mistress, particularly parts of her body, or her dress and her ornaments, and the same is often done when speaking of children, then with the diminutive idea as well as endearment. As far as articles of dress and ornament are concerned, there is not the slightest indication that the -ov words of $\$ 130$ had the remotest tendency to be used oftener in hypocoristic situations. as when the lover is speaking to his love, or the parent to the child, and we must consequently conclude that this kind of hypocorism was foreign to the Greek language, probably for the very reason that so many words of this kind in meaningless -ov had been formed before the full development of the hypocoristic use, that the suffix could not be easily recognized as a means of expressing endearment in this congeneric group. There is, however, some eridence for the use of
hypocoristic－ov in words designating parts of the body．The best example is post－Classic ：ỏ ö $\mu \dot{\tau} \tau \iota o \nu$ ：${ }^{\circ} \mu \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ ，＇dear little eye，＇Anth．P．

 ह̃ $\lambda \varepsilon$ p $\omega v \alpha \rho i \omega v$ ．That the same usage existed already in the time of the Old Comedy，is shown by the following words：तó⿱⺈⿻コ一寸





 $\chi!\tau \omega v i ́ o u ~ \Pi \alpha p \alpha p p a \gamma e ́ v \tau o s ~ \tau \iota \sigma O i o v ~ \pi p o x o ́ ч a v . ~ C f . ~ a l s o ~ t h e ~ f o l l o w i n g ~ w o r d s ~$



239．There is not a single probable example extant in which a hypocoristic word in tov is used to express endearment for a lifeless thing itself．Apparent cases of this kind are either such that the endearment is directed to something else than is designated by the word in－tov（cf．§ 244 f. ），or the idea is＇neat，＇＇pretty，＇＇elegant．＇ etc．，i．e．there really is no affection present at all（cf．§ 240）． For an apparent exception in－九ঠ̌ov see $\& 315$ ．XII．E．

## 3．MODIFICATIONS OF HYPOCORISTIC MEANING．

240．Since endearment often results from an appreciation of beauty，the two ideas are intimately associated，and the latter may become dominant in situations where the emotional element is less keenly felt，e．g．when the endearment is directed to an absent person． Thus Ouyd́cpov is used particularly with reference to beauty in Ar． Thesm． 1210 （ $\$ 237 \mathrm{a}$ ），and so is bpviorov in the examples of $\S 237$ d，i．e．either because of appreciation of the beauty of the bird itself or of its song．The endearing use of－tov has thus developed a meaning that is quite similar to that in words like $\tau \alpha \pi \hat{\eta}^{\prime}$ tov（ $\left.\$ 2111\right)$ ， or $\dot{\alpha}$ xouquátiov（ $\$ 232$ ），which are largely due to other causes．

241．Sometimes the use of a term of endearment results fromk pity，from the desire to console，etc．，so e．g．$\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v ~ i n ~ A r . ~ P a x . ~$ 111，Thesm． 731 （§ 236 a）；id．Lys．880，Eccl． 92 （§ 237 a）．

[^66]Similarly ßázov and vritrópoov in Ar. Plut. 1011 (§ 236c). The use of hypocorisms from such motives is too natural and common to let us suppose that this usage as a whole goes back directly to the diminutive meaning, on the ground that weakness became associated with small size, and pity with weakness. It would be wrong, moreover, to say that the emotion of pity was really connected with the suffix, but it rather belonged to the whole situation, while the suffix, as otherwise, was simply the exponent of endearment.
242. The same can be said of the use of hypocorisms in entreaties, e. g. xóprov, Theocr. 11. 60 (\$ 236 a); $\pi \alpha \tau \hat{\varepsilon} p$ ov, Luc. Menipp.
 ('ycl. 266 (l. c.). The position of one asking a favor is one in which it is natural to adopt an affectionate and coaxing tone.
243. It is ordinarily also indifferent, except for stylistic reasons, that there may be a certain dramatic irony displayed in the use of a hypocorism in comedy, i. e. the speaker is supposed to use a term of endearment in a perfectly sincere manner, but the poet and spectator have a laugh on the side when the object of the endearment is a particularly large or uncouth or dignified person, so e. g. Kuxえćmiov in Euripides (§ 236 b), Ėpurî́rov in Aristophanes (l. c.), $\pi \alpha \tau \bar{\varepsilon} p$ oov addressed to the blind old seer Tiresias in Lucian (\$ 236 a), $\mu \mathrm{z} \lambda$ iv $\tau$ tov 'sweet little bee,' addressed to the uncouth juryman in Ar. Vesp. 367 (§ 236 c ), or vnctópoov 'dear little duckling,' supposed to be addressed to a hideous old woman in Ar. Plut. 1011 (1. c.). Sometimes, however, such irony may result in deteriorative meaning. Cf. § 152.
244. Sometimes hypocoristic suffixes are used not so much to indicate affection for a certain object or to designate it as beautiful or delicate, but rather because the speaker is in a sympathetic or hypocoristic mood. ${ }^{1}$ After these meanings had once developed in certain words which designated the object of the emotion or the possessor of the admired qualities, the suffix could also be illogically added to words which did not themselves designate an ohject viewed with affection. Thus, when a child is told to see the "horsy " or to take care of the 'doggy,' the endearment expressed by the suffix -y is really directed to the child and not to the horse or dog. An emotion will not necessarily wait for its expression until the word
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Belié, Arch. f. Slav. Phil. 23. 143. Revently this has been calleal "Enallage der Diminution" or "infektiöse Chertragung der Diminution" by Skutsch, ALL, 15. 37 f .
which designates the object to which it is directed is uttered, but may cause the addition of its linguistic exponent to any word whatever, provided only that the addition of a certain suffix to a certain kind of word is in harmony with the habits of the language. When a person is speaking with a child or lover, when he is addressing an entreaty to someone, in some languages, e. g. Lithuanian, ${ }^{1}$ even when he desires to express himself in a neat or elegant fashion, he can use hypocoristic suffixes and attach them to any word which strikes his fancy. How small a part logic plays in this, may be seen e. g. from the Lithuanian dainos. In a little song a lover bewails to his love the necessity of his going to war, and uses a 'diminutive' of the word for 'war' : "î krygẽlę jójau," although a man who is so reluctant to go can neither think of a war as a small affair nor look upon it with affection. It is very plainly the fact that he is speaking with his love that produces in him a hypocoristic mood, and induces him to give vent to it by adding the suffix to the nearest word which can take it, the only substantive of the clause. Similar things occur in the German dialects of East Prussia. When some one has failed to understand the speaker and asks for a repetition, it is a mark of politeness to say 'Was-che?,' or, when speaking to children affectionately, one may ask 'Was-sagst-du-che?' The same tendency in some languages has caused the addition of hypocoristic endings to adjectives, although the proper object of the endearment is really the modified substantive. So frequently in Latin, e. g. Catullus 3. 18, Flendo turgiduli rubent ocelli. id. 69. 4, perluciduli deliciis lapidis. id. 17. 15, puella tenellulo delicatior haedo. id. 61. 193, Uxor in thalamo tibi est Ore floridulo nitens. ${ }^{2}$
245. Although Greek -tov has certainly not progressed as far in this line, at least in the Classical period, as the Balto-Slavic languages, or even the Latin, there are a few passages which show that even in the time of Aristophanes this usage must have had a place in the language of every-day life. On the one hand, the use of -tov diminutives to designate objects of which the speaker desires that they shall be given to him, may partially have its root in this illogical use of hypocoristic -tov (cf. § 215). There is also, however, at least one passage in which this is the only possible interpretation, namely, Ar.

[^67]Equ. 906, where Cleon and the sausage maker are vying with each other in making promises in order to gain the favor of Demos: A^^.


 $\lambda_{i}$ yuov can not have been thought of as really designating a small object; for that would be contrary to the pretence of the giver, who would want to appear to be giving as much as possible. It is rather the coaxing tone of the whole passage that has caused the 'diminutive,' the sausage maker is speaking to Demos as he would to a child. In the same way is to be understood $\varepsilon \lambda x u \omega^{\delta} \rho \cdot \alpha$ with the conglutinate - $\mathbf{0}$ poov, and to translate as a deteriorative ('nasty little sores'), as one editor does, is hardly in accord with the tone of the passage. For $\tau \omega \varphi \rho \cdot \alpha \lambda \mu \delta \delta \dot{\delta} \omega$, however, is possible the translation ' your dear little eyes' (§ 238). Other examples of this usage of simple -tov are doubtful. Perhaps x $\omega \pi$ iov ( $: x \omega \bar{\omega}$ ' 'oar') is used in this way in Ar. Ran. 269, where Charon shouts to Dionysius to quit rowing: ${ }^{*} \underline{Q} \pi x ข ๊ \varepsilon$ $\pi \alpha \tilde{\varepsilon} \varepsilon, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta \alpha \lambda \circ \tilde{\Delta} \tau \widetilde{\infty} \chi \omega \pi i \omega$. . The grim old ferryman must then be understood to have entreated Dionysius, not commanded him to stop. It is, however, not impossible that $\alpha_{\text {cotiov followed the analogy of in- }}$ strument nouns in -tov (§78). Perhaps the amorous tone of the passage caused sixóvov (: sixúsv 'image') in Plut. 2. 753 B , $\varepsilon_{\rho} \tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha t$


 amples of conglutinates in -tov used with 'Enallage of Diminution': ßoióápov (\$ 366. X. D.), ßoîtov and yopîiov (§ 315. XII. F.).

## 4. FADED HYPOCORISMS.

246. Since an tov word with the idea of daintiness in the suffix could refer to a class as well as an individual, the hypocoristic meaning could fade in exactly the same way as that of diminutives referring to a class ( $\$ 220)$. An example of this is ruicision, originally 'fine cake' of preserved fruit, but totally equivalent to its
 $\mu \varepsilon \hat{\varepsilon} \lambda$, हैं $\lambda \alpha 10 \%$.
247. As to terms of endearment, it is an often mentioned fact ${ }^{1}$ that they are prone to lose their color merely by frequent use. In the
${ }^{1}$ So e. g. W. Schulze, Graeco-Latina 20 ; Brogmann, (ir. 2. $1^{2} .672$ f.
language of lovers and the family such hypocorisms are so frequent that they may become habitual, and will then be used also without the emotion which accompanied their use in the beginning, and this the more easily when directed to the third person instead of the second ( $\$ 237$ ). In this case the fading will be assisted by the frequent failure of the hearer to understand the speaker's affection. Moreover, words which are used only as a result of the speaker's hypocoristic $\operatorname{mood}(\$ 244 \mathrm{f}$.), are very nearly equivalent to their primitives from tho beginning, ${ }^{1}$ and may also easily lose their hypocoristic flavor in the course of transmission.
248. It is possible that many certain examples of these processes could be found by a detailed study of post-Classical literature, but for Classical times their importance has certainly been much overestimated. In order to establish such a faded hypocorism it is, of course, not sufficient to point to a case where -tov derivative and primitive are equivalent; for this sameness of meaning can have a variety of different causes. It is necessary either to show that the very same word actually existed in a living hypocoristic usage, or at least that it belongs to such a category that the analogy of other Greek words makes it probable that this one should have been used as a term of endearment. Thus, while the many extant hypocoristic proper names make it certain that names of women like Kóvotiov or $\Lambda$ sóvtoov originate from the hypocoristic use of -tov, it would be diametrically opposed to the spirit and usage of the Greek language to assume that names of vessels, like $\chi u \mu \beta i o v$, or of missiles, like $\gamma \& p \mu$ dódov $^{\prime}$ or $\alpha x$ óvtoov, originated in the same way, since there are almost no examples extant in which words of this category are used with living hypocoristic meaning. According to this criterion, the number of faded hypocorisms in the Classical period is exceedingly small, and this is really what might be expected from the comparatively recent origin of the usage ( $\S 261 \mathrm{ff}$.), and from the fact that the Greek language had not gone far in the application of hypocorisms to inanimate objects (§ 239), nor used them to a very great extent merely because of the hypocoristic mood of the speaker (§ 245).
249. A certain example of the fading of the idea of endearment in Classical times is raıdiov. In the meaning 'child,' referring to size or youth, it seems to be completely equivalent to its primitive in


[^68] \üтoús $\tau \varepsilon$ xגi $\tau \alpha$ $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i ́ \alpha$. In this meaning, however, the equivalence of primitive and derivative may as well be due to the fading of the diminutive idea ( $\leqslant 220$ ) ; but when $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$ refers to descent, and is simply 'son,' not 'little son' or 'dear son,' there must have occurred fading of the hypocoristic meaning. So in the phrase ${ }^{\text {Apesc }}$
 Similarly 'vráı@ov later becomes equivalent to Ouróonp, as is shown by its being parallel to $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \lambda \rho_{\rho} \dot{\eta}$ in an inscription of legal contents


 Gen.) 'ear' is also a faded hypocorism, and passed from the language of nurses and lovers into universal use. While this view has support in the existence of words like bupátiov (§ 238), it seems significant that both this word and the equivalent $\omega \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ ocov ( $\varsigma 366$. X.E) are never used when the ear is thought of as an organ of hearing, nor in a figurative sense, but only when the outer ear is distinctly in mind. And since there is no example extant of hypocoristic use of either of these words, though both not very rare, it seems as though briov and $\omega \tau \alpha \dot{p}$ cov were rather thought of as 'that which belongs to the ear,' i. e. 'the ear lap.' Cf. Anth. P. 11. 81, ${ }^{2}$ E $\sigma$ yov $\delta$ ' हv Hior $\mu$ 文v


250. The fading of the hypocoristic meaning of -tov in proper names and the consequent use of the suffix in permanent names ( $\stackrel{\wedge}{ } 237 \mathrm{~b}$ ) left it the new function of forming names of women, particularly courtezans, and in this use it was extended regardless of the relation of primitive and derivative. Thus while Návvcov is derived from Návva, which is itself a proper name, and thus might have originally been a hypocoristic form of the latter, this is impossible for other names of this kind which are derived from appellatives or adjectives.

 a 'little Athena,' but 'she who belongs to Athena,' a priestess.

## 5. SECONDARY HYPOCORISTIC WORDS.

251. Old -tov words which are not originally hypocoristic, if used in hypocoristic situations, so that it is clear that they
designate the object of endearment，could be analyzed so as to lodge the source of the hypocorism in the suffix．Thus qovoiov（ $\$ 101 \mathrm{~A}$ ）， originally designating anything made of gold，could be used meta－ phorically as a term of endearment，but its source would be in the metaphor，not the suffix ；for the hypocorism is present just the same when there is no＇diminutive＇suffix attached（cf．e．g．the Latin ＇ille aureus puer＇（Priapea 83．40）．Yet the speaker or hearer might become conscious of the fact that ypuoiov ended in the same suffix which is so frequently associated with endearment．So Ar．Lys．930，
 1200，see § 238 sub 兀ぃтOiov．

## XVII．CONGENERIC CLASSES OF－七七 WORDS OF HETEROGENEOUS ORIGIN．

252．The influence of congeneric words ${ }^{1}$ in causing other words to receive the same suffix，even though in the latter it brings with it no change of meaning，has been mentioned in many instances，e．g．

 tablet，＇after $\beta$ ß $\beta$ 入iov＇that which is made of papyrus，＇＇a book＇
 requisite is that the original meaning of a suffix should at least tempo－ rarily be forgotten，be it that the word has become so frequently used that it is no longer analyzed，but recalls its concept as a whole （ $\S 133$ note），or be it that primitive and derivative have for some reason become equivalent，and the old meaning of the suffix is per－ manently obscured；and in either case a word can cause other words of kindred meaning to be assimilated to it as far as their ending is concerned，i．e．the speaker，consciously or unconsciously，now as－ sumes the suffix to be the exponent of the category to which these words belong．Thus，when $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \tau i o v ~ w a s ~ m o d e l l e d ~ a f t e r ~ \beta i \beta \lambda i o v, ~ t h e ~$ speaker could not have felt the latter as＇that which is made of papyrus＇but simply as＇book，＇and then the suffix was free for a new interpretation，and could be thought of as a means of forming words designating writing－materials．

[^69]253. Some of these congeneric groups of words in -tov are due to a convergence of different original meanings of the suffix, e. g. articles of dress and ornament, a class which contains words in which -rov wass a compound forming suffix, meant 'belonging to' or 'connected with,' 'made of,' 'belonging to the category of,' 'like to ' (s 2601), E). It is evident that wherever the nucleus of words in such a group is of heterogeneous origin, there is a particularly powerful influence to break down the original meanings of the suffix and to impute to it the new one, in this case the function of forming words designating articles of dress and ornament, which is distinctly more tangible and has the advantage of causing to appear as semantically related words which are identical in structure.
254. We can be sure that this reinterpretation of the suffix has actually taken place only when it results in the formation of words like $\delta \varepsilon \lambda$ tiov, which are equivalent to their primitives from the beginning. Sometimes it happened that the same suffix in different meanings accidentally formed words of the same congeneric group, and yet the relation of these words was never felt, nor did they converge int, a homogenous group. Thus names of animals were formed with an -ov of generalizing meaning ( $\S 118 \mathrm{~A}$ ), one which designated similarity ( $\S 142$ ) and were sometimes faded diminutives ( $\S 208$ Ba, 220 ), and yet there is no evidence that -ov was ever thought of as merely an animal designating suffix, though that does not prevent us from assuming that names of animals mutually influenced one another within the bounds of a certain suffixal meaning. The same is true of the following groups: words designating parts of the body, which may have a compound forming -tov (§ 51. 2, 57. 2), one which means 'belonging to' or 'connected with' (xpoviov, poví $\alpha$, 85:
 $\S 107 \mathrm{~A}$ ), •like' the primitive (§ 149), or they may be hypocorisms (§ 238) ; place names, which may be originally abstract nouns (§341) and note), their suffix may have meant 'belonging to' or 'connected with' ( $\S 61 \mathrm{ff}$.$) ), 'provided with' ( \lambda_{\iota} \beta \dot{\alpha} \delta \mathbf{\delta} \circ \mathrm{ov}, \S 107 \mathrm{~A}$ ): words designating poems, songs, etc., either compounds (\$51.4) or hypocoristic words ( $\S 232$ ); words designating articles of food, which may be original abstract nouns ( \&qúvov, $\S 3 \overline{5}$ ), may have an -oov that means 'made of' ( $\S 101 \mathrm{~F}$ ), a generalizing - tov ( $x x=x$ yur-
 (§ 231).
255. On the other hand, we can be certain that -oov was reinter-
preted as a suffix forming plant names in a large number of words, because its use here did not remain within the bounds prescribed by the older meanings of the suffix, but words of this kind were formed regardless of the relation of primitive and derivative. I have omitted discussion of nearly all plant names up to this point for the reason that they afford one of the best examples of the unification of an originally heterogeneous group, and, even if an extremely large number of them are semantically obscure, and they have not as a whole been sufficiently investigated to be available for detailed etymological work, yet the general lines along which they have developed would seem to be perfectly clear, both from certain plant names for which the Greeks themselves gave the reasons, which, even if they are not historically correct in every instance, nevertheless are instructive in showing their general attitude toward the suffix, and also from a few words which are so clear as to be self-explanatory, and from the analogy of modern methods of naming plants.
256. By the examination of those plant names which will in this manner show the cause of their existence, two things become clear: in the first place, as would be expected even by a-prioristic conclusions, almost any function of -tov which is found in substantives of a different kind can also be found in plant names; in the second place, these are not primarily, if at all, a diminutive or hypocoristic category. There is not the slightest indication that the Greeks habitually thought of plants as something little (cf. § 206) or delicate. There are, moreover, a number of words for which the assumption of a faded diminutive of the Dundxuov kind (§ 219) would be absurd. Who could suppose that $\beta$ riycov, a remedy for cough ( $\left.\beta \dot{\gamma}^{\prime} \xi\right)$, was originally 'a little cough,' or that $\chi \varepsilon \lambda \iota \delta \delta \dot{v} v o v$, so named because it sprouted when the swallows ( $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\iota} \delta \delta \omega v$ ) appeared, was originally 'a little swallow?' If this objection were to be answered by the possibility that the whole category started as a diminutive category, and that only after the fading of the original meaning -tov became a suffix for plant names, as it did for women's names ( $\S 250$ ), it would be necessary to show that a nucleus of words actually is found with diminutive or hypocoristic meanings ; but in reality, when both primitive and derivative designate the same plant, e. g. oirouppor and oucouppoov, there is not the slightest indication that the -tov form was preferred in a situation which points to the idea 'small,' 'delicate,' or 'beautiful.' And finally, the use of oîciov in Sophocles (frg. 546 , où¢iou $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon_{i} \mu .(\omega v)$ shows that the tragedians felt no relation
between 'diminutive' -ov and these plant names; for the former was most carefully avoided (cf. § 274).
257. The following is a list of etymologically clear plant names classified according to the function of the suffix.
 бхо́льо' ' looking-to-the-sun.' Arist. De Plant. 1.4. 819 b 21 . i/גıoгю́тtor' 'turning-toward-the-sun.' Theophr. H. P. 7. 15. 1, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \sigma \alpha$ ठ $̀$

 нс́xєov 'loose-strife.' id. 4.3. т $\iota-$ чúl $\lambda \iota 0 v$ 'having-three-leaves, ' clover.'

B. -tov in the meaning 'belonging to,' 'connected with.' Boup $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\prime}$ ' vor, 'that which has to do with $\beta$ oußav,' a plant acting as remedy
 Boivror : ßouvós, 'that which belongs to i. e. grows upon a hill.' id.

 spring-flower '). xo@ćxıov : xóp $\alpha$ 'छ, 'the raven's plant.' Arist. Mirab.


 $\lambda \varepsilon \mu \mu \dot{\omega}$, 'that which grows upon or comes from the meadow,' sea-
 $\gamma \prime o v: \varphi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \gamma \xi$, 'that which is connected with a (poisonous) spider,' a







 'wind-flower,' because growing in windy places. Diosc. 2. 207. Most words in which the suffix could logically be a suffix of possession, e. g. छupoov, as though a plant which 'has swords' for leaves, are really formed with the idea of similarity ( $\$ 140$ ). Cf. the English 'lady finger,' 'bear's foot,' etc., which have no possible linguistic exponent of the possessive idea. The resemblance of one part of a plant to some other object is sufficient for the imagination to either think
of the whole plant as like it, or even actually to apply to the plant metaphorically the name of the object compared.
D. Generalizing -tov. ӧбт@ıov 'pulse' and yvxiov 'sea-weed' (§ 118 B .).
E. -tov as an exponent of similarity. Similarity of plants to other objects was probably the most important source for plant names then as now, and when a linguistic exponent of it was desired, -tov was a most convenient suffix ( $\S 132 \mathrm{ff}$.). It is obvious that a plant usually will not suffer comparison with other objects as a whole, and so the comparison will apply only to a part, e. g. leaves, flowers, stalk, (ir roots (cf. C). Such parts are naturally often smaller than the objects compared, and so, as in all words of the $x \varepsilon p \dot{\alpha}$ tiov type ( $\S 136$, 189), there may have occasionally existed a diminutive interpretation, but they could not have originated as diminutives, since this is a much later use of -tov than that of designating similarity, nor could this interpretation have been very common without leaving more distinct traces than is actually the case. Moreover, words like $\chi$ वucut $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega v$ and $\sigma \%$ wos show that in Greek also such plant names were given without reference to small size. Examples are: re@ávov: $\gamma$ épavos, 'that which is like (the head of) a crane.' Diosc. 3. 131, K $\alpha \lambda . \varepsilon \tau \tau \sim \alpha \downarrow$




 because of the resemblance of the fruit to a viper's head. id. 4. 27,



 because of the rough crocodile-like surface of the stalk. id. 3. 12. छıyiov: छiopos, because of the sword-like shape of the leaves. id. 4. 20,
 because of the resemblance of its root to the polyp. id. 4. 188, $\mathfrak{\rho} \boldsymbol{1} \zeta \alpha$

 3. 143. tœáyıov: тpáyos, because the plant smelled like a he-goat.



$\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha v$, sxhnpóv. Sometimes a name of a plant is derived from that of a similar, but not identical species, e. g. ázóv'łtor' 'a plant like the $\alpha^{\alpha} x \alpha{ }^{\prime} v \cdot \cdot \alpha$ (thistle), but not the real one ' (Diosc. 3. 18). There is no evidence in the description of Dioscorides that the dxávorov was the smaller of the two. Similarly zioбiov (Diosc. 3. 106) is not the


258. From a nucleus of such words, which, though their suffix had widely divergent meanings in the different words, yet all were plant names, the development of -tov as a plant suffix took place. After the old meanings had faded in a number of words, the idea 'plant' was definitely connected with the suffix, and there resulted a large number of new formations which do not show any trace of its original meanings. Thus several plant names in tov are derived
 for the name being shown by the alternative $\mu . \varepsilon \lambda \alpha v^{2} v o s ~ \pi o ́ \alpha$. Similarly $\pi$ óíno, 'gray-plant' is merely the Neuter of the adjective

 because is it used to dye the hair yellow (Diosc. 4. 138). Other plant names appear to be derived from proper names (sometimes no

 eniźciov (id. 4. 91). The best evidence, however, of the complete independence which the plant-designating use of -tov had attained, is to be gathered from a number of words to which the suffix was added without causing the slightest change of application and without adding a hypocoristic shade of meaning. Thus the following pairs are perfectly equiralent: व̌ぬuvoos and $\alpha^{3} \psi i v v^{\prime} t o{ }^{\prime}$ (Hipp. 491, Xen. An. 1. 5. 1), 'worm-wood'; xávvaßus and zavvápıov (Diosc. 3. 165, К $\alpha$ wvxßus
 'cherry-tree '; xıyópn and rıxógov (Theophr. H. P. 1. 10. 7) 'suc-


 2. 72 , 82 ; Pherecr. frg. 2. 253; Arist. De Plant. 1. 7. 821 a 31). a certain sweetly smelling plant; oxópoioco and oxogidior (Ar. Plut.
${ }^{1}$ Since recíov also designated a leek, it is possible that песionor was formed with this meaning in view, and would then have been thought of as 'that which is like a leek.'





 of $\delta$ ह̀ т $\sigma \rho \delta u \lambda o v)$ ．

259．Just as an indication of the great extent to which the use of－七v in plant names had developed，I will give the following se－ lected list from those not mentioned before，without attempt at classi－




 $\pi \varepsilon ́ v \delta \rho i o v, ~ \sigma x o ́ p \delta i o v, ~ \sigma x u ́ \lambda \lambda l o v, ~ \sigma \mu u ́ p v i o v, ~ \sigma \pi \alpha p \gamma \alpha ́ v i o v, ~ \sigma \pi \alpha p \tau i o v, ~ \sigma \tau p o u o i o v, ~$


260．The individual cases of congeneric attraction in other groups than plant names，and those in which it took place between a few isolated words，have been mentioned under the different words or meanings which caused the attraction．Here it remains merely to give a summary of the larger and more heterogeneous groups．

A．Instrument nonns．a）Abstract nouns，e．g．उұ́wvov（§ 34 F and note）．b）＇connected with＇an action，e．g．¿́sólcov，入oútpov （§ 76）．c）＇belonging to＇an agent，e．g．乌sux rnptov，onjavińpoov （§ 77）．a）analogical extensions of old instrument nouns，e．g．


B．Tools and similar utensils．a）Instrument nouns，see sub A．


 f）analogical extensions，see sub Ad．

C．Vases，vessels，bags，boxes．a）Instrument nouns，see sub A．



 e．g．ท́ $\delta u \pi$ óviov（§ 129 b ），трúß入ıov（§ 129 c ）．Also doubtless some classified as＇specializing．＇

1）．Articles of dress．a）From a preposition，aupoiov（§ 30）．


 （ $\$ 130 \mathrm{~b}$ ）．f）＇like＇the primitive，えxג́兀兀ov，yıróvov（ $\$ 145 \mathrm{~A}$ ）． g）analogical extensions，usually not to be distinguished from those originally＇specializing．＇

E．Jewels and other ornaments．a）Compounds，$\pi \varepsilon p(x u y$ ́voov，$\pi \varepsilon \rho!-$

 d）analogical extensions，following either the words just mentioned or the smaller articles of dress（ $\S 130 \mathrm{c}$ ），e．g．oup $\alpha \gamma i \delta \bar{\delta}$ tov．

F．Juices．powders，and similar words designating an indetermi－ nate mass．a）Instrument noun，ג̀ ג̌éiqiov（§ 35）．b）＇made of，＇e．g．
 c）＇like＇the primitive，ron入ópov，тéppoov（§ 150）．d）analogical





## XVIII．THE TIME OF THE ORIGIN OF THE

 DETERIORATIVE，DIMINUTIVE，AND HYPOCORISTIC USES OF－tov．261．After gaining a complete picture of the diversity and com－ plicated development of the different meanings of the suffix－tov it is at length possible to form an estimate upon the disputed question whether those of its uses which are usually grouped together as di－ minutive，＇viz．the deteriorative，diminutive，and hypocoristic functions，are inherited from the Indo－European mother tongue or are purely a Greek development．To avoid incessant confusion as to what really is meant by the terms employed，I will say here that for the sake of brevity I use the term＇diminutive，＇when enclosel in quotation marks，in the usual sense，so as to include the commonly associated deterior－ ative and hypocoristic uses，but do not include functions like that of designating similarity or descent．Although the lattor may give rise to＇diminutive＇meanings，it does not by any means follow that they
must always develop in this way, nor is it allowable to directly compare a certain formative which is a diminutive suffix in one language and cite as a proof of the same meaning in other languages words in which it really means 'descended from' or 'like' the primitive. To avoid such misunderstanding, then, it is necessary to distinguish between the terms referring to the different related meanings most carefully.
262. Since the suffix -tov is found in such a number of different meanings, and several of these may develop into 'diminutive' meanings, it is evident that the latter, even if found in several different languages, may have reached the same end by different roads, and then no conclusion as to the age of the usage would be gained by comparison. In order to be sure of the identity of origin of a 'diminutive' use of a suffix in different languages, each must first be examined on its own merits as far as possible, and only when the actual usage as well as the nature of the transition types coincides, is it possible to maintain connection of origin.
263. A number of attempts have been made to connect the 'diminutive' uses of Greek -ov with kindred uses in related languages, e. g. by Kluge, Nom. Stammbild. ${ }^{2} 33$ note 2 ; Schwabe, De Dim. Graec. et Lat. 53 ; and now Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2} .676$, who actually states that -(i)io- formed diminutives already in Indo-European times (p. 669). Against this view is that of Leo Meyer, Vgl. Gramm. 2. 479, and formerly Brugmann, Gr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 180, who held that the diminutive development was post-Homeric. It will be of advantage to clear the ground by first examining the reasons for the former view. If they are such that they ineritably point to an Indo-European origin, we must do our best to bring the Greek into harmony; if, on the other hand, the arguments adduced are such as to merely bring forth ambiguous phenomena to support an a-prioristic theory, they may be neglected, and the burden of proof rests on the Greek.
264. The attempts of Schwabe to find cognates for the 'diminutive' uses of -tov need hardly be taken seriously today. When he brought forth Sanskrit patronymic formations like deviya-s and sịhiya-s,
 the Greek diminutives in -tov he commits not only the fatal mistake of comparing similar but by no means identical phenomena (§ 261), but fails to explain the discrepancy in gender. It is true that he claims that this is of no import, and that Greek secondarily changed its diminutives to the Neuter gender, whereas the Indo-European method
was to form them all of the same gender as their primitives, but he here assumes an unproven premise. Osthoff, Patrubany Spr. Abh. 2. 98 ff ., had as much right to assume that the Neuter was the original gender, and Brugmann now (IF. 19. 215 f., Gr. 2. 1². 669 f.) explains the discrepancies in gender by distinguishing between diminutives derived by means of substantive and adjective formatives. This shows that the gender of diminutives was not at all well understood by Schwabe, and that it really is a most important factor to be considered. Any comparisons between the Sanskrit masculines and the Greek neuters are therefore out of place until a rational cause for the difference is brought forth. That the tendency of Greek to change diminutives to neuters can not really have existed, is also shown by those in -toxo-, -toxn, which have no inclination whatever to so change.
265. Schwabe's comparison of Germanic forms are likewise irrelevant. The suffix of the Swiss diminutives in -i, e. g. äugi, füeszi, does not come from I. E. -(i)io-m but from -īno-m, ${ }^{1}$ and the Dutch diminutives in -(p)je like schaapje, kalfje, bloempje, do not end in a suffix representing -(i)io-m, but -kīno $>-k i \bar{n} .{ }^{2}$ It is totally indifferent in this respect that I. E. -(i)io and -inno- may be ultimately related. ${ }^{3}$ Whatever their origin, these two suffixes were completely developed in I. E. times, and it is necessary to determine the semantic listory of each one separately. Only after I. E. 'diminutive' meaning has been proven for both suffixes independently, can there be any justifiable speculation as to the ultimate identity of the uses of Greek -tov and Germanic -inna-. Schwabe's contention, therefore, that since i is the characteristic letter of -tov, all other suffixes which contain i must be related, lacks all support. This sound, as well as all other sounds, originated in more than one way, and aside from this, semantic identity does not follow from ultimate formal identity.
266. Brugmann discards the comparisons of Schwabe, but brings forth different ones. In the first place, like Kluge, ${ }^{4}$ he finds an I. F. 'diminutive' -(i)io-m in O. Icel. fyl 'foal' and kid 'kid.' Both words are neuters, end in the -(i)io suffix, and designate young animals ; and the former has a striking cognate in Gr. $\pi(0)$ iov (though with

[^70]a different grade of the root-vowel), an undoubted diminutive. If the I. E. origin of the diminutive use of -(i)io-m were actually established, it would be a safe inference to regard these words as Germanic remnants of it ; but they can not be used as a proof ; for the primitives themselves have the very same meaning (cf. Gr. $\pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda \circ \varsigma$, Goth. fula, O. Icel. fole, etc.). The large number of -tov words even in Greek, where it was a living diminutive suffix, which have attained to complete equivalence with their primitives in a multitude of different ways, forbid us to assume that fyl and kid were certainly 'diminutives' in origin. Just as well their suffix could have meant 'belonging to the category of' (cf. O. H. G. swīn (§ 113), which does not designate a young animal), or have been attracted by some congeneric word. In addition to these two words Kluge (1. c.) suggests a few other possible Germanic -(i)io-m diminutives, which, however, are much farther removed from the limits of probability. Neither Goth. nati 'net' nor O. Nor. eple 'apple,' nor O. H. G. kinni 'chin,' bini 'bee' could ever have been taken as diminutives on their own account, and O. H. G. fingiri 'finger ring' is, of course, not 'a little finger,' but 'that which belongs to the finger.' Precisely like the Germanic fyl is the Prussian maldian ${ }^{1}$ 'foal.' The suffix is here also not the exponent of small size, but that idea is already an element in the meaning of the primitive; for maldian is related to maldai ${ }^{2}$ 'young.' It is, therefore, a petitio principii to assume that it must have originated as a diminutive.
267. From the Latin Brugmann ${ }^{3}$ doubtfully brings forth senium, usually an abstract noun with the meaning 'old age,' but also applied to an old man with a deteriorative shade. He suggests that this latter use might be a remnant of I. E. diminutive -(i)io-m, but admits that the concrete meaning may have developed from the abstract. Since the latter is actually extant, and by far the more common use, this would seem to be much preferable. Brugmann further surmises that Latin 'diminutives' in -iōn-, ${ }^{4}$ like senecio, homuncio, pusio, and pumilio, contain old -(i)io- remodelled by an -n- suffix. This explanation is again not impossible, but rather a violent one when we consider how much more easily the Latin words are explained on the basis of the Latin uses of the suffix -iōn-. It was used to form de-

[^71]nominative masculine personal names, and these could often get a humorous tinge when its addition lent a mock aspect of dignity to a concept which was considered undignified. Thus while there is no humorous element in centurio 'centurion,' curio 'priest of a curia,' and histrio 'actor,' the addition of this personal suffix is the very source of the humor in words like cūrio 'sorrowful specimen of humanity,' essurio 'ravenous fellow,' tenebrio 'swindler,' vulpio 'foxy fellow,' toculio 'usurer,' longurio 'bean-pole.' It is only a slightly different form of humor when pusus 'a little boy' becomes pusio, pumilo 'dwarf' becomes pumilio, and senex 'old man' becomes senecio. ${ }^{1}$ That such formations were oftener prompted by damaging wit than by playful humor, is as might be expected, and consequently the deteriorative shade became most prominent, e. g. in senecio and homuncio. Nevertheless a formation of this kind might also be used in a good-humored sportive mood, and then the suffix would sometimes appear as though it was charged with hypocoristic meaning, e. g. occasionally in pusio. Real diminutive meaning, however, does not seem to occur except as secondary to the deteriorative. ${ }^{2}$ It must be borne in mind, of course, that the source of the idea of small size in pusio and pumilio is not the suffix, but the root ideas 'boy' and 'dwarf.' On the other hand, the diminutive idea in homuncio is quite subordinate and incidental to the deteriorative. It is repeatedly (Ter. Eun. 591, Cic. Ac. 2. 134, Sen. Ep. 116. 6, Juv. 5. 133) applied to man in contrast to the gods, but not because he was thought of primarily as smaller, but as weaker and comparatively powerless. ${ }^{3}$ It is, then, totally unnecessary to go beyond the Latin to explain the uses of the 'diminutive' -iōn-; but even if
${ }^{1}$ By analogy to senec-io arose homun-c-io, the latter word taking over not only the suffix of the former, but also the c of the stem. This was the easier because the oblique cases of senex were formed from the stem sen-, and in comparison with these the c of senecio could appear to belong to the suffix. That the c of homuncio should have been a solitary remnant of I. E. diminutive -ko- (Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 676) does not seem particularly probable.
${ }^{2}$ Homuncio is also not a pure diminutive in Sueton. Vit. Hor., where Augustus calls Horace "purissimum penem et homuncionem lepidissimum." There is no point to the latter oxymoron unless homuncio is halitually thought of as a deteriorative.
${ }^{3}$ Homuncio is consequently slightly different from civop(i)riaxos in Euripides $(\S 205)$. Since the latter is put into the mouth of the giant Cyclops as a term of address to Odysseus, the diminutive iden is in this cuse the more prominent, while the deteriorative element follows from it.

it is preferred to find cognates outside of the Latin, why is it necessary to go so far as to assume a remodelling of a diminutive suffix of which the existence is unproven for Latin, when there are close at hand words which are both formally and semantically related? Greek $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha x i \omega v$ 'tender-foot,' $\delta s \iota \lambda \alpha x p i(\omega v$ 'unfortunate wretch,' and 'A $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { ruxicov, a contemptuous name for an Athenian, end in the same suffix }\end{gathered}$ as Lat. senecio, and have the same deteriorative shade of meaning, and yet Brugmann ${ }^{1}$ admits that they were purely a Greek development, and that 'Avテuxicsv, whose the root-meaning will not account for its deteriorative shade, was modelled upon $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha x^{\prime}(\omega v$ and ठst $\lambda x x^{\prime}$ ív. That these can not have been due to an extension of old -tov is self-evident; for the latter was a living diminutive suffix in Greek, and there could be no impulse to change the common formation to a new one which was otherwise free from 'diminutive' meaning. If, then, the deteriorative meaning of -iōncan develop in Greek alone, it can do so in Latin, and we may conclude that similar causes produced similar results in the two languages independently of each other. It is, however, also possible to assume direct connection of the Greek and Latin uses; but to let the former develop the deteriorative meaning from old -iōn-, and to divorce the latter from it in order to establish a secondcousinship with an Indo-European phantom, is not a convincing method of procedure.
268. Finally, Brugmann compares with Greek -tov a number of Balto-Slavic diminutive conglutinates ending in I. E. -(i)io-, e. g. Lith. -ytis, O. Blg. -ištı, Lith. -elis, -èlis, -użis, -isztis Pruss. -istian. While admitting that at present the suffixal element preceding the -is has become the exponent of the diminutive meaning, ${ }^{2}$ he appears to base his opinion of the relation of these words to -tov on a course of reason like the following. The formation of neuter derivatives from masculine and feminine primitives is something that belongs peculiarly to 'diminutives,' and consequently if this gender is established as used in derivation from other genders, this is a strong indication that the suffix which takes the neuter is originally a diminutive suffix, and this all the more so when it occurs as the final member of conglutinates of undoubted 'diminutive' meaning. Of the latter there can be no doubt for the conglutinates mentioned above, and as to the Neuter gender, it is an established fact for Prussian words like

[^72]wos-istian 'kid': wosee 'goat,' gert-istian 'chicken' : gerto 'hen.' Original neuters are also made probable for the Lithuanian by certain discrepancies of gender, in as much as masculine diminutives are formed from feminine primitives, e. g. upêlis m. 'little river' : ùpè f. 'river.' ${ }^{1}$ Since the Lithuanian Neuter gender has merged into the Masculine, words like upẽlis may very well represent original neuters, and thus is gained at the same time an explanation of these discrepancies of gender and a proof for the existence of 'diminutive' -(i)io-m in Lithuanian.
269. Ingenious as this chain of argument is, it repeatedly operates with unproven premises. In the first place, the discrepancies of gender between primitive and derivative in Lithuanian do not necessarily prove an original Neuter gender. Similar abnormalities occur not only between Lith. -ka-s, -kė and their diminutives, e. g. visztùkas m. 'little chicken' : visztà f., which are explained by Brugmann as following the analogy of those ending in -is, ${ }^{2}$ but also for I. E. -ko- and -lo- diminutives ${ }^{3}$ and the Greek ones in -tono-, ${ }^{4}$ which can not be explained in any such way. If such discrepancies can be secondary for all other languages, they may be in Lithuanian, ${ }^{5}$ unless it has been shown that the usual forces which cause aberrations of gender, e. g. the influence of congeneric words, are insufficient for it. Nevertheless, the question is not of much importance for our point of view, since the neuters actually existed in the Prussian, and that would be sufficient to establish 'diminutive' -(i)io-m in Balto-Slavic territory if the rest of the argument were valid.
${ }^{1}$ Gr. 2. 12. 671 f. Cf. also Osthoff, Patrubany Spr. Abh. 2. 100 f.
${ }^{2}$ 1. c.
${ }^{3}$ Cf. Brugmann, IF. 19. 216 note 1.
${ }^{4}$ Cf. Janson, De Graec. Serm. Dim. in -iбxcs -iбəŋ 7 f., De Graec. Serm. Nom. Dim. et Ampl. 67 f .
${ }^{5}$ At first sight the absence of feminine diminutives to masculine primitives (cf. Osthoff, l. c.) would seem to be a point in Osthoff's and Brugmann's favor for establishing an original neuter -iiom in the Lithuanian, if that needs any more proof than the existence of the Prussian neuters. Yet it would be too much to say that the original Neuter gender is the only conceivable cause for the predominance of the masculines. It is at lenst equally probable that it started from the use of the Masculine where both male and female were designated, i.e. by its use as common gender. Since we comparatively rarely think of the sex of young animals, the Masculine, as the common gender, was used for the diminutive designating them, and so we find masculine diminutives corresponding to feminine primitives as well as masculines. From these patterns the usage sprend to names of things also.
270. It is, however, a perfectly untenable theory that either-(i)iom or the Neuter gender of derivatives from masculine and feminine primitives had the slightest tendency to be confined to diminutives. It was the favorite gender for all kinds of substantivations from -(i)io- adjectives from Indo-European times, no matter whether the suffix meant ' belonging to,' 'coming from,' ' made of,' etc. Thus Skr. gávya-m 'that which comes from the cow,' 'cow's milk' has the feminine primitive gāú-s 'cow,' and even in the Greek non-diminutive neuters in -tov are at least as frequent as 'diminutives,' cf. e. g. ơpriov 'cell of wasps' nest':

 ives f., Ompiov : Onp m. Nor is Prussian -ian confined to 'diminutives': cf. camstian 'sheep,' kelian ' spear,' kalabian 'sword,' laitian 'sausage.'
271. And finally, the mere fact that -(i)io- existed as the final member of certain Balto-Slavic 'diminutive' conglutinates is not the slightest indication that the 'diminutive' force was ever perceived to have been connected with that part of the word. The suffix -iaoccurs in so many conglutinates without 'diminutive' meaning, that it would be as rash to assume that the latter was ever lodged in the -is of -elis or -ytis, as that the agent idea of the conglutinate -tójis originally belonged to its final member. The -ia- had merely become a favorite declensional ending with no more of a tangible meaning than the n-suffix of the Germanic weak declension. No one could think of saying that the 'diminutive' meaning of the Gothic -ilōn- ${ }^{1}$ ( $=-\mathrm{ilo}$ - + weak declension) in words like mawilō 'little maiden' or barnilo 'little child' was ever lodged in the -n-, and yet the case is exactly parallel to the Lithuanian -èlis and -użis. Just to show that these need not have anything to do with any inherited meaning of -(i)io-, I will call attention to the following possible origin. The suffix -iè- was widely used to form feminines not only from masculines in -(i)io-, but also from other classes. ${ }^{2}$ Thus the feminine to Lith. viilka-s m . 'wolf' is vilké, and to dễva-s m . 'god' it is deivẽ.. Regularly a masculine agent noun in -ika-s has a feminine counterpart in -ikė. ${ }^{3}$ Similarly Balto-Slavic -ela- in masculine diminutives could have formed a feminine in -eliē- Lith. -elė. But since these feminines in -iè could also be formed from masculines in -ia- (Lith. N. S. -is), a feeling of uncertainty as to what was the corresponding masculine

[^73]to a certain feminine could result in forming a new masculine in -iainstead of the original -a-, -elia- Lith. -elis instead of -ela-. In this way the -ia- lost all meaning except that of gender, and could be attached to any masculine word as a counterpart to feminine -iè-.
272. Since, then, the Balto-Slavic has also failed to give certain indication of a 'diminutive' use of -(i)io-m, we may sum up our result up to this point as follows. Every comparison of non-Greek suffixes with diminutive -tov arose rather from a search to find cognates for the latter than from an unbiased examination of the usage of the languages compared. While these comparisons may strengthen the assumption of an I. E. origin if that is otherwise established, they are in themselves no indication whatever, because all of these phenomena can also be explained differently, and the explanations given for some are even intrinsically improbable. The burden of proof thus rests on the Greek (§263); if it points to a prehistoric origin, it is possible that the diminutive use of -ov dates back to the parent language; if, however, it points to origin in historical or even purely Greek times, the final word has been spoken.
273. It is a fact commented upon by both ancient and modern grammarians that the Homeric poems do not contain any diminutives. Cf. Schol. ad Dionys. Thr. AB. 856, Janson, op. cit. 4 ff., Leo Meyer, Vgl. Gram. 2. 478. As to the reason for this absence there has been diversity of opinion, and we may distinguish three different possible causes in which the explanation may be sought. It may be due:
(1) to individual reasons, because the poet or class of poets had a repugnance to diminutives either because they had a vulgar flavor or because they considered them out of place in elevated style;
(2) for dialectical reasons, because the poets' dialect did not know them; or (3) for chronological reasons, because the Greek language of their time had not yet developed this meaning.
274. It is the first which has usually been deemed the cause of the lack of Homeric diminutives, both in ancient and modern times, and it has been laid down as a general precept that elevated language avoided diminutives. Cf. Schol. ad Dionys. 1. c.; G. Mueller, De Ling. Lat. Dim. 15; Janson, 1. c. While there can be no doubt that language in its higher flights can not revel in diminutives like some popular dialects, it does not necessarily follow that it must aroid them altogether, and Ryhiner, De Dim. Plaut. Terent. 3, has pointed out that Lucretius has used them repeatedly, in spite of the elevation of his style, e. g. angellus (2. 428), and crepitacillum (5.229). At times
diminutives, like many other effects borrowed by poets from daily speech, could even become a valuable resource of expression, and it does not seem possible that Homer, who usually did not at all disdain grotesque effects of language, who does not hesitate to use such rude warriors' jests as speaking of the dying as 'biting the dust with their teeth,' who lets Achilles and Agamemnon shout against each other an array of the most vulgar abusive names, ${ }^{1}$ would suddenly have had compunctions to use the powerfully derisive effect to be gained by an -tov deteriorative any more than the orators found it opposed to their dignity to employ such words in their most exalted orations. An other objection to this view is the total absence in Homer of faded diminutives, which can not be distinguished by the speaker from words in the same suffix which never did have diminutive meaning, and thus could not meet with any more objection than the latter. What German poet would care, or even be able to avoid the use of the faded diminutive 'Mädchen,' no matter how exalted his style? Theognis, who also seems to have avoided diminutives on the whole, let ajhioros slip in once. Yet of all Homeric words in -ov there is only one which could even be pressed into service as an original diminutive, and this one $\left(\tau \varepsilon y y^{\prime}(0 v)^{2}\right.$ is better explained otherwise (§ 147 B ) ; and yet, if the 'diminutive' use of tov was really already Indo-European, it must have existed many centuries before Homer. This objection can not be met on the grounds that the ill flavor of these -oov 'diminutives' had already spread to non-diminutive -ov words, and that the poet therefore avoided all words with this suffix. On the contrary, the Homeric poets had no objection to use such -tov words as later became tabooed for tragedy. Thus ápóquov, Onpiov, iotiov, ioxiov, unpiov, oixiov, and recyiov are all Homeric, though not allowed in tragedy; axóvtiov occurs in the Homeric hymn to Hermes, and poptiov in Hesiod, but both are put on the blacklist by the tragedians. The inference, then, is not that Homer and the early Epic poets objected to any tov word, but that they were much less

 ßópos $\beta$ кбti九v́s (A 231).
${ }^{2}$ The diminutive idea has been sought in this word by Buttmann because it designates e. g. the wall of a court-yard, which is smaller than a city wall ( $\tau \varepsilon i \chi 0 s)$. The mere fact that the derivative designates a smaller object than the primitive does not make the former a diminutive here any more than O.H.G. fingirī 'finger-ring' is a diminutive because it designates a smaller object than a finger.
averse to them than the tragedians, and we may consequently conclude that something took place in the interval to bring about this change. Only through the development of the 'diminutive' meaning of tov in the meantime can the change of attitude of the poets be explained. The question now arises in what way the development of 'diminutive' -ov could have caused the general proscription of words in that suffix. Partially, perhaps, this was due to the colloquial flavor which arose in 'diminutives' and spread to other words in the same suffix; but a much more powerful influence in their avoidance was undoubtedly the example of Homer. It is those kinds of poetry which are most thoroughly influenced by the early Epic diction, i. e. the later Epic as well as all the Tragic, Elegiac, and later Choric poetry, e. g. Pindar and Bacchylides, that go farthest in the avoidance of 'diminutives,' and after the tradition had once been built up, Homer was outHomered, and nearly every denominative -oov word was ousted from the list. That the objection to diminutives can not entirely or even mainly be due to their ill flavor, is seen from the early Choric poet Alcman, who wrote in the Doric dialect and was not strongly influenced by Homer, and so used diminutives in -toxo- without hesitation, in spite of the fact that even his Choric poetry could certainly not have stooped to use words of a really undignified flavor. Moreover, since Euripides in his Cyclops and Sophocles in his satyric plays ${ }^{1}$ also used 'diminutives', it would seem to be reasonably clear that the cause of their total avoidance in tragedy was chiefly the influence of the Epic tradition. And since the latter can only be explained by the assumption that the earlier Epic poets did not know them (see above), the theory that diminutives were avoided because of the repugnance of the Epic poets to them is totally untenable.
275. To the question whether the absence of -cov 'diminutives' in Homer is due to their absence in his dialect, although they were known in Greece generally at his time, the Homeric poems themselves do not give a decisive answer. This proposition would seem to derive some support from the fact that Homer also did not use 'diminutives' in -toxo-, which was certainly a dialectic peculiarity due to the Aeolic ground-work of the poems, since there is not a single example of the suffix in any meaning either in Homer or the Aeolic lyrics or the Aeolic ${ }^{2}$ inscriptions, not even in proper names. ${ }^{3}$ As far as -ov is con-

[^74]cerned, it does indeed occur in all of these sources, but not in 'diminutive' meaning. It is uncertain, however, whether this is due to the meagerness of the sources, or whether it was also a dialectic peculiarity.
276. The question, then, is thrown upon the few fragments of lyric poetry antedating the fifth century B. C., and of these again almost entirely upon the Iambic and Melic poetry, since the Elegiac poets were also strongly influenced by the Epic, and again upon those which were not written in the Aeolic dialect (cf. § 275). It would seem at first sight that the fact that the decision lies with such a very few short fragments would make a negative decision perfectly worthless because liable to be due to the accident of transmission. Fortunately, however, comparison with the 'diminutives' in -toxo- will yield a wellnigh certain conclusion. Although in later times diminutives in -tov were many times more numerous that those in -toro-, yet in these few lyric fragments the total absence of anything that could reasonably be taken as an -七ov diminutive is in contrast with ten clear cases of -toxo-, mostly in deteriorative and hypocoristic

 pionos (id. 38), xuт $\alpha \sigma \sigma i \sigma x \circ s ~(H i p p o n . ~ 18), ~ \mu \varepsilon \lambda i \sigma x o v ~(A l c m . ~ 65), ~ \sigma \alpha \mu . \beta \alpha-~$入ioxov (Hippon. 18), oxaciiorn (Anacr. 21. 13), and $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \varphi \alpha v i \neq x o s ~(i d . ~$ 54). Since these words come from both Ionic and Doric dialects, it is highly improbable that -tov should have existed in 'diminutive' meaning in these same dialects at that time; and since there also is no evidence for the latter in the Aeolic dialect ( $\S 275$ ), it is a nearly certain conclusion that the 'diminutive' uses of -oov could not have existed in Greece at that time except in the merest beginnings, and certainly could not have had behind it thousands of years of development, as is presupposed by the supposition of Indo-European origin. Just when the origin of the 'diminutive' use is to be placed, it would be futile to ask. The earliest example is $\pi \delta \delta \mathbf{\delta}$ ov 'a little foot' in the ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{H} \beta \alpha_{\varsigma}$ Г' $\alpha \mu \mathrm{s}$ of Epicharmus, ${ }^{2}$ and thus there is no case of a clear -tov diminutive before the fifth century B. C., and in the interval between this period and the time of the lyric poets the development must probably have taken place. On the one hand, how-

[^75]ever, the popular language may have been ahead of the literary language, and at any rate the preliminary steps in the development of the 'diminutive' ideas must have been taken some time previous; on the other hand, however, the rarity of 'diminutives' in Epicharmus in comparison with their extreme frequency in Aristophanes and the fragments of the later Attic comedy shows that the usage can not yet have progressed very far in his time.
277. The result thus gained from examining the occurrence of 'diminutives' in literature is roughly confirmed by phonological considerations. As was pointed out $\S 16$, the 'diminutive' meanings are found only in the historic Greek -tov. Whenever I. E. -Hio-m was so changed by phonetic processes that it could not be recognized as two distinct syllables, or when the suffix had the form -io-m from the beginning, no diminutive force could be attached to it. Thus no word like $\pi \varepsilon \zeta \sigma \nu<* \pi \varepsilon \delta j o v$, nor one which ended in the conglutinates -atov, -stov, or -olov, in which the 1 formed part of a diphthong, is ever a 'diminutive.' The only disputed word is šryỀs.sov 'eel' (: š $\gamma-$ $\gamma^{2} \lambda \cdot{ }^{5}$ ), which Liddell and Scott doubtfully so classify ; but aside from the fact that no 'diminutive' meaning is apparent in any passage where it occurs (Pherecr. frg. frg. 2. 300 ; Callias frg. 2. 735; Ar. frg. 2. 1077 ; Antiphan. frg. 3. 21, 71, 130; Alexis frg. 3. 455 ; Theophil. frg. 3. 627 ; Poseidipp. frg. 4. 517), its adjectival origin is
 reason for this limitation of 'diminutive' meaning to disyllabic -tov can be only that this function had developed in -tov after all of these phonetic changes had taken place, e. g. after - $\delta \mathrm{j}-\mathrm{had}$ become $-\%$, and $-\alpha \sigma t-$, $-\varepsilon \sigma t-$, -o $t-$ had become - $\alpha t-$, $-s t$-, -ot-, i. e. after the separate existence of the Greek language. It might be argued that diminutives e. g. in these conglutinates could have existed originally, but were latter changed to end in -tov because of the much greater frequency of the latter. If such were the case, however, we would expect that the many centuries between the I. E. time of development and these Greek phonetic changes would have produced at least one solitary faded 'diminutive' which was no longer recognized as such at the latter period, and would consequently reveal the early age of the 'diminutive' development to us by escaping the influence of analogy in levelling these phonetic changes, but not one plausible example of this kind is forthcoming.
278. Another indication of the pwst-Homeric origin of - 102 with 'diminutive' force is the accentuation of $\pi x$ uhiov, which, as we have
seen $\S 182$, was the principal pattern type of the diminutives, and so one of the very oldest. Since $\pi \alpha i \check{s}<\pi \dot{\alpha} \bar{\delta}$ ls was often still dissyllabic $\pi \alpha$ 人ís in Homer, the diminutive, if formed in early Homeric times, would have accented the penultima, for it would have been contracted from $\pi \alpha i \delta 10 v$, and the accent is never shifted after such a contraction (§ 21, end). Consequently $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v ~ m u s t ~ h a v e ~ o r i g i n a t e d ~ a f e r ~ \pi \alpha ́ i s ~ h a d ~ b e-~$ come $\pi \alpha i \xi$, i. e. later than the earlier portions of Homer, and thus shows that all of the words modelled upon it, i. e. nearly the whole diminutive category, also can not antedate the Epic.
279. We may state our final conclusion as follows. Over against the failure of those who believe in the I. E. origin of the 'diminutive' uses of -tov to bring forth a single convincing proof or inevitable comparison, the direct evidence of Greek Literature and phonetic changes shows the development nut only to have been a purely Greek one, but even post-Homeric, and the evidence of the Lyric poets shows that the usage could not have exceeded the smallest beginnings in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.

## XIX. CONGLUTINATES WITH -ıv AS FINAL MEMBER.

280. For 'diminutive' conglutinates with -ov as final nember there are to be considered three main possibilities of origin. ${ }^{1}$ Sometimes the first part of the conglutinate is not a diminutive suffix at all, and the -tov coalesced with it because a certain word was analyzed wrongly for some reason or other, so that a part of the primitive was supposed to be a part of the diminutive ending. Thus oiváp-tov: oivapov was analyzed oiv-ג́pov because referred to oivos, and gave rise to the conglutinate - $\alpha$ pov in words like $\alpha_{\nu} \nu \bar{\rho} \rho-\alpha_{p}$ ov. So $\pi \alpha \iota \delta-$ cov was divided $\pi \alpha \iota-\delta i o v ~ a n d ~ g a v e ~ r i s e ~ t o ~ \beta o u ́-\delta t o v ~ a n d ~ \gamma \eta ́-\delta t o v ; ~ \alpha v \delta \rho-~$ cov imposed its - $\delta \rho-$ upon its opposite $* 0 \cdot n \lambda \dot{\rho}-\delta \rho o v$, which in turn was


 $\chi_{\text {Elown }}$ gave rise to $\sigma$ rio-óviov.
281. Similar to these words is the second group of conglutinates, of which the first part occurs as a 'diminutive' suffix elsewhere, but not in the words which gave rise to the conglutinates. Thus - $\delta \delta-$

[^76]forms a few diminutives from early times, but the suffix -iठov ${ }^{1}$ mostly did not originate in words which already had a diminutive - $\ell \delta$-, but rather in words like $0 s p \alpha \pi \alpha v i \delta-t o v$, which, though coming from the
 and so analyzed $\rho_{s p \alpha \pi \alpha v v-i \hat{\delta} \iota o v . ~ S i m i l a r l y ~}-\alpha \chi$ - is a rare diminutive suffix e. g. in $\lambda i 0 \cdot \alpha \xi$ 'jewel,' but the conglutinate - $\alpha x$ ov arose from words in which $-\alpha x$ - either never had 'diminutive' force or in which it was faded. Thus $\alpha \lambda \mu \mu_{1} \alpha \alpha_{\text {-cov }}: \alpha \lambda \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha \xi$, ladder' seems to have given
 The suffix -tono- f. -tren was both a 'diminutive' and non-diminutive suffix, and some words in -toxtov follow patterns in which -tonodid not have 'diminutive' meaning, e. g. y.rovíroos 'a tunic' formed
 rise to $y^{\lambda \alpha v-i \sigma x o v . ~}$
282. The third class of diminutive conglutinates consists of those of which both parts are living diminutive suffixes in the very words in which the conglutinates came into existence, i. e. a diminutive suffix was added to a word which was already a 'diminutive ' in form and meaning. So mo-is (gen. -î̃os) 'a little island' became mo-i̊ov, piux cav-is 'a little blister' became piux
 with the same meaning, and $\mu \Sigma \lambda$-í $\sigma x-$-ov 'little song' takes the place of the earlier $\mu . \varepsilon \lambda$ - -oxov, which, is itself a diminutive. A word of this kind with a double 'diminutive' suffix could easily be referred to the first primitive, e. g. $\mu . \varepsilon \lambda i \sigma x{ }^{2}$ appeared as one, and consequently $\mu \varepsilon \lambda$ - -i $\sigma$-cov gave rise to pr $\mu \cdot \alpha \sigma$-i $\sigma$ uov, without interposition of *pnucc-iซnov. The motive of this kind of conglutination usually is to give more than the usual force to the expression of small size, contempt, or endearment, e. g. Nus-aci- $\mathrm{\delta iov}$ 'tiny little bit of a jewel.' Often words with two or more living 'diminutive' suffixes have a humorous tinge, particularly those ending in the more complex suffixes, which are often of such a nature as to raise a laugh by their very appearance. Thus Aristotle quotes from Aristophanes as used while joking (oxúñ(ตy) the words ypuvi̊ápov and iuctiópoov. As to the frequency of this mamer of conglutination for emphasis, an inspection of the following pages will show that it was very much rarer than that by the mechanical process of wrong division of words of the first two groups. The importance which is often attached to the intensive doubling of suffixes is
${ }^{1}$ Cf. § 306 ff .
not at all justified, and least of all the attitude of Schwabe, who felt at liberty to assume that both parts of any conglutinate were originally independent 'diminutive' suffixes.
283. There are still other methods by which 'diminutive' conglutinates arise, but they hardly much affect Greek -tov. Thus in the Gothic -ilon- the source of the 'diminutive' force was in the first part from the beginning, and the -n- suffix was merely a formal addition for the purpose of bringing the words into the favorite system of declension, and so was the -is of Lith. -elis, -uzis, etc. (§ 271). A somewhat similar part is played in certain dialects by Greek -tov in -toxov derived from neuter primitives. The expected -toxov became so rare, e. g. in the Attic dialect, that people welcomed the opportunity given by the 'diminutive' -tov to bring all neuters in -tox.0-into the familiar -oov category, and consequently was formed xavioxiov: xávsov, not ravírov.
284. Conglutination of suffixes is only apparent when a 'diminutive' suffix is added to a permanently faded diminutive. Thus o $\psi \dot{\alpha}$ poov, originally a hypocoristic form for ó ơov, became the ordinary word for 'fish' as food, and consequently, when the diminutive b'申apiSoov was formed from it, the -apt- necessarily remained intimately connected with the root $\dot{j} \psi$ - as part of one and the same idea, and there is no necessity of the diminutive force being sought in - opiotov and the consequent abstraction of such a suffix. When, however, the 'diminutive' force of a certain primitive was felt by some and not by others, the transmission of its 'diminutive' derivative from a speaker to whom the primitive had no 'diminutive' force to a hearer who did feel it in that way, could cause the latter to abstract a complex conglutinate from a word like $3 \psi \alpha p i \delta i o v$.
285. The efficient causes for the creation of conglutinates have already been touched upon, and sufficiently discussed for the intensive doubling of suffixes. For conglutinates of which the first part is non-diminutive, two forces are of the greatest importance, the existence of a simpler by-form to which the 'diminutive' can be referred rather than to the real primitive, and the direct influence of related or congeneric words. As examples of the former I have already mentioned the existence of oivos, to which oivápoov could be referred,


入íroog, xórùios. In every case, after a compound suffix like -iঠoov
was once abstracted, it could be felt as a single diminutive suffix and become productive on its own account, without necessarily remaining within the bounds prescribed by its origin or the laws of congeneric association.
286. The second cause for the mechanical abstraction of conglutinates is the tendency to make words which are particularly closely associated with one another take the same endings, since the latter were easily felt as designating the class to which an object belonged
 caused $\pi \iota \tau \tau \alpha ́ x u o v ~(: ~ \pi i \tau \tau \alpha)$, designating a different kind of a tablet, to get its $-\alpha x$ ov, although it did not have a primitive in $-\alpha_{\xi}^{\xi}$, and so probably $\mu \alpha v v \alpha ́ x ı o v ~ ' a ~ n e c k-l a c e ' ~(: ~ \mu \alpha ́ v v \alpha) ~ a f t e r ~ \sigma \alpha \mu \alpha ́ x ı o v ~(: ~ \sigma \alpha ́ \mu ~ \mu \alpha ́ \xi), ~$ another kind of women's ornament. $\gamma_{\mathrm{E} \text { ióviov ' lip,' 'jaw' influenced }}$
 $\sigma$ opov), a certain woman's ornament, gave rise to $z v-(\omega \tau$ - $\alpha$ pov instead of Evvítov 'ear-ring,' although otherwise - xpov does not take the place
 a name of an animal, gave its -apiov to ompóquov 'little animal'; and Épiquov (: špuos) 'little kid' gave its -(i)ptov to bpvíquov 'little bird.' The association of opposites gave rise to a conglutinate in case of

 after $x \lambda \mu \mu \alpha x_{10}$ 'little ladder.' In all of these cases in which a conglutinate arose because of association with another word, the new word, when thought of in connection with its primitive rather than the associated word, revealed the existence of the new suffix; $\pi \iota-$ $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \iota o v$, when referred to $\pi i \tau \tau \alpha, \quad \chi \lambda \iota \sigma \mu \dot{\alpha} x \iota o v$, when referred to $\alpha \lambda \iota \sigma \mu \dot{\sigma}_{\varsigma}$, necessarily caused a consciousness of the suffix -axcov, which could then give rise to new formations.
287. An altogether singular cause of conglutination gave rise to the suffix - $\delta$ oov. The accident that the Vocative of $\pi \alpha \tilde{\varrho} \xi$, viz. $\pi \alpha \tilde{x}$, did not have $-\delta$-, together with the frequency of that case in hypocorisms ( $\S 235$ ), caused $\pi \alpha \iota \delta$-iov to be referred to $\pi \alpha \tilde{\imath}$ and so analyzed $\pi \alpha t-\delta i o v$.
288. The causes of the spread of the different individual suffixes can, of course, not be accurately determined, since individual preferences for one suffix or the other or peculiar external circumstances largely governed their use. Largely, of course, attraction of congreneric words caused their spread in one line or other. Sometimes certain formal categories have a predilection for a certain suffix, e. g. the late 'diminutives' in $-\alpha \delta$ ov are largely derived from $-\bar{\alpha}$ stems
（§ 323）．The suffix－$\delta$ ov again had a tendency to be attached to
 The reason why so many＇diminutives＇retained－tov，while many others preferred conglutinates，is largely the motive of clearness．${ }^{1}$ A certain diminutive in－tov would not be satisfactory if the same form existed as the neuter of an adjective，and the resulting obscurity was avoided by a conglutinate，as e．g．$\pi \alpha \tau \rho i \delta i o v$＇dear father＇instead of $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ poov，which was neuter of the adjective $\pi \alpha^{2} \tau p$ os．For other examples see $\S 310$ ．Sometimes simple－ov could not be attached to a word without causing either obscuring phonetic changes or ab－ horrent combinations of sounds．Thus＊rriov would almost immedi－ ately become＂rĩov and could not then be felt as a diminutive， whence rń⿱亠乂口丿ov；रpouviov would be a monstrosity and so $\gamma \rho \bar{\alpha}-\bar{\delta}$ iov was used instead．On the other hand，words in $-\alpha \tau$－，like $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$ ，usually took only a simple－tov because diminutives like $\sigma \omega \mu \mu \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ ov were both perfectly clear and unobjectionable phonetically．From the fact，however，that the conglutinates were more serviceable and so preferred in many in－ stances，one must not conclude that－tov had its regime only in the very earliest period and was soon ousted by the longer suffixes． This may be true for the very latest periods，but in the Classical and Alexandrian epochs－ov increased in frequency of use no less than the conglutinates．It was not the vast array of meanings which it carried with it in different words which was objectionable；for the speaker is only conscious of its use in one word at a time，and the complexity of its sphere of usage was largely shared by the conglu－ tinates．Only when ambiguity arose in a particular word was there any reason for preferring a different suffix．

289．The meaning of the finished conglutinates can be of the ut－ most variety，almost as great as of simple－ov，as can be seen from the classified lists under the individual suffixes．For，in the first place，the more widely used conglutinates have more than one pattern type，and the conditions may be different for each one．The process of conglutination was not patented by the diminutive，deteriorative， and hypocoristic meanings，but was applied to all other kinds of denominative words just as well．Thus $\pi 0 \lambda \tau-\alpha$ ṕpov＇porridge＇was completely equivalent to $\pi \delta \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \tau 0 \varsigma$ and never had diminutive meaning， and from it is made，with the idea of appurtenance，$\pi 0 \lambda \tau \alpha p i-\delta$ ov＇$a$ vessel for holding porridge，＇also not a＇diminutive，＇and yet it ends in a double conglutinate of two members each，a combination which

[^77]according to the ordinary view would lead us to expect the utmost intensity of feeling. The meanings 'belonging to,' 'made of,' 'belonging to the category of,' 'like' the primitive, etc., are all represented in the different conglutinates. An exception is made by the words with verbal force, which have a nature so widely different from the denominatives as not to have been felt in any relation to the latter, as can be seen from the occurrence of such verbal abstracts,
 fully avoided denominative -tov words. There is, however, one word which seems to have crossed the border line, namely, $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ xpsxádit 'fine tapestry' in Aristophanes, which is probably derived directly from the verb $x_{\rho} \delta^{\prime} x \omega$ by means of the suffix - $-\delta \delta$ tov. This word probably followed certain adjectives in - $\alpha \delta$ oos, which were derived from adverbs in - $\delta 0 v$ (§ 321), and had verbal meaning, e. g. גupoß $\beta \dot{\delta} \dot{\imath} \circ \mathrm{s}$
 the exocentric compounds in -tov were also not felt as ending in the same suffix as 'other -tov words, but aside from the solitary zvverápoov, which is due to congeneric attraction ( $\S 286$ ), there is one compound in - $\alpha \delta \iota o v$ (§ 324. II) and quite a number in -tঠ̌ov (§ 315. I), of which the oldest arose by substantivation from adjectives in -iסtog, which were largely compounds from early times (§ 306 f.).
290. If the nature of the pattern types were the only factor to be considered in the spread of meanings of conglutinates, those groups which have only one pattern should have a homogeneous meaning, but in reality the influence of the pattern types is continually counteracted by the tendency to syncretism of the meaning of the suffixes.

 were it not for the fact that since -apoov has here assumed the same function which -tov has in other words, e. g. bpvio-tov 'little bird,' a feeling of equivalence of the two suffixes resulted. Consequently -apov could also be used in other meanings of -cov than that found in the pattern type. This assimilation of meanings naturally takes place most easily between the diminutive, deteriorative, and hypocoristic meanings, but other functions can also be imparted to the conglutinate in this way. On the other hand, the pattern type will also have its influence, and there is a continual struggle between the two forces, the one tending to diversification of meaning, the other to keep it in narrow bounds, and the resulting aggregate of uses of a suffix is sometimes a compromise between the two forces, some-
times one or the other is victorious. Thus in case of -torov, -aprov, and -toxiov the fact that there were several pattern types paved the way for almost complete assimilation to -tov, and similar is the late - a $\delta$ rov. On the other hand, -u $\lambda \lambda$ cov is in the Classical period found only in deteriorative and hypocoristic meaning, because its pattern $\mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \rho \alpha x \dot{\delta} \lambda \lambda .0 \nu(\S 352)$ had those meanings. Later, however, we find
 meaning 'made of' in $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon \varepsilon \rho \alpha \mu , j \lambda \lambda . c o v ~ ' a n ~ ( e a r t h e n - w a r e ) ~ j a r . ' ~}{ }^{1}$ It has
 determining the weight of liquids. Similarly -apov and -upoov refer to small size in the large majority of examples, but the same process of syncretism has caused a hypocoristic meaning in $\delta \varepsilon v \delta \rho \rho \dot{u} \varphi{ }^{\circ}$ tiful tree,' and in छupd́q̧ov 'razor' it appears as an instrumental suffix. The uses of -uסpov distinctly show a compromise between the two forces. Its origin is deteriorative, and this is its prevailing use in the Classical period, but from the beginning other meanings also occur, and in post-Classical times the deteriorative predilection is lost. Nevertheless assimilation of meanings to -tov did not go beyond the diminutive and hypocoristic meanings, except in case of the obscure oxeqúdiotov of Epicharmus, in which it seems to designate similarity (cf. § 328. I). In every case of semantic syncretism, after the sphere of usage demarcated by the original pattern type has once been exceeded, the way is paved for a more rapid extension of meaning, since the word with the new meaning will at once become a new pattern for other words.
291. When a certain suffix spreads because of semantic syncretism with another suffix, the feeling of equivalence of the two suffixes allows one to be directly substituted for the other in a certain existing word without reference to the primitive. Just as -tov could take the place of - $1 \delta$ - in certain words whose meaning allowed them to take either suffix (§ 17), so any conglutinate in -tov could take the place of simple -tov in any word just as soon as a general feeling of equivalence had been developed. Thus when huyviov 'lampholder' became $\lambda u$ yvioioov (without diminntive meaning), the -tòov was not added to the stem of the latter, but took the place of -tov because the feeling of equivalence of the two suffixes allowed one to be substituted for the other even where -lov was a suffix of appurtenance. Though we can not be sure in the individual example whether a given

[^78]word has received its suffix by substitution for an equivalent suffix or by being formed independently from the common primitive，yet there is always the possibility that one of two equivalent words dif－ fering only as to their suffix arose in this way．So perhaps were made



 vápoov＇woman＇s shift＇$=$ yเซ＇ө́vov，etc．This substitution of suffixes is most evident when there is no primitive without－ov in existence，
 When such words are equivalent from the beginning，the addition of one suffix to another is clearly out of the question except by congeneric attraction，and most of them arose by substitution of suffixes．The same thing can，of course，just as well occur between two different conglutinates of tov or any other two suffixes．Thus moiòrov＇little island＇＝m noósipov，छsvó入入ıov＇contemptible stranger＇
 words of which there was no possible common primitive in ex－ istence，e．g．$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \alpha$ ósov＇pillow＇$=\pi \rho \rho o n \varepsilon \varphi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota o v ~(\S 318)$ ，and $\chi^{\lambda} \alpha^{2} \delta \delta o v$＇mantle $=\chi^{\lambda}$ 人qvi̊̀ov（§ 315．VIII．B）．In every case this process results in a pair of equivalent words，and consequently sub－ stitution of suffixes is out of the question in words like horápex ＇contemptible words，＇which can not have had anything to do with $\lambda$＇órov＇oracle，＇but must have been formed directly from hóros．It is evident that this point of view complicates still more the question as to the precise motive of formation of many a word，and often makes a classification according to the psychic attitude an impos－ sibility，so that in the list of uses of the individual suffixes a word has often been classified according to the original meaning of the－tov whose place is taken by the conglutinate．Thus $\beta$ 倪 $\beta$ xipov is placed under the heading＇made of，＇because the－lov of $\left.\beta, \mu^{\prime}\right\rangle$ iov originally had that meaning，although it had long since faded，and probably never entered into the meaning of $\left.\beta_{1} \beta\right\rangle \dot{\alpha} \dot{p} c o v$. Freruently，in fact，the creator of the word with the substituted suffix could not have had any definite attitude to it at all，and the rague fecling of general equivalence of the two formatives was sufficient to cause the un－ conscious substitution of one for the other without the slightest analysis of the word，and so without connecting any meaning with its suffix．In no other way could have arisen words like gidivosov，
which substituted - $\delta$ ov for the -iठov of $\chi^{\lambda}$ avi $\delta \overline{-}$ tov although the $-t \delta-$ belonged to the stem of the primitive.
292. Since the meanings of the different conglutinates were determined by the influence of the pattern types and of simple -lov, the development of their uses did not take place within the conglutinates themselves, but they were thrust upon them ready-made. Consequently the important thing to investigate is merely the extent of their usage, while the different examples which should happen to be on the borderline between different meanings are usually of no significance and entirely accidental. It is this consideration which justifies my roughly dividing the material according to convenience into the larger semantic groups, without paying much attention to the transition types, which must as a matter of course exist anywhere in such a large body of interrelated meanings.

## XX. THE SUFFIX -( $)$ סiov (-uסiov, -ousiov, - $-\iota \delta i o v$ ).

293. The suffixes - $\delta$ tov and -itoo will be treated as one because often difficult to distinguish formally, and because semantically identical. This does not, however, mean that - $\delta$ oov is to be ignored, or that it is even to be denied existence except as an illusion to our eyes which is due to the -t- of -totov coalescing with the root-vowel
 tions from Teos and Samos (Hoffmann Gr. Dial. 3. 106. 16, 169. 30) of the middle of the fourth century B. C. is sufficient evidence that - $\delta$ rov existed as a real suffix to the Greek mind as well as to our eyes, and that at a comparatively early date.
294. Among other words in -סıov the most satisfactory is $\beta$ oúSıov : ßoũs, occurring already in old comedy (Hermipp. frg. 2. 393 (1)). This form is attested for Hermippus in Antiattic. AB. 85. 29, $\beta$ oú $\delta<\alpha$,
 difference that Phrynichus (p. 86) condemns the form, and that Meineke reinstated $\beta$ oisi九 for $\beta$ oúsıc in Hermippus. The very mention of $\beta$ oúdiov by Phrynichus is another proof of its existence, and the objection of Meineke that it is without parallel, and that poúsoov, ب̧oúsiov, and $\mu$ voósoov, which might be cited as such, are very late forms, is without bearing on the question; for poóotov: poía 'pomegranate' does not have an -ou-in the stem, but received it analogically

primitives, ழ̣ㄱüs < ̣̂oos, and $\mu$ voüs < $\mu$ vóos. In these words the influence of those cases in which the product of contraction was not -ou-, or where -ou- appeared as belonging to the case ending (e. g. in $\varphi$ र.õ), would make a formation with -ov- from the Nominative Singular much more difficult that if the diphthong was without doubt felt as the stem-final. Thus the stem $\beta$ ou- occurs in the Nom. Acc. Voc. Sing. and Dat. Acc. Plur., and there is no reason why a derivative $\beta$ oú- $\delta$ oov should not have been formed at the very earliest time. Meineke's search for analogies is altogether superfluous, because $\beta_{\circ} \tilde{u}_{5}$ is the only word which has an old stem in -ou-, and he might with as good a right have denied the existence of the Dat. Pl. ßourt because there is no other example of such a form ending in -soot. The other forms in -ou $\delta \circ 0$, while thus not contradicting the early existence of $\beta$ oúdoov, are themselves good evidence that - $\delta$ oov existed as a distinct suffix in later times; for a contraction of -ovïठoov $>$ -oudiov is out of the question. Other words in -ousiov from contracted primitives in -ou- are $\pi \rho o y o u ́ \delta i o v: ~ \pi \rho o ́ z o u s, ~ a n d ~ v o s ́ s i o v: ~ v o \tilde{s . ~ C f . ~}$

295. The suffix - $\delta$ rov is further attested by xps $\dot{\alpha} \delta$ ov, which usually has a short penult, so Ar. Plut. 227, frg. 2. 1185 (36); Alexis frg. 3. $416,440(5.11), 466(4)$. Cf. Janson, op. cit. 48. It is no objection to the analysis $x p s \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\delta$ ovv ${ }^{1}$ that the word also occurs with a long penult, ${ }^{2}$ e. g. Alexis frg. 3. 396 (1.5); for it is the latter which needs explanation. The primitive xpé $\alpha \varsigma$ has short $\check{\alpha}$, and $-\breve{\alpha}-+-\delta \delta \circ o v$
 due to the analogy of the varying quantity of the $u$ 'in $\bar{y} \%$
296. Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 194, also gives as an example of $-\delta$ oov
 है $\gamma \gamma \varepsilon$ होus. The earlier scholars, however, who were bent on not admitting the existence of - $\delta$ oov except as a late vulgar error, ${ }^{3}$ building upon the fact that these words usually have a long $-\bar{u}-$ when their quantity is determinable with certainty, ${ }^{4}$ declared that -udoov every-
${ }^{1}$ The $\sigma$ of the stem xoícs wat not felt as a part of the stem hecanse it had disappeared by phonetic processes in most cases. The analogy of words like $\chi^{\varepsilon}$ Qucid-ıov: $\chi$ ₹Quús, - didos, must also have had its influence in the formation of $x \rho \varepsilon \dot{\alpha}-\delta \iota o \nu$.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Meineke ad Men. 180, Var. Not. ad Ar. Plut. 227. Most of the passages for which $-\bar{\pi} \delta \iota o v$ is claimed are corrupt, e. \&. Alexis frg. 3. 429 (1. 15), Men. frg. 4. 223 (1. 13).
${ }^{3}$ So e. g. Lobeck, ad Phryn. 83, in his discussion of Boridiov.
${ }^{4}$ Cf. Janson, op. cit. 57.
where was contracted from -uïठ̌ov. ${ }^{1}$ Since the contraction of -ut-> $-\overline{\mathrm{v}}$ - before consonants is well authenticated, ${ }^{2}$ this force must certainly be allowed as a probable factor, but to assume that every -uסoov comes from -vïठoov is unnecessary and even impossible. On the one hand, ixous, the primitive of iyoudrov, had a long - $\overline{-}$ - in the Nom. Acc. Voc. Sing., and these forms could have been used as the basis of derivation, and in the same way the adverb $\beta 0 \tau p$ öठóv shows the existence of $-\overline{0}$ - in the stem $\beta$ orpu-. Moreover, one derivative in - $\overline{0}$ ov could have attracted the others by analogy; and in case of a long succession of short syllables the form with the $\bar{u}$ was naturally preferred for the sake of the rhythm. And finally, lyovotov, with short -ŭ-, occurs in dactylic poetry, where iyơodov would be less useful, e. g. Anth. P. 11. 405, Archestr. ap. Athen. 311 C. Leaving out of account certain passages in Comedy where -ǔ- is possible, though not necessary, there is at least one Comic passage in which it is tolerably certain, namely Cratin. Jun. frg. 3. 379 (2), where some would change xai iyoúsica to riyơ. be just as suspicious on account of the rare crasis as the manuscript reading because of the synizesis. It is, then, certain than - $\delta$ rov was also used to form derivatives from -0 stems, though it is usually impossible in the individual word to distinguish it from -istov. Other




297. All other possible occurrences of - $\delta$ ov are more or less uncertain, and can not be distinguished from -iǒov. Thus the diphthongs $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\omega$ are pronounced and sometimes written $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\omega$ after the second century B. C., ${ }^{4}$ and this led to a complete confusion of - $\delta$ oov and -titov in words of which the basis of derivation ended thus, and only inscriptions which antedate this period could be of much service in establishing certain conclusions, though when the spelling of a certain word in the manuscripts is nearly uniform, it would point to a tradition which may be derived from earlier times. Thus the uni-



[^79] is without it in the manuscripts, and this would lead to the analysis $x \omega-\delta \iota o v$, but $x(\bar{\rho} \delta \iota v$, i. e. $x \omega-$-î̀ov, has inscriptional evidence from Hali-
 (: $\chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \xi$ ) occurs beside $\chi \alpha \lambda \omega \omega^{\delta} \delta o v$ in the manuscripts, but only the latter in inscriptions, and this would point to the suffix -to̊ov. When the basis of derivation ends in $\eta$ there is the same ambiguity; for already in the second century A. D., i. e. also before the date of our manuscripts, both $\eta$ and $\eta(\varepsilon l)$ were pronounced $\iota^{1}{ }^{1}$ Since, however, $\gamma \gamma_{i} \dot{\delta}$ oov (: $\gamma \tilde{\eta}$ ) is spelled without $\iota$ subscript in the large majority of instances, and since the dropping of the $t$ was by no means usual in all occurrences of that diphthong, we may conclude that fridov had - $\delta$ ovv. Less certain is $\pi n \not r y$ riotov : $\pi n \nmid n$ in Suidas.
298. The question further arises how far words in -iठov which have a primitive in $-t$, -to-, or $-t \bar{\alpha}$ - really have the suffix $-\delta \delta o v$. Thus

 As long as the existence of - $\delta$ ov was denied the question was comparatively simple. $t-$ ioioov was contracted to -iठ̀ov, and consequently words in -tiov could have primitives in $-t--t 0--\bar{x}-$ only when the antepenult was long. All words in -iठठov were therefore to be referred to primitives without an i in the suffix, and conversely, -iठiov always presupposed such a primitive. When the facts would not fit in with the hypothesis, the text was suspected rather than theory. An extensive discussion of the question is found in Janson, op. cit. 52 ff . It is evident that if the distribution of -iठoov and -iठoov really is such as is claimed by him, no suffix - $\delta$ ov is to be recognized in these words; but in reality there are numerous exceptions to the rule in two ways. In the first place, there exist words in -iठoov from primitives without an t in the suffix. Thus Boterídov (Ar. Ach. 872) is a 'diminutive of Bot $\begin{gathered}\text { ós } \\ \text {, } \delta \alpha x \tau u \lambda i \delta \delta o v ~(i d . ~ L y s . ~ 417) ~ r e f e r s ~ t o ~ a ~\end{gathered}$ toe, and so can not come from $\delta \alpha x=$ ćncos 'finger-ring,' but from $\delta \dot{\alpha} x-$ Tu入os 'finger,' 'toe.' 'Eppuíठıov (Ar. Pax. 382, 924): 'Equйs has been removed by some editors in the interests of the theory; $\pi$ opviioov, while usually with -ǐiov, has -iठoov in Ar. Ran. 1301, and of course the text is suspected of being corrupt; oxalu,i$\delta \mathbf{\delta o v}$ (Com. Anom. frg.
 [1.4.]): $\tau \varepsilon 00{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ is declared by Meineke (ad loc.) to have gotten its a from a primitive $\tau$ evoís, though admitting that the Attic always used the word with a short $i$; utoidiov can be rescued by referring
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, op. cit. 29, 53.
it to $\pi=0$ iov rather than to $\tau u 0 \circ \xi$, although the addition of -iotov to a living 'diminutive' in -tov is not otherwise known. On the other hand, the following words in -idiov come from primitives in -t-,
 Meineke ; $\lambda u y v i \delta i o v$ 'lamp-holder': $\lambda u y v i o v, ~ t h o u g h ~ u s u a l l y ~ w i t h ~-i \delta i o v, ~, ~$
 (Ar. Ran. 582) : $\Xi \alpha v i r i \alpha$, which Janson wrongly declares to have -īioov, a measurement manifestly impossible, since $\tilde{\omega} \Xi \alpha v o i \delta \delta \iota o v ~ s t a n d s ~ a t ~ t h e ~$ beginning of a trimeter; $\pi$ ornpiotov: $\pi$ ornipov, in a corrupt verse of Menander frg. 4. 74 (4), where, however, the text seems beyond suspicion to the end of $\pi 0$ гnpitioc ; ímo $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho i \delta i o v$ (Eubul. frg. 3. 269
 more significant when we consider that many other words in -i̊iov can come from a primitive with an $t$ in the suffix, although they must not. Thus $\dot{\alpha} \sigma x i \delta i o v ~ c a n ~ c o m e ~ f r o m ~ \dot{\alpha}$ oxiov as well as from


 yoïpos, ఫuxenpisiov from ఫuxtinpoov or quxtinp. On the other hand, words in -isoov which may have come from primitives with an $t$ in the suffix are not necessarily referred to them; àprupiózov can come

299. It is evident, then, that the exposition of Janson is either not true or does not contain the whole truth. It is not impossible that a formation like *aprupuísoov occasionally did come into being, and it may even be conceded that certain people used it long enough to allow it to suffer contraction and thus to give it a chance to influence other words analogically; but that this should have been the regular method of formation is contradicted both by the failure of the facts to correspond to the distribution of -iठtov and -iठiov as claimed by Janson, and by the intrinsic improbability of the assumption that the Attic dialect, sensitive as it was to all kinds of hiatus, should have at any time regularly used formations in -uठठov when there was at hand the suffix - $\delta$ rov which would result in an unobjectionable -t-סıov.

[^80]300．A different cause for the length of the $\bar{\iota}$ must then at least have assisted the contraction of－uǐov，and more probably have been the chief cause．The hint is given by $\pi$ opvíioov（：$\pi \dot{\circ} \rho \mathbf{p} n$ ），which， though usually with short antepenult，has a long one in Ar．Ran． 1301，where $\pi$ opvisiov closes a trimeter and the $t$ has the verse－ictus， while otherwise it is in the thesis of a foot，e．g．in Ar．Nub． 997 ：
 eter．An examination of all other cases of－iioov reveals the fact that $t$ is lengthened only when it receives the ictus，and the large majority of examples come at the end of the Iambic Trimeter，where a succession of three short syllables or an anapaestic succession could not occur：ג̀prupídov（Ar．Plut．147，240，frg．2． 1164 （4）：Eupol． frg．2． 479 （42）；Diph．frg．4．384），Botcrídiov（Ar．Ach．872）， ＇Equídov（Ar．Pax 382，924），íuc兀íbiov（Ar．Plut．985），x $\alpha \lambda i \delta i o u s ~$ （Eupol．frg．2． 442 （5）），入uyví íov（Crates frg．2． 234 （5）），入uyvi̊ioov （Ar．frg． 2.949 （15）， 1059 （5）），oixídov（Ar．Nub．92），orníiovv（Ar． frg．2． 1076 （3．1）），oñí $\delta \iota \alpha$（Ar．frg．2． 1050 （9）；Eubul．frg．3． 268
 Anon．frg．4． 696 （366）），$\tau \varepsilon ง \partial i ́ \delta \iota \alpha$（Eubul．frg．3． 258 （1）），$\tau \tau 0 i \delta \iota \downarrow$ （Ar．frg．2． 1084 （14））．In a different position or（once）in a different meter，but also with an ictus，are גopropíiotov（Ar．Av．1622，Lys． 1050，in a choral ode），$\beta_{1} \beta \lambda \iota 8$ íou（perhaps in Antiphan．ap．Poll．7．211，

 3． 586 （22）），оїбiठ̀ov（Nicomach．frg．4． 587 （1）），नrai di＇（Eubul．frg． 3258 （1）），onTi$\delta \iota \alpha$（perhaps Alexis frg．3． 455 ，though－iठoov is also possible）．The consensus of such a large number of passages without one exception proves conclusively that，whatever the origin of the long c of idoov in its earliest patterns，there was a complete redistribution of－iठiov and ǐiov according to rhythmical laws．

301．The bearing of all of this on the existence of the suffix $-\delta t o v$ is evident．If words in $-t \delta$ oov can come from primitives without $~$ in the final syllable of the suffix，no conclusion is allowed as to the origin of－istov in words from primitives in $-t$ ，$-t \omega-$ ，and $-t \bar{\alpha}-$ ；for the $\bar{\imath}$ undoubtedly must have at least partially originated by the very same forces in the latter class as the former．Consequently any word in－isoov which has a primitive with an $t$ in the final suffix

 this kind hat－iठov the suffix－$\delta$ oov is a certainty ；xmpisiov（：xompobe）
must be $x \omega \beta i-\delta t o v$, and similarly $\Xi \alpha v O i-\delta t o v(: ~ \Xi \alpha v i i \alpha s)$, ímo $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho i-\delta i o v$
 is consequently no conclusion possible as to the quantity of the antepenult, and if it were, it would be immaterial because quantity need have nothing to do with the nature of the primitive. Consequently any of the following words in -to- $(-t \bar{\alpha})$ with indeterminable quantity may have been, and many doubtless were formed with the suffix







 $\chi^{\omega} \rho \dot{\rho}$


302. Altogether indistinguishable - $\delta$ ov and -tioov are when the basis



 ever, the primitive has a stem in - $\varepsilon \cup-$ or $-t$-, derivatives in - $\varepsilon$ i $\delta \circ 0 \mathrm{v}$
 ícoov, being formed upon the oblique cases, ${ }^{1}$ e. g. Gen. Pl. ¿גucopé $\omega v$;


 ably the Sicilian ¢osiồov also belongs here, and came from a primitive * posés. To assume a conglutinate -stòtov for this one word hardly seems necessary.
303. We may summarize our conclusions as to - $\delta$ oov as follows. That it was one of the oldest conglutinates of tov is shown by the אoó-סoov of Hermippus of the age of Pericles. Since it was more convenient than -iठtov when the basis of derivation of the primitive ended in a vowel, it doubtless was used at least as much, if not more than the latter, under these circumstances, as is seen by quite

[^81]a number of words for which it is more probable than -istov, and by very many words where it is possible. That - $\delta$ oov was not much in use after consonant stems is due to the unendurable combinations of sounds which would often have resulted. The form $\chi^{\lambda} \dot{\alpha}_{\alpha} v-\delta o v v$, from inscriptions of the fourth century B. C., nevertheless shows that a beginning was made in this direction. In later times -iठoov encroached upon - $\delta$ rov, as is shown e. g. by $\chi \alpha \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \delta$ tov, but the latter also kept on existing, e. g. in words like phoósiov and $\mu$ vocisiov.
303. There are diverse possibilities of origin of the suffix - $\delta$ rov. In the first place it might come from adjectives in - $\delta$ os, e. g.
 These adjectives could then be referred directly to the root, and thus the appearance of an adjective suffix - $\delta$ oo- was created, which was exactly equivalent to -60-. The $\delta$ thus could take upon itself the function of an hiatus-avoiding device and be transferred to substantives in -tov. Thus if some one wished to form an -tov diminutive to $\gamma \tilde{\eta}$, he would eagerly seize upon some device like the $\delta$ for avoiding the awkward *rriov, which would scarcely be intelligible because of the difficulty with which kindred vowels are distinguished acoustically and in pronunciation. The objection to this view is the fact that - $\delta \iota 0-$ occurs in so very few adjectives, and that these have suffixal meanings so widely different from those of the extant - $\delta$ ovv substantives that it is difficult to see by what lines of association the $\delta$ was transferred from one to the other.
 - -́dos) must undoubtedly have played a part, as is pointed out by Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 471. Since -u- stems as well as -uס- stems had a Nom. Sing. in -us, proportional analogies like the following
 analogy could arise - $\delta$ oov in derivatives from -t- stems: $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi i \delta-$-ov :
 followed the model $\pi \alpha \delta_{i} \delta 0$. Since this was largely a hypocoristic word, it was much used in the Vocative case ( $\S 235$ ), and was often brought into association with the Vocative of its primitive, particularly since it was a habit in calling the same person twice to use a hypocorism once, preceded or followed by the primitive. Cf. Ar. Nub. 132, $\pi \alpha \tilde{u}, \pi \alpha i \delta i o v ; i d$. Ran. 37, $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v, \pi \alpha \tilde{L}$. As a result of the association of $\pi \alpha i_{i o v}$ with $\pi \alpha \pi$, which had mo $\delta$, the suffix - $\delta$ osv was abstracted, and this spread most easily to other words with monosyl-

sumption that these latter words were influenced by $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v ~ t h e ~ d i f-~$ ference of accentuation can not be used as argument; for they may very well have been accented on the penult when first formed. But since -ifoov and -סtov could not be distinguished in so many words, and the former always accented the antepenult, it was natural that
 it was not always, but only occasionally associated with the Vocative $\pi \alpha \tilde{u}$, and otherwise with the real stem $\pi \alpha \iota \delta$. After the suffix - $\delta$ oov had thus gained existence in derivatives from monosyllabic bases as well as in -u- and -t- stems, it was comparatively easy to extend it to other formations also, e. g. the -to- and $-t \bar{\alpha}-$ stems followed the $-t$ - stems, etc.
305. The suffix -idov, as far as it came in contact with - $\delta$ oov, has been treated in the preceding paragraphs. With this exception an exposition of its formal history is unnecessary, because it has been done by Schwabe (op. cit. 65 ff .) and Janson (op. cit. 46 ff .). It remains to discuss its origin, and to determine, if possible, the cause of its spread. As to the age of -totov, it appears already in Epicharmus to denote similarity in inniठ̊ov, and so is one of the oldest -tov conglutinates.
306. The first possibility of the origin of tioov is from the old adjectives in -tioo-, which are already Homeric, and are more or less productive in the whole Classical period. They can not, however, account for the whole mass of words in -tioov; for they do not keep pace with the development of the -七- adjectives so as to allow substantivation with as great a variety of meanings as simple -to-, but -tठo- is on the whole confined to certain kinds of adjectives. The largest group is composed of words designating an object as being in a certain place, ${ }^{1}$ and of these the compounds are the most



 front of the breast,' $\delta \pi s p\rangle \alpha \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma i \delta i o s ~ ' a b o v e ~ t h e ~ s e a ' ~(o f ~ c o a s t-l a n d) . ~$. Among simple words: zvtooiidios 'in the inside,' $\mu \varepsilon \sigma$ oidos 'in the middle,' voouiîtos 'removed,' 'secret,' buncoisios 'in the rear.' The large number of the words of this kind point to an origin from a Locative Dative or local adverb, and so $\begin{gathered}\gamma \\ \gamma \\ \text { sep } \\ \text { ioioos, probably the }\end{gathered}$ pattern type of the compounds, is to be analyzed $\varepsilon \begin{gathered} \\ \gamma \\ -\chi \\ \text { spi }\end{gathered}$ being the same as in adjectives like $\dot{\alpha} \mu q \alpha \dot{0}$ ıos (§ 321). Similarly


[^82]
 piòrov ypóvov 'for a short time.' Moreover, since words like éryspioícos were compounds, the suffix spread to other compounds which did not
 Delos Ditt ${ }^{2}$. 514. 3), ímonevpiồos 'winged' (Alcm. Parthen. 49), ن́moy $\alpha$ hevidica 'lower parts of the bridle.' Then again, some of the compounds designating position could pass to the meaning 'coming from' (cf. § 92), and $\varepsilon^{\xi} \xi x p y i(i o s$ had that meaning from the beginning. This meaning then spread to words like $\mu$ ucyiôoos 'born from adultery,' Orngeí̂oos 'coming from a dead body.' There remains
 -tǒo- here originally meant 'belonging to the category of,' and the phrase was equivalent to 'my girl (i. e. young) wife,' as a term of endearment, but became used so frequently that it became a compound, and the adjective was then practically meaningless.
307. Quite a number of words in -iסoov are substantivations from these adjectives, or were formed analogically to others that were so
 apo-बтepviitov 'a covering for the breast,' 'that which is over the breast.' Other compounds of this kind are given $\S 315$. I. Among simple words perhaps the dialectic ropioioov 'maiden' was substantivized from the adjective ropîios, which must then have retained its original idea of appurtenance to a category at the time and in the dialect where xopitiov first arose. The word may, however, also be a faded diminutive or hypocorism.
308. A second group of words in -tòov probably came from words in which - $\delta$ tov was preceded by an $t$ as the basis of derivation of the primitive. From the list of words given $\S 301$ those are most favorable for the production of a suffix -\&ठoov, which have a primitive in -to- -l $\bar{\alpha}$ - alongside of which there was in existence a simpler word with the same meaning, but not with the $t$ suffix. Thus the fact that
 came from the latter, to be reanalyzed $\chi \chi^{\omega} \rho$ - $i \delta i o s$ and so referred to $\chi^{\omega} \rho_{\rho \alpha}$ or $\chi^{\tilde{\omega} \rho o s . ~ O t h e r ~ p o s s i b i l i t i e s ~ o f ~ t h i s ~ k i n d ~ a r e: ~ x u p i s i s i c o v: ~ x u p u-~}$



${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, IF. 16. 494.
${ }^{2}$ For other interpretations cf. Ebeling, Lex. Hom. sul, xorpedios.
309. The third and probably the most important source of -tiocv is from nouns in - - $\varsigma,-1 \delta \circ \varsigma$. The conglutinate could be transferred directly from one congeneric word to another, e. g. ג̀ $\sigma \pi i \bar{\delta}-\mathrm{tov}$ 'little shield ' could give rise to छ̌ro-î̃oov 'little sword,' even though no conglutinate -tiov existed before this ( $\S 286$ ). The most potent influence in its separation, however, must have been the existence of equivalent words in -tঠ-, which were the primitives. and without it, to which the words in -iठoov could be referred. This happened most frequently with $-\iota \delta-$ and $-\breve{\alpha}$-, since $-\check{\mathrm{t}} \delta-\mathrm{had}$ taken the place of I. E. $-\overline{\mathrm{I}}-$ as a feminine formative, ${ }^{1}$ and this led to the existence of diverse words in -ts and $-\breve{\bar{\alpha}}$ with virtually the same meaning, e. g. among names
 $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha x \eta_{\eta}$. The same thing in case of names of animals or things : xivis and $x \lambda i v n$, xpnvis and xprivn, $\mu$.avis and $\mu x i m n$, oxapis and oxaipn
 $\chi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \mu \mu$ ( $\tau$ stem). A derivative from a word with the $-\tau \delta-$ suffix could easily be referred to the by-form without it, e. g. yutpiôiov to $\chi^{\prime} \tau \tau \rho \alpha$ instead of yutpís, which would then serve as pattern for new formations in -tiov. Very rarely -tòov seems to be composed of diminutive -iठ- + diminutive -ov (§ 282), though it is not impossible that e. g. moiîoov 'little island' was formed by means of the suffix -to̊ov directly from vñoos, with no thought of the existing diminutive mosis.
310. While the spread of the conglutinate - $\delta$ oov was largely due to the fact that the initial $\delta$ of this suffix avoided hiatus with a vocalic final of the basis of derivation (cf. § 288), in contrast to -cov, which was unserviceable in such a position, -tiov was no better than -tov in this respect. Its advantage, however, was the opportunity afforded for forming a diminutive or deteriorative suffix for a word of which the -tov derivative was preempted by other meanings. Thus, besides $\pi \alpha \tau \rho i$ îcov, which was mentioned above ( $\S 288$ ), such a word is छgioidov 'little sword,' instead of छrqiov, which was a plant name ('gladiola'), and so would not be readily understood as a diminutive. Similar $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho i \bar{i}$ oov 'a little belly' owes its -tǒrov to the fact that
 $\gamma \lambda \alpha 0 \widetilde{x o s}$ (a fish) has -iסtov because $\gamma \lambda \alpha 0$ xuov is the juice of a certain
 bird, but can not refer to the fish; $\lambda$ orioiov 'oratiuncula' because

[^83]入órov is＇an oracle．＇It must not，however，be supposed that－iסoov was exclusively used for forming real＇diminutives．＇The reverse， namely，that－iotov is used to express a non－diminutive idea because the－tov word is a diminutive，occurs in $x \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda i \delta i o v$＇a covering for the head，＇while repóniov is＇a little head．＇

311．Whether other vowels than t and $\alpha$（ $\S 316 \mathrm{ff}$ ．）coalesced with－$\delta$ ov into a single conglutinate，is hard to decide．There are apparent examples of a suffix－uסtov，but all of a more or less doubt－ ful nature．Cf．Lobeck，Proll．401．Of these coxapósiov is certainly corrupt；for it occurs only in Stephanus alongside of toxapîoov，which is clearly the only possible－סoov diminutive of coxápov．A substitu－ tion of $u$ for $a$ when the latter is a part of the primitive stem is not to be expected，except after both letters were pronounced alike．

 if authentic，is probably dissimilated from $\delta \varepsilon v \delta \rho-\delta \delta \delta_{p}$ ov by loss of one of the two r sounds in the repeated group $-\delta_{\rho}$－（ $\S 329$ ），or the $u$ may belong to the stem：$\delta \varepsilon v \delta \rho \dot{\rho}-\delta$－ $10 v$（cf．Brugmann，Gr．2． $1^{2}$ ．387）． And finally，$\beta$ xpódiov（Hero Spir．197．2）：$\beta \dot{x} p o s$ is most probably influenced by the adjective $\beta$ opús or formed from it in the beginning．

312．A conglutinate－oudiov seems to occur in the late vavosióov （Schol．Clem．Alex．271）：vãvos＇dwarf．＇None of the words in －oudrov（§294）with an ou belonging to the stem seem to be suf－ ficiently related to have caused an analogical exchange of endings．

313．Apparent cases of further conglutinations of other suffixes with－（t）ठoov are usually due to the fact that the so－called diminutive suffix of the first part has really a different use or at least does not have living diminutive force．So xopaciìov apparently has－xct－סוov， but it really is a simple＇diminutive＇to xop $\dot{\sigma}$ oov，which usually is completely equivalent to xópr．Similar and more frequent is－xpeisicy，
 סoov，which is a diminutive to the faded＇diminutive＇j＇popoov．In тo八च⿱⿰㇒一乂口iotov，on the other hand，－$\delta$ oov means＇belonging to＇and－xpt－ again belongs to the non－diminutive $\pi 0 \lambda \pi \alpha \alpha_{\text {pos．}}$ ．Due to real intensive accumulation of suffixes are probably $\lambda$ woxpiños，2orapiîosv，\％．．xvoxi－ סoov，and＇Appoठırapioiov．－－ax－tiovv occurs in the hypocorism $\Delta r_{-}$－ $\mu x x^{i}$ orov，which is a humorous formation，and took its $-x x$－from＇Kose－ formen＇like Г $\dot{\lambda} \alpha \xi .{ }^{1}$
${ }^{1}$ Cf．Fick－Bechtel，Die Griech．Personennamen 27.
314. It remains to give a survey of the different uses in which -(t) $\delta$ oov occurs. It is of importance particularly for -tioov that its origin is of an extremely heterogeneous kind, that it has all sorts of pattern types, and that in a large group of words it is from the beginning the neuter of adjectives in -iठio-, particularly in compounds. Since the latter have connections with simple words on every hand, it is only natural that the gap between their meaning and that of those words in which the function of the suffix is no longer associated with adjectival origin should be filled out. Consequently -iठoov occurs in more different uses than any other -tov conglutinate, and closely approaches the complexity of the use of simple -tov. Like -aptov (§362), however, it does not occur in abstract or verbal formations.
315. Collection of Examples. The same classification as for simple -tov is usually followed, though I have not hesitated to depart from it for the sake of convenience.
I. Compounds. $\quad \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma-\boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \varrho-i \delta \iota \alpha$, a sort of ear-rings. Poll. 5. 97. ${ }^{\prime} \gamma$ - $\chi \varepsilon \varrho(i-\delta \iota o v$ 'that which is in the hand,' 'a hand-knife,' 'dagger.' Herod. 1. 12, 214 ; Hermipp. frg. 2. 395 (1.5). $\vec{\varepsilon} v$ - $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\prime} \delta \iota \nu{ }^{1}$ ' that which is in the ears,' 'ear-ring.' CIA. 2. 652 B 10 (398 B. C.).
 'that which is upon a fillet.' Insc. Delos Ditt². 588.188 (ab. 180 B.C.). $\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha-\gamma \nu \alpha \vartheta-$-idıov' 'that which is over the jaw,' 'cheek-piece.' Schol. $\Delta$ 142. $\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha-5 \omega \nu$-idıov 'that which is at the girdle,' 'a dagger.'
 thighs,' 'thigh-armor.' Xen. An. 1. 8. 6. $\pi \alpha \varrho \alpha-\pi \lambda \varepsilon v \varrho-i \delta \iota \vartheta v$, cover 'over the sides' of war horses. Xen. Cyr. 6. 4. 1. $\pi \alpha \varrho-o \pi \lambda$-i i $\iota o v \cdot$ $\mu u x \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha} \not \subset \alpha \iota \rho \alpha$ Hes. $\pi \varepsilon \varrho \iota-\delta \varepsilon \iota \varrho-i \delta \iota \emptyset v$, that which is around the neck,' 'necklace.' Inss. Delos Mich. 833. 42 (279 B. C.). $\pi \varepsilon \varrho \iota-\tau \varrho \alpha \not \eta \lambda-$ $i \delta \iota o v=$ preceding. Pap. Magdol. ap. Melanges Nicole 282. 5. тৎо$\mu \varepsilon \tau \omega \pi-i \delta \iota o v$ 'that which is in front of the forehead,' 'the skin of the forehead' in Herod. 6. 70, 'frontlet' in Xen. An. 1. 8. 7 (Pl.). т@o-бtغৎv-idiov 'that which is in front of the breast,' a covering for the breast of horses. Xen. An. 1. 8. 7, Equ. 12. 8. тৎo-бт $9-$-idıov 'that which is in front of the breast,' an ornament for the breast. Polyb. 22. 20.6. $\pi \varrho \sigma-\chi \varepsilon \iota \lambda-i \delta \iota o v$, the projecting part of the lip. Poll.

[^84] idiov' 'that which is under the mixing-bowl,' its stand. Not a di-

 тapò Kvioious Hes. Closely related to these compounds, but really belonging to II., are substantivations from simple adjectives denoting
 pig,' Athen. 381 B.
 a certain vessel or measure. FGH. 133. 14 (343-344 A. D.), है $\pi \varepsilon \mu \downarrow \downarrow$
 to do with weight,' 'a weight.' Hero Spir. 197. 2. vè ' ${ }^{\text {'E@штidı } \alpha^{2}}$

 46 C . zeyciidiov: $\kappa \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \dot{n}$, 'a covering for the head' (cf. Lat. capitulum). Isid. Orig. 19. 31. 3; Poll. 2. 42. x@cádıov : xp $\varepsilon$ к , a pot which contains meat. Ar. Plut. 227. Cf. Schol. ad 1., xps-
 vos, 'that which belongs to the lamp,' 'lamp-holder.' ${ }^{\text {s }}$ Ar. and Crates ap. Poll. 10. 118 f., Hermipp. frg. 2. 411 (3). $\mu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon ш \varrho i \delta ı o v: ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon-$ $\tau$ 'ध由p $\alpha$, 'that which has to do with things aloft,' 'a horoscope ' according to Grenfell and Hunt, Pap. Oxyr. 117, in a letter of the second
〒र́pıov, a jar for cooking porridge. Galen. vol. 14. p. 422. 6, 469.
 (cf. $\pi p o \sigma \omega \pi i \xi$ ), 'that which belongs to the face,' 'a mask.' Ar. ap. Poll. 10. 127. rautsidıov: vauusix, 'that which is connected with the office of pay-master,' 'the treasury.' Suid. $\chi$ हוৎidıon : 7 sip (cf. ysipis), 'that which belongs to the hand,' 'a glove' for rubbing the body. Antyll. ap. Oribas. 1. 494. 10.

Particularly noteworthy are several indefinite plurals in -t $\delta\llcorner x$ (cf. $\S 87 \mathrm{ff}$.). $\tau \dot{\alpha} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \chi_{i} \delta \iota \alpha$ : $\alpha_{p} y \dot{y_{1}}$, 'the parts belonging to the foundation, i. e. the foundation. See Herwerden, Lex. Suppl. s. v., who cites a
 is related to $\boldsymbol{x}^{\prime} \lambda \mathbf{\gamma}$, the meaning being 'the regions of or parts belonging
${ }^{1}$ If the $-(\varphi-$ - is merely a suffix, the word, of course, does not belong here. Cf. Prellwitz ${ }^{2}$ s. v. vine@ $\uparrow \eta$.
${ }^{2}$ Kaibel unnecessarily emends to ${ }^{3} E \rho \omega r i \delta \varepsilon c \alpha$.
${ }^{3}$ Not a diminutive to iuxuiov. Cf. Ar. 1. c., AA23 aionice 2rixpos 'Ouctórutu

to the intestines．＇$\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi v \gamma i \delta \iota \alpha: \pi u \gamma{ }^{\prime}$, ＇the region of the buttocks．＇
 valent to that of the primitive in Ar．Equ．1368，По入入ois $\gamma{ }^{\prime}$ ino $\lambda i \sigma \pi 01 s$

 $\mu . \alpha \sigma \tau o u ́ s$. The derivative has become completely equivalent to the primitive in the form $\sigma \tau \omega \dot{\delta} \delta \iota ⿱ ⺌ ⿻ 上 丨 匕$ ，Diog．Laert．5． 51.

III．Instrument nouns and names of tools which are equivalent to their primitives（§73）．røayвidov＝रpaŋgiov，＇pencil．＇Suid．；
 ＝Opaviov：Opävos，＇bench，＇＇stool＇（cf．oxoخúOppov）．Ar．ap．Poll． 10． 47 ；Etym．Mag．454．13．i $\mu \alpha \tau i \delta \iota o v=$ í．$\dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \circ v, '$ cloak＇etc．Ar． Lys．401，470，Plut． 985 ；Lys．ap．Poll．7．42．кhıvidıov $=\alpha^{2} \mathrm{ivm}$ ，
 ＇couch．＇Phot．Lex．171．12．छ̌ı̧iסıov＝छॄipos，＇sword．＇Ar．Lys．
 AB．51．$\dot{\sigma} \xi v \lambda \alpha \beta i \delta \iota o \nu=3 \xi v \lambda \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta$, a kind of tongs，among the surgical instruments of Cod．Laur．74． 2 ap．Herm．38．282．тeiexúdıov per－ haps $=\pi \varepsilon \lambda_{\varepsilon x v}$ ，＇ax．＇Only in Schneider，and so perhaps diminutive． $\sigma \approx \alpha \lambda \mu i \delta \iota o v=\sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda \mu \sigma_{\varsigma}$, the pin in which the Greek oar was fastened． Com．Anon．frg．4． 696 （366）．бжауєidıov＝бкаœвiov，＇a digging－tool．＇
 mattock．＇Ar．ap．Poll．7． 148.

IV．＇Coming－from．＇Ivpoeidov as if：owr̃ats＇death，＇＇that which comes from a dead body，＇the skin of a beast that died．
 which comes from the barley corn，＇its husk．Arist．Probl．20． 8.
 cense tree，＇＇frankincense．＇A conjecture of Bentley for＇írov，Men． frg．4． 145 （1）．ra＠avividiov＇that which comes from Tarentum，＇ a kind of fine garment．Poll．7．76；Luc．D．Mer．7．2．qoıvoxidıov： ழoive $\xi$ ，＇that which comes from the palm，＇＇a palm－leaf．＇Insc．Delos


To these words may be added a few others designating the young of animals，which are，however，at least with equal probability dimin－ utives in origin（§95）．éxidıov ：हैyıs，＇a young viper．＇Arist．H．A． 5．34． 558 a 29．＇̌̌V̛v́dov ：ǐớs，＇a young fish．＇Arist．＇H．A．6． 14. 568 b 10，20．xvví८ov：x́sov，＇a young dog．＇Plato Euthyd．298 D ； Arist．Probl．10．12． 892 a 11．б $\begin{aligned} & \text { ridıov ：} \sigma \eta \pi i \alpha \text { ，＇a young cuttle－fish．＇}\end{aligned}$ Arist．H．A．5．18． 550 a 16.
V. 'Made of,' 'consisting of.' ảprveídoov : àprípıov, äp rupos,



 Suid. होcidıor: हो $\bar{\alpha} \alpha$, 'that which is made of the olive,' 'olive oil.' Sotal. frg. 3. 585 (1. 7), 586 (27) ; Archedic. frg. 4. 436 (1. 11).
 $\pi \mathrm{iniov}$ : $\pi$ inos, 'a felt cap.' Plato Resp. 3. 406 D (otherwise deteriorative or diminutive). $\pi \omega \alpha x i \delta \iota o v=\pi \iota v \alpha \nsim \iota v, \pi \iota v \alpha x i s: ~ \pi i v \alpha \xi \xi$, 'a (board)
 $\pi \cup$ Ěos, 'a boxwood tablet.' Ar. ap. Poll. 4. 18; Insc. Delph. CB. 2275. 17 ( $150-140$ B. C.).
VI. Words designating an indeterminate mass, by analogy to the preceding group, among which cf. ż $\lambda$ ádov and xpioiôov. $\mu v$ ९idiov $=$
 'vinegar.' Suid. sub. đ̋ॄsï ; Pap. Berol. 417. 31.
VII. 'Generalizing' (§ 114 ff.). $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ קoidıc: $\beta \sigma \tilde{s} s$, the members of the cattle tribe.' Plato Euthydem. 298 D, see $\S 366 . \mathrm{V}$ sub wovápla. ix'f tidıov: ǐoús, 'a kind of fish' etc. Theopomp. frg. 2. 812,





 a rope': $x \dot{\alpha} \lambda(\omega \varsigma$ 'funis nauticus' (cf. § 117). Primitive and derivative are equally applicable to the nautic cables designated by the latter in CIA. 2. 807 a $63,75,142,159$ ( 330 B. C.) ; ib. 2. 812 a $3-4$ (ab. 323 B. C) ; Poll. 1. 93. The derivative alone could be used in



 Arist. Mech. 18. 853 a 34. qù wevidue : x'sov, probably 'the members of the dog tribe' in Xen. Oec. 13.8, though it might be taken as a


${ }^{1}$ The passage implies contempt (see $\$ 166 \mathrm{sub}$ ixn(wuirtor), and this may have been associated with - $\delta$ duv in addition to the material idea.
 Outuóv 'the sort of dagger used for sacrifice.' ruvidov: $\pi$ vóov, 'a short of winnowing shovel,' perhaps with the implication 'not

 members of the pig tribe.' Plato Euthydem. 298 D, see § 366. V sub. xuváprov.
VIII. Words which are equivalent to their primitives, including those originally 'specializing' (§ 122) (excluding those of III and VI).




 zoıtidıv $=$ xotís, roim, 'box,' 'casket.' Schol. Luc. Gall. 21.


 ladling wine.' CIA. 2. 778 C 11 ( $350-300$ B. C.). лотทoidıov $=$ тосท́prov, 'drinking-cup.' Men. frg. 4. 74 (4); CIA. 2. 836 c-k 86
 'a jug for pouring.' Cratin. frg. 2. 127 (16); Stratt. frg. 2. 771 (1);
 Mag. 563. 39. бтоvঠozoidıov (cf. oivoyoî̀ov) 'a vessel for pouring libations.' Insc. Delos Ditt². 588. 206. idoidıov $=$ ípí $\alpha$, 'a water pot.' CIA. 4. 700 B. 31, 36. zoídıov (lnsc. Delos BCH. 1882 p. 117) is probably an abbreviation of some word like $\pi \rho \circ \%$ oî̀ov. Cf. $\beta \dot{\alpha}$ роv

B. Articles of dress and ornament. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi \iota \delta \varepsilon i \delta \iota o v=\dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi \imath \delta \delta ́ \alpha ́ \alpha$ 'bracelet.' CIA. 2. 698 II 25 ( 350 В. С.). гœожатіঠıоv $=$ хрохс́тьоу, хрожөт $\sigma \varsigma$, 'a saffron-colored frock.' Ar. Eccl. 332, Lys. 47. $\chi$ גćúdıov $=\chi^{\lambda \alpha v i \delta i o v,} \chi^{\lambda}$ avis, 'mantle.' The feeling of equivalence for - $\delta$ oov and -iठoov caused the former to take the place of the latter in $\chi_{i}^{\lambda} \alpha v_{i}-$
 red, and $\chi^{\lambda} \alpha \alpha^{2} \delta \delta o v$ is thus without direct primitive. Insc. Teos ap. Hoffmann Gr. Dial. 3. 106. 16 (370-350 B. C.); Insc. Samos ib. 169. 30 ( $346-345$ B. C.).
C. Miscellaneous (mostly by congeneric attraction). $\beta \alpha \lambda \alpha \nu \tau i \delta \iota \nu=$ $\beta \alpha \lambda(\lambda) \alpha$ रctov 'purse.' The general feeling of equivalence of $-\delta \iota o v$ and
－torov caused the latter to take the place of the former even though no definite meaning could have been connected with it in $\beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\prime} v_{\text {colov，}}$ which is without known primitive．Eupol．ap．Poll．10．151．rocu－
 sub V）．Men．frg． 4.166 （7）．rooíðov ：xóp巾，＇maiden，＇＇girl．＇Con－ demned as süचะ九ás by Phrynichus＇73，but frequently used in inscriptions from Delphi．That it is probably＇specializing，＇i．e．adjectival，in origin can be seen from collocations like $\sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu x$ y yuvatxeiov xopî̀ıov（CB．1699．$\overline{\text { 万 }}$ ）， though it is not impossible that this is due to the analogy of $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \cdot x$ xopóotov（§ 377），which is certainly an adjectival phrase．In this case ropioioov would have to be explained as a faded hypocorism or a diminutive referring to a class．x＠avidıov $=x_{c}$ व́voc，＇helmet，＇by analogy to articles of dress，e．g．$\pi \mathrm{i} \lambda(\mathrm{i}$ orov．CIA．2． 678 B 4， 69
 of the latter in Attic prose and comedy，evidently because the word was thus brought into the favorite declension and uncouth forms like the genitive $\chi(\omega)(\omega)$ were thus avoided．As to its origin，it may have been＇specializing，＇in which case some generic idea like $\sigma \tau \rho \tilde{\omega} \mu . \alpha$ was taken up by the original adjective ；or else it followed some word like the faded diminutive $\gamma \times \mu u s$ sivoov＇bed on the ground＇（§ 208H）． x́́siov occurs Ar．Ran．1478，Pax 1122，1124，Equ．400，Thesm． 1180，Plut． 166 ；Phil．frg．4． 10 ；Plato Protag． 315 D ；Arist．H．A． 8．10． 596 b 8 ；in the form wóto̊ov Insc．Halicarnas．Ditt ${ }^{2}$ ．641． $14 \overline{5}$.

 others of his＇diminutives＇it is probably a translation of a faded Latin diminutive，in this case porcellus．ravidıov＝Tavivi＇fillet，＇ ＇strip of linen，＇probably following articles of dress and ornament， though it might be a diminutive referring to a class．Hipp． 398 ； CIA．2． 835 c -170 （320－317 B．C．），2．766．16；Insc．Delos．Ditt²．
 soldiers＇，for obscure reasons．Agath．Diaconus de Actis II Synodi ： Anon．Combefis．in Porphyrog．n． 29 ；Suid．

IX．＇Like，but not equivalent to the primitive．＇poreridov：：$\ddagger$ ＇an ear－ring like a grape．＇Com．ap．Poll．5．97．रivztidur ：Єう रi：sx＇j ＇that which has the nature of sweetness，＇＇something sweet：＇（CY． riuxádoov，§ 324．VIII）．Pap．Berol．417．\＆（in a letter of the 2d or 3d century A．D．）；Theodos．6i5．29．Sezeidior：$\$$ oxks．＇，＇that which is like tears，＇a kind of scammony，becanse it emits a lluid from its roots when they are cut．Late medical writers．Sopdor：

ఢตัov, 'that which is like an animal,' originally 'a figure of an animal,' but generalized so as to designate any painted, carved, or embroidered figures. Thus it is used of figures upon a bronze xparíp in Herod. 1. 70, of woven figures Arist. Mirab. 96. 838 a 22, of figures carved upon stone id. ib. 134. 844a 16. The word is also used of metal and wooden figures in inscriptions: CIA. 2. 678 B 59 (378-366 B. C.),

 signs of the zodiac (Arist. Metaphys. 11. 1073 b 20, Meteorol. 1. 6. 343 a 24) and once of figures sixteen ells long (Diod. Sic. 1. 47,
 minutive force could have been felt in it. Эearoidıov: Déacpov, 'that which is like a (little) theater,' 'a bird cage.' Varro RR. 3. 5. 13, theatridion avium. iллidıov : im $\pi \sigma$, that which is like a horse,' a kind of fish. Epich. frg. 44 (ap. Athen. 304 E.). rv@quidıov: тupňv, 'that which is like a kernel,' 'a button,' 'knob,' etc. (cf. तupriviov). Pap. Berol. 781 III 8, тoьprvióors (cf. Herwerden App. Lex.
 scorpion,' an engine of war for discharging arrows. Polyb. 8. 7. 6; LXX I Macc. 6. 51.

A special group of words in -iס̊ov is composed of those designating an image or likeness, which, since usually smaller than the object represented, are largely on the border line between this class and the diminutives. ßö̈dıov : ßỡs, 'an image of a cow.' Insc. Att. Ditt ${ }^{2}$.
 Epigr. 21. 3; Ps. Anacr. 115, 116 ; Ps. Simon. Ceos 178. 'Equidıov
 'an image of the youth' Apollo. Hes. sub noupî́rov, \áx(oves dè xou-
 vixn, 'an image of victory.' CIA. 2. 766. 15, 4. 845 cc 3 . icidıo': o'pıs, 'an image of a serpent.' CIA. 2. 766. 16 (340-337 B. C.), 722 A 17 (319 B. C.), 835 c-1 6, 52, 62 (320-317 B. C.) : Insc. Delos Mich. 833. 50.
X. Deterioratives. A. Referring to an individual as compared








 'meat.' Cephisod. frg. 2. 885, see § 161 sub raply.ov. Alexis
 Ar. frg. 2. 1030 (12) (a corrupt passage variously emended, cf. Meineke









B. Referring to a class. $\alpha i \bar{i} i \delta \iota o v: \alpha \gtreqless \xi$ 'goat.' Pherecr. frg. 2.
 @idıov: àprópov, äp $\gamma u p o s ~ ' s i l v e r, ' ~ ' m o n e y . ' ~ A r . ~ A v . ~ 1622, ~ " O \tau \alpha v ~ \delta \iota \alpha-~$


















 ${ }^{\circ}$ Eтix
${ }^{1}$ Cf., however, Meineke ad loc.













 Antiphan. frg. 3. 156 (71) ; Men. frg. 4. 223 (2); Com. Anon. frg.


 'cuttle-fish.' Alexis frg. 3. 455, see § 166 sub тpyi̊̀ov. бxทvi-






C. 'Merely,' 'nothing but,' etc. roúdıa 'merely old women.' Xen. An. 6. 3. 22, see § 167 sub repóvctov.
D. A faded deteriorative probably is roq́dっov in the following pas-

 word passed through the same development as $\gamma \varepsilon p$ óvtiov ( $\$ 16 \overline{5}$ ).
XI. Diminutives. (1) Referring to an individual as compared to a class. The letters of the subdivisions here and under 2) correspond to those used under simple -ov, except that words in which the suffix means 'dainty' rather than 'small' (§ 193 ff .) are all grouped
 not (like the Latin regulus) 'a petty king.' Plut. Ages. 2, حòv




Exuousiou. B. ảrýdiov: àpón 'anchovy or sardine.' Ar. frg. 2. 1152 (10) probably combined with the idea of deliciousness), $\tau \dot{\alpha}$

 dıov: ßoũ̧. Hermipp. frg. 2. 393 (1) (combined with contempt), (Ot


 Alexis frg. 3. 429 (1. 5), ǐQuסícv Mเxpడ̃v. Arist. H. A. 5. 16. 548 a 30,






 is diminutive or 'generalizing' in passages like Arist. H. A. 4. 29.


 @aídıov: xépas 'horn.' CIA. 2. 826. 22 (precise force doubtful).

 bopous 'hip.' Precise force uncertain, only Theognost. Can. 125. 10.


 Can. 125. 9, precise force therefore uncertain. т@ぃidor': apivos.


 with the shrubbery with which the lesser gods among the birds will be content, cf. Koch ad 1.). ovzidıov: $\sigma u k \tilde{r}_{1}^{\prime}$ 'fig-tree.' Ar. Pax 597.













 ávııov : ג̀voptús 'statue.' Insc. Delos Ditt². 588. 167, 171. tvлidıov (cf. тuтiov): 兀útoc 'image.' CIA. 2. 835 c-1 73, 87 (320-317 B. C.), $\tau \cup \pi[i] \delta \iota \alpha$ ह̀mi $\sigma \alpha v i \delta i o u ~ \delta u ́ o . ~ G . ~ a ̈ \sigma z i d ı o v: ~ a ̀ \sigma x i o v, ~ a ̀ \sigma x o ́ s ~ ' b a g . ' ~ A r . ~$

 ing-bowl.' Joseph. A. J. 3. 6. 7, rụapía xà xpiva oìv potíroors xà


















 $\chi \alpha \lambda \iota \alpha$ 'hut.' Eupol. frg. 2. 442 (5), Oixoั̃テt $\delta$ ' हैvor $\alpha \delta$ ' हैv тptoiv $\alpha \alpha \lambda \iota-$


 oỉzidıov : oixia etc. 'house.' Ar. Nub. 92, 'Opä́s тò Oúpıov тои̃тo xà̀
 22 ; Dem. 57. 65, 59. 39; Plato Eryx. 394 D (see sub X. A).






 'letter.' Etym. Mag. 241.6. ravidıov : रoví ' corner.' Luc. Necyom.



 intidiov : $\lambda$ io oos, 'a little stone,' i. e. 'pebble.' The diminutive origin was forgotten occasionally, as is shown by Arist. Probl. 23. 29.



 бриоヘ̃бt. бı $\lambda i \delta \iota o v: \sigma \tau \dot{r}_{1} \lambda \eta$ 'grave-stone.' Theophr. Char. 21, zuvapisu








 Tov $\dot{\alpha}$





 عis 兀òv íñov. ұovoidiov : ypugiov, ypurís, 'a little gold.' Isac. 2. 9.





only in Etym．Mag．347．54．Rovidıov ：$\lambda$ óros，＇short argument．＇

 Pericl． 30 ；Athen． 4 A ．

2．Referring to a class．B．$\delta \alpha \mu a \lambda \varepsilon i \delta \iota o v: \delta \alpha ́ \mu \alpha \lambda \iota s$＇heifer．＇Philem． Lex．96．ixfódıov：iyoús＇fish．＇Mnesimach．frg．3． 568 （6），voùs


 vavoúdıov ：vävos．Schol．Clement．Al．Paed．3．4，Mèıraĩov xuví－


 Can．121．29．zoıoidıov（cf．yơpiov）：yoipos＇young pig．＇Ar．Ach．
 830，Vesp． 573 ；Strattis frg．2． 784 （2），see § 193 a sub bpvióoro． C．रaбr＠idıov：$\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau$ ńp＇belly．＇Ar．Nub．392，Exéழ的 voivov ànò




 Actt．SS．Jul．t． 1 p．166．14，168．8．$\mu о \sigma$ жidıov ：$\mu .0$ бүоя＇a young











 feathers．＇Gloss．i九Э o＠iסıov ：入eoópoov＇pebble．＇Gl．Alex．Trall． 3 p．61，Yņ̣iov，tò heoxpî́rov．L．סıxidıov：סixn＇law－suit．＇Ar．Nub．

 $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ ．
3. Among peculiar modifications of the diminutive meaning which (do not follow from the classification may be mentioned the following:
A. The meaning 'soft,' 'elegant' (§ 211 D ). rizidion': miliov,
 ridıo': 耳..'́s 'soft, delicate skin.' Cratin. frg. 2. $183(23)=$ Crates




C. 'Fine,' 'ground fine' (cf. note to $\pi \alpha \lambda$ irpux́ziov in § 231), probably due to the influence of the adjective $\lambda . \varepsilon \pi \sim \delta(\$ 210)$.

D. The use of a diminutive to give an impression of modesty (§ 213). čorveisıov 'my little bit of money.' Eupol. frg. 2. 479
 ours.' Ar. Vesp. 64, 'A $\lambda \lambda$ ' हैб




E. The use of diminutives for objects for which the speaker asks as a favor (§ 215). áorveidıv 'a little money.' Ar. Plut. 240,






F. Closely related to the preceding is the use of a diminutive to make a thing appear small so as to excuse the speaker for some transgression. Cf. oneućpiov (§ 366. IX. 3) and Kock ad Ar.


G. The use of diminutives in the sense 'merely,' 'nothing but'


犭op ajorinupov. бuxidiov: $\sigma$ tiyos 'line of poetry.' Plut. 2. 60 A , resit




XII. Hypocoristic Words. A. Articles of diet, including animals
 ßótpus 'grape.' Alexis frg. 3. 462 (1. 13), Borpódóóv $\tau l$, yópov, žv






 (a good example of the extravagance in the use of such 'diminutives' by certain dandies and gluttons), K $\alpha \grave{\imath}$ नuил $\alpha i \zeta \varepsilon \iota ~ к \alpha p ı \delta \alpha p i o v s ~ M \varepsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \rho-$



 'wild-boar.' Ar. frg. 2. 2. 1151 (9.2), see $\S 194$ b sub ín $\tilde{\sim}$ itoov.

 rooczuvidov: xopaxivos (a kind of fish). Pherecr. frg. 2. 274 (2),



 id. frg. 3. 416, 429 (1. 15) ; Men. frg. 4. 223 (1.13), K $\rho \varepsilon \alpha \check{\partial} \iota{ }^{\text { }}$ $3 \pi \tau \tilde{\alpha_{i}} . ~ \chi \omega \beta i \delta \iota o v: ~ \chi \omega \beta \iota \sigma \varrho$, (a kind of fish). Anaxandr. frg. 3. 172, see sub Upox





 § 193 b sub $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho u \sigma_{v ı o v . ~ \sigma ı z u ́ d ı o v ~: ~ \sigma w x u ́ \alpha ~ ' c u c u m b e r . ' ~ P h r y n . ~ C o m . ~}^{\text {. }}$


[^85]







 'porker.' Men. frg. 4. 222 (1.3), yopiồov êv ju'gu.sv. Diph. frg.

B. Human beings (also gods in comedy, cf. § 243). a) Apel-
 reqúdıov : रoxüs 'old woman.' Ar. Thesm. 1194, vaì vaí, रpódios,












 zooidıo 'little pigling.' Ar. Ach. 834 (the Megarian to his two


b) Proper names. Those occurring in Old Comedy are all occasional formations occurring beside the regular name, just as the corresponding names in simple -oov ( $\$ 237$ b). The later examples e. g. Boisoov, are mostly permanent names, sometimes aven formed from primitives which are not themselves proper names (cf. $\$ 250)$.
 tezan in Luc. D. Mer. 8. 2. Áşodizceidoor, Plato Com. i. lex. Sabbaitico p. 3.1. Boïdıov : ßoüc. Anth. P.9.713. Boncoridior : Bocotós
${ }^{1}$ The mscs. have $\pi$ quidiols.








 some kind of animal, in which case the suffix is an exponent of


 Laert. 7. 3, 兀í ̧̣ú
C. Parts of the body (cf. § 238). $\delta \alpha z \tau v \lambda i \delta \iota o v: \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \cup \lambda .0 \varsigma ~ ' f i n g e r, ' ~$


 'nipple of breast.' Ar. frg. 2. 1084 (14).


 גेvinorñן $\alpha$. For Ar. Equ. 100, where is also found voidıov: vóos
 Anon. Cat. in Psalm. t. 1. p. 61. 34, चò д̌oî́cuov prnaeî̀ov.
E. An apparent case of hypocoristic -iठ̊ov to express endearment for a thing is $2 \alpha \varrho z i \delta \iota o v: \lambda \alpha$ pros 'char-coal basket' in Ar. Ach. 340,
 humorous personification of the basket. Cf. § 239.
F. The use of hypocoristic words merely to voice the mood of the speaker (§ 244 f .) even when the object designated by him is not the one to which the endearment is directed, is represented by Ar. Ach. 1036, where the farmer, when refused a drop of peace
 yoiv 及oisiow. The motive is, of course, pity for himself, not for the oxen, as is shown by the Nominative case of $\alpha \alpha x 0 \delta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu . \omega \mathrm{v}$. Less certain is Ar. Pax 387, where the chorus is pleading with Hermes: M $\gamma \delta \alpha \mu \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$,

 The suffix of yoopiotov may be caused by the entreating tone of the passage, but it is not impossible that the idea is 'delicious little porker.'

## XXI. THE SUFFIX - $\alpha \delta \iota \circ v$.

316. Concerning this (mostly late) conglutinate cf. Lobeck, ad Phryn. 74, Proll. 351 ff. ; Schwabe, op. cit. 67 f.; Janson, op. cit. 46 ff. The earlier scholars largely doubted the existence of a suffix - $-x \delta$ ov, and wanted to refer all apparent cases to -iठov by assuming contraction of an $\bar{\alpha}$ of the stem with the $t$ of the suffix. Cf. Buttmann, Ausf. Gr. Spr. 2. 443 n. ; Janson, 1. c. Lobeck, Proll. 353 f., suspects all occurrences of $-\alpha \delta$ ovv ${ }^{1}$ which are not adjectival and can not be explained in this way, i. e. all except those which have a primitive in $-\bar{\alpha}$ or - $\alpha$ ov, from which he believes that a diminutive in -tiocy would


 on the other hand, unreservedly admits the existence of - $\alpha \mathbf{\delta} \circ o v$, referring it to primitives in $-\alpha \delta$. He assumes, as is his wont, that both parts of the conglutinate were independent diminutive suffixes.
317. The explanation of $-\alpha \delta$ ovv from -tioov can not be upheld for several reasons. In the first place, it is not probable that an - $\alpha_{1} \delta \iota o v$ $<-\bar{\alpha} i \bar{\delta} \iota o v$ should have regularly been written without : subscript. Although $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\alpha$ were pronounced alike at the end of the Alexandrian period, and consequent confusion of orthography resulted in many cases, yet the scribes tried to distinguish between the two, and no doubt followed certain traditions of spelling which must usually have had a historical foundation; and the fact that the suffix -xiosv was regularly spelled without the $t$, while $\gamma p$ ódov was spelled with it, points to an original difference and discountenances the derivation of -xìov from $-\bar{\alpha}-$ - $\delta$ ov. It is also improbable that the $\bar{\alpha}$ of $-\bar{\alpha}-$ stems should suddenly have been habitually retained before an initial vowel of a suffix, although it is otherwise a firmly established halit of the language that $\bar{\alpha}$ as well as the thematic vowel was dropped before a following suffixal vowel.
318. As regards the contention that -asiov can be the result of the formation of a diminutive in -ઠठov from a word in -xıov, it may be said that this is phonetically impossible. -xt- + -tiocy can not
 $\lambda \alpha i \delta o v$; for if the $\alpha$ of $\alpha t$ is short before contraction with another
${ }^{1}$ I. e. $-\alpha \delta \iota o \nu$ as areal conglutinate, not when derived from a primitive in -ad-。
', it must be short after it. The opinion of Eustathius is without the slightest value in this respect, because he, and doubtless his sources, belonged to such a late period that they had no direct knowledge of anything concerning quantity. If all of the words quoted by him really have - $\bar{\alpha} \delta$ oov, the reason must be sought in the analogy of
 referred to the latter, and then caused e. g. $\sigma \pi \eta \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta o v: ~ \sigma \pi \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \alpha o v$. There is, however, not the slightest indication that the - $\alpha$ doov, even if these words should go back to a period when the original quantities were still observed, ever did have a long $\bar{\alpha}$, and the formation of derivatives in - $\alpha \delta$ ov from primitives in $-\alpha .0 \nu$ can be much more easily explained in a different way. Those neuters in - $\alpha$ סoov which belonged to adjectives in $-\alpha \delta \omega$, were semantically related to those in $-\alpha ı o v ~ f r o m ~ a d j e c t i v e s ~ i n ~-\alpha ı o s, ~ e . ~ g . ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} ~ o j \partial \rho \alpha \hat{\partial} \iota \alpha$ 'the tail parts' was equivalent to $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ oujp $\alpha i ̃ \alpha$, although one was not derived from the other, but both independently from the substantive oupd 'tail.' In such words the feeling of equivalence of $-\alpha \delta \iota o v$ and $-\alpha_{1} \circ v$ developed, and consequently, when the former gained currency, it could take the place of the latter in the words discussed, $\sigma \pi r_{1} \lambda \hat{\delta} \iota o v$ for $\sigma \pi \gamma_{1} \lambda \alpha 10 v$,
 x $\alpha \hat{\delta}$ ıov for the neuter of $\gamma \lambda 0 x \alpha i 0 s$, and perhaps $\tau u \% \alpha \hat{0}$ ov for the neuter of ouycios, although it may have been formed from toyn.
319. Since, then, these words may as well be explained with a short $\breve{\alpha}$, it may well be asked what evidence there is in the poets
 Vesp. 1215, which is plainly adjectival, and so could not have been admitted as evidence by Lobeck, there is only one passage which gives any cue as to the quantity of the $\alpha$, and in that one (Anaxandr. frg. 3. 172) it is short in the word $\psi \eta \tau \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ ®ov. Lobeck (Proll. 354), however, since the short $\check{\alpha}$ made untenable his explanation that - $\alpha \delta$ ov was contracted from $-\bar{\alpha}-\mathrm{c} \delta \circ 0$, emended in the interests of his theory. The verse in question runs thus: K $\alpha \grave{\psi} \psi \eta \tau \tau \alpha \delta i o s s ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} ~ \chi \omega 0 \alpha \rho i \omega \nu$ (mses. $\left.\chi \omega \beta \leqslant \delta \alpha \rho^{\prime} \omega v\right)$, and the change to $\psi \eta \tau \tau \alpha p i o r s$ is all the worse because it assumes that a scribe would change from the more familiar - $\alpha_{p o v}$ to the less familiar - $\alpha \delta$ oov, even though another word in - apov occurred in the very same line, a condition which would lead us to rather expect $-\alpha \delta$ ov to be changed to $-\alpha$ poov. In want of more evidence, then, we may conclude that - $\alpha \delta$ oov had short $\breve{\alpha}$ in a number of words,
 ence.

320．As to the origin of the suffix，it will be seen that there is a close analogy to - iorov．There are several different strata，and the whole number of words may be roughly divided according to whether they come from adjectives in $-\alpha \delta$ os or are patterned after substantives in $-\alpha \delta$－ov，although these classes can not be separated with precision because the－cov of the latter often has an adjectival meaning．

321．That there was a number of adjectives in $-\alpha \delta \delta_{0}$ which were largely to be referred to adverbs in－$\delta 0$ ，was already pointed out by

 ＇answering＇i．e．＇alternate＇：¿u $\mu \circ \beta \alpha \delta \delta \sigma^{\prime} v$ the suffix was transferred to

 vation of such adjectives that there came into existence words like $\pi p o \sigma x \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda$ cosiov＇that which is placed close to the head，＇i．e．＇a
 $\tau \grave{\alpha} x_{\rho} \varepsilon x \alpha \widehat{\delta} \iota \alpha$＇woven things，＇i．e．＇tapestry＇：$x_{\rho} \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma(\omega)$＇I weave．＇Sub－ stantives of this kind came into contact with similar ones in simple －oov on every hand，and thus prepared the way for complete semantic syncretism of the two suffixes．

322．On the other hand，substantives in－$\alpha$ olov which were derived from primitives in $-\alpha \xi-\alpha \delta 0 \varsigma$ occur from the earliest times and with a large diversity of meaning of－tov．Thus $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \hat{\alpha} \iota o v: \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha_{\zeta}$ is an instrument noun，ysquर⿱亠乂口丿ov：ysucis is＇that which is connected with winter，＇＇winter quarters，＇$\lambda_{\iota} \beta \alpha \widehat{\delta} \iota o v: \lambda_{\iota} \beta \alpha_{s}$ is a place＇well supplied
 the stone kind，＇i．e．a stone used as missile，similarly $20 \pi \alpha \bar{\delta} เ o v:$
 ＇drizzling rain＇is probably a diminutive．These words could give rise to a conglutinate $-\alpha \delta$ oov in the usual ways（ $\$ 285 \mathrm{f}$ ．）．In the first place，some of them could be referred to other words than their real primitive in $-\alpha \varsigma-\alpha \delta \circ \varsigma$ ，e．g．alongside of $\eta \varepsilon \mu, \dot{\alpha} s$ there exists $\gamma \varepsilon \frac{s}{\tau} \mu x$
 but not the oblique cases were thought of．As a result there occur
 onucósov：चò oñuc．The rationale of the latter form was already partly


 could be referred to $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi n$ as well as to $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha^{\prime} s$ ，and then caused the
transfer of - $\alpha \bar{\delta} \iota o v$ to other $\bar{\alpha}$ stems, e. g. $\psi \eta \tau \tau \alpha \bar{\delta} \iota o v: \psi \tilde{\eta} \tau \tau \alpha$, xop $\alpha \bar{\delta} \iota o v:$ xóp $\eta, \pi \eta \gamma \alpha \alpha_{0}$ ov : $\pi \eta \gamma^{\prime} \eta$, etc. Words in $-\alpha \delta$-ovv or - $\alpha \delta$ oov from adjectives could, of course, also exert a direct influence upon congeneric words in causing their whole ending to be transferred. Thus $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \hat{\delta}-\sigma \circ$, an instrument noun, could cause $\alpha x o v-\alpha \hat{\delta}$ ov, $\chi_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon p \mu \alpha \hat{\delta}-$-ov as a name of a mis-
 give rise to $\pi \iota \lambda$ - $\alpha \dot{\delta} \iota o v$ and $\alpha \nu \alpha \beta 0 \lambda-\alpha \bar{\delta} \iota \circ v$, and $\tau \dot{\alpha} x_{\rho} \rho x-\alpha \hat{\delta} \iota \alpha$ 'a kind of

323. The spread of - $-\alpha \delta$ oov was largely determined by formal analogy. Those words which have a primitive in -avov or $-\alpha \tau$ - have been mentioned above. The largest number, however, comes from $\bar{\alpha}$ stems ${ }^{1}$ :




 in $-\alpha$ come $\alpha \lambda \varphi \alpha \hat{\delta}$ ov : $\alpha \lambda \varphi \alpha$ and $\gamma \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \bar{\delta}$ ov : $\gamma \alpha_{\mu}^{\mu} \mu \alpha$.

324 . As may be expected from its heterogeneous origin, - $\alpha \delta \iota \circ v$, even though always one of the rarer suffixes, nevertheless is found in a great variety of uses. There is no tendency whatever to confine it to 'diminutives,' in fact the latter uses are found only in about one third of its occurrences. I subjoin a list of these words classified according to meaning.
I. With verbal force. гøєxádı $\alpha$ : xpéx $\omega$, 'the weavings,' i. e.

II. Compound. тৎобжєч $\alpha \lambda \alpha ́ d \iota o v: ~ к \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \lambda$ ', $\pi \rho о \sigma к \varepsilon \varphi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota \circ v, ~ ' p i l l o w . ' ~$ Eustath. 1552. 32.

 prayer,' "locus in ecclesia ubi quis orans constitit, paullo elevatior." Ap. Leon. grammat. in Leone sapiente p. 480. v̀̀ ov̉@ádıa (cf. $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ oupaiix) : ojp $\alpha$ ', 'the parts belonging to the tail.' Geopon. 20. 27,

IV. Instrument nouns. ảzovádıov: axóvn, a surgical instrument. Cod. Laur. 74. 2 Herm. 38. 281. $\beta$ ạ̛ádıov = $\beta$ 人́opov 'step.' Ar. ap. Poll. 10. 47.
V. 'Made of.' re@ódoov : रéppov, 'that which is made of plaited


[^86]VI．＇Provided with．＇óøy＠ádıov ：b̌־чp $\alpha$ ，＇that which has a（strong） smell，＇a scent used to revive fainting persons．Eustath．46．3： Nicetas in Isaacio 1 n． 9.

VII．Words which are equivalent to their primitives，including some which might have been originally＇specializing．＇ảvapoiádıov（cf．えvx ${ }^{\circ} \dot{\delta} \dot{-}$ $\lambda \alpha \iota v)=\dot{\alpha} v \alpha \beta о \lambda y^{\prime}$, ＇a mantle，cloak．＇Eccl．жола́dıov＝хо́тхьоv，＇a piece．＇ Ap．Ducang．$\lambda \varepsilon \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota o v=\lambda \varepsilon ́ \mu \beta \circ \varsigma, ~ ' b o a t . ' \quad$ Const．Manass．C＇hron．3766，





VIII．＇Like＇the primitive．ảisćdıov＇that which is like the letter $\alpha \lambda \varphi \alpha$, ＇＇a rule．＇Eustrat．Comm．ad．Arist．Eth．6．7．रivぇćdıor＇： $\gamma^{\lambda} \dot{u} x \alpha{ }^{\prime}{ }^{1}$（see $\leqq 318$ ，end），probably originally＇that which has the nature of sweetness＇（cf．$\gamma \lambda \cup x \varepsilon i ́ \delta \iota o v ~ § 315 . ~ I X), ~ b u t ~ e u p h e m i s t i c a l l y ~ a p-~$

 like a tent，＇＇tegumentum．＇Anon．in Maji Spicil．Rom．vol． 2 p． 322.

IX．Diminutives．ro＠údıov ：xópr，＇a little girl．＇Hes．，xóppıov．
 Mapsuci ap．Lebas et Waddington 1499．veızádıor＇：veíw．r．（ $=$ víx．r． ）， ＇a little statue of victory．＇Insc．Palaestin．CIG．4558，の＇v vetrx
 Joann．Mosch．Prat．Spir．in Cotel．Monum．vol． 2 p． 429 A，$\pi r_{\gamma} \gamma^{\alpha} \delta \iota \iota$ $\pi \alpha ́ v u$ uıxpóv．onućdıov：or̃，ux，probably＇a little tomb．＇Eustath． 1675．46，see § 322.

X．Hypocoristic words．＇Equádıov：＇Epuřs．Luc．（＇har．1，ג̀ 2．．．亠̀
 †rĩ $\tau \alpha$ ，＇delicious little flat－fish．＇Anaxandr．frg．3．172，see § 315. XII．A sub Opartiסıov．

XI．Plant names．E＠vqŋćdıov＇madder，＇＇rubia tinctoria＇：èpujupós ＇red．＇Schol．Nicandr．Th．74．Perhaps zoxzor cediov，of tutally ob－ scure meaning and derivation，is also a plant name．（f．Herwerden， Lex．Suppl．s．v．

 ＇fortune．＇Eustath．1552．31，see § 316．318．q（wxidっ（u）＇：p（i） ＇seal．＇Lobeck ad Phryn． 74.
${ }^{1}$ Janson，op．cit．47，wrongly derives the ending from Duric ides．

## XXII. THE SUFFIX -uס̄pov.

325. The origin of this conglutinate has not so far been satisfactorily explained. The suggestion of Schwabe, op. cit. 68, that it is a conglutination of $-0 \delta-\alpha p-t o v$, can not possibly be correct because of the unwarranted assumption of syncope of the $\alpha$. Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2} .471$, likewise maintains that the $\delta$ of -uסpoov is the same as
 explain the origin of the $\rho$. Nevertheless it can be shown that in all probability the $\delta$ of -u官ov has nothing to do with any other suffixal $\delta$ in the Greek language. On the other hand, Brugmann is undoubtedly right in saying that the $u$ of this conglutinate must be derived from some $u$ stem, and, it may be added, the earlier a word which fulfills this condition occurs, the more likely is it to be the right pattern type; for -uסpov occurs already in Epicharmus, and so, together with -( $)$ ) $r o v$, is the very oldest of -ov conglutinates. While now there is extant not a single word in actual -uסpiov which has a primitive in -u-, yet there is in existence a word which can not be separated in origin from this suffix, namely, the deteriorative on $\lambda_{0} u-$ סpícs 'a woman-like fellow,' 'a sissy,' which has for its primitive the $-\nu$ - stem O$\ddot{\eta} \lambda u-\varsigma$ 'feminine,' and occurs already in Herodotus ${ }^{1}$ (7.153,
 the place of an original *om $\lambda \cdot 0$ opov with the same meaning, the change of -tov to $-t a c$ being an example of a similar kind of humor as in Latin pusio or senecio (§ 267), in this case because of the additional sarcasm given to a deteriorative like *om $\lambda \boldsymbol{j} \delta$ ppov by fitting it out with a masculine ending. If, then, the pattern type of -udpoov has left any trace of its existence, it was *0m $\lambda \dot{0} \delta \rho \circ o v$, and this form may be explained by the influence of the congeneric word divopiov. After the latter, 'a being like a man,' but 'not a real man,' had come into use for designating an effeminate person, some one made a similar formation from the stem Ondu- 'feminine,' which then had a double expression of the idea of effeminacy, and in forming this word he must necessarily have thought of zudpiov, with the result that he made the two words end similarly, i. e. he transferred to *O.m入óiprov not only the suffix -tov but also the preceding $-\delta \rho$-, which was the easier because the Nominative Singular of the primitive duvip was also without

[^87] rise to other words like $\xi \varepsilon v-\delta \delta \delta p o v: ~ \xi \in v o s$. The $\delta$ of the suffix -u $\delta$ poov is consequently nothing more than the inorganic $\delta$ of the oblique cases of $\alpha$ wrip which was purely a phonetic development.
326. On the formal side it may be noticed that -uסplov was in Classical times a particular favorite for $-\varepsilon \sigma$ - stems, four out of eight



327. As might be expected from its origin, the deteriorative shade of meaning is most frequent for -udpov in Classical times, but the tendency to semantic syncretism with other 'diminutive' suffixes later effaced this, and from the beginning of the transmission diminutive and hypocoristic uses occur occasionally. Perhaps it is significant, however, that personal names in -uঠpoov are always deteriorative, for when using these the speaker was most liable to think of *om $\lambda$ ópiov or Orihuopix
328. Collection of examples, classified according to meaning.
I. 'Like' the primitive, only in oxuf idouov: oxiopos, 'that which is like a sword,' mentioned by Epicharmus frg. 42. 5 among $\pi x v=0-$

 in other than deteriorative, diminutive, and hypocoristic meanings, the above etymology would appear somewhat doubtful. Perhaps it was a remodelling of an old oxucioioov through popular etymology, which fancied it heard $\delta \delta \omega \rho$ 'water' (cf. the proper names Mev--j $\delta \rho-$ oov and $\Lambda \varepsilon \psi_{\psi}-\delta \delta \delta_{p}-$ ovv $)$ in -uסpoov, and considered it a fit suffix fur a word designating a water animal.





 $\mu \imath \lambda \lambda$-ı́doıov : Пр́quos. Epich. ар. Cram. Anecd. Ox. 4. 273. 9. бхк-


 deuv: चéyvn 'trade,' cf. चsyviov. Plato Resp. 475 E , चojsous oiv


III. Diminutives. Ėxúdœıov : ジچxos, 'a slight sore.' Hipp. 829,










 $\chi \varepsilon p o ́ \delta \rho \rho \stackrel{\alpha}{ }, \mu \alpha x \rho \dot{\alpha}$ ठ̀̀ $\beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon$.
IV. Hypocoristic words. With the idea 'delicious' is found $\sigma x \varepsilon-$






V. The following words in -uspoov either are merely mentioned by grammarians or are used in such a way that the precise force of the suffix can not be determined : aủzúdoıov (Arch. f. Pap. 1. 298 col.



 (id. ib. 1430) : $\chi \alpha \lambda \alpha \sigma \varsigma$.
 $\beta \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho 05$, and toxapósiov' 'usurula,' also had -uס̧pov, but lost one $\rho$ of the two by dissimilation. While this is possible for the first, because
 makes the last two exceedingly doubtful. Cf. § 311.

[^88]
## XXIII. THE SUFFIX -axıov.

330. The very common modern Greek diminutive suffix $-x<t$ in words like $\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda$ oquxt and $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \dot{\alpha}<{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ has its roots as far back as the Classical period, but it was no more than a mere beginning.
331. The origin of this conglutinate, like that of -iסtov, is hardly to be sought in the addition of one living diminutive suffix to another; for the real diminutive $-\alpha x$ - is exceedingly rare, and mostly found only in petrified remnants, in which it could no longer have been felt as a diminutive suffix at the very beginning of the transmission. And aside from this, the fact that most early words in $-\alpha x 0^{\circ}$ have non-diminutive meaning points to at least a partial origin from other words than diminutives.
332. Derivatives in $-\alpha x-$-6v from primitives in $-\alpha^{\xi} \xi$ were found from early times, and in these -oov could have any meaning which it had in other words. Several of these primitives are indeed prehistoric
 oxun $\alpha$ xiov; but since no primitive without $-\alpha x$ - existed beside these forms, and these must therefore have been faded 'diminutives ' already
 could not have been felt any differently than $\alpha \lambda \mu, \alpha^{\prime} x$-oov 'little ladder' : $\chi \lambda \tilde{\mu} \mu \dot{\xi}$, or $\sigma \omega \mu \mu \dot{\alpha}-$-ov : $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \mu$. . Consequently -tov after $-\alpha \chi$ - stems was no more confined to 'diminutive' uses than after any other suffix. It is a suffix of appurtenance in ropóxiov: xóp $\mathcal{E}_{\xi}^{\xi}$, the name of a

 and derivative were also sometimes equivalent: $\mu \nu \dot{x}^{\prime} u \sigma v=\mu, j^{\prime} x_{\xi}^{\prime}$, cf.

 From words of this kind as well as 'diminutives' the separation of $-\alpha x$ tov as an independent suffix could take place.
333. The earliest word in -axiov is sut-cixiov in Dinolochus ap. AB. 112. It comes from $\pi i \tau \tau \alpha$ and probably designates a kind of writing-tablet, so that it must have received its suffix from miváx-cov, which had an -tov meaning 'made of' Hlat-wood ( (ivxes).
334. The next word in -axoov is a real diminutive from the end

${ }^{1}$ Cf. Schwabe, op. cit. 63.
${ }^{2}$ It is possible to take quveciano as a diminutive referting to a chass
 the abstraction of the conglutinate in this case probably was the etymologically related $x \lambda \mu \mu \alpha^{\prime} x-$-ov 'a little ladder,' which could easily suggest itself when the speaker was seeking for a diminutive of the associated $\kappa \lambda . \sigma \sigma \mu$.б.
335. Patterned after $\psi u \delta \bar{\rho}-\alpha$ ' $\chi$-cov 'blister' were two words which seem to have been formed directly from a verb: $\varphi \lambda v_{5}$ - $\alpha$ cetov 'blister':


336. Athenaeus 497 F quotes Crates and Philemon as authorities for a certain Persian cup called ocvoózov, beside which occurs the form oávvaxpov (Athen. l. c.). Probably, unless one of the two is corrupt, $\sigma \alpha v v \alpha^{\prime}$ _ov was remodelled from oávvaxpov through the influence of the congeneric $\beta \alpha \tau$ cóxcov (§ 129 a ): $\beta \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \dot{x} \eta$, and stands beside it in the passage from Philemon as quoted by Athenaeus.
 Hes. This is, however, probably not formed directly from $x \alpha^{\prime} \psi \alpha$, but is more closely related to the xaupdixns of the Septuagint, in as much as there either existed a by-form $x \alpha \psi \alpha{ }^{\prime} n_{s}$ to $x \alpha \mu \psi \alpha \alpha_{n} n_{s}$, as
 formation of rapxixiov. The -oo was added by analogy to xißiotiov or some other -tov word designating boxes.
 like most names of ornaments in -tov. Cf. Schol. Theocr. 11. 40,
 was probably patterned after $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha_{\alpha} \alpha$-ov ( $\S 145 \mathrm{~B}$ ) or some word like it.
 ontvon'p 'spark' is a diminutive, but it is not so certain that it is a real case of the conglutinate $-\alpha \times 10 v$, for there are in existence the derivatives $\sigma \pi \omega v \otimes_{\rho} \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\iota \sigma \mu \alpha$ and $\sigma \pi w v_{n} \alpha \alpha x-\omega \delta \delta_{\xi}$, which point to the
 On the other hand, these may be due to retrograde derivation from the latter.
337. Our conclusions may be summed up as follows: - $\alpha x$ ov had indeed begun to exist as an independent conglutinate in Classical times, but its productivity was very small, and, like - $\alpha \delta$ ovv, it was not par excellence a deteriorative, diminutive, and hypocoristic suffix, thus differing from most other -lov conglutinates. How the transformation to a living 'diminutive' suffix was accomplished, remains to be investigated on the basis of the latest periods of the Greek language.

## XXIV. THE SUFFIX -toxıov.

341. Since -tro- occurs in a large variety of uses, both diminutive and non-diminutive, it is to be expected that the conglutinate -trovov is also not a unit semantically, but all sorts of relations between its components are possible. It is, therefore, not at all certain that it is always due to an intensive accumulation of 'diminutive' suffixes, but other forces must also have played a part. We may divide the comparatively numerous words in -toxuov which have both a primitive with and without -toro-, and so may have been among the pattern types, into two groups, according to whether the word in -tons- -tokr $r_{-}$ is itself a 'diminutive,' or is not felt as such, whaterer its origin.
342. When the primitive in -toxo- is not felt as a 'diminutive,' the formation of an -ov 'diminutive' is not different from that of any other 'diminutive' in the same suffix, and the fact that the derivative ends in toruov is merely accidental. Strictly speaking., the suffix can not be called a conglutinate unless analogical formations from primitives without -toxo- show that it was felt as a single suffix. The most conspicuous non-diminutive use of -tono- was the function of designating a primitive as 'like' the derivative, and from such words quite a number of real 'diminutives' in -tox-tov were formed. Thus from $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \omega^{\prime}$ ' elbow' comes $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times(\omega) v i \sigma x o s$ ' that which is like an elbow,' e. g. a bend in the pillar (LXX Ex. 26. 17), and from this is formed the simple diminutive $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa$ ovíco-cov, designating the 'little elbow-like bend' on the flute. From wóxhos "circle " comes xux
 a short frock which differs so much from the ordinary yoriov that the latter name would not be applicable, and this word forms yorovion-ov 'a little \%irwvínos.' In other words -toxo-, like -tov, had become a suffix for forming names of vessels, usually without difference in meaning from the primitive. Thus kiohiorn (Poll. 6. 95, 10. 66: Dionys. H. 2. 23) is equivalent to 火'フึu's 'cup, whence wishisx-tov 'a little cup.' Similarly hexionos (Hipp. ap. Poll. 10. s7) was the same as $\lambda$ isxos 'plate,' and formed the simple diminutive $\lambda . s x i \sigma x-60$ 'a little' plate. From $\alpha \alpha \delta i \sigma x o s$, which when meaning 'jar' is equivalent to its primitive $x \times \bar{\delta} 05$, comes $20 \bar{\delta} i \sigma x-c o v$, which designates a part of a spice-box, the -ov being an expoment of the idea of similarity in addition to small size. From faded 'diminutives' in -toros-

 Any of the words so far mentioned could be referred to the word without -tono- instead of to the immediate primitive with that suffix, and then gave existence to a conglutinate coxov which was no more emphatic than simple -tov.
343. When the primitive in -tono- of a 'diminutive' in -toxov is itself a 'diminutive,' various causes may be operative. On the one hand -troo- may be changed to -toxov by the attraction of some associated word of the preceding group, e. g. тpo\%ioniov 'little wheel' instead of the equivalent rpoyínos (Arist. Mech. 848 a 25 ) because of xux ionoov. There are a few cases of real intensive accumulation of 'diminutive' suffixes. So certainly roтuдionov: xoтuдínos 'little cup,' in Ar. Ach. 459 (in the begging scene, cf. § 215), $\mu \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$
 little bit of a cuplet.' Similarly $\pi \mathrm{ivaxioxtov}: \pi \mathrm{mvaxi}$ onos 'a little
 uuxpóv, тò $\pi \iota v \alpha x i \sigma n o v$. Other 'diminutives' in -toxoov from 'diminutives' in -toxo- are $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \iota \delta i \sigma x i o v ' l i t t l e ~ ' s h i e l d ' ~(=~ \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \iota \delta i \sigma x i n, ~ c f . ~ H e s ., ~$

 'fine little song' ( $=\mu \varepsilon \lambda i \sigma n o v ~ A l c m . ~ f r g . ~ 65), ~ v a i ́ \sigma n o v ~ ' l i t t l e ~ t e m p l e ' ~$ (= vaïonos Hero Spir. 191), qpaүionoov, a childish hypocorism for трд́үos 'hircus' (= трдүínos Theocr. 5. 141). Perhaps $\pi$ тиpyioxiov 'a little turret' also belongs here, in as much as the meaning 'little tower ' rather than 'that which is like a tower' may be accidentally not quotable for $\pi$ uprionog. If this is not the case, $\pi$ uprioncov must be referred directly to $\pi \dot{\rho} p \gamma o s$ instead of to $\pi \quad \rho \gamma i \sigma \pi o s$.
344. The suffix -toxoov, abstracted from the words of the preceding two groups, had only a very limited productivity in forming words without intermediate form in -tono-, but there are a few examples. By congeneric attraction to $\%$. $\tau \omega v i \sigma x o v$ is to be explained $\chi \lambda \alpha v i \sigma x o v$, diminutive of $\chi^{\lambda}$ 入uvis 'cloak.' The four remaining words are all formed from neuter primitives: xavioxuov'(fine) little basket': रд́vsov, $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha x i \sigma x i o v ' l i t t l e ~ b a s k e t ': ~ \mu \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ x i o v ~(s e e ~ G l o s s . ~ s . ~ v),. ~ p ́ n \mu \alpha \tau i \sigma x o v v ~ ' p e t t y ~$
 to the fact that neuters in -troov were avoided in the Attic dialect ${ }^{1}$

[^89]after - tov had been established as the neuter diminutive suffix par excellence. Thus $\mu . \lambda_{\text {hionov in Alcman became } \mu . \varepsilon \lambda i \sigma x o v \text { in Antiphanes. }}$
Probably the consciousness of the existence of the suffix -truov together with the great similarity of -torov and -toxov caused incipient formations of the former rarer kind to become the latter as the more frequent in the course of utterance.
345. Since many words in -toriov arose by the formation of a diminutive in -tov to a non-diminutive in -toxo-, the pattern types of the former largely had a diminutive meaning, and this is by far the commonest function of the conglutinate. At the same time there are also a few examples with hypocoristic and still fewer with deteriorative meaning, but there is no tendency whatever to extend the use of -toxov beyond this to the more adjectival uses of -tov. When, therefore, $\alpha \alpha \delta$ ionvov 'part of a spicebox' seems to be 'that which is like a jar,' this is incidental and accessory to the diminutive idea, as is shown by the use of the modifying adjective $\lambda \varepsilon \pi \pi=0$ in the only passage where it occurs. There follows a list of examples classified according to meaning.

 a very uncertain conjecture of Ahrens for Timocr. of Rhodes frg. 1.











 $\ddot{\alpha} \pi \alpha v \tau \alpha$ 久.







 onov, ib. 7. тוvaxiozıov, see § 343. rvgyiozıov. Schol. Aesch. Sept.




 $\varphi \dot{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon \iota$ Ms $\gamma \alpha p$ é $\omega v \tau \grave{\alpha} \chi^{\lambda \lambda \alpha v i \sigma u \iota \alpha ~(' t h e ~ v e r y ~ c o a t s ~ o f ~ t h e ~ M e g a r i a n s, ' ~ c f . ~}$

III. Hypocoristic words. The idea 'fine,' 'elegant,' as in axouo$\mu \alpha^{\prime} \tau \circ v$ (§ 232), is found in $\mu \varepsilon \lambda i \sigma \sim \iota o v$, Antiphan. frg. 3. 119, $\alpha \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$
 $\pi \alpha p \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon \tau \omega \tau \tau \zeta$. Due to endearment are probably, besides proper names like Boifuov, zo@iozıov, Poll. 2. 17, and the childish t@cyiozıov in
 हídos $\pi \alpha p \dot{\alpha}$ Tapavđívors.

## XXV. THE SUFFIXES $-\alpha \lambda(\lambda)$ เov AND $-\varepsilon \lambda \lambda \iota o v$.

346. Of the former Schwabe (op. cit. 85) brings forth only ro$p \alpha^{\prime} \lambda(\lambda)$ rov, roupó̀sov, rop $\alpha^{\lambda}$ ıov, for which he quotes three passages from



 pó̀ $\lambda$ loov 'imagunculam Adonidis.' The same word elsewhere repeatedly designates a coral: Theophr. Lap. 38; Luc. Pro Merc. Cond. 1; Diosc. 5. 139. While the origin of the latter meaning is obscure, the former seems to point to $\operatorname{cop}^{\prime} \lambda(\lambda)$ ( $o v$ etc. as a diminutive or hypocorism to xópos (xoüpos, xธ̃pos), and since there is no primitive in $-\alpha \lambda(\lambda) o-$ to be found, it makes probable the existence of a real diminutive conglutinate $-\alpha \lambda(\lambda)<0 v$, which is also found in $\sigma \pi u p\left\llcorner\delta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda 10 v\right.$

 $\mu \quad$ кхр $\alpha$.
347. With such a meager material it is, of course, impossible to determine with accuracy the starting-point of the suffix, but it cer-
tainly can not be a conglutination of diminutive $-\alpha \lambda 0-+-t o v$, as is claimed by Schwabe (op. cit. 62); for there is not the slightest trace of a diminutive $-\alpha \lambda_{0}-$ in the Greek language, and the words given by him as examples are either not diminutives at all, or, if so originally, had lost that meaning before their first appearance; so e. g.
 oै $x \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda 0 \varsigma, \sigma \alpha \alpha^{2} \delta \alpha \lambda o v$. Even if a word of this kind should be a remnant of I. E. diminutive -1 -, this would not affect the origin of the postClassical Greek $-\alpha \lambda$ cov. This must have been abstracted by the process

 there are extant no collateral forms of any one word with and without $-\alpha \lambda 0-$, it can not be decided which word or words were the real patterns; for there is not one among them that would seem sufficiently associated with xopó̀ ( $\lambda$ ) oov or $\sigma \pi 0 \rho \delta \delta \dot{\alpha}^{\prime}$ cov to cause direct
 'a little basket.'
348. The evidence for the conglutinate - $-\lambda \lambda$ nov, which Schwabe also considers to be derived from two independent diminutive suffixes, is so doubtful that its existence may with great probability be denied. In the first place, a few Latin loan-words must be removed from the list. When Latin words in -ello- or -ella- were admitted into Greek, it was natural that they should often be remodelled by the influence of some congeneric Greek word or, if they were 'diminutives,' by the addition of a suffix that would be recognized as 'diminutive' in Greek. Thus the Latin flabellum 'fan' became Gr. $\varphi \lambda \alpha \beta \bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda$ oov through the influence of Greek instrument nouns in -cov, and similarly flagellum 'whip' became $\varphi \lambda \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \lambda \lambda c o v$. Through association with other names of ressels in -ov Lat. patella sometimes became $\pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon \lambda \lambda$.oov, though $\pi \alpha-\varepsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ also occurs.
349. It is not impossible that $-\varepsilon \lambda \lambda$ nov should have been transferred from such words to congeneric native Greek words, and thus caused the abstraction of a suffix $-\varepsilon \lambda \lambda c o v$, but there is no decisive evidence that this was really ever done. Thus Schwabe mentions zopxé), , iovv as a diminutive of xpixos 'circle' in Alex. Trall. cap. De Dolore

 not in diminutive meaning. (1f. G1. ex Actis Sylrestri Papae p. 271.


${ }^{1}$ Spelled with - $\lambda \lambda$ - Photius 496. 20.
$\tau i \vartheta \varepsilon \tau \alpha l . ~ \sigma \alpha x \varepsilon \lambda, c o v \cdot \delta \mu o i \omega \xi$. Since, then, these two words are also no evidence for a conglutinate $-\varepsilon \lambda(\lambda)$ rov, there is but one very doubtful word left: $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \alpha p \gamma \varepsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda, \ldots$ 'a kind of palm-tree with fruit like a pearl,' which is a conjecture for the msc. $\dot{\alpha}_{p} \gamma \varepsilon \in \lambda \lambda c \alpha$ in Cosmas Indicop. 11 c. 9. Passow also has $\mu \alpha_{p} \gamma_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\lambda} \lambda \ldots$ ' 'a pearl,' but gives no citation. Of this word there exists a Greek primitive neither with nor without $-\varepsilon \lambda(\lambda) o-$, so that it is much safer to reconstruct a primitive * ${ }_{\mu} \alpha \rho \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\lambda} \lambda \alpha$ than * $\mu \alpha_{\rho}^{\prime} \rho \gamma \alpha$, and then to argue the existence of a conglutinate $-\varepsilon \lambda \lambda .0 v$ merely on the basis of a hypothetical word. Much more probably, however, $\mu$ xpyé $\lambda \lambda \lambda_{0}$, if it actually existed, was a borrowed word, perhaps also from the Latin, since margella, though with the meaning 'coral,' occurs in the Gloss. Gr. Lat.
350. Unless better evidence is brought forth, the conglutinate $-\varepsilon \lambda(\lambda)$ oov was consequently a non-entity, but even if we admit its existence, its origin from Latin loan-words is much more probable than the assumption of a double diminutive suffix (Schwabe p. 62). This is impossible for the same reason as for $-\alpha \lambda(\lambda)$ tov, namely, that $-\varepsilon \lambda(\lambda) o-$ does not occur as a living diminutive suffix at any period of the Greek language. Schwabe (p. 39) could only quote $\boldsymbol{x} \boldsymbol{j} \pi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda$ ov 'cup,'

 the whole question of Greek diminutives in 1 suffixes other than with u see Janson, op. cit. 83.

## XXVI. THE SUFFIX - $\nu \lambda \lambda$ cov ( $-\nu \lambda \iota o v$ ).

351. With the above explanation of the origin of the suffix -uסptov (§ 325) Brugmann's suggestion (Gr. 2. $1^{2} .376,471$ ) that
 only support: for, if the $\delta$ of -uסpov comes from the inorganic $\delta$ in duopiov, it is impossible to use it as an analogical support for -*u $\delta \lambda .00$, which presupposes a suffixal - $⿰ \delta \delta$-. We may then return to the usual explanation that $-v \lambda \lambda .0 v=-u \lambda \lambda 0-+-$ cov, and that $-v \lambda \lambda 0-$ comes from $-0 \lambda 0-$ by the same doubling of consonants as in the hypocoristic forms of proper names. ${ }^{1}$ Those appellatives which are used like proper names in address, e. g. titom 'nurse,' or $\gamma^{\text {ơvws ' }}$ effeminate person,' ${ }^{2}$ point out the way by which $-v \lambda \lambda 0-<-\nu \lambda 0-$ was transferred from

[^90]proper names like Bávundos to personal appellatives，and it is by the addition of－ov to one of these that the suffix－u $\lambda .2$ oov must have arisen．After it had once grown into a single＇diminutive＇suffix in these personal names，it would naturally be put on a par with other ＇diminutive＇suffixes，with the result that its use was extended to words designating things，e．g．àvớخ入iov ：ǎvvos＇flower．＇

352．In no case does there exist a primitive in－un．2．0－beside the word in－u $\lambda \lambda$ cov，and consequently the primitive of the pattern type is lost．The pattern itself，however，can be determined with some certainty．It appears from above that it must be a personal appel－

 ＇infant．＇A further indication is given by the fact that the suffix is used in deteriorative meaning in the great majority of passages，and aside from it only the hypocoristic use is found in the Classical period． This points to a pattern type in which the deteriorative use be－ came in the nature of the case the usual one，and one in which it was intimately associated with hypocoristic meaning．This can only be $\mu s \iota \rho \alpha x \dot{j} \lambda \lambda \ldots o v$, which，though hypocoristic in origin，naturally became deteriorative in most cases，because the idea of effeminacy easily at－ taches itself to any term of endearment addressed to males when older than mere children．This $\mu s \varepsilon_{p} \alpha \operatorname{cov}^{2} \lambda$, ov was derived from a primitive＊$\mu . s \varphi \rho \alpha x \nu \lambda \lambda 05$ which had within it already the same meaning， and the addition of - tov was a case of emphatic doubling of suffixes． The existence of a primitive＊$\mu \varepsilon \uparrow \rho \alpha \alpha_{0} \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{0}$ is further made probable by the fact that $\mu s s_{\rho} \rho \alpha x^{\prime} \lambda_{\lambda}$ iovv has no direct primitive to which it could
 not come from $\mu \varepsilon \varepsilon_{i} \alpha \xi$ ，because that only refers to girls（ $\$ 148$ ）． Even the assumption that－ohinov was substituted for the－tov uf usećxiov because the two suffixes were felt to be equivalent is out of place here because－oov in $\mu . s$ podxuov does not convey any meaning that is ever found in－u入入．ov．

353．Of the prevailing deteriorative use of－v．．．．ove I have found the following examples：$\beta$ ¢éguizhıov：（Fpépos＇haby．＇Luc．D．Mer． 9.


${ }^{1}$ After＊$\mu$ вцрс́x roov，and it is probably by analogy to this word that formations like toule prix． ioov（Theognost．Can．126．25）：дcudicpoon were made．Similarly oxuriduor ： $\sigma \chi$ ólıov．










 $\mu \varepsilon ı \rho \alpha \dot{\jmath} \lambda \lambda \iota \alpha$. 'Merely a youth' (§ 167 f.) in Dem. 21. 78, $\mu \varepsilon \imath \rho \alpha-$

 pou



 $\tau \varepsilon x \alpha \grave{ } x \alpha \lambda \omega v$ ยैp $\gamma \omega v$. It is to be noticed particularly that the dete-riorative-hypocoristic origin presupposed for the suffix above finds support by the large percent of examples where these two ideas are really both present. Thus the ironical use of a hypororism is not only represented in some of the examples of $\mu \varepsilon \rho \rho \alpha \times \dot{\delta} \lambda \lambda \lambda 0 v$ just quoted, but also in the first example of $\xi \varepsilon v \dot{\delta} \lambda \lambda i o v$. The examples of $\varepsilon \pi \tilde{j} \lambda_{\lambda} \lambda o v$, on the other hand, are cases of dramatic irony. It is supposed to be 'fine little poem' in the mouth of the speaker, but 'worthless poem through the intrusion of the poet's personality. Cf. § 152, 243.
354. Alongside of the deteriorative and deteriorative-hypocoristic functions of the suffix the purely hypocoristic had not been given up entirely. So with endearment $\mu \varepsilon \iota \varrho \alpha \boldsymbol{z}_{i}^{\prime} \lambda \iota o v$ in Anaxandr. frg. 3.








355. After the Classical period the process of semantic syncretism
with simple－ov caused the sphere of usage of－u分cov to be extended beyond the hypocoristic and deteriorative uses．In an inscription from
 Cf．Ditt＂． 588.179 ，xвр $\alpha \mu \dot{j} \lambda \lambda$ cov $\dot{\alpha}$ propoưv Xĩov．This word must he either a diminutive meaning a＇little vessel，＇or the－v $\lambda \lambda$ oov has taken the place of the－tov of xspóu．ov，which originally meant＇made of．＇


 taken the place of－tov as an instrumental suffix，viz．puc⿻i人iziov： $\beta \dot{\alpha} \rho o \varsigma$ ，an instrument for finding the weight of liquids，Synes． 175 A ．

35̄6．－u $\lambda$ cov with one $\lambda$ seems never to have gained independence as a＇diminutive＇conglutinate．＇Ȟ̀únıov（Plaut．Pseud．187）is formed from an extant ${ }^{\text {＇H }} \mathrm{H} \delta \dot{\prime} \lambda \eta$ ，which has become a permanent personal name，
 see § 80．There remains rovò́ncov，which designates a cup，and which Homolle，BCH．6．116，surmises to be a diminutive to xóvঠ̊u． This is hazardous，however，not only because it would be the only example of a conglutinate－（v）hoov，but also because there exists as a possible primitive nobvōuloc．Just what the relation of primitive and $^{\text {a }}$ derivative would be it would be useless to ask，but the latter，of course，could not be a diminutive to the former．

## XXVII．THE SUFFIX－uvoov．

357．A conglutinate－uviov seems to occur in the one word $\sigma 1 r_{1}$

 Phryn．384，otrióviov bpvioriou $\lambda$ érouai tuses oux bppows．The hypu－ coristic meaning appears faded in Poll．2．162，चò ठè $\sigma$ Trỗouv $\mu$ ．ह́ovv



35̃．Unless a primitive＊ornoúvr，is accidentally not quotable． onnouvoov must have gotten its suffix by analogy to words like $\lambda \alpha \gamma^{j}-$
 the latter，because，like serpoiviov，it designates a part of the borly． If Meineke＇s conjecture for Epich．frg．42． 2 is correct，there existed a form onoóvov＇a kind of mollusk，＇which would point to a primitive＊rri－ Qóm beside trouov．In that case atrobvov could have received its－uvcov


## XXVIII. THE SUFFIX -( $\delta$ ) apov.

359. As pattern types of the suffix -apoo the following words are a possibility: $\beta \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha^{\prime} \circ \circ$ : $\beta \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha$, 'a kind of fox' (§ 142), zб $\gamma \chi^{\alpha}$ prov: ह̇ $\sigma \nless \alpha$ 'p $\alpha$, 'a pan of coals' ( $(80)$ or 'a little hearth' (§ 199), каллх́pıov (ap. Plut. 2. 668 B) deteriorative to $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \pi \pi \alpha$ рьs 'caper plant,'
 'poor wine,' etc.: ovvapov 'vine,' orox́pov 'a certain women's ornament': бíxopov a certain plant (§ 145 B ), $\tau \alpha \lambda \alpha$ 人pıv $=\tau \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \alpha p o s ~ ' b a s-~$ ket' ( $\S 131$ ). Any of these words could give their -apoov to associated words by the force of congeneric attraction, e. g. z zox $\alpha_{\rho}-$ tov 'a pan of
 tov, a name of a women's ornament, could give rise to ęvv $\tau$ - $\alpha^{\prime}$ pov 'ear-ring,' or roouxipıov 'ornament.' Probably the greatest part, however, in the creation of the new suffix was played by oiváplov. Originally it must have been 'a little vine' or merely 'wine,' being formed from oivopov with the idea 'that which comes from the vine.' This double nature as a diminutive to otvopov and as a synonym to oivos could cause contamination of the two meanings, so that oivápoo was felt as a 'diminutive' to olvos 'wine,' and then the abstraction of the suffix -apoov was inevitable. The original adjectival nature of oivápov presupposed by its derivation as 'that which comes from the vine' receives support from its use as a real adjective in Antiphanes frg. 3.
 is retained, so that we may translate oivápov हitos as 'a kind of wine,' i. e. 'a poor excuse for wine,' or whether ${ }^{\gamma} \delta 0 \rho$ is substituted with the idea 'vinegar belonging to the category of wine,' the adjectival nature of oivópoov remains the same.
360. Adjectival in origin was also ż $\sigma y$ q́pıov' 'a pan of coals,' clearly a substantivation from the adjective Ėбýpoos 'belonging to the hearth.' This feeling for the connection between adjective and the suffix -apoov could crop out again and again in later times, and no doubt had some influence in giving to the latter its large sphere of meaning. We have actual late evidence of the feeling for this relation in the use of the phrase $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \mu \alpha \alpha_{\alpha} \delta \alpha^{\rho} \rho \circ$ exactly parallel to $\sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$

 late Boeotian inscription (after 212 A. D.) ap. Ditt ${ }^{2} .740 .8$ - $\alpha$ pıois actually considered an adjectival suffix, and forms the secondary
aljective $\sigma$ ouphápıos 'rough,' perhaps because of the deteriorative

 of pastry cakes ' (CIG. 9311): $\pi \lambda \alpha x$ ouv $\alpha$ р́pov $=\pi \lambda \alpha \chi \circ \tilde{\mathrm{s}}$.
361. With the -aplov originating as above must not be confounded the late suffix which is the representative of Lat. -ārium or -ārius.

 7. 3) from sigillarium, $\delta$ ŋqvópıov is adapted from Lat. denarius, $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha \dot{p} \circ o v$ (Insc. Calymna Ditt². 869. 6, Smyrna ib. 871. 6) from assarius $=$ as.
362. It is to be expected even a priori that a suffix which separated from a variety of prototypes in which -tov had a large diversity of meaning, will carry with it a corresponding variety of

 in meanings which do not differ from those of their primitives, the diminutive use of zeyćpov, and the deteriorative use of sivépov would all be of influence in extending the function of the suffix as found in themselves. Other meanings which did not happen to be represented among the pattern types could follow because of semantic syncretism with other suffixes, and so -apov became equivalent to -ov in practically all of those denominative uses which were felt as being related to each other. This excludes, of course, the abstract and verbal formations, and on the whole the compounds, though the attraction of congeneric words is a bridge to the latter which has been crossed


363. While -apov is thus far from being strictly a 'diminutive' suffix, yet the deteriorative, diminutive, and hypocoristic uses, as also in case of -iठoov, are comparatively more strongly represented than in simple -tov, particularly in earlier times, for it is natural that the assimilation of meanings should progress further in course of time. H. Stephanus, and later Janson (op. cit. 76), maintained that the suffix had a special predilection for the deteriorative use, and there is some truth in this when compared to -tiosv or simple -oov. While the diminutive use of the latter suffixes is found very much more frequently than the deteriorative, the two meanings are nearly on a par in the examples of -apoov. There is, however, no tendency to extend the latter to such proportions as to outweigh all others put together. as was the case with -uסpoov and -uinuoy in the Classical perimed.

364．Instead of－xpoov－npoov is occasionally written in one word，
 a number of times，it was probably an actual form，which was con－ taminated from छu入ápov and छu入nj̣iov（§ 380）．
365．Like－$\alpha$ poov in meaning is the conglutinate－$\delta \alpha$ pov，which arose in words like $\beta$ oid́ópov：$\beta$ oícov．The habit of considering－apov as equivalent to－tov and of substituting the former for the latter could also be applied to words in－（t）$\delta$ iov；for the popular conscious－ ness would often not distinguish whether the $\delta$ belonged to the stem， as in $\pi \alpha i \delta i o v$, or to the suffix，as in $\beta$ oidiov．Consequently there occur
 for poícov．In the same way－apor could be substituted for the－tov of－tioov after consonants，and so we find $\beta_{1} \beta \lambda i \delta \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ oov for $\beta_{1} \beta \lambda \lambda \delta \iota \circ$ ，

 beside－tòov，there is no evidence that a consciousness for a suffix －tסopıov was ever developed，but an unmistakable－$\delta \alpha$ poov without preceding $:$ is found in $\mu \nu \alpha-\delta \alpha_{\rho} \rho \stackrel{ }{ }$ ：$\mu \nu \nu \tilde{\alpha}$ ．

366．Collection of Examples，classified according to meaning． For a few examples which are classified according to the original meaning of the－tov of which the place is taken by－apoov rather than by the actual attitude of the speaker，see § 291.

I．＇Belonging to．＇＇connected with，＇sometimes approaching the
 belongs to the reeds＇or＇that which holds the reeds．＇Jo．Lyd．de Magistr．2．14．2vuvıtó＠ıov，Suid．without gloss，but cf．the following
〒óvos，＇pitch－pipe．＇Quint．1．10．27．$\chi \propto \lambda \iota \nu \propto ̛ \varrho \iota ө v: ~ \chi \alpha \lambda \iota v o ́ s, ~ ' t h e ~ c h e e k-~$ ornament of a bridle．＇Schol．$\Delta 142$ ，$\pi \alpha p \alpha \gamma v \alpha 0$ ídiov vò võv $\chi \alpha \lambda$ ivcópov х $\alpha \lambda$ ои́ $\mu \varepsilon v o v$.

II．Names of instruments and tools，particularly those which are




 that the primitive was not known later except in literature，and that no diminutive force could then have been felt in the derivative．
 $\varphi p \alpha \tau \tau \varepsilon \sigma \vartheta \alpha, \alpha 0 \tau \alpha \alpha_{s}$ Suid．（relation to the primitive $\mu$ otós obscure）．




 Anth. P. 11.78. Ruvéoov' 'net': $\lambda$ ivov 'flax.' Eustath. 1452.61. גıvápıx́
 root from which it is made. Strabo 784. yvećooon 'rouge $=$ prsiov


IV. Words designating an indeterminate mass, largely by analogy to some of the preceding group, e. g. roovápiov and guxג́pıov. xır-


 bibl. nat. Par. (W.) 2220. $\mu v \dot{\xi} \alpha ́ \varrho \iota \iota v=\mu \cdot{ }^{\prime} \xi \alpha \cdot$ discharge from the nose,

 sub VII.
V. Generalizing. xorðógov : xóryף, 'a kind of muscle.' Diosc.













 possibly a diminutive. Hes., $\beta$ psvovivá '



[^91]



 deteriorative meaning in Diph. frg. 4. 384 (3. 2), see § 166 sub $\left.\varepsilon^{2} \pi \pi \omega \mu \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau c o v . ~ c\right) ~ e q u i v a l e n t ~ t o ~ t h e ~ p r i m i t i v e ~ i n ~ A r . ~ R a n . ~ 172, ~ " A v \theta p \omega \pi \varepsilon, ~$
 plant' or 'a little plant.' Schol. Ar. Av. 662, żx võ ßou $\beta$ ó $\mu$ ou
 $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi о \tau \alpha \dot{\mu}, \frac{v}{}$.
VI. Words which are equivalent to their primitives, excluding those of II and IV, but including those which were originally
 generic idea like 'animal' was understood. Ar. frg. 2. 982 (27),

 with the idea 'animals of the kind for a team,' as is still possible

 fine distinction was lost, and 弓suүव́pıov = ఢءঠ̈үо૬. So Ar. frg. 2. 987 (8),





 'shield.' Cf. words in -oov like axóveiov and סopáziov (§ 127).
 its origin, owes its suffix to words like $\lambda$ n $\delta \dot{\alpha} \alpha_{p}$ ov. Liturgia Chrysostomi p. 70.
VII. 'Like, but not equivalent to the primitive.' à $\gamma \omega \nu \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \varrho \iota o r: ~$ ąciv, 'something like an athletic contest, but not a real one.' According to Paton and Hicks IC. 43 it designates a kind of college examination or competition. Insc. Cos Ditt ${ }^{2} .619 .25,31,35=\mathrm{IC} .43$.



 tóœıov: : \{ud́s, something that corresponds in some way to a strap or
reins : a naval term, and so hardly a diminutive. Hes., iuxv=x́pıo.




 a shell,' 'a spoon.' Poll. 6. 87, see II sub puनचinג́poov. Diosc. 2. 50,
 letter II.' For the ₹ cf. $\dot{\rho}\left(\omega-\tau \alpha x \iota \sigma \mu \rho_{s}\right.$ and $\sigma v \gamma \mu \alpha-\tau i \zeta()$. Math. Vett. p. 116, 117. rioucooov: $\pi \lambda$ oiov, 'that which is like a boat,' a sort
 onórros, a 'spongy ' substance, i. e. a kind of eye-salve. Alex. Trall.


 \%irovíonos, but not a real one' because shorter. Eustath. 1166. $\overline{2} 2$,
 eitcéetov : oüs, ढ̄tós, 'that which is like an ear,' 'a handle of a vase.'
 $\omega \tau \alpha \rho_{i}(\omega v \gamma \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha$. It designates a shell-fish in Athen. 87 F . An alternate name is ov̈s 'A ¢poठírns.

A special group of words in -apiov also is composed of words designating an image or likeness, which are often on the border line between this class and diminutives (cf. § 146). No idea of small size, however, could be connected with 'Equć@⿰ov (Etym. Mag. 146. 57) when referring to the ordinary busts of Hermes. On the other hand, the following words may have been partially felt as diminutives: $\gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \dot{c} \varrho \iota o v$ : $\gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \alpha$, 'an image of a tongue.' Pap. Berol. 162. 2 ( 2 d or 3 d cent. A. D.), $\gamma^{\lambda}(\omega) \sigma \sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho c \alpha \chi_{\rho}$

 3 d cent. A. D.), among gifts in a temple. witcipor' an image of an


VIII. Deterioratives. A. Referring to an individual as comparel to a class. ảvdeciócov: àvip 'man,' cf. àvōpiov. Ar. Ach. 517, wjyi



























 бхะர̃os, 'paltry garment,' 'wretched stuff,' etc. Ar. Vesp. 1313, àvt-







B. Referring to a class. $\gamma$ vvcıxóøıoy : Yow' 'woman.' Marc. Ant.







'Youth.' Epict. 2. 16. 29, see § 315. X. B sub rupracî̀sov. Birá-










 $\lambda . v 6{ }^{2}$ ' 'bridle.' Epict. 4. 1. 80, see sub bvápoov.





IX. Diminutives. 1. Referring to an individual as compared to a class. For the subdivisions cf. § 315. XI. 1. A. лcudciéor :











 12. 693 a 22. b) 'a little figure.' (TA. 2. 736 A 4 (after $307 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$ ).
























 stone,' i. e. 'jewel.' CIA. 2. 835 c-l 67 (320-317 B. C.) $\lambda w$ dópoov

 $\delta \lambda x i ̀ v \cdot$ Гトᅡト. K. छviácoov : छvinov, 'a little piece of wood.' Diose.



 papov, 'but into the stomach all things go.' Anth. P. 11. 189, Eis
 Ant. P. 11. 189, see sub oivápov. b) 'a little loaf of bread.'










2. Referring to a class. A) $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \dot{\varrho} \varrho \iota o \nu: \pi \alpha i ̃ \varsigma ~ ' c h i l d . ' ~ A r . ~ V e s p . ~$










3. Among peculiar modifications of the diminutive meaning in -xpov may be mentioned in the first place the use of axevégoov 'little utensil' to make its theft appear small (cf. §315. XI. 3F). So



The use of diminutives in the meaning 'merely,' 'nothing but,' etc. ( $\S 216$ ) is represented by $\hat{y} v$ ỏvóooov 'only one ass' in Diph. frg.





 $\mu^{\mu} \omega \nu$ озтө́лотв.
X. Hypocoristic words. A. Articles of diet. deиtrágor': ภะĩnvov


 Anaxandr. 1. c. by Schweighäuser. oivá@orv' : olvoş 'wine.' Alexis frg.









 unknown), a kind of fish. Anaxandr. frg. 3. 172, see § 315. X11. A








 ＇matercula．＇Gloss．ฉทıтćœıv ：w $\tilde{\tau} \tau \tau$, ＇duckling．＇Ar．Plut．1011， see $\$ 236 \mathrm{c}$ sub $\beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota o v . \pi \alpha \iota \delta \alpha ́ \varrho \iota o v: ~ \pi \alpha u ̈ \varsigma ~ ' c h i l d, ' ~ ' s e r v a n t . ' ~ A r . ~$





 ب：入órns＇love，＇with hypocoristic doubling of consonant．Ar．Eccl．


 2． 835 ab 26．NavváQıov，Men．frg．4． 154 （4），Navvápıov है $\sigma \gamma \eta \gamma \alpha \varsigma$


C．In a sense somewhat approaching that of $\dot{\alpha}$ xouqux́ziov（§ 232） is used ч由vágov ：̣ovm＇，＇delicate or beautiful voice．＇So Ar．ap．


 veral．For Anth．P．5． 132 see $\S 238$.

D．Due to the hypocoristic mood of the speaker（cf．§ 244 f ．）， who is pleading with his companion，rather than to endearment for



E．Faded hypocorisms．Because of the general use of＇diminu－ tives＇to designate favorite articles of diet，the originally hypocoristic word i廿úcoov came to be equivalent to its primitive ó ơov，and largely took its place，particularly in the meaning＇fish，＇since this was the most common of delicacies at Athens．Already in Alexis frg． 3. 464 （2．2）the hypororistic force of bux́pov must have been very

 O $\alpha^{\prime}$ poov. In the New Testament buýpoov is the regular word for - fish,' and ǒqov does not occur at all. A similar development must have taken place in two names of birds, viz. ג亢兀 which took the place of their primitives; for the birds designated



Fading of endearment occurred in the occasional use of scudicior as equivalent to $\pi \alpha \tilde{c} c$ 'child,' though the loss of original diminutive force must also have contributed to this. Cf. $\pi x i \delta i o v ~(§ 220)$. dovićerov' 'slave,' used as equivalent to $\delta$ oji $\lambda \eta$ already in Ar . Thesm. 537, might as well be a faded deteriorative (cf. д̌v $\delta \bar{p} \alpha \pi \delta \delta \partial \iota o v ~ § ~ 165), ~$ were it not that Lucian (Lex. 25) states that it was properly used only for women, which points to hypocoristic origin. ${ }^{2}$ wicéotor is equivalent to cüs 'ear' already in Arist. frg. 228. 1519 a 40, ठ pónos. ọoiv, èv चoĩc ढ̄apios rurvóuzvog. Like ढriov it is specialized so as to refer only to the outer ear, and so was probably not a faded hypocorism; but formed with the idea of appurtenance. Cf. $\$ 249$.
XI. The following words in -( $\delta$ )apoov are either of obscure derivation or their occurrence without context makes their precise meaning
 rocuнćcoov 'a weight of three obols,' Ducang. App. Gloss. p. 51.


 ap. Arist. 1. c.

## XXIX. THE SO-CALLED SUFFIX -uprov.

367. Schwabe, op. cit. 70, brought forth three words to establish a conglutinate -uptov, which he considered to be compounded of a diminutive suffix -upo- + -tov, citing Etym. Mag. 160. 32 (Eipr, -xu
 authority of the grammarians may very well be neglected in this matter because of their confused notion of what diminutives really are. and their tendency to so classify every word which is equivalent to

[^92]its primitive（§ 2）．We may consequently dismiss the idea that －uptov was a conglutination of two living diminutive suffixes．

368．Of the three words given by Schwabe as evidence of the existence of－upoov two must be removed because primitives in－upo－ exist alongside of the＇diminutive＇in－uptov．From an unknown
 text is correct，${ }^{1}$ occurs váxupov．vaxúpıov $\delta$ ép pux（：váar）．There con－ sequently remains only one word without a collateral form in－upo－， and that is $x \alpha \lambda$ 白pov：$x \tilde{\alpha} \lambda o v$, ＇a little piece of wood，＇in Hesychius： $\alpha \alpha \lambda \dot{\rho}$ เov or xalóporov，and，to say the least，it would be very hazardous to rely upon a single occurrence in an author whose text is in as bad a shape as Hesychius to prove the existence of a suffix．Moreover， even if the text is correct，it would be better to assume a lost prim－ itive＊x $x \lambda u p o v$ than to take one word as proof for the existence of an otherwise unproven conglutinate．The evidence for－upoov is thus of the very weakest kind．

## XXX．THE SUFFIX－aø兀ov．

369．The conglutinate－xotov has been treated in a series of ar－ ticles by Solmsen：Rh．M． 59.503 f．，60． 636 f．，D．Littzt． 1906 col． 1692，Rh．M．62． 636 ff ．In these，besides giving the material，he has shown that it probably had attained a certain local productivity in the Northwest of Greece，and in the third article he connects the $-\alpha \sigma-<-\alpha \tau-$ with the Slavic diminutive－ęt－in words like ovičęt－＇lamb．＇ It remains to reconsider the problem of the origin of the suffix in connection with its extant meanings and in the light of the analogy of simple－tov．

370．To begin with，mere mention might be made of the old theory of Buttmann，Ausf．Gr．Spr．2．442，that xopócov came from ＊ropáprov by dissimilation．This is，of course，impossible because of the want of support for such a change；because，as Schwabe（op． cit． 69 f．）has pointed out，there was no objection to forms like え̀vōpópıov；and because－actov occurs oftener in words without $\rho$ in the preceding syllable．

371．That the－t－of Slavic－ett－and Greek－$\alpha$ cov，as Solmsen assumes，were ultimately identical，is a proposition that can not，of

[^93]course, be refuted, and may very well be true ; but the real question is whether we are entitled to assume direct semantic connection between the Slavic diminutives in -ęt- and the Greek ones in -xsovv. Did this meaning really go back to a period when linguistic innovations found no barrier in the difference between the two languages? In answering this question we may waive for the moment the fact that it is in itself exceedingly suspicious that there is no other evidence of an old diminutive -t- suffix either in Greek or any other I. E. language except those of the Balto-Slavic branch (vrioj- $\tau-0 \rho$,
 formen,' would not necessarily have anything to do with real diminutive meaning, cf. § 2 end). An examination of the extant Greek meanings of -xotov and a comparison with related Greek suffixes will show whether it is really more naturally connected with a distant Slavic suffix.
372. The Greek suffix - $60-$ I. E. $<-t(i){ }^{2}{ }^{-1}$ occurs in adjectives as completely equivalent to -七- from I. E. times. This -oto-, which is sometimes derived from I. E. -t- + -io-, e. g. in
 $\delta \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \circ \rho: \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma t \varsigma$, occurs in verbal as well as denominative adjectives


 adjectives in -oto- substantivized neuters are found with the same meanings as in -tov (cf. § 19). Thus -owov forms verbal abstracts
 приurriot 'stern-cables' : прúum 'stern' shows the meaning 'belonging to.' as does also 'Aprepiocov 'temple of Artemis,' rupisigov 'herd of swine': $\sigma u \beta$ órns 'swine-herd.' In 'Aprepioiov ' image of Artemis ' - otov denotes* likeness.
373. Since, then, there is no doubt that substantives in -tovov, -orov, etc. are exactly like those in -tov, and since -xoto- is foum in adjectives just like -too-, we would a priori expect substantives in which -owo is preceded by an $\alpha$ which are also exactly like -tov substantives, and thus there can be no doubt of the history of the abstract ropvástov (: $\operatorname{\gamma ouva} \dot{\zeta}(\omega)$ ). It would follow that when we find substantives in -astov with more developed meanings, we should be very circumspect about divorcing them from others like ropuáoov, which ent in the same
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 186.
suffix, and from words of related meaning like 'Aprsuírov‘ image of Artemis,' in order to find a far-off Slavic cognate which otherwise has no support as an I. E. phenomenon. Unless striking proof to the contrary is brought forth, we must assume that words in -aбtov are exactly like other words in -tov, that the -t- which in Indo-European times added nothing to the meaning of a word added no more in Greek - $\alpha$ ovov than in -rooov, -toov, -oorov, etc. Only on the assumption that the diminutive meaning has nothing to do with the adjectival use can Solmsen's separation of words like xopóosov from other -ato- forms, from adjectives in - $\alpha$ otoc, and even from other substantives in - $\alpha$ orov be justified, and this assumption is untenable in view of the fact that the 'diminutive' uses of -tov developed from its adjectival uses in purely Greek times (cf. § 261 ff .).
374. An examination of the examples of the suffix - asoov reveals the fact that the diminutive use is comparatively rare even among the words given by Solmsen. Four of them are geographical names, a category which, though it may contain a late diminutive here and there, is certainly not diminutive in origin (cf. $\S 6$ ) as far as simple -tov is concerned, and why then should similar words in -actov be
 diminutive that Solmsen himself suggests the possibility of adjectival origin, comparing $\pi \varepsilon \delta \delta$ rácuoç. 'A little elm' ( $\pi \tau \varepsilon \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \alpha)$ ) would certainly
 be 'that which is provided with elms.' Similarly Пpuuráorov (Schol. र' 404) can not have been 'a little prow' or 'a little foot of a mountain,' but 'that which is situated at the foot of the mountain.' Kopuqúcove (Thuc. 4. 3. 2) : xopuop' is in all probability not 'the summit of a hill,' but 'that which is situated on the summit,' as can be seen by the designation of Athena as Kopupxoíx as connected with a certain hill upon which a temple was dedicated to her (Pausan. 4. 36). And finally, Hoגcócıov (Polyb. 16. 16. 2) : $\pi$ ó $\lambda \iota s$ may be a diminutive, but there is no evidence that it was one. and more probably it shows that -astov had become a suffix for geographical names without regard to the relation between the primitive and derivative.
375. In a similar way most of the appellatives in -acov originated. Just as words designating articles of dress had largely come to end in -tov through the original meaning 'belonging to the category of ' (§ 130), so بatróotov was 'a shoe of the paux ${ }^{\prime}$ 's kind,' and then became equivalent to its primitive. Cf. App. Bell. Civ. 5.

primitive pxux́s here shows where the $\alpha$ comes from，and it is not necessary to resort to Slavic－ett－With yawxigus is to be compared $\alpha \alpha \pi(\pi) \alpha$ coov（Nicetas in Manuële lib． 4 num．2）＇felt cap，＇also without diminutive idea．In the same way－ov had come to form many words designating cups（ $\$ 129$ ），and this use would be paralleled by hois－ áruov（Athen． 486 A ），if，as Solmsen（Rh．M．62．638）thinks，it came
 these do not exist，however，it is better to refer hof 3 xious to an extant入oobr＇as＇that which is used for libation，＇and the－xowo is thus a suftix of appurtenance．Less certain is $\sigma \pi x_{p} \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \sigma y \cdot$ 万̌pvesv èp．pspès oヶpoviq．Hes．Hoffmann，BB．21．140，connects it with Goth．sparwa （）．H．G．sparo＇sparrow，＇and it thus probably was conceived as a bird＇like a sparrow，but not a real one＇（§ 132 ff ．），though it is barely possible that it was a diminutive referring to a class．Hope－
 a＇machine，however，it would seem that－$\alpha$ o七v had，like－tov（乌̧ 71 ff ．）， become a sort of instrumental suffix．

376．There remain three words which show that－xous was oc－ casionally a diminutive－hypocoristic suffix．Of these two are proper names，viz．，Adelphasium（Plaut．Poen．154，203，757，894）and Philocomasium（Plaut．Mil．417），which show that－xotov has taken part in the function of－ov of forming permanent names of women （§ 237 b ）．The only probable appellative＇diminutive＇is ropáos，： xópr＇maiden．＇Some support for taking this as a＇little maiden＇is gained from the inscriptions from Delphi，in which a ropácoov liberated from slavery was not on the average rated as high as a full－grown slave．While the latter were usually worth from three to ten minas，sometimes more，but rarely less，a xopáous is rated at 30 staters in（B．1705．4； 2 minas，1708．6； 1 m．，1714．4： $2 \mathrm{~m} .$. 1751．2； $1 \mathrm{~m} ., 2144.8$ ； $3 \mathrm{~m} ., 2151.5$ ； $6 \mathrm{~m} ., 2204.5$ ； 40 staters． 2213． 6 ； 10 st．， 2219.14 ； $3 \mathrm{~m} . ; 2249.7$ ： 15 st．，2254． $4 ; 4 \mathrm{~m}$ ．， 2259．5； 3 m．，2267．5； 2 m．，2269．9； 3 m．，2300． 5 ： $2 \mathrm{~m} .$. 2316． 6 ； $3 \mathrm{~m} ., 2324$ ．6．Much can not be made out of the individ－ ual case，however，because of other features which help to determine the value．Thus while the highest valuation for a xopóouv was six minas，a full－grown slave was repeatedly rated as low as two minas． At Phocis（CB． 1555 c 7）a ten year old xopxosov is worth even ten minas in contrast to five minas for a man $i b$ ．$b s$ ．It must alan be borne in mind that the primitive xópr，like the English＂girl，＂ could indeed refer to a full－grown persom at times，but would oftener
not do so, and consequently the apparent diminutive force of the suffix of xopáotov comes mainly from the root. There is, however, just one passage which shows that ropó $\sigma$ tov was sometimes used hypocoristically, namely Ps. Plato Epigr. 31, 'A Kúmpıs Moúraıби.
 The humorous mixture of mock tenderness and contempt is entirely due to the irony of the situation (cf. § 152), while the force of the suffix itself is hypocoristic.
377. As to the origin of the 'diminutive' use of - $\alpha$ orov, it seems quite certain, in view of the more frequent words with non-diminutive meaning, that it is altogether due to semantic syncretism with -oov. The two suffixes were parallel in so many uses that it was possible in some dialects to extend the equivalence to the 'diminutive' functions, while others did not go so far. Probably ropócov was the pattern type for the hypocoristic use, and the proper names followed. It was originally a substantivation from an adjective meaning 'belonging to the category of maiden,' and became equivalent to xop $n$, without implication of small size or endearment. Remnants of the feeling for the relation of this word to the adjectival -tov are seen in collocations like $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha \alpha$ xop $\alpha \sigma \iota \circ v(I n s c . ~ P h o c i s ~ C B . ~ 15555 c ~ 5), ~ w h i c h ~ i s ~$ exactly parallel to the frequent $\sigma \omega ึ \mu \alpha \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \delta \rho \varepsilon i o v ~ o r ~ \sigma \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha$ रovatxeiov (cf.
 diminutive or hypocoristic meaning was secondarily infused through the influence of congeneric words in simple -cov, e. g. xópov 'little maiden.'

## 

378. The suffix -apov must have taken its origin from primitives in - ooo-, most probably from names of animals in - $\alpha$ o 0 , in which the latter was quite productive. ${ }^{2}$ From these there is extant only one 'diminutive' in -tov, namely ह̀ $\lambda$ ćpov 'little deer': है $\lambda$ apo૬, used as a term of endearment in addressing a dancing-girl in Ar. Thesm. 1172 , and so sometimes, though I believe wrongly (cf. \$ 236 c , note to $\begin{gathered} \\ \lambda \\ \text { ćọov), taken as a proper name. It occurs again, and indispu- }\end{gathered}$

[^94] This word，from the primitive है $\lambda \propto \rho \rho$ ，which is the most common of words in－apos，was，then，probably the pattern type of the dimin－ ntives in－apov．From it the suffix could spread directly to other n：mes of animals by congeneric attraction，e．g．to Srp－ápos－little animal．＇After the relation e．g．of Orfp to Orpópoov had caused －acov to appear as a single suffix，it could－spread to words of any



379．For the frequent diminutive use of－xpov no other extant pattern type can come in question，but in other meanings there is at least one word which had a limited influence．Thus dicx́gesy ＇sulphur＇＝Əśopos（§ 260 F ），and this，as a word designating a powder－like substance，probably caused そnpáọtov＇a desiccative powder for wounds＇：छnpós ‘dry＇（cf．छ̌ipoov § 260 F ）．oxipáçov，a mse． viriant for oxpocpsiov＇＇gambling－house＇：oxipa甲os＇dice－box，＇is not a possible pattern，because－ayov is never a suffix of appur－ tenance．

380．In the one word $\xi u \lambda n^{\prime} p o v^{2}$＇a little piece of wood（：＂乡́ $\lambda s \%$ ） －nevov seems to occur instead of－opov．This form is guaranteed by the length of the vowel in Alexis frg．3． 423 （1．24），and its early age both by the same passage and by Hipp． 682 f ．It may be ex－ plained by assuming that the $\alpha$ of－apov was lengthened somewhere because connected in the mind with the first declension in words like $\not \omega \rho \dot{\alpha} \varphi \rho \circ v: \chi \omega \rho \alpha$ ，and that－$\quad \varphi \quad$ ov resulted analogically from some other word in $-\eta$ ，either the by－form $\xi u \lambda \eta^{\prime}$ ，or，if the late appearance of this word is not accidental，some other word which attracted छu入ńpov．There was involved the abstraction of a suffix－poov imstead of－aplov．

381．There also occurs a suffix－ipoo in a few isolated instancers： לpriciov＇a young bird＇：oppres is found in Ael．An．Nat．4．41，and छu入ipoov is a variant msc．reading for छu入ńpoov in diverse passages． While the custom is to change छu入ipoov everywhere to छ $\bar{\xi} \lambda r_{i} p o v$, and opvigoov to bovúpov，it would seem that the very fact that the forms in－iptov were intermingled by the scribes is testimony to their exist－ ence somewhere．To assume that the identical pronunciation of $\eta$
${ }^{1}$ That the form in $-u \nu$ is not necessarily a corruption of－un can he seen from words like $\pi \iota \sigma v \gamma \gamma \iota o \nu: \pi i \sigma u y \gamma o s(863)$ ．
${ }^{2}$ For Lobeck＇s opinion that छvixipho，should be substituted for Eidi，win wherever it occurs cf．§ 384.
and $\iota$ in later times caused the confusion does not take account of the fact that it occurs particularly in certain words，but not everywhere alike．

382．As to the explanation of bpvicoov，it is impossible to assume with Janson（op．cit．85）that it is syncopated from＊弓pverópoov：for there is no evidence of any syncope of that kind in the Greek language．The real cause of formation lies close at hand．Just as
 after this was patterned the congeneric bovípov，a formation which allowed the word to retain the stem－vowel of its primitive．The in－ fluence of this word in turn may have caused छu入içov as a by－form to＇乡u入nंழุっv，particularly since a feeling of uncertainty as to the vowel preceding the $y$ must have already arisen in the latter through the variation of forms in－aplov and－npoov．

 ways without the extant words allowing a decision．On the one hand， －uẹtov may have been directly transferred from some－七ov derivative from
 is，however，extant not a single word in－upov from such a primitive，
 тò 火éluỵos，though not in＇diminutive＇meaning（ $\S 118 \mathrm{C}$ ）．If the $u$ of－upor was short，we may assume a lost pattern like＊xopúp̣っv， certainly not an improbable conjecture．Another explanation is given by Brugmann，Gr．2． $1^{2}$ ．387，who assumes $\delta \varepsilon v \delta p u ́ \varphi t o v ~ o r ~ s o m e ~ w o r d ~$ like it as the pattern．This would presuppose the existence of a stem－ form $\delta \varepsilon v \delta \rho u-$ in＇Ablaut＇with $\delta$ év $\delta \rho \varepsilon[F]-\circ v$ ，or $=\delta \varepsilon ́ v \delta \rho[F]$－ov minus the thematic vowel，for which Brugmann compares Hes．，$\delta \varepsilon v \delta \rho u \alpha \dot{\zeta} \zeta$ ，
 been abstracted from some word like ל̇pvípov：oppve－s（stem ópvio－），and this－poov in turn coalesced with the $u$ of the－v－stem．

384．There seems to be no difference of meaning between the various－pov suffixes，but there was a distinction in so far as－uopo was avoided after stems containing an $u$ for euphonic reasons．（f． Schwabe，op．cit．68，who refutes the untenable statement of Theo－ gnostus 126．There is thus weak support for the छu入úpoov which Lobeck （ad Phryn．78）would substitute everywhere for छu入vipov．While it is not impossible that छu入úpoov，which is actually found e．g．in Suidas， actually existed in the speech of some individuals who were less sen－ sible to euphony，it is not allowable to attribute the form to the whole community．
34.5 . As far as the few examples with sufficient context can determine, words in the -gov suffixes were almost, though not quite, exclusively a diminutive category, i. e. referring to small size,
 'a little tree or tree-like plant.' Theophr. H. P. 4. 7. 3, prikr, ठ̀̀



 beast.' Damocrates ap. Gal. vol. 14 p. 91 ed. Kühn, K $\alpha \grave{\iota}$ - ̃ัv $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \pi-$
 piece of wood.' A conjecture for ка入ípoov (§ 368) in Hes., кх入ij-


 ' a little ointment,' referring to quantity (§ 202), combined with




















 हैv
386. Other uses than the prevailing diminutive use are excoedingly rare. छroćs, $\iota$ (Aet. 6. 92 ; Paul. Aeg. 7. 13), 'a desiccatire
powder for wounds,' which followed Dexucov: Oexuos, has been mentioned above (§ 379). As an instrument suffix -apov appears in one word, viz. छ̌v@ćчя ov 'razor' = छupóv. . Cf. Schol. Ar. Ach. 849,

 is probably due to the fact that छu入dopov, which is so much like छ$\langle\lambda$ ríqov, could designate a small wooden instrument, whence छupdipiov by congeneric attraction. Of semantic syncretism with other -tov suffixes there is very slight evidence. Deteriorative meaning is only found in combination with the diminutive (cf. $\mu$ podóorov and oxevựovov § 385). There is one passage, however, in which $\delta \varepsilon v \delta \varrho \dot{v} \varphi t o v$ is used hypocoristically as 'beautiful tree,' namely Marc. Ant. 4. 20, for which see § 354. Perhaps x $\omega \lambda$ v́qıov : $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \omega \lambda \tilde{\eta}$, 'ham,' also belongs here, in as much as it may have meant 'delicious ham.' Cf. Phryn.

387. The precise meaning of the following words in -q.ov can not be determined because of lack of proper context: ágrvé́qıov: áp pupos

 1. c. vióqıov : viós 'son,' Gloss., Hipp. De Aere p. 179. 由ì้ чıи : ̣̂óv 'egg,' Theogn. Can. 127. 2.
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roppíov ．．．．．．． 11
xópolov ．．．．．101，103， 105
Kopupфбí ．．．．．． 274
Kopuéáбוov ．．．．．． 274
＊xopúqlov ．．．．．． 278
xобки入их́тьк ．．．．． 124
noouáplov ．．．．． 260,263
xóбulov ．．．．．．117， 119
nootáplov ．．．．． 263
notт $\alpha$ ßlov ．．．．． 43 f ．
xoтu入íoxiov ．．．163，206． 252 f．
коти入íбко६ ．．．．．． 252
xоupá $\lambda$ וov，see ropá $\lambda \lambda ו$ ．
roupeĩov
9， 40
noupídiov ．．．．．．． 230
xoupídios ．．．．．． 221
roү入ıáplov ．．．．．． 265
xроц乃ві̃०ン ．．．．．． 68
xрац乃istov ．．．．．． 238

| xpxufiov | 68， 189 |
| :---: | :---: |
| xpavidiov | 218， 229 |
| xpaviov | 52， 63 |
| xparáviov | 94 |
| xpatrpíiov | 218， 234 |
| xpatriprov | 47 |
| xpéxósov | 213，225，231， 238 |
| хрвхх́бıх | 209， 242 ff ． |
| xpsíjitoov | 258 |
| xprivn | 222 |
| xprividiov | 233 |
| xprivis | 222 |
| xpítov | 218， 233 |
| xpevíior | 227，231， 235 |
| xpLxé入入lov | 255 |
| xpixe入入入os | 2 วัอ |
| xpoxodsíhlov | 188 |
| хрохн－ídov | 216， 228 |
| xpoxćtlov | 95 |
| Kpóvia，$\tau \alpha$ | 43 |
|  | 43 |
| x¢uб立入入12ov | 190 |
|  | 255 |
| $x$ ¢́viov | 12，83，104， 112 |
| $x$－ñeíoiov | 218， 231 |
| xućorov | 91 |
| xuáveos | 75 |
| xußéncov | 189 |
| xj́prov | 69 |
| xúx入los | 73 |
| кux入íruov | ． 251 ff． |
| кuх入íonos | 251 |
|  | 37 |
| Kuк入ढ́лtov | 115， 174 f．， 179 |
| xunixiov | 83，89，121，147， 169 |
| xunioniov | 251， 253 |
| кu入iбиos ． | 251 |
| xuniyvov | 81 |
|  | －． 109 |
| xupiidiov | 215，221， 234 |
| xupiov | 7，12，88，91，129， 182 |
| zuvápoov． | ．．211，263， 266 |
| xuvr ${ }^{\text {cosocov }}$ | 16 ff．，22， 273 |
| xuriprov | ．．17， 22 |
| nuvidiov | 211， 226 f．， 231 ff ． |
| xuvoxeqú入入ov | 187 |
| xuл＜ıpionos ． | 202 |
| кuт椬ínos | 202 |


$\lambda \alpha \beta \rho \alpha ́ x<о v$ ..... 142
$\lambda \alpha \beta$ óviov ..... 94
$\lambda \alpha \beta$ рǿvios ..... 124
$\lambda \alpha \dot{\gamma}$ ю०v $10,108,135,142$
$\lambda \alpha$ yúvov ..... 209
入aүळ́sıov ..... 214， 287
$\lambda \alpha \lambda$ ло́s ..... 13
 ..... 175
$\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha \dot{\delta}$ เov ..... 48，112， 243 f．
$\lambda \alpha 0 x i \delta i o v$ ..... 216， 240
入єアทтápıov ..... 260
入єアท́tiov 89，92， 163
$\lambda$ лєuávıov ..... 187
$\lambda$ रíplov ..... 29
入єьттpiov ..... 48
＾suч́úpiov ..... 247
入exavíiov ..... 228
入sxáviov ..... 83， 89,92
入єx＜́pıov ..... 268
入．sxioxiov ..... 251， 253
$\lambda$ вкíтоя ..... 251
入єu．ßर́diov ..... 944 f．
$\lambda \varepsilon \xi(\varepsilon)$ ） $8 เ \circ \mathrm{v}$ ..... 218， 239
$\lambda \varepsilon \xi \dot{\jmath} \delta \rho 10 \vee$ ..... 248
入．$\frac{\text { ovtáplov }}{}$ ..... 265
\ebvilov ..... 182 f．
入．$\varepsilon \pi i \delta 1 \circ \mathrm{v}$ ..... 190
$\lambda \varepsilon \pi$－iov ..... 158， 161
$\lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau b \%$ 159 ff．，168，179， 237

| $\lambda e \pi$ úprov | 121，145，158， 166 | $\mu \dot{\alpha}$ ¢lov ．．．．．．84， |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\lambda \eta \delta \alpha$ ¢́pov | 269 | uxivn ．．．．．．． 222 |
| $\lambda$ ńdiov | 9，12， 95 | ucividiov ．．．142，206， 238 |
| 入nxúorov | 125，131，147， 169 | Maivis ．．．．．．． 222 |
| 入nuiov | 152 |  |
| $\lambda$ 入 $\beta$ 人́dıov | 72， 243 | $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \alpha_{1} \alpha$ ，چへे ．．．． 29,81 |
| $\lambda$ i 3 vvíiov | 226 |  |
| $\lambda \hat{*} \alpha \xi$ | 205 | $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha x^{\prime}(\omega)$ |
| $\lambda$ 入oxpiotov | 205，223， 236 | Mapuд́piov ．．．．．． 270 |
| $\lambda$ dớpov | 268 | uavróx＜ov ．．．．．207， 250 |
| $\lambda$ 入oristov | 235 | $\mu \alpha p \gamma \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda$ וov ．．．．． 256 |
| $\lambda$ iouov | ．．． 11 | Mapuáplov ．．．．．． 72 |
| $\lambda$ 人iolos | 64 | uxprúplov ．．． $17,23,40 \mathrm{f}$ ． |
| $\lambda$ ¢ucvíoniov | 52 f | uxyalpíitov ．．．．．218， 228 |
| 入ıиегі́окоs | 52 | u．$\chi$ 人iplov 48 f．，100，112，148， 162 |
| 入upviov | 145 | Medísplov ．．．．．． 247 |
| 入eváprov | 263 | $\mu \varepsilon і \lambda i \chi$ ¢оऽ ．．．．． 28 f． |
| $\lambda$ 入отย́трıov | ．．． 38 |  |
| $\lambda . \pi 0 \tau \alpha \xi$ \％ou $\gamma p \alpha$ | 20 | 257 |
| 入opapífiov | 223 |  |
| 入oráplov． | 211， 266 | $\mu$ ¢єрххібкоร ．．．．． 252 |
|  | 9， 40 | $\mu \varepsilon ⿺ 辶 ⿻ 丷 木)$ |
| 入oyidov | 222，231， 236 f ． | ＊$\mu$ ¢¢ра́ки入入入о૬ ．．．．． 257 |
| 入ójov | 2， 16 f．，22， 211 | $\mu \varepsilon)^{1} \rho \alpha^{\xi}$ ．．．．102，110， 249 |
| 入orúdiov | 48 | $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \alpha ́ v$ Orov ．．．．．． 189 |
| 入orxáplov | －． 266 | $\mu \mathrm{k}$ ífriov ．．．．205， 252 ff ． |
| $\lambda$ 入óxiov | 106 ff |  |
|  | 275 |  |
| 入orßeiov |  | $\mu \varepsilon \lambda i \tau \tau ו \circ ้$ ．．．51，62，175， 179 |
| 入otסopnućctov | 51 f | $\mu$ uौéśpiov |
| 入omádiov | 84，88，92， 243 | $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \alpha<y \mu$ оv |
| イomádiov | 177， 183 |  |
| $\lambda$ doutnpísiov | 218， 228 | $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \vee \tau$ éplov |
| 入outńpiov | 47 | $\mu$ кбiठios |
| 入oútpiov． | 44， 46 | $\mu . \varepsilon \sigma о \gamma$ 人váciov |
| 入uryoúpiov | ．．．． 97 | $\mu \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ ¢оүóviov |
| 入urniov | ．．．． 104 |  |
| 入úxiov | 190 | $\mu$ кгожvи́puov |
| 入úplov | 97， 108 | $\mu$ ¢б大oxúviov |
| $\lambda$ 入обućyıov | 87 | $\mu \cdot \varepsilon \sigma 0 \mu \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ lov ．．．．．． 37 f |
| 入úбtos | 273 | $\mu$ ¢ |
| $\lambda u \chi \vee$ ขiov |  | $\mu \varepsilon \sigma о \mu и ̆ р ı \alpha$ |
| $\lambda u \chi v i \delta$ \％ov | 216 f．， 225 | $\mu \varepsilon \sigma о \mu \varphi \alpha \lambda \lambda$ ıov |
| nuyviov | 12， 49 | $\mu \varepsilon \sigma о \pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} p<\alpha$ |
| $\lambda$ 入uvirápıov | 262 | $\mu$ кєбол |
| $\lambda \omega \mu$ átiov | 60 | $\mu \varepsilon \sigma о \pi$ ¢́रıov |
| $\lambda \omega$ т兀оv | 95 | ¢eбomúprov ．．．．． 38 |
|  |  | $\mu$ ecoúplov |



| rvorov ．．．．．． 189 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Eviov ．．．．．．． 45 | $\delta \pi \lambda \alpha \rho^{\text {p }}$ |
| छ̇zvódpor ．．．204，211， 247 | 3－ |
|  | ǒprco |
| छnpớ¢iov ．．．．．277， 279 | 8piov |
| Eniouv ．．．．．．． 191 | opxiov |
| Ě¢̣ītov ．．．．222，226， 23 | брхөибогт |
| Eupiov ．．．．．103， 187 f | opviópor |
| óviov ．．．．．．． 14 | Bpviorov 9 f． |
| $\lambda$ ápoov |  |
| 入áorov | prov |
| inpor | opvípoov |
| níciov | bóbiov |
| ípio | ठрроти́y |
| Eunsoun | bptúyov |
| póçov ．．．．．．210， | opjurov |
| 年 | bpy（e） |
|  |  |
| ， | бббтро⿱ |
| xuov ．．．．．．．2， 49 |  |
| ото́po | ठбтрх́xcov ．．．．66，70，72 |
| cov | ōбupódıov |
| oídov ．．．．．．． 236 | －uóórov ．．．．．．214， 233 |
| prov | ¢pódı $\alpha$ ，$\tau \alpha \times$ |
| гix，$\tau \dot{\alpha}$ | oujpávios |
|  | ouciitov |
| nuর்̇tov ．．．116，121， 148 | ọcioiov |
| 万ेov ．114，217，231，234， 23 | jop－ajuídov ．．178，181 |
| 11， 28 | beíroov |
| ¢́pıov 204，206， 260 f．， 266 | oupósiov |
| 0yoiotov | 3¢apiôov |
| $\lambda \lambda \lambda .05$ | ápoov |
| avrapyio | ठutrapiou sixn |
| 2xiov |  |
|  |  |
| 少这tov ．．．143，178， 18 | ， |
| ．0пх́грюоร | iproov |
| （xiov | $\pi \times 1 \delta$ ¢́ne |
| oov ．．．．．．267， 26 | ıర́áprov ．114，260， 266 ff ．， 276 |
| ठiov ．．．．．．． 23 | uбхро́入入ıov ．．．．． 257 |
| （3ycov ．．．．．9，107， 14 | aiov |
| tov ．．．．．．． 22 | 128 |
| áplov | 164 ff．，171， 173 |
| 人ß́＇írov ．．．．．． 22 | 203 f．， 207 |
| omintiov ．．．．．． 45 ， | \％òr $\times$ ápiov |
|  | xĭ¢ ．．112， 134 f．，140，204， 207 |
|  | ג＜́Orov ．．．．172， 181 |
| oooupáviov ．．．． 3 |  |


|  | － | тepıau\％éviov ． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 172 |  |
| $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \delta \iota o v$ | 102， 108 |  |
| $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \times \dot{\prime}$ | 222 | тврьхх́ртьо้ ．．．．．33，ธั |
| $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha x^{\text {i }}$ ¢ | 232 | терьхоцих́тіо⿱ ．．．．1ธ9， 172 |
| $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha \prime \iota o v}$ | 111 | $\pi \varepsilon p ı$ ótiov ．．．．． 32 |
| $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi^{\prime}$ | － 222 | терирроvтท́prov ．．．．45， 47 |
| $\pi \alpha \pi \pi i$ iov | 216， 239 | терוбке入íiov ．．．．． 97 |
| $\pi \alpha p a \gamma v a 0$ ísiov | ．．． 224 | тєpıбте́piov ．．． 106 f．，143， 176 |
| $\pi \alpha p \alpha \gamma(\bar{\jmath} \gamma$ ¢ov | 44 | терrб¢úplov ．．．．． $31 \mathrm{f} ., 33$ |
| $\pi<p \alpha \zeta$（1）víiov | 224 | тeproúplos |
| $\pi \alpha p \alpha 0 \alpha \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma i \delta i o s$ | S ．．． 220 |  |
| таралоupríiov | ．．．．． 95 | $\pi \mathrm{p}$ кíiov |
| тороцирitiov | 224 |  |
| тарацúviov | 2，17，19，24， 32 |  |
| $\pi \alpha р \alpha \pi \lambda \varepsilon u p i \delta i o v ~$ | ．．． 224 | $\pi \mathrm{rr}$ ¢́diov ．．．．215̃， 234 |
| $\pi \alpha p \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \delta$ ¢ov | 148， 165 |  |
| тарабө̣̂viov | 33 | тrviov ．．．．．．11， 53 |
| тарঠ＜́入 | 82 | тnpiótov ．．．．．．229， 232 |
| ти́pరıov | t | тıeatńplor ．．．．． 47 |
| тарDisvex＇́n | 84 | тedóxviov ．．．．．87， 92 |
|  | ．．． 84 | $\lambda \alpha$ dıov |
| тaporéviov | ．．．． 190 | тı入ísiov ．．163，216，227，232， 237 |
| таpȮ́vios | 73， 75 | тı入iov ．．．．65，68，71， 127 |
| $\pi \alpha р о \pi \lambda$ ¢8ıov | ．．．． 224 | vaxíiov ．．218，221，227， 234 |
| $\pi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \alpha^{\text {coiov }}$ | ．．．． 150 | nov $67,128,168,205,207,249$ |
| $\pi \alpha \sigma \tau о \varphi$ ¢́plov | f． | тuvaxioniov ．．．．．252，254 |
| aráviov | ．．．． 92 | тıvaxiбnos |
| тe入入iov | 92， 255 | $\pi \iota \sigma \cup ́ \gamma \gamma \mathrm{ov}$ ．．．．． 40 f．， 277 |
| $\pi \alpha \tau \varepsilon$ ptov | 115， 174 f．， 179 | тróplov |
| тотрíiov | 208，222， 239 | тurธáxiov ．．．205， |
| $\pi \alpha$ триоя | 74， 208 | 14 |
| $\pi \alpha u p i ́ \delta i o s$ | 21 | $\pi \lambda \alpha$ iobv ．．．．．．17， 24 |
| $\pi \alpha \chi \cup \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ | ．．．． 13 | 10 |
| ふı́áo | 274 | $\pi \lambda \alpha$ xouv $\alpha \dot{\alpha}$ pov |
| iov | 12，14，99， 113 |  |
| dov |  | $\pi \lambda$ aroúvalov ．．． 149 |
| $\pi$ ¢く̧óv | 6， 203 | $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha \tau i o v$ |
| $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \chi u ́ \delta$ ¢ov | 214， 226 | － |
| $\pi \varepsilon \lambda เ$ ¢́s |  | $\pi$ тsupiov |
| $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \tau \alpha$ plov | 7 f | $\pi \lambda$ ńoplov（－тplov） |
| $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \tau$ ¢ítov | 23 | Пגпuúplov |
| $\pi \varepsilon \mu \mu \alpha$ тוоv | 84 | т入，notos |
| $\pi \varepsilon ์ \mu \pi \varepsilon \lambda 0 ¢$ | 256 | $\lambda$ evoíov．84， 99 f．， 108 |
| теvOnuutódiov | ．．．．．35 | $\pi$ riouxpov |
| тeveóช̧ılov． |  | ¢́xt |
| $\pi \varepsilon$ ¢ $\lambda$ 入ov | 90 | Tveupútiov |
| epoixiov | 148， 190 | cupóvior ．．．．14． 1 |


| $\pi 0 \delta \alpha$ pıov | 269 | троотทriotov ．．．．． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi$ ¢́ठıov | 11，144， 202 | тробютíiov ．．．．．． 225 |
|  | 151 f ． | тробढ́тוо⿱ ．．．．．． 190 |
| тoypavóplav | 51 | $\pi \rho \circ \chi \varepsilon \iota \lambda$ ¢itov ．．．．．． 224 |
| тófuriov． | 9， 51 | троүoísov，－oudiov ．．．213， 228 |
| $\pi 0 \lambda \varepsilon \mu$ ¢́viov | 189 | Прußvóбоov ．．．．．． 274 |
| Пo入ećatov | 274 |  |
| $\pi 0 \lambda$ ¢́stov | 218， 234 |  |
| $\pi$ ¢＇入ıov | 189 | $\pi \tau \varepsilon$ ¢́j์ட०้ 9，73， 100 ff．，105 f．，109， 111 |
| толıб这тしо้ | 134， 137 | $\pi \tau$ ¢́pu¢ ．．．．．．． 103 |
| то入ixvov | 114，145， 162 | $\pi \tau$ utisov ．．．．．．． 228 |
| то入 $\tau \alpha$ рíiov | 208，223， 225 | $\pi$ тuxtiov ．．．．．． 29,67 |
| то入то́ptov | 208， 263 | $\pi \tau u y i o v ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ 11 f . ~$ |
| то入údpıov | 248 | Tućviov ．．．．．．69， 71 |
| то入uTódiov | $61,142,170,188$ | Tứvos ．．．．．．． 64 |
| тоиnpía | 128 | $\pi \cup \gamma i ́\langle$ c $\alpha, \tau \grave{\alpha}$ ．．．．． 226 |
| тounpós | 130 | тuxtiov ．．．．．．． 67 |
| торvíiov | ．215，217， 232 | $\pi \cup \xi 6$ iov ．．．211，218，221， 227 |
| тороúprov | 61， 170 | $\pi \cup \xi$ iov ．．．．．．．2， 67 |
| тócorov | 178 | тupribiov ．．．．．． 232 |
| Побをьס¢́vเov | 42 | тuprioniov ．．．．． 252,254 |
| тота́usо้ ． | 145 | тирүínos ．．．．．． 252 |
| $\pi о$ ти́p | 45 | тupsiov ．．．．．．． 12 |
| тotnpídiov | 216， 228 | Tupéttov ．．．．． 151 f．， 161 |
| тоти́puov | 45，47，49， 190 | Tupクvíiov ．．．．．． 230 |
|  | 115， 162 | Tupŕviov ．．．．． 100 f．， 107 |
| трх́бтоv | 189 |  |
| Прьаци $\lambda \lambda$ и́брьо | 47 | тupiov ．．．．．．12， 150 |
| Прıquú入入ıov | 258 | $\pi \omega \lambda$ ápıov ．．．．．． 267 |
| трıvítov． | 233 | $\pi \omega \lambda$ iov ． 53,153 f．，157，166， 193 |
| трох́бтtov | 31 f ． | $\pi \widetilde{\omega}$ ，o¢ ．．．．．．62， 194 |
| трохú入vov | 33 | $\pi \omega \mu \dot{\alpha}$ ¢оv ．．．．．． 261 |
| троßáttov | 125，142，156， 166 |  |
| троßб́入lov | 87， 90 | ¢́apiiov ．．．．101，105， 14 ¢ |
| троßоu入єบцх́тtov | 123， 125 | ¢¢́xしov ．9，12，95，129，163， 169 |
| трохо́八刀ıо้ | 33 | ¢́ххо૬ ．．．．．． 95 |
| трохо́и．гоv | 31， 33 |  |
| троха́ияо⿱ | 33 | popóviov． |
| $\pi \rho о \mu \varepsilon \tau \omega \pi i \delta i o v$ | 224 | र́ยu＾átiov ．．．．．． 146 |
| троขต́тıа |  | ¢̂пux́tiov 9，115，122，125，162， 173 |
| троขต́тıоs | 33 | ṕnuxtínıov ．．．．205， 252 f ． |
| трооíurov | ．．．． 31 |  |
|  | 46 | ¢́noídov ．．．．．．218， 231 |
| тробеuy ${ }^{\text {人jorov }}$ | ．． 243 f ． | Şt¢áplov ．．．．．．． 263 |
|  | 211， 241 ff ． | ¢¢i¢lov ．．．．．．83， 145 |
| тробкв¢¢́入入Lov | 211 | ṕtvóprov ．．．．．．． 262 |
| тробтврvídıv | 221， 224 | ¢́tvía ．．．．．．．． 52 |
| $\pi р о \sigma \tau \varepsilon р v i \delta i o s$ | ．．． 220 f ． | ¢िvornátrov ．．．．．． 49 |


топпuх́тtov ．．．．．． 151 f．
тоцuavóplav ．．．．．． 51
то́́fviov ．．．．．．．9，51
$\pi о \lambda \varepsilon \mu \operatorname{cóv}_{\text {Lov ．．．．．．}} 189$
По入七ф́б七ov ．．．．．． 274
толiठiov ．．．．．．218， 234
$\pi \delta \lambda$ lov ．．．．．．． 189
$\pi о \lambda \iota \sigma \mu \dot{\alpha}$ тוо้ ．．．．134， 137
$\pi 0 \lambda l$ fиレov ．．．114，145， 162
$\pi 0 \lambda \tau \propto \mathrm{p}$ ©́tov ．．．208，223， 225
то入兀גpLov ．．．．．208， 263
то入úठpเov ．．．．．． 248
то入uпóסıov ．．61，142，170， 188
тоиррía ．．．．．．． 128
тоипро́s ．．．．．．． 130
тopvidiov ．．．．215，217， 232
тор甲úpıov ．．．．．61， 170
то́テण゙ロン ．．．．．．． 178
Побєıठळ́viov ．．．．．． 42
$\pi о \tau \alpha ́ \mu \iota \circ$ ．．．．．．． 145
тотทp ．．．．．．． 45
тотпрítov ．．．．．216， 228
тотท́plov ．．．．45，47，49， 190

pactov ．．．．．． 189
Прเхuט́入入ıov ．．．．． 258
$\pi$ р七vítov ．．．．．．． 233
троג́бтLOV ．．．．．． 31 f ．
трохút．ov
$125,142,156,166$
87， 90
троßои入вuна́тіо้ ．．．123， 125
трохо́خлเо้ ．．．．．． 33
троко́рио⿱ ．．．．．31， 33
трокตцо⿱ ．．．．．． 33
троцвтнтiotov ．．．．． 224
троขют兀к ．．．．．． 33
троレヒ́т兀оऽ ．．．．．． 33
троо́furov ．．．．．． 31
тробаүஸ́үьо⿱ ．．．．． 46

тробквழ̣ $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ iov ．．211， 241 ff．
тробиеро́ $\lambda \alpha$ коv
тробтєрvídov
тробтерví̊ıos
220 f ．

трогтท⿱⺈⿸⿻口丿乚丶iotov ．．．．． 224
троб由тiठiov ．．．．．． 225
тробढ́тьov ．．．．．． 190
$\pi р о \chi s i \lambda 1810 \mathrm{~V}$ ．．．．． 224
троyoíiov，－ouסiov ．．．213， 228

$\pi р \cup \mu \nu \dot{\jmath} \sigma \iota \alpha$ ，$\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ．．． $10,53,273$

$\pi \tau \varepsilon$ ри́ $\mathfrak{\text { Lov }} 9,73,100$ ff．， 105 f．，109， 111
$\pi \tau$ épu̧̧ ．．．．．．． 103
$\pi \tau u t$ 万uv ．．．．．．． 228
т兀uxtiov ．．．．．．29， 67
riuyion ．．．．．．． 11 f ．
TuávLov ．．．．．．69， 71
тuávlos ．．．．．．． 64
$\pi \cup \gamma i ́ \delta t \alpha, \tau \grave{\alpha}$ ．．．．．． 226
тuxtiov ．．．．．．． 67
$\pi \cup \xi$ द̌itiov ．．．211，218，221， 227

тupүítiov ．．．．．． 232
．．．．．．．252， 254
тupeiov ．．．．．．． 12
тupéttov ．．．．． 151 f．， 161
тupクiviocov ．．．．．． 230
Tupríviov ．．．．． 100 f．， 107
тuptota ．．．．．．160， 237
$\pi \omega \lambda \alpha ́ p r o v ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ 267 ~$
$\pi \omega \lambda$ iov ．53， 153 f．，157，166， 193
$\pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda .0$ ．．．．．．62， 194
$\pi \omega \mu \alpha ́ p l o v ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ 261 ~$

р́વ́xしつv ． $9,12,95,129,163,169$
ṕ́xоऽ ．．．．．．． 95
papavídiov ．．．．．． 145
focóviov ．．：．．．． 9 f．

p̂núátเov 9，115，122，125，162， 173


ṕnaídiov ．．．．．．218， 231
ṕţáplov ．．．．．．． 263
fi¢iov ．．．．．．83， 145
peváplov ．．．．．．． 262
欠́lvía ．．．．．．．． 52
ṕvooráolov ．．．．．． 49

| pevo topíveov ṕosídiov póorov potix́puov poísor <br>  poúsiov furyiov ṕústov p＇jóves putoptániov |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sigma \alpha \times \alpha ́ \delta \iota \%$ |  | ona¢̣írov ．．．．． 234 |
| б人xé | －$\cdot$ ． 2555 f． | oxaciov ．．．．．12，93 |
| $\sigma \chi(x)$ xiov | 8，98，134， 137 | onxبís ．．．．．．． 222 |
| охuд́xiov | 107，207， 250 | биะ入и́ర́ptov ：．．．．． 247 f． |
| $\sigma \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \lambda$ íкоу | 202 | бx\＆ux́plov ．．．263，266， 269 |
|  | ．．．．． 63 | бuevóprov ．．．．． 278 ff |
| баvס这ıov | 255 |  |
|  | 55 | ounvíiov ．．．．． 232 |
| oxvídiov | 67， 168 | onnvoppáciov |
| oavváxiov | 250 | oxnvúdpiov |
| ox́potov | 8，63， 75 | oxráxiviov |
| oxpióviov | 70 | oundioun |
| oxprísiov | 35 | бuцло́ठiov ．．．．．148， 158 |
| oxpxiov | $100,105,149$ f．， 172 | бuıvठ́́pıov ．．．．．． 269 |
| $\sigma \alpha{ }^{\text {oxp }}$ | ．．．．． 149 | бxupa¢̧iov，－ג́¢̧ov ．．．． 277 |
| 「avupíiov | ．．．．． 240 | oxi¢údipıov ．．．202，210， 247 |
| $\sigma \alpha$－＇plov | 104， 188 | oxóncov |
| бeıpádiov | 4 f | oxoliós |
| $\sigma \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ |  | бRo入．omévסplov |
|  | －．．． 265 | oxo入úOpiov |
| бe入njúov | 63， 190 | биб́тє入о¢ |
| бe入入入plov | ．．．．． 263 | oxópঠiov． |
| on¢ $\alpha^{\prime}$ ठ | 243， 245 | oxopódioy |
| onuxv－ñplov | 45， 47 | oxoptidur ．．．．218， 230 |
| or，itióprov | 262， 269 | бxoptio |
| oraíioov | 217，226，232， 238 | бxupahtoniov |
| ońriov | 52， 63 | Exu0íio |
|  | 233 | бxu入＜́xiov ．．125，155，157， 249 |
| otarovid，$\tau \alpha$ |  |  |
| бтүı入入д́pıov | 61 | oxúlcov |
| otoriptov | 65， 198 | loov |
| oidov | 52，61， 63 | бxupriov |
| ธ๘ชúdıov | 214， 238 | бxutáhtov ．．．48， 199. |
| ธuxućvia |  | oxutapuov |
| Gi | 186， 190 | Gxúpiov，－iov ．7，77，83，91，93 |
|  |  | Gxoņrixiov ．．．．82，144 |



бкшuцд́тtov ．．．．．151， 164
бuı入д́pıov ．．．．．． 263
quivúdiov ．．．．．214， 226
ouúpriov ．．．．．．． 190
テoudáplov ．．．．．． 261
боং！$\mu \dot{\alpha} \tau$ ．．．．．．123， 125
блádıov ．．．．．．16， 25
$\sigma \pi \alpha$ نे $\alpha \lambda$ Iov ．．．．．． 10

бォ＜právLOV ．．．．．． 190
õaptíov ．．．．130，161， 190
omsipiov ．．．．．．． 68
блериव́тіоン ．．．154，158， 166
（1）入रotov ．．．．． 241 f．， 245
oxivonpaxiov ．．．．． 250
बTiviठtov ．．．．．． 238
ojiviov ．．．．．．． 143
от $\alpha<\gamma \chi \vee i \delta<\alpha$ ．．．．． 239
б枋vioy ．．．．．． 68

ão |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| aptov ．．．．．． |
| 260 |

бтo $\begin{array}{r}\text { riov ．．．．．．113，} \\ 163\end{array}$


õupídiov ．．．．．． 163
araolov ${ }^{\circ}$ ． 25
бтаúuiov ．．．．．．ธั3
бт $\lambda \lambda \gamma \mu \mu \circ$ ．．．．．10， 107
otapvaplov ．．．．．． 268
oгapviov ．．．．．．2，87， 93
exicov


бтe甲áviov ．．．．．108， 126
бтepavíruos ．．．．．． 202
atruiov ．．．．．．．． 9
otnoúviov ．．．204，207， 259
oтn入íitov ．．．．．． 235
otnuóviov ．．．．．． 53
бтlyáplov ．．．．．． 264
бचヶíiov ．．．．．．． 236 f．
．．．． 148
－otol $\alpha$ ，$\tau$ ．．．．．． 226
大тo八vov ．．．．．．． 11
бтópuov ．10，50，53，100，103， 113
otpopincov ．．．．．． 107
बтpoubóplov ．．．．． 270
oтpoutiov ．．61，82， 142 f．， 190

бтро́plov ．．．．．． 97
бгupáxiov ．．．108，134， 137
бтиழ̣ג́plos ．．．．．． 261
бт $\omega t \delta 10 \vee$ ．．．．．．． 226
テuáxiov ．．．．．．． 249
তußõtov ．．．．．9，51， 273
биүүрацц．⿱㇒木тіоv ．．．．122， 152
бutíisov ．．．．．．229， 232
бuxáplov ．．．．．．． 270
бuríiotov ．．．．．．． 233
ouxiov ．．．．．．． 68
бบムार́大tov ．．10， 16 ff．，25， 273

бuvédpiov ．．．． 16 ff．，25， 32
ouplryíiov ．．．．．． 234
oupiryrov ．．．．．． 113
oupuadoov ．．．．．243， 245
बuб大ítiov ．．．．． 16 ff．， 25

oupópßiov ．．．．．． 51

opaүlos ．．．．．．15， 31
apxipiov ．．．．111，113， 149
oprxiov ．．． 13 f．，51，63， 198


а甲paүiઠiov ．．．．97，122， 131
ạupíov ．．．．12，48，148， 165
б\％ทuவ́tiov ．．．．．． 84
$\sigma$ \％ivos ．．．．．．． 188
бyouviov • • ．2，8，11， 64 f．， 69
бyonuoplov ．．．．．248， 257
－ 1 xpatiotov ．．．．． 240
бөu๙́тし०v $54,120,122,128,144,149$ 208， 249

〒 $\alpha$ vídiov
218， 229
cancoplov ．．．．．98， 260 f ．
таutiotov ．．．．．218， 225
$\tau \alpha \xi \varepsilon i ́ \delta \iota \circ$ ．．．．． 218,229
テали́चוоv ．．．．．160， 178
тарíy七ov ．．．．122，149， 172
гар๒отш入вiov ．．．．． 40

Tetyiov ．．．2，9，11，109， 200
Teiyion73

тexuñiov ．．．．．．17， 26


трı甲व́бто૬ ．．．．．． 273
тр⿺𠃊̣́̃え入ıov ．．．．．． 34
тр！xítov ．．．．．．． 125 f．
тpíylov ．．．．．．． 161
тръєиц́тіоン ．．．．． 160
$\tau \rho เ \omega \beta_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{i} \alpha$ ．．．．． 35
трเตßодเаїоร ．．．．． 36
три́́ptov ．．．．．．． 34
трочо́入ıо⿱ ．．．．．9，172
трохí́ruov ．．．．．252， 254
троуíбкоя ．．．．．． 252
трúßhiov ．．．．．．．12， 94
тpuरóviov ．．．．．． 190
трűáviov ．．．．．．．．． 49
трибímт兀ov ．．．．．． 38
тpuyíor ．．．．．．． 68
$\tau \rho \omega \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda$ lov ．．． 16 f．，26， 131
тршүスúdiplov ．．．．． 248
тuphiov ．．．．．．． 11
TuTidiov ．．．．．．211， 234
rutiov ．．．．．．146， 211
tupíor ．．．．．．． 150
tuppíítov ．．．．．． 235 5
тuyવ́diov ．．．． 241 f．， 244 f．
£́ $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ चiov ．．．．．．146， 150
űठiov ．．．．．．．． 232

Úpíiov ．．．．．．218， 228
Úع́tlos ．．．．．．． 71
víạ́̂ov ．．．．．．277， 280
vidiov ．．．．．．． 232
Sneғtи́ptov ．．．．．． 47
ธлíтрเоv，－троv ．．．． 413
Épéveoy ．．．．．．． 144
£́cópßıV ．．．．．． 51

Ũะеро́piov ．．．．．． 83


Únoそúplov ．．．．．． 83
ड́toxprinpiotov ．．．．225
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The mistake of the Greek grammarians as well as of some moderns lay in considering the two as really and necessarily identical. This does not hinder us from admitting that the same suffix could have sometimes served both purposes or that diminutives could develop from 'Koseformen' and vice versa. Cf. Brugmann, K. Vgl. Gr. 339; Wrede, Die Dim. im Deutschen $\S 87 \mathrm{ff}$. (= Dialektgeographie p. 132 ff .).

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Deutsche Littzt., 1906 col. 1692.
    ${ }^{2}$ Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 676.
    ${ }^{3}$ Kluge, Nom. Stammbild ${ }^{2} .33$ n. 2.

    - Schwabe, op. cit. 51.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Delbrück, Gr. 5. 130 ff., Brugmann, Gr. Gr³. 414, K. Vgl. Gr. 691 f.
    ${ }^{2}$ Delbrück objects to the term substantivation in this case because the substantive remains in the subconsciousness of the speaker and the adjective remains an adjective as before. Thus when the Greek said $\dot{\eta} \delta \varepsilon \xi \iota \alpha$, 'the right (hand),' he always understood $\chi \varepsilon i \rho$ with it. I have nevertheless sometimes used the objectionable term, and not merely on account of its convenience, but because for certain classes of frequently used words it can be maintained that the consciousness of the word understood is entirely lost, even though the very same idea may have been now incorporated in the original adjective. This is particularly easy when ellipsis has affected a

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf．Brugmann，l．c．

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ It really should be observed, however, that not all of the words quoted are diminutives in meaning, so e. g. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \delta \iota o \nu$.

[^5]:    
    

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ If, as seems probable, líyoov is formed from hó $\gamma o s$, the latter must at one time have designated the action of speaking as well as the spoken word, whence an adjective $\lambda$ iólos, 'speaking,' and the use of neuter hóyıov as an action noun. The development of the meaning 'oracle' or 'short saying' from the general idea 'speaking' is exactly paralleled by the German 'Spruch ' and the English 'saying,' and it is therefore unnecessary to assume with Thayer, Lex. N. T. s. v., that hógov was a diminutive of hóyos with the original idea 'short saying,' and then 'oracle' because these were generally short. The latter view is particularly hazardous when we consider that in the numerous passages in which it occurs there is not one indication that it was felt as a diminutive, no accompanying adjective denoting small size, no indication of any emotional content of the word. It occurs, moreover, already in Herodotus, and that it should have lost its diminutive force so early, at a time from which we have no other example extant of a diminutive of an abstract word, is not conductive to the probability of the theory.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Passow, Lex. s. v.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ For reason for placing these examples on the border line see note to $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \iota o \nu$ ．
    ${ }^{2}$ Perhaps concrete from the beginning．Cf．t⿳亠口冋丸灬 ${ }^{2} \nu \iota c$, § 34 C ．

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 1². 626.
    ${ }^{2}$ id. ib. 641.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ In Attic dacuóvıov was applied only to inferior divinities, cf. Plato Symp.
     development is due to the influence of the diminutives in -cov; dacuóvoov: $\delta \alpha i \mu \omega \nu=\pi \alpha \iota \delta i o \nu: \pi \alpha i \check{\varphi} . \quad$ Cf. § 222.
    ${ }^{2}$ The accent of $\sigma \kappa \dot{o} \not \iota o \nu$ on the propenultima instead of ultima must be later than its substantivation, and is due to the analogy of other substantives (§ 20 ff .).

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ For terms esocentric and exocentric cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 71 ff .

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Since there is no trace of the idea＇leaning＇or＇sloping＇in the use of the adjective $\pi \rho o \nu \dot{\prime \prime} \tau \mathbf{o}$ ，it seems better to divorce it and the substantive
    
     The $-\nu$－can be explained as brought in from the congeneric i $\nu$－winnos and
     citation of Eustath．82．35，312．14，is，of course，unquestionably wrong．
    ${ }^{2}$ The late adjective intornoos＇with black eye＇（Poll．8．79）is a retrograde derivative from inuintov；for its meaning could mot have developed from ＇under the eye＇in the adjective itself．

[^12]:     Lat. tri-horium must be a Greek word because its last constituent is Greek. The rarity of Greek words of this type in comparison to the Latin is a. sufficient answer to this.
    ${ }^{2}$ Perhaps a diminutive, cf. § 211 D s. v.
    

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ Words of this type do not owe their -८o to the t@८-: $\tau \varrho \iota \eta \mu \iota \pi \lambda i \nu \vartheta \iota o \nu:$
    

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Here accented $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \imath \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{i o \nu}$.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ Sometimes the idea of persons connected develops as an accessory notion and may become dominant over the place idea（cf．Brugmann，（ir．2．13．（621）．
     93．4．关œoostrigoor designates the audience Plut．Cat．Maj．22，dixacorigeov is used with the accessory notion of the assembled jurymen Ar．Vesp．6i4，
    

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ Also designates towns where such temples are located, e. g. in Boeotia, Strabo 403.
    ${ }^{2}$ Perhaps rather derived from an old name of $\Delta \eta \mu \eta_{i} r_{i} \rho$.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ That $-\iota 0 \nu$ in this use is always a corruption of $-\varepsilon \epsilon 0 \nu$ is a proposition as incapable of proof as for the place names. Cf. § 63.
    ${ }^{2}$ íućtiov cannot come from $\varepsilon i \mu \alpha$, which was ${ }^{*} F \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma-\mu \kappa$, but is related to
     was formed, which gave rise to the Attic ídítov. The dialectic eiućtoov may, of course, have come from sifce or have been influenced by it, but for the Attic the spelling without $-\varepsilon$ - is uniform in inscriptions. Cf. Meisterhans ${ }^{3} 53$, Prellwitz ${ }^{2}$ s. v., and references there given.
    ${ }^{3}$ Perhaps the primitive $v \lambda \_\sigma \tau \rho o \nu$ was itself an instrument noun, so that viiatoron belongs to C .

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ The historical meaning of the primitive, viz. 'wife's dowry ' ete., points to an original abstract meaning. Cf. 834 C .

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ Rām. 1. 3. 25 ; Sākuntala 1. 38, 17. 3, 108. 7.
    ${ }^{2}$ Nom. Stammb ${ }^{2}$. 29.
    ${ }^{3}$ Gr. 2. 12 673.

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ Declared to have been originally 'little nose' by Lobeck, ad Phryn. 211, and the lexicons, though without explaining the strange development of meaning.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf．Ebeling，Lex．Hom．s．v．

[^22]:    as a corresponding masculine name of the tree. So xouceos is the strawberry tree, and xópreoo its fruit ; xdotcvos is a chestnut tree, and xcisrcevov a chestnut. Similarly Lat. arbutus and arbutum, the straw-berry tree and its fruit.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Albert-Schmidt ad loc.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Blümner, Tech. 3. 262.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ It is，of course，uncertain how far Doric words in－七o－originally had－80－．

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Blümner, op. cit. 4. 306.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Birt, Ant. Buchw. 20 ff.

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ In this use rivcixoon and ocuidion were, of course, rather associated with words like $\chi^{\alpha \lambda x i o \nu}$ (see sub A, end), xєр'́quov (see sub B), and other words designating vessels (§ 260 C ).
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Pauly-Wissowa s. v.
    ${ }^{3}$ By semantic syncretism is meant the process which is preparatory to real or formal syncretism, the assimilation of meaning which may result if two words or formatives have a portion of their sphere of usage in common and a consequent feeling of equivalence results, but without the dissappearance of one of the two synonymous expressions.
    ${ }^{4}$ From rivxtion comes ruxtion (Anth. P. 1. 84) by dissimilatory loss of the first t. Cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr³. 134.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ The form is puzzling; for dopú is an -u- stem, and we would expect Sóotor. It is probably due to a kind of contamination, an already existing Sopcituon, which belongs to Sógv 'spear,' being interpreted as coming from Sood because of similarity of sound.
    ${ }^{2}$ The honey is, of course, intimately associated with the comb, and might. become the dominant idea, so e. g. H. Hom. Merc. 559, Krgia B Borxorta,
    

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ This is all the more probable on account of Lucian's well known Atticistic tendencies, which always afford a strong presumption that a word occurring in him alone is borrowed from some old Attic source.
    ${ }_{2}^{2}$ The possessive meaning of -(i)io-, however, is frequent in Lithuanian, but not in the kindred Balto-Slavic languages. Cf. Leskien, Bild. d. Nom. 304. Lithuanian examples ib. 303 f .

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12 664.
    ${ }^{2}$ zicuice is the most satisfactory conjecture made instead of the msc. \%iovic.
    ${ }^{3}$ The adjective $\mu \varepsilon y c i \lambda o c$ disproves Liddell and Scott's classification of öбtøđ́xьo as a diminutive.
    ${ }^{4}$ The Greeks explained the name from the legend that Zeus was born here and nourished by a goat. Cf. Pauly-Wissowa s. v.

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ The singular $\vartheta \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu \circ \nu$, probably formed by hypostasis of the plural (cf. § 87 ff .), occurs Eur. Tro. 267.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Kluge, Etym. Wörterb ${ }^{6}$. s. v. Schwein, following Grimm, calls the word 'a diminutive, but without giving any reasons.

[^32]:    ${ }^{1}$ I translate: 'It was a large sort of beast.' Owing to the particular situation there is almost amplificative force present: "Es war ein grosses Untier." Classen, Fleckeisens Jahrb. 1859. 314, on the basis of this passage, declares that $\vartheta_{\text {roiov designated a single animal in opposition to the genus. }}^{\text {dion }}$, By this he did not mean that it designated a single animal as belonging to a genus, which would be correct for some cases (§ 114), but he was rather making an attempt to force it into the same pigeon-hole as oitiov, ұ@voiov, and ćœqú口ıov, which, as we have seen § 101, were derived from the use of $-\iota o \nu$ in adjectives of material, and $\chi \omega \rho i o \nu$, which is probably hypostasized from an indefinite plural ( $\S 90$ ). Of all these words he says that they designate "den einzelnen aus der Masse gesonderten Gegenstand." It is evident that this is merely a logical abstraction, and that the point of view was the desire to find some thread, no matter how slender, by which the whole group could be attached to the diminutive category. A similar idea, namely that diminutives are originally strengthened individualizations ("verschärfte Individualisierungen "), is now upheld for German diminutives by Wrede, Die Dim. im Deutschen p. 135. As to how such a shade of meaning should have gotten into the suffixes, however, we are left in the dark.
    ${ }^{2}$ Some have seized upon passages like these or like Arist. H.A. 9. 19.
    

[^33]:    
     word unfamiliar to himself. If he has good authority for his statement, the word must also have been used as a diminutive.
    

[^34]:    ${ }^{1}$ Possibly with a deteriorative shade of meaning．

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Whitney, Skr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 1222.
    ${ }^{2}$ axíqoov is a metrically necessary substitution by Bergk for the mse, axivecor.

[^36]:     by the phrase $\mu \circ \lambda \nu^{\prime} \beta \delta \kappa \iota \nu \alpha \iota \chi \varepsilon \varrho \mu \alpha^{\alpha} \delta \iota \circ$ (Luc. Lex. 5). Since there is no evidence of the existence of an adjective $\chi^{\varepsilon q u a}{ }^{\prime} d_{i o s}$ between Homer and Lucian, the
    

[^37]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the change of the initial voiceless to a voiced explosive cf. Vasmer, Byz. Zeitschr. 16. 544 ff.

[^38]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the relation of the two forms cf. Fick, KZ. 22. 105.

[^39]:    ${ }^{1}$ Possibly，however，the rare and late $x \alpha \lambda \pi \eta$ is the direct primitive of хव่́лльо．
    ${ }^{2}$ We may，of course，reject such guesses as that xioбv́pıov is related to
     should be able to explain the suffix no less than the root．
    ${ }^{3}$ The relation to the meaning＇mast－head＇is obscure．

[^40]:    ${ }^{1}$ Since this is a general statement of a reflecting philosopher, qoıvixuncannot be a diminutive.

[^41]:    ${ }^{1}$ It is, of course, self-evident that all such statements refer to the time when a word was first formed, or when its etymology was still perceived. Just as soon as a word had become definitely fixed in some concrete meaning, and the consciousness of its derivation lost, there could be no attitude to the suffix at all.

[^42]:    ${ }^{2}$ For relation of forms see $\S 18$.
    ${ }^{2}$ In phrases like this, where the derivative is modified by an adjective designating small size, the diminutive meaning was doubtless the one most easily suggested to the hearer.

[^43]:    
    
    
    
    
    

[^44]:    ${ }^{1}$ The primitive could refer to descent as well as to age．Cf．B 205，where
    

[^45]:    ${ }^{1}$ So Schwabe, De Dim. Gr. et Lat. 17 ; Stolz, Hist. Gram. 575 ; Brugmann, Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 681 ff .

[^46]:    ${ }^{1}$ Primitive and derivative are actually contrasted in this manner RV. 8. 21. 18, cítra íd râjā, rājakáa id anyaké, 'you are an illustrious king, the others are mere kinglings ', i. e. 'nnt worthy of the name.'

[^47]:    ${ }^{1}$ The parasite probably means by $\tau \varepsilon \chi^{\nu i o n}$ 'that so-called vulgar trade.'

[^48]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 1². 682.

[^49]:    ${ }^{1}$ Similarly Hipparch. ap. Athen 484 D lets a character ask whether icu$\beta \varrho(́ \nu \iota o s$, a name of a cup, is a bird.

[^50]:    
    

[^51]:    ${ }^{1}$ I am speaking with reference to the spoken language of to-day, for which the origin as well as the former spelling is in this respect immaterial.

[^52]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Liddell and Scott s. v.
    ${ }^{2}$ The fact that rohoбucituov does not occur before Polybius would seem to exclude it from the number of probable diminutive pattern types.
    ${ }^{3}$ Those who first formed racediov in the meaning 'baby' must have thought of $\pi \kappa \tilde{\tau}_{s}$ as referring to size and age, not descent. With the latter idea in mind arose the roudion of $\S 150$.

[^53]:    ${ }^{1} \beta$ ßépos designates only the newly born babe.

[^54]:    ${ }^{1}$ The adjective $\mu \iota x \rho a$ shows that the idea of small size was uppermost in the mind of the writer, and that he did not conceive ródiov as 'a footlike thing, but not a real foot.'

[^55]:    ${ }^{1}$ In passages like this one the indefinite pronoun tis shows that the -ov word refers to a particularly small specimen. A large bridge is a well known feature of a neighborhood, and would oftener be referred to by the aid of the definite article than the indefinite pronoun.

[^56]:    ${ }^{1}$ In a combination of this kind the idea of small quantity pleonastically has a double expression in the adjective and the diminutive suffix. Though this really is an illogical combination, this interpretation is preferable to taking roiozv́vtıov e. g. as 'delicious gourd' (§ 195); for the phrase $\mu \iota x$ oóv 七七 with the Genetive produces a constellation of thought that is favorable to the interpretation of the diminutive as referring to quantity, and this could not very well be neutralized by logical scruples.

[^57]:    ${ }^{1}$ The adjective $\mu$ rooci as well as the fact that Socrates is speaking of his own teachings，shows that $\sigma$ кeices vọu⿱宀八九七ov，from the stand－point of the speaker，is strictly a diminutive．Seen through the spectacles of the poet， however，there is a deteriorative element present．

[^58]:    ${ }^{1}$ The text is probably corrupt. At any rate the Plural causes trouble for the usual diminutive interpretation.

[^59]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Schwabe, De Dim. Graec. et Lat. 20.
    ${ }^{2}$ One might be tempted to take çumélıov as used hypocoristically, with a force of the suffix like the adjective qi'dos in Homer, or the German 'lieh,' in 'das liebe Brot' etc., but there are no parallels for $-\iota \frac{1}{}$ in this meaning'-

[^60]:    ${ }^{1}$ The pronoun av́ri shows that $\pi \nu \varepsilon v \mu$ citiov must have been understood as 'bare life,' and that its suffix was not due to the entreaty, as in the words of § 215 .

[^61]:    ${ }^{1}$ Such reinterpretation is, of course, as uncertain and varies as much as for deterioratives. Cf. § 171.

[^62]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Polzin, Stud. z. Gesch. des Dem. im Deutsch. 1.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Wrede, Die Dim. im Deutsch. 132 ff., who, however, unnecessarily insists that proper names (Kose-formen) must have antedated appellative hypocorisms.

[^63]:    ${ }^{1}$ Barbarisms for $\varkappa \alpha ́ \vartheta r \sigma \sigma$ and $\vartheta v \gamma \alpha ́ t \rho \iota o \nu$.

[^64]:    ${ }^{1}$ Tiváocov, a metrically necessary conjecture of Bentley for l'uszipue, is attested for Menander by Philostratus.
    ${ }^{2} 3^{3} \Omega$ Mvpoivon is the reading of R , while $\Gamma$ has in uivplor, and some ed-
    
    $3^{3}$ /̈xiciov is here often taken as a proper nomin, but since there are in old comedy no other examples of such a name hecoming permanently uttached to a person (cf. $\$ 237$ b), it seems safer to considen it an appellative like ueגít兀ov.

[^65]:    

[^66]:    ${ }^{1}$ Barbarisms for $\sigma \chi \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{o} \sigma \boldsymbol{\psi} \iota o \nu$.

[^67]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Jurkschat, Lit. Erzählungen 102.
    ${ }^{2}$ Other examples from Catullus, though interpreted in a different way, will be found in Platner, A. J. of Phil. 16. 186 ff. Cf. also Kessler, Die Lat. Dim. 3 f.

[^68]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Belič, l. c.

[^69]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf．Bloomfield，A．J．of Phil．12． 1 ff．，16． 409 ff．

[^70]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Old High German words like zicchi 'little gont; Kluge, Nom. Stammbild ${ }^{2}$. 29.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Wrede, op. cit. 81 ff . Otherwise Jan Te Winkel, (ir. (ier. Phil. 1. 87 d.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Brugmann, K. Vgl. Gr. 435 note.
    ${ }^{4}$ Nom. Stammbild ${ }^{2}$. 33 note 2.

[^71]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 676.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf, Berneker, Die Preussische Sprache p. 306, s. v.
    ${ }^{3}$ Gr. 2. 12. 676 note.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. W. Meyer, ALL. 5. 230; Stolz, Hist. Gr. 492 f.

[^72]:    ${ }^{1}$ Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 316, 685.
    ${ }^{2}$ Gr. 2. $1^{2}$. 675 note.

[^73]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Polzin, op. cit. 2 ; Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 375.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Leskien, Bildung der Nom. 281 f.; Brugmann, Gr. 2. 1². 220 ff.
    'Cf. Leskien, l. c.

[^74]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Janson, op. cit. 7.
    ${ }^{2}$ By Aeolic I mean the Aeolic of Lesbos and A sia Minor.
    ${ }^{3}$ The DiAioxos of CB. 306. 2 is a Rhodian. $^{2}$

[^75]:    ${ }^{1}$ One would expect a feminine ${ }^{\dot{\alpha}} \sigma x \varepsilon \rho i \sigma x \eta$ (: $\dot{\alpha} \sigma x \varepsilon \rho(\alpha)$, but the analogy and contact of the neuter $\sigma \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \lambda i \sigma x o \nu(: \sigma \alpha \mu \beta \beta \lambda \nu \nu)$ caused the change : $\chi \alpha i$ $\sigma \alpha \mu \beta c c-$
    
    ${ }^{2}$ For the obscure $\sigma x \iota y v \delta \rho \varrho o v$ (in the conglutinate -vঠ@tov) of the same work see § 328. I. For $\Pi \varrho \iota \alpha \mu \iota \lambda \lambda v^{\prime} \varrho \iota o \nu$, also in Epicharmus, see § 328. II.

[^76]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Belič, Arch. f. sl. Phil. 23. 138 ff.

[^77]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf．Brugmann，Gr．2．12． 675 note 1.

[^78]:    ${ }^{1}$ The passage where it occurs is insufficient to decide whether it designates any jar or only small ones and so is a diminutive.

[^79]:    ${ }^{1}$ So Janson, l. c.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 49.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Meineke ad loc.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr .54.

[^80]:    ${ }^{1}$ In the light of § 291, such examples have no value in this question; $\lambda v \chi \nu \iota \delta \iota o \nu$ probably got its $-\iota \delta \iota 0 \nu$ by substitution for $-\iota o \nu$, and thus need not be derived from $\lambda u \chi v i o v$ by the addition of $(-i) \delta \iota o v$. On the other hand, $\lambda u \chi \nu \iota d \iota o \nu$ originated in the same way, and is no argument for *iv ${ }^{\prime} \nu \iota-i \delta \iota o \nu$, since it is equivalent to $\lambda v \chi^{\nu i o v}$, not a 'diminutive' of the latter.

[^81]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Schwabe, opt. cit. 67, who cites Etym. Mag. 347. 54 for the difference between $\varepsilon \xi i d i o \nu$ and $\varepsilon \xi \varepsilon i d i o \nu, i b .560 .12$ for $\lambda \varepsilon \xi i \delta \iota o \nu$ and $\lambda \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon i \delta i o \nu$.

[^82]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Pape, Etym. Wörterb. 97.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Brugmann, IF. 16. 494.

[^83]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr ${ }^{3}$. 182.

[^84]:    ${ }^{1}$ Just how this form is related to $\varepsilon v \omega \tau i d \circ \nu$ is doubtful. Perhaps we may assume that $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\prime} \tau \iota o \nu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \tau i \delta i o \nu$ were contaminated to $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega \dot{d} \delta o \nu$, and that this form received an iota subscript by the influence of the suffix -idiov in words like zaג̣́dıov.

[^85]:    ${ }^{1}$ Var. lect. жалv́рıк.
    ${ }^{2}$ Probably some one is scoffed at for using 'diminutives' of this kind.

[^86]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Schwabe, l. c.

[^87]:    ${ }^{1}$ The word also occurs Luc. D. Deor. 5. 3, and of animals in Arist. H. A. 9. 49. 631 b 17, Probl. 4. 26. 879 b 21.

[^88]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the loss of the $\iota$ of $\sigma \chi \dot{0} \lambda \iota o \nu$ cf. $\S 352 \mathrm{n}$.

[^89]:    ${ }^{1}$ This fact led earlier scholars unreasonably to doubt the existence of -८oxov altogether, and the texts were emended accordingly. Cf. Janson, De Graec. Ling. Dim. in -ıoxos 3 f., De Graec. Serm. Nom. Dim. et Ampl. 65.

[^90]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 44.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Brugmann, l. c.

[^91]:    ${ }^{1}$ That avpripiov was used as a diminutive in the following sedtion dues not prove that it needs must he one here, but only shows how simular was the attitude toward diminutive and generalizing meaning. ( $\%$, yifow \&\% 185 .

[^92]:    ${ }^{1}$ The real primitive is, of course, civccy $\eta$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 12. 678.

[^93]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf．Albert－Schmidt ad loc．

[^94]:    ${ }^{1}$ The long $\bar{\alpha}$ of xopíatov is the result of metrical lengthening according: to Bechtel, Att. Frauennam. 67 n. 1; Solmsen, Rh. M. 59. 503.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr ${ }^{3} .197$.

