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## INTRODUCTION.

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

In this Catalogue Buttmann professes to have two objects in view : first, to enumerate all the primitive verbs,
whether regular or irregular, which are in general use, particularly in prose, specifying in each the actual usage of the best writers: secondly, to give a list of all verbs, and all forms of verbs, which are anomalous or irregular. On the former of these points little need be said: in some respects its importance is not at all inferior to the latter, particularly for the composition of Greek prose; but in extent it is comparatively inconsiderable. The regular verbs occurring in this Catalogue are so few, (almost every Greek verb having an irregularity in some part of its formation,) that their occasional appearance does not alter the general character of the work; and I have therefore given it a title corresponding with its great leading object, which is, to examine and explain those verbs (with their tenses and persons, which are properly irregular. If it be asked what verbs Buttmann considers to be properly irregular, I answer in his own words, those which do not follow some general analogy. In accordance with this idea, he has omitted in his Catalogue one numerous class of verbs ending in -áh $\omega$, $-i \zeta \omega,-a i v \omega,-\dot{v} \nu \omega,-\in \dot{v} \omega,-{ }^{i} \omega$, -á $^{\prime} \omega$ and $-\epsilon \in \omega$, because they are derived from other words (not verbs) according to a fixed analogy, because they are all formed in the same simple way, have' all a perfect active in -ка, and are invariably defective in the aor. 2. active and passive. For the same reason he has excluded those also which are formed in $-\omega$, with the preceding syllable of the radical word strengthened ; consequently those ending in -aip $\omega,-\lambda \lambda \omega$, $-\pi \tau \omega,-\tau \tau \omega$, and $-\sigma \sigma \omega^{*}$. Where, however, we find a verb with either of the above terminations not derived from a noun or other word, but only a lengthened form of some simple stem or root, it is manifestly a deviation from ge-

[^0]neral analogy ; and as an aor. 2. may be formed from the
 aor. 2. (from КТҮП $\Omega$ ) éктuтov,-such verbs have a place in the following Catalogue; as have also all those ending in -áv $\nu \omega$, that termination being invariably of the same kind. Within these and the like restrictions almost every irregular verbal form occurring in any known writer will be found, either expressly mentioned or sufficiently referred to in the present work.

In the prosecution of Buttmann's first object, all verbs, whether regular or irregular, which are common in the best prose writers, are distinguished in this Catalogue by a larger type, so that the pure Attic usage of each verb is seen at one view. But any point requiring a more minute disquisition, anything which seldom occurs in prose, which belongs to the language of poetry or to the dialects, is added in a smaller character and in a separate paragraph. Those verbs also whose whole usage brings them under this second class are inserted in the same smaller type.

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

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

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

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

Whatever meaning-active, passive or middle, transitive or intransitive-is given to the present, the same is supposed to belong to every succeeding tense not expressly marked with a different meaning. If, for instance, under
 the aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \beta_{o v} \lambda_{\eta}^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ from the passive, this shows that these are the only two forms which occur in the sense of the present $\beta_{o v} \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime} \rho \mu \mathrm{a}$, and consequently that there is no instance


The insertion, in their alphabetical places, of supposed verbal stems or roots is intended less for the accommodation of the student, than to complete the plan of the work : and this may be said not only of those which must necessarily be supposed in every methodical treatise of this kind, as $\Lambda \mathrm{HB}-$ for $\lambda \dot{\eta} \not \psi_{o \mu a t, ~ e ́ \lambda a \beta o v, ~ b u t ~ o f ~ m a n y ~}^{\ell}$ which are merely apparent, i.e. where a change, for which there is no foundation in the regular inflexion, but which has been effected by the operation of syncope or metathesis,
is referred back to a root formed by that same figure; e. g. KMA- relates to Ká $\mu \nu \omega$.

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

The attempt, however, to make this Catalogue etymologically complete might in some particular cases produce confusion; as, for instance, when certain verbs, springing from the same stem or root with different yet cognate meanings, are placed together as belonging to one and the same verb. In such cases it is rather the province of grammar to keep separate what usage has already separated.
 gically the same, and yet each must be preserved distinct from the others, to render the explanation of each the more clear and intelligible; $\chi^{a \delta \epsilon i \nu}$ must be confined to the sense of containing, $\chi^{a} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota ~ t o ~ t h a t ~ o f ~ y i e l d i n g, ~ a n d ~ \chi a v e i ̀ ~ t o ~$ that of standing open; in order that, where it is not sufficiently clear from the context which of these different senses a form has, we may not be led to give it a meaning which does not belong to it.

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

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

J. R. FISHLAKE.

Little Cazverel, Nov. 1837.

## IRREGULAR VERBS.

## A.

'Aáw, I harm, lead into error. Of this verb Homer has the 3. pres. pass. àâraı*, the aor. 1. act. à áa, contr. $\dot{a} \sigma a$ (Od. $\lambda, 61$.), and of the pass. and midd. áć $\sigma \theta \eta \nu$, áa $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$, ä $\sigma a \sigma \theta a$. Both alphas are common. Verbal adj. áarós, whence with á priv. ááaros ( $\cup-\simeq \cup)$ inviolable.

Immediately from áác comes the subst. ẵ $\eta$ with $a$ long; and from this latter, but with $a$ short $\dagger$, come two new forms, viz. 1.) árá $\omega$ synonymous with áá $\omega$, found only in the pres. and imperf. pass.; ár $\boldsymbol{\omega} \mu a t$, I suffer harm, used by the Attic poets : 2.) á $\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \omega$, with intrans. meaning, found only in Il. $v, 332$. and Herodot. 7, 223. in the particip. átéovta, àтéovees, senseless, desperate.

- It may perhaps be thought that $A \Omega$ is the original form of this verb, and áá $\omega$, áá $\sigma \omega$ a resolution of it: but general analogy is contrary to the idea of a resolution, unless where there has been previously a contraction, As little disposed am I to consider árá $\omega$ the original, and that the $\tau$ was dropped afterwards. The true original form is $A F A \Omega$, as is evident from the Pindaric auáza (Pyth. 2, 28.), and the Laconian ááßaктos (Hesych.) for ááazos. On the other hand the meaning of to sutiate is classed under $\ddot{\alpha} \omega$, because in that meaning the double $a$ is rare and even suspicious. This is the only way of marking clearly the distinction between the two Homeric epithets ááatos (ááw) inviolable, and áas (ä $\omega$ ) insatiable.
"AAR, I satiate. See"A $\omega$.
'A ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega \ddagger, I$ deck, adorn: fut. $\dot{a} \gamma \breve{a} \lambda \hat{\omega}$; aor. ${ }^{\eta} \gamma \eta \lambda a, \dot{a} \gamma \hat{\eta} \lambda a \iota$
[* used in an active sense; but see Lexilog. p. 8. and note.-Ed.]
[ $\dagger$ I find the $a$ in $\dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\alpha} \omega$ marked long both in Maltby's Lex. Prosod. and in Passow's Gr. and Germ. Lex. I know of only two passages where the word occurs, viz.

[^1](Eurip. Med. 1027. Lex. Seguer. p. 328.).-Midd. áyád-入opat, I pride myself on, delight in: the aor. of this voice is nowhere found.
"Ayauat, I admire: Depon. Pres. and imperf. like ï $\sigma$ танаt,

 but found also in Demosth. pro Cor. 59. and Aristid., and

This family of verbs has in the Ionic dialect the collateral sense of to envy, to be indignant; but in the pres. it is only in the form áyáo $\mu a$ a
 araiopar has it in Ionic prose also. The other tenses have both mean-
 $\sigma a \nu \tau 0$, they admired.
"A yaput is used by all writers in a good sense. The above induction appears sufficient to confine $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \mu a \iota$ to the other meaning; to which one passage only, Od. $\pi, 203$., seems at first sight to be an exception. But ááaofar in that passage would be utterly superfluous, if we under-
 áýáaOAı). Hence I think that the idea of admiration is heightened to the collateral idea of envy, i. e. Ulysses represents the excessive admiration of his son as bordering on envy or jealousy.
Midd.

Besides the aor. l. we find not unfrequently both in act. and pass. the aor. 2. also; this tense however is not free from suspicion, as it depends on a single letter. Thus in Eurip. Androm. 1242. ( ${ }^{(\pi \pi a \gamma \gamma \dot{e} \lambda \eta) \text { ), in }}$ Iph. A. 353. ( $\delta(\dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda o v$ ), and in Thuc. 8, 86. (í $\pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} o v$ ) both the senise and the manuscripts are decidedly in favour of restoring the pres. and imperf.; and a little further on in the same chapter of Thucydides the aor. 1. i $\pi \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \iota \lambda \epsilon \nu$ is actually restored to the text from the best ma,nuscripts. The same has been done in Xen. Anab. 3, 4, 14. where, contrary to Xenophon's usage, $\pi a \rho \eta$ í $\gamma \in \lambda \epsilon$ formerly stood. But in Lycurg. 18.p. 150, 8. and 87. p. 158, 26. the manuscripts offer no alternative for
 text*: and so in Plat. Meno 2. $\dot{\text { ci }} \pi a \gamma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, though otherwise weakly

[^2]ciously than at 15. p. 149, 32. of the same work, where he has adopted from one manuscript the imperfect in the place of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda 0 \nu$, which is evidently incorrect.
supported, may be defended by the sense against the present, which is found in a great majority of the manuscripts. . In Soph. ©d. T. 955. the
 have $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\lambda} \nu$, which the glosses in the Cod. Lips. explain to be the aorist (see Hermann *), a tense much more natural in that passage than the future. Compare also the various reading áy $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\dot{\epsilon}} \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ in Eurip. Or. 1539.(1533.Matth.) and my note on Demosth. Mid.11,2. Least of all should I have thought of altering $\pi a \rho i ́ \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dagger$ in the Ionic writer Herodotus 9,53 ., where Schweighäuser has adopted from the single Florentine manuscript an imperfect for which there are no grounds in the context. The aor. 2. pass. occurs in Eurip. Iph. T. 932. (ỉyとé $\lambda$ ns) without any various reading, although $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \gamma \dot{\ell} \lambda \theta \eta s \ddagger$ would be admissible. In Al. V. H. 9, 2. occurs $\delta \partial \eta \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \eta$. In Plut. Galb. 25. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \gamma \gamma^{\hat{e}} \lambda \eta$.-In єimeiv and éverkeiv the two aorists are so easily confounded, that great caution appears to me advisable in this verb also. Nor is it unworthy of consideration, that a form which undoubtediy existed, (for this I think is proved by the number of instances adduced,) should never have been branded as objectionable by any Atticist.

## 'Ayeip $\omega, I$ collect together : Att. redupl.-Mind.

 the syncopated part. á $\gamma$ рó $\mu є$ ъos.-Compare ' 'Eуєípo.

 reading of Aristarchus $\bar{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \rho \in \hat{\varepsilon} \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \omega \mathrm{c}$, Il. к, 127. instead of the common


We may certainly feel some hesitation in explaining ù $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ¢́porто Il. $\beta$, 94. to be an aorist, and ijyeípovio $\beta$, 52. an imperfect, as there is no appearance of anything in operation but Epic prosody, and Epic indistinctness between imperfect and aorist. But if the grammarian is not to be deterred in a similar case from distinguishing at Il. $\beta, 106$. 107. éd $\lambda_{l}-$ $\pi \epsilon \nu$ and $\lambda_{\epsilon} i \pi \epsilon$ (at least according to form) as aor. and imperf., as little

 identity of sense, while the tenses are unquestionably different. We must also recollect, that not only the accents, but even the very turns of thought, adapt themselves to the metre. At $11 . \beta, 52$. मु $\gamma \in$ eiporio at


[^3][^4]it is true, stands in the midst of imperfects. But when it is said oi $\delta^{\prime}$
 they were assembled [not assembling] : the crowd heaved restlessly." Besides, as á $\gamma \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \nu$ os (by syncope for á $\gamma \epsilon \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon v o s$ ) is undoubtedly an aor. particip. assembled, so áréfovio must in every instance be considered an aorist also. Nor is there anything in Od. $\beta, 385$. to prevent our accenting, with Barnes and Porson, á $\gamma \in \rho \in \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$, as this form is in all its relations a common aor. 2. (compare $\dot{u}^{\lambda}\langle\tau \in \in \sigma A \alpha t$ ), and the silent traditionary accent on an infinitive occurring but once can be of no autho-rity.-Compare "Ey ${ }^{\text {ef }} \boldsymbol{\theta}$ Oat.

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

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

${ }^{\prime}$ A $\gamma v \nu \mu$, I break (trans.): fut. $a \xi \omega^{*}$ : the past tenses have the syllabic augment: aor. act. $\begin{gathered} \\ \\ \xi\end{gathered} \alpha$ (Il. $\eta, 270$. contr. $\grave{\eta} \xi a$, Il. $\psi$, ड92. Od. $\tau, 539$.), aor. pass. ' 'á $\begin{gathered}\eta \nu \\ \text { with } a \text { long: }\end{gathered}$ the perf. 2. $\check{\epsilon} \bar{a} \gamma a$ (Sappho), Ion. ${ }^{\ell} \eta \gamma a$, has the passive or intransitive sense, I am broken $\dagger$.-Midd.

The $a$ in this verb is originally long, as shown particularly in its derivatives ' $\bar{a} \gamma \eta$ ', $\dot{a}^{u} \gamma \eta \eta^{\prime} s$, which are connected with é'í $\gamma \eta \nu$ in the same way as $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma \eta^{\prime}$ is with $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \gamma \eta \nu$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\nu} \pi \pi \dot{\eta}$ with $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\nu} \dot{\imath} \pi o \nu$. Hence the $a$ of the

[^5][^6]root is long in the aor. 2. pass. t́á $\gamma \eta \nu$, as we see from some passages of the Attics, (Brunck on Aristoph. Ach. 928.) and from I1. $\lambda, 558$. But it is also found in Epic poetry short; although, by the disappearance of the digamma, which belonged originally to this verb, as will be seen below, we cannot now ascertain in some passages the true Homeric form of this tense. See Heyne on Il. $\gamma, 367$., who tries to establish, and not without probability, the digamma and the long a uniformly. In the later poets, as Theocr. 22, 190. it is most certainly short. Compare $\pi \lambda \eta$ ท́rtu, of which the aor. 2. pass. retains its original length, but shortens the syllable when used in one particular sense.

The digamma, whence the irregular augment comes, is proved beyond a doubt to have originally belonged to this verb by the Hesiodic form кavúkaus ( $\epsilon, 664.691$.), which can be explained in no other way. That is to say, FA芭AI became in composition KAFFA安AI, as $\beta$ á $\lambda \lambda \omega \kappa \pi \beta-$ $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$. This spiritus, thus doubled and united by the metre, was of necessity retained here, while the digamma disappeared everywhere else. But by the intimate affinity, and in some respect identity, of the sounds $U$ and $V, \Upsilon$ and $F$, it passed over into $v$, and consequently with the $a$ into the diphthong $a v$. See the same process in evader', under 'A $\nu$ dáv.
 Od. $\tau, 539$.) the more remarkable. In the same way Hippocrates has $\kappa a \tau \bar{\eta} \xi a$ (Epidem. 5, 13.) ; but as he writes the substantives also кর́í $\eta \xi \iota$, кárŋ $\begin{aligned} \mu a & \text { (De Artic. 16. 17. De Fract. 16. 28.), it would appear that in }\end{aligned}$ the Ionic dialect the whole formation, with the exception of the pres. and aor. 2. pass., had the $\eta$ in the root: in Homer on the other hand,
 Il. $\zeta, 40 . \pi, 371$. (see below the same form under"A ${ }^{\prime} \omega$ ), $\eta_{j} \xi \alpha$ can be only the augment. If however we compare är $\tau$, which comes from AFATA, we shall be the less surprised at $\tilde{\eta}_{\tilde{n}} \xi$ as a contraction from EFA $\Xi \mathrm{B}$ A.

It is far more astonishing to find that in this verb the augment is carried on even to forms in which it is naturally inadmissible, and that this takes place in very old writers. Thus Hippocrates has very com-
this form only with the immediate meaning, which in almost all cases is of an intransitive nature : thus-
ä $\gamma \nu v \mu \iota-\tilde{a} \gamma \nu v \mu a \iota, I$ break (intrans.); perf. $\check{\epsilon} \bar{\alpha} \gamma a, I$ am broken.
$\delta a i ́ \omega-\delta a i o \mu a \iota$ and $\delta \in \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \eta \alpha$, I Uurn (intrans.).
 غं $\gamma$ ค́ $\gamma \quad \rho \alpha, I$ am on the watch.



 $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi n \gamma \alpha, \dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \nu \mu \alpha \iota, \frac{\epsilon}{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \omega \gamma \alpha, \cdot \sigma \eta \pi о \mu \alpha \iota$

 үova. Compare also déрконаи, $\mu$ кіронає
 this its connexion with passive or middle forms arose the improper appellation of the perfect midd.

Monly катєа 1．2．－Apollon．Rh．4，1686．has $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \alpha \epsilon i \sigma \alpha$ ，which metrical passage，in a poet of some antiquity and a learned grammarian，is of great weight． The passages quoted from the Attic writers must be left for future criti－ cism ：Plat．Gorg．p．469．e．，see Heind．and Bekker；Lysias c．Sim． p．99．катєаүєis，according to Bekker＇s MSS．катаүєis；ib．p．100， 5. катє́́そаขтєs without any various reading．

In the other verbs which have this kind of augment，and which were in common use quite as much as the above，this irregularity is not found until a very late æra；for instance，á $\pi \epsilon \omega \sigma \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau o s$ in Pæanius 9 ．，$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ in Theod．Prodr．p．17．，$\dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu \eta \sigma a \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu$ in an inscription of a still later time in Chishull＇s preface to his Travels，p． 6 ：and this gives additional importance to the antiquity of the examples from a $\quad \gamma \nu v \mu$ ，in which verb this irregularity was probably introduced and sanctioned by usage earlier than it was in others，in order to avoid confusion with $\ddot{a} \gamma \omega$ and $\ddot{\text { ä }} \tau \tau \omega$ ．

Of the later forms ä $\sigma \sigma \omega$ and катá $\sigma \sigma \omega$ for $\tilde{\alpha} \gamma \nu v \mu$ ，Schneider in his Lexicon quotes the Schol．Hom．，Celsus ap．Orig．7．p．368．，Hesych．
 55．and 213．the form катєáббш．
＇A ${ }^{\prime} \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha \sigma \kappa \epsilon 7$

＇A
 common interjectional particles，like age in Latin and tenez in French． The rest of the verb disappeared before aipé $\omega$ ，leaving some derivatives． One instance of the indic．remains in a fragment of Archil．in Br．Anal． 1，41．For a more detailed account see Buttm．Lexilog．p．20，\＆c．
＂ $\mathrm{A} \gamma \mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{w}}$, I choke，transitive．Midd．intransitive．
${ }^{\wedge} \mathrm{A} \gamma \omega$ ，I lead ；fut．${ }^{\prime} \xi \omega$ ；takes in the aor．2．the redupli－
 äynoxa† ；aor．1．act． $\bar{\eta} \xi \alpha$ ，imperat．${ }^{2} \xi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, Hom．；aor． 1.

[^7]are undoubted aorists，notwithstanding all which has been said to the contrary．

+ With á $\gamma \dot{\eta} \chi^{\alpha}$ we may class some other anomalous forms which change their vowel to $o$ in both perfects：$\tilde{\varepsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \omega \gamma a$（perf． intransit．）from $\dot{\rho} \eta \dot{\gamma} \nu v \mu$ ．$\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega \kappa \alpha$ from IIETR，$\pi i \pi \tau \omega$ ．$\epsilon i \omega \theta a$ for $\epsilon i \theta a$ from $\epsilon \theta \omega$ ．
 from aitpw or áє́ipw．$\in \omega \kappa \alpha, \dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \omega \kappa \alpha$ ， Dor．（whence in N．T．á申éwvtai）for

midd. $\eta^{\prime} \xi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$, seldom in the Attic, but its compounds frequent in Herodotus: perf. pass. $\tilde{\eta}^{j} y \mu a t .-M i d d$.

For a full account of $\boldsymbol{a}^{\gamma}{ }^{\prime} \chi^{\alpha}$ see Buttm. Lexilog. pp. 116..139. The use of this form in the letter of Philip and in the resolution of the people in Demosth. pro Cor. p. 238. 249., in Lysias ap. Phrynich. p. 121. and in Aristot. EEcon. 1, 7. shows that it was an old and familiar form, which, being in no respect worse than édícoka, recommended itself for use instead of the indistinct $\hat{\eta} \chi$ a, as $\bar{\epsilon} \dot{\delta j} \bar{j} o \kappa a$ took the place of $\hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha$. The Attic writers, however, preferred the shorter form. See $\pi \rho 0{ }^{\prime} \chi^{a}$ in Reisken's Ind. ad Demosth. $\sigma v \nu \eta \eta^{a}{ }^{a s}$ in Xen. Mem. 4, 2, 8. note. In general the perfect was avoided as much as possible; and hence the later grammarians sometimes marked ${ }_{\eta} \chi^{a}$ as obsolete, sometimes rejected $\mathfrak{a} \boldsymbol{y}^{\boldsymbol{n}} \mathrm{X}^{a}$ as bad Attic. See Dorv. ad Charit. p. 481. (494.) Lob. ad Phryn. p. 121.

An aor. 1. ${ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \xi a, \hat{a} \xi a \iota$ was also in use, but rejected by the Attics. It is found however in $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \eta \xi \not \xi \nu$, Thuc. 2, 97., in äłac, Antiph. 5, 46. p. 134.
 Batrachom. 115. 119., in $\mathfrak{a} \xi \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$, ad $\xi \alpha \nu \tau 0$, Il. $\theta, 505.545$. with many other passages which need the examination of the critic. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 287. 735. In Aristoph. Ran. 468. àm $\mathfrak{\eta}$ द̆as is from á $\pi a ́ r \tau \omega ;$ hence the latest editors have distinguished it by the $\imath$ : see átiovw.
 is one of those aor. 2. which take the characteristic $\sigma$ of the aor. l., but are commonly mistaken for anomalous derivatives of the fut. 1. Homer uses it instead of ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, which would not be admissible in the hexameter; curaye he does use at I1. w, 337. With this form we may join

'aгeomai. The reading áréóevov in Herodot. 3, 14. might be adopted without hesitation, if Schæfer's opinion, that this too is cor-

'A $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \eta \sigma \\ & \text {, to feel dislike. Of this verb Homer has in the Odyssey the }\end{aligned}$
 I1. $\lambda, 88$.; and as this last has the first syllable short, but the two others have it always long, they are written, according to the example of some
 Lexilog. p. 22 : see also dं $\sigma a \iota$, to satiate, under " $\mathrm{A} \omega$.

$\delta o k a$, and in Hom. pass. $\epsilon \subset \dot{y} \dot{j} \delta \rho \mu t$, fromi
 very defective Epic perfects $\ddot{\iota} \nu \omega \gamma \alpha, \dot{a} \nu \eta \eta^{-}$ $\nu_{0} \theta a, \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \nu_{0} \theta a$.

* [Homer always uses ációow, áєioouat. "A, $\sigma \circ \mu \alpha \iota$ is properly Attic (see Markl. Eurip. Suppl. 932. Brunck. Aristoph. Vesp. 122S. Fr. 1294.), but is found in

The future midd. is Attic (Aristoph.) ; see Piers. ad Mœr. p. 38. : $\boldsymbol{a} \epsilon i \sigma \omega$, $̆ \neq \sigma$, is in other dialects, Theogn. 4. Theocr. 7, 72. 78. The imperative áciofo is one of those aor. 2. which take the characteristic $\sigma$ of the aor. 1. See above ${ }^{\circ} \xi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, under "A $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$.

Hermann has very properly defended ácioधo in the 17th Hom. Hymn against ćeifeo; (in Hymn 20, where áeífeo stands without any known various reading, it must remain,) for áeíioual as active is an unheard-of form. Now as the aor. midd. of $\dot{\alpha} \in i \delta \omega$ and $\bar{\psi} \delta \omega$ is equally unknown, this aeíeeo may be an imperative formed from the future úєiбона. But there are as little grounds in common usage for the Epic aorist $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \beta \dot{\eta} \dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \text { eo }}$ as for the one in question; and as that stands in the same relation to $\varepsilon$ é $\beta \eta \nu$ and $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ (tenses in common use) as áєíбєo does to $\dot{\eta} \sigma a$ and $\ddot{\varphi} \sigma о \mu a$, it appears that the aor. midd. of some verbs, as well as the fut. midd., had in the old language a purely active meaning. See also Lexilog. p. 226. note.
'A $\Delta$-. See 'A $\downarrow$ ơáv.
'Aєió $\omega$. See " $A, \delta \omega$.
'Aeípw. See Aípw.
'Aé $\ddagger \omega$. See Aǘ $\omega$.
"A $\eta \mu$. See ${ }^{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{\omega}$.
 pass. $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta \delta_{\epsilon} \sigma \eta \nu$; aor. 1. midd. $\grave{\eta} \delta \epsilon \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$. The aor. pass. and midd. have the same meaning; but in the Attic language aidéracoat refers to the person who has committed a shameful action with the meaning of to pardon. [See Demosth. Aristocr. 72.]

An old poetical form of the present is aidopal*, from which arose the one in common use. It never has the augment: aidero. Of the


 in the Epic poets and Pindar.

Aivíoбoнat, I speak enigmatically: Depon. midd.

[^8]סopal and aidéopal, but forms all his tenses from the latter, which is also the prevailing form in prose.-Passow.]
$\dagger$ [In good prose writers we seldom if ever find aivéw, always é $\pi \alpha \iota \nu$ é $\omega$.-Passow.]
$\ddagger$ See note under $\Delta \varepsilon^{c} \omega, I$ bind.

Aìv $\mu a \iota$, I take. Only pres. and imperf.: without augment therefore, aivvio. [Hom. and Hes.]

Aipé $\omega$, I take: fut. aip $\eta \sigma \omega$; perf. ทֶ $\rho \eta \kappa \alpha$, Ion. ápaíp $\eta \kappa a$;

 Midd.-Verbal adj. aipєтóc, -є́ос. Compare ‘A入íбкодає.

A less frequent future is $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}$; thus we find $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \hat{\omega}$, Aristoph. Equ. 290., кaөєлєĩ, Antiphil. Epig. 15., à $\phi \in \lambda o v ิ \mu a \iota$, Com. ap. Antiattic. Seguer. p. 80, 12., and occasional examples down to the latest writers.

The aor. 1. $\ddot{\eta} \rho \eta \sigma \alpha$ too is found in the common language; and even in Aristoph. Thesm. 760. we have $\dot{e} E \eta \rho \eta_{i j}$ aro, which cannot be rejected as a false reading. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 716.

The Ionians have a peculiar reduplication for the perfect, d́paf $\rho \eta \kappa \alpha$, ápaipquas with the spir. lenis, the usual form in Ionic prose for the com-



Eỉa, è $\lambda a t$, and $\epsilon_{\hat{i} \rho a}$ from eípı $\sigma \kappa \omega$, forms occurring in the later writers, as the Alexandrine, the Orphic poems, \&c., are regular aor. 1. by virtue of the characteristic; but as only the aor. 2. of these verbs, ei $\lambda o v$, evpov, was in common use elsewhere, it is plain that these are instances of the change of termination from the aor. 2. to the aor. 1. which took place in some unformed dialects. Other terminations beside the 1. pers. sing., as for instance the 2. pers. in as, the infin. in at, the part. in as, are seldom found, but in their place the regular terminations of the aor. $2 . \dagger$ Hence it is clear that the indiscriminate use of $\varepsilon i \pi o \nu$ and eima, of $\eta_{\nu} \nu \gamma \kappa \circ \nu$ and $\eta \nu \varepsilon \gamma \kappa a$, in the oldest and bestwriters, arises from the same change : all which tends to prove the original identity of the two aorists.-In the aor.2. midd. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon i \lambda a ́ \mu \eta \nu , - \omega , - a \tau o , - a \nu \tau o , \& c \text { ., in } \varepsilon \dot { \imath } \rho a ́ \mu \eta \nu , \& c \text { ., }}$
 ш̈бфрорто, Herodot. $1,80,26$., we have the same mixture of termination; of this the later writers furnish most frequent instances, but the older Ion. dialect is not without them. On these two forms, and the 2. pers. єï $\lambda \omega$, see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 139. 183. The Homeric $\gamma$ ćvro will be found in its alphabetical place.

## Aip $\rho$ (Att. and poet. áeip $\boldsymbol{\rho}$, I raise) is formed regularly

[^9]chius. In the above examples we must not overlook one thing, that only the terminations of the aor. 1. are adopted; the formation of the root renains the same, otherwise it would be $\dot{\alpha} \phi \in \bar{\epsilon} \lambda a \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta \bar{\eta} \lambda \alpha \iota$.
according to the rules of verbs having as their characteristic one of the liquids $\lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho .-$ Midd. Compare "A $\rho v v \mu a t$.

The Attics were enabled to use the $\alpha$ of the fut. long because $\alpha^{\prime} \epsilon p \hat{\omega}$ is contracted from dंipw. As the same thing is expressly mentioned by one of the grammarians with regard to $\phi a i \nu \omega \phi a \nu \bar{\omega}$, there is no doubt of it in the present instance, although most of the cases that occur are still under the consideration of the critic. In many passages, where for instance the text has the present of aip $\omega$ or aipé $\omega$, all becomes correct by adopting some form of ' $\bar{u} \hat{\omega}$ : and in Eurip. Iph. T. 117. the emendation of $\dot{a}^{\dot{\rho} \rho \hat{v} \mu \in \nu}$ is indeed confirmed by all the manuscripts*. In Eschyl. Pers. 797. ápoû $\mu \epsilon \nu$ is likewise the old and acknowledged reading: and in Eurip. Heracl. 323. áp $\hat{\omega}$, in Iph. A. 125. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, and in Tro. 1148. ápov̂ $\mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ are, according to this analogy, placed beyond a doubt both by sense and context $\dagger$. This however need not make us doubt the correctness of the form $\dot{\alpha} \rho \bar{\omega}$ with $a$ short; as in Soph. Aj. 75. ápeîs, and in CEd. Col. 460., ápeîo日e stand in the Iambic place.

- The aor. 2. active is never used in any of its forms; but in the middle, Homer has the aor. l. in the augmented indicative only ( $\quad$ i $\rho a ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta a$, $\eta_{1 p a r o), ~ a n d ~ w i t h o u t ~ t h e ~ a u g m e n t ~ t h e ~ a o r . ~ 2 . ~ i \rho o ́ ~}^{\mu \eta \nu}$; in all the other moods the aor. 2. only, á $\rho \omega \mu \alpha \iota$ ( $\alpha$ short), á $\rho o i ́ \mu \eta \nu, a \dot{a} \rho \in ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$. The Tragedians were able to use the same moods when the metre allowed it (e. g. in Soph. El. 34. ápoí $\mu \nu$ ), otherwise they have always the aor. 1. of which the $a$ is long.

 lengthened from $\dot{\varepsilon} i \rho о \mu \alpha$, with the quantity of the root changed. Compare $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \in \rho \in ́ \theta \theta o \mu a \iota$ under 'A $\gamma \varepsilon i ́ \rho \omega$.

And lastly by resolution into - $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega}$ comes the form aip $\epsilon$ v́ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ os for aipó-- $\boldsymbol{\mu \epsilon} \boldsymbol{v o s}$ in Hes. $\epsilon$. 474., where however it has been hitherto obscured by a mistaken reading in almost all the manuscripts of $\beta \iota o t o \iota \circ$ é $\rho \in \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$, and still more by the present $\beta$ ótov aipev́ $\mu \in v o v$. The poet is speaking of

 are therein:" this is the only natural construction of aipє $\sigma \theta a \iota$. But aipév$\mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ stands for aipó $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$, as is sufficiently certain by comparing it with

[^10]slight mistake he thought to be able to form aipù also from äip $\bar{\omega}$, in order to approach nearer to the text as handed down: and thus this barbaric form actually crept into some later cditions. Elmsley (on Eurip. Heracl. 323.) corrected it.
 And this, which is the only true reading, is actually preserved in the Etym. M., but in an article disfigured by mistakes*.
 fut. ai $\sigma \theta^{\prime} \eta \sigma o \mu a \iota$; aor. $\eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \theta_{o}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \dagger$. [Later writers have also a passive form aio $\theta \dot{\eta} \theta \bar{\eta} v a l$, as the LXX.]

AirӨopat also must have been in use, as some grammarians have wished to distinguish it from aiбӨávouaı; see Lex. Seguer. pp.183.216. 359 : and in Plat. Rep. 10. p. 608, a. Bekker has adopted from the manuscripts air $\theta \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ instead of ai $\sigma \theta \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, which does not suit the passage. See also Isocr. Nicocl. p. 28. Steph. according to Bekker's reading; Fronto, Epist. ad Marc. 1, 8, 4. where see the Add.
'Aïorw (in Hom. a depon. pass. also), I rush, hasten. In the Attics a dissyllable, and even in the Tragedians $\underset{\sim}{\ddot{c}} \sigma \sigma \omega$
 with and without the iota $\ddagger$.

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

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


## Ai $\sigma \chi^{i v} \omega$, I make ashamed, treat in a shameful manner:

[^11]aipov́ $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ or aipєú $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$. Whether the reading of the Hesiodic manuscripts from which Grævius quotes be aipcú $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$, or whether it be aipev́ $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$, which he rejected without mentioning it, is uncertain.

+ Verbs of three or more syllables in $\dot{a} \nu \omega$ and some in aiv come from a radical form without the alpha, which supplies it with some tenses as formed from $\dot{\epsilon} \omega$ : thus $a v \nexists \omega$ and $a v \dot{\xi} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega ; \beta \lambda a \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, aor. ${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau 0 \nu$, fut. $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ : see also
 $a^{\prime} \lambda \phi a ́ v \omega$ and $a^{i} \lambda \phi \alpha i v \omega ; \alpha^{\lambda} \lambda t \tau \alpha i \nu \omega, \eta ̉ \lambda \iota \tau 0 \nu$, à $\lambda \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; є́ $\rho v \theta a i \nu \omega, \kappa \in \rho \delta \alpha i ́ \nu \omega$, ỏ $\sigma \phi \rho a i ́-$ ขонає.
$\ddagger$ Most probably the iota subscript in the Attic forms may be ascribed to the accuracy of the grammarians. See Hemst. ad Plut. 733. Valck. ad Phœniss. 1388. and compare the various readings of the passages there mentioned. In pronunciation it was naturally distinguished by lengthening the $\alpha$.
pass. I am ashamed; perf. pass. $\eta^{\eta} \sigma \chi \nu \mu \mu \iota *$, part. $\eta^{\prime} \sigma \chi^{v \mu-}$
 Aifé $\omega$, I ask.-Midd.
Aitiáopat, I accuse: Depon. midd.
'Aí $\omega, I$ hear. Used only in pres. and imperf.
Verbs beginning with $a$, $a v$, and $o t$, followed by a vowel, have no
 but the $a$ if short becomes long, therefore "aiov \&c.-O"̈oдat and aeiío
 Plat. Hipp. Maj. p. 289. E.) Herodot. 9, 93. Apoll. Rhod. 1, 1023. 2,195 . with the augment and $\iota$ short.
[Passow in his Lexicon marks dí $\omega-\cup-$, and says that in Hom. the first syllable is short whenever the third is long. In the Tragedians it is common, Seidl. Eurip. Tro. 156. The iota is much oftener short than long, Heyne Il. o, 252. Spohn Hes. $\epsilon, 215$.]
'Aках ${ }^{i} \zeta(\omega$, transit. I grieve, vex any. one. The theme $\mathrm{AX} \Omega$ gives the fol
 mon use. From the same aor, as a new theme $\ddagger$ came the fut. diкa $^{\prime} \dot{f} \sigma \omega$, Hymn. Merc. 286., and again an aor. 1. áкá ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\sigma \epsilon}$, I1. $\psi, 223$. -Midd. üđo-


 is most probably a corruption of ák $\eta \chi \in \dot{\epsilon} a \tau a$, , which is a various reading, is regular, and supported by iкkaxeiato, Il. $\mu, 179$., (while for the $\delta$ there are no grounds whatever.-To the same intransitive meaning of the middle belongs also the part. pres. act. á $\chi$ '́ $\omega \nu$, -ovaa, grieving, lamenting.
'Akaxpévos, sharpened, pointed. Hom.-If this perf. part. pass., (the only part of the verb which occurs) be compared with the substantive áк乡́ and áкшкŋ́, a point, it leads us to a verb $\mathrm{AK} \Omega$ (acuo), because the

[^12]tense, were taken very naturally new forms. Thus from єṽpov, êrvðov, infin.
 $\chi \eta \sigma \omega$, not from $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{\mathcal{E}} \omega, \tau \cup \chi \in \in \in$, which were never in existence.
§ The perfect passive, as well as the other perfects, is intimately connected with the present; and as the terminations are similar in the infinitive and participle, this affinity can only be shown by adopting the accent of the present; thus $\dot{\epsilon} \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha-$ $\mu \alpha \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda a \mu \epsilon \nu о s ; \dot{a} \rho \dot{\eta} \rho є \mu \alpha \iota, \alpha \dot{\rho} \eta \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о$ s, and many others.
$\chi$ of the perf．act．before the $\mu$ is not changed into $\gamma$ ．For the $\alpha$ instead of $\eta$ in the second syllable see below，note（＊）．

＇Aќ́o perf．takes the $\sigma$ ．［The act．is found once in Hippocr．Loc． in Homin．c．5．The aor．pass．áкє $\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{\theta} \hat{\eta} v a \iota ~ h a s ~ a ~ p a s s . ~ s e n s e ~\end{aligned}$ in Pausan．2，27，3．＇Акєtá $\mu \in \nu$ ос is a false reading for áкєє－ о́ $\mu є \nu о с$ ，from áкєіодаı，Epic sister－form of áкє́одаı，Od．$\xi, 383$. II．$\pi, 29$ ．—Passow．］

＇Акои́ш，I hear†：fut．midd．áкои́боцає；perf．Att．áки́коа， Dor．ăкоики，later йкоика；plusq．perf． $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ йкоєьข．The pass． takes $\sigma$ ，and the perf．pass．is formed without reduplication，

＇Aкроа́онає，I hear：Depon．midd．The fut．is áкроáбонаи， not $-\eta \sigma o \mu a t$ ，an exception to the general rule．Of this
 also in use among the Attics ：the former occurs in Lex．Se－ guer．p．${ }^{7} 7,22$ ．，and the latter at p．98．is quoted from An－ tiphanes．See Piers．ad Moer．p．16．Lex．Seguer．p．18， 10.
＇А $\lambda a \lambda{ }^{\prime} \check{\zeta} \omega, I$ shout ：fut．－$\xi \omega, \& c$ ．
＇A入a入кєì．See＇A入́

 aor．$\dot{\eta} \lambda \dot{j} \theta \eta \nu$ ，poet．$\dot{a} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ ．－Passow．］

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


（＊）In forming the Attic reduplication the temp．augm．of the second syllable is sometimes neglected；for instance in $\alpha \times \alpha-$
 $\chi \eta \mu \alpha$ ，а $\rho \alpha i \rho \eta \kappa \alpha$, а $\rho \alpha i \rho \eta \mu \alpha$ ．

+ ［No pure Attic writer has the fut．act． $\dot{\alpha} \kappa 0 \cup \cup \sigma \omega$ ，Schæf．Greg．p．1063．It first

[^13]that of the perfect，that usage is constantly confounding them．See Buttm．Lexilog．pp．112．and 202，note．
＇$A \lambda \delta a i \nu \omega^{*}$, I make large and strong．The present is found in the later Epic poets，as Nicand．Alex．402．Homer has $\ddot{\eta} \lambda \delta a \nu \epsilon$, Od．$\sigma, 70 . \omega, 768$. where，particularly in the second passage，it appears to be completely an aorist．At II．$\psi$ ，599．stands the intransitive $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \bar{\delta} \eta \sigma \kappa \omega \dagger$ ，to grow，increase． Other forms are not found in the older poets ；Schneider in the Supple－ ment to his Lexicon has collected those which occur in the later $\ddagger$ ；among them is the intransitive äd $\lambda \delta o \mu a t$ in Nicander，for which undoubtedly he had an older precedent ：compare $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \theta o \mu \alpha \iota, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \theta a i \nu \omega$ ．From this camè the verbal adj．ú入rós，whence in Homer äva入ros，insatiable，literally whom nothing fills and nourishes，Od．$\rho$ ，228．$\sigma, 113,363$.

 B．as restored by Bekker from the best manuscripts．Midd．
 the Att．$a \dot{\lambda} \lambda_{\eta} \lambda \iota \emptyset a$（Demosth．in Callipp．29．），and the pass． $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{\jmath} \lambda \iota \mu \mu a \iota$ were in post－Homeric use．－Passow．］

In the Attic reduplication $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon i \phi \omega$ ，like $\dot{\alpha} \times n \dot{v} \omega$ ，takes a short vowel in the third syllable，even shortening the vowel of the root ：$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon^{\prime} \dot{\phi} \omega, \dot{a} \lambda \hat{\eta}-$
 $\lambda_{\varepsilon \iota \pi \tau a l}$ ；but whether this be a correct form，or a false reading for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\lambda} \lambda \eta^{\prime}-$ $\lambda_{\iota \pi \tau \alpha \iota}$ or $\eta_{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \tau \alpha \iota$ ，is uncertain．




See Schneid．on Xenoph．Anab．1，3，6．From the aor．1．act．，formed according to the analogy of the future，come the Homeric $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \dot{\xi} \dot{\xi} \tilde{\epsilon} \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ and $\dot{a} \pi a \lambda \epsilon \dot{\xi} \dot{\eta} \sigma a \iota \mu$ ．There are no grounds in Pind．O1．13，12．for a present $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \dot{\xi} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu$ ．The pres．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \rho \mu a \iota$ ，which sounds so like a future，and is

[^14] 1363．＇A $\lambda$ ín $\sigma$ коv $\sigma \alpha$, Eratosthenes，where Scaliger reads á $\lambda \delta i \neq \kappa o v \sigma \alpha \iota . \quad$＇A $\lambda \delta i ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ ， Suid．＇A $\lambda \delta \alpha$ ivovat，Nicand．Al．402．＇E $\nu$－ $\alpha \lambda \delta o ́ \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ ，Nicand．Al．532．＇Eva入 $\delta \dot{\eta}-$ $\nu \alpha \sigma \alpha$ ，transit．409．＇A $\bar{\delta} \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \kappa \in \nu$ ，from à $\delta$ é $\omega$ ，Orph．Lith．364．＇A $\lambda \delta \dot{v} \nu \eta \tau \alpha$, Quint．Sm．9，473．where Rhodomannus reads ả $\lambda \delta \alpha i \nu \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ ．＇A $\lambda \delta \hat{v \nu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \in ́ \nu o v s$, Suid． －Schneid．Suppl．］
thought suspicious (see Schneid.) in Xenophon, appears certain in Sophocl. ©d. T. 171. and particularly 539.
 with the reduplication $\dagger$ from $A \Lambda K \Omega$, whence $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \tau i ́ p$ and $\dot{a} \lambda \kappa \dot{d} \theta \epsilon i r$. Hence (according to the note on áкахєìv, áках $\dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$ ) came a new future


A present $\dot{u} \lambda e ́ \kappa \omega$ appears to hàve been actually used by the epigrammatic poet Diodorus (Epig. 1. Anthol. 6, 245.), although it is only as a conjecture instead of the á $\lambda$ éroos of the manuscript. Still however the early existence of this theme would not even then be proved, as these later poets occasionally made a form from analogy. But this $a \lambda$ éce bears the same relation to the forms which we have seen above from the root A $\Lambda \mathrm{K}$-, as ópé $\gamma \omega$ does to ópyvá́, ò $\rho \gamma \eta^{\prime}$ : see also Buttm. Lexilog. p. 132. From the aorist of this verb $\alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \alpha<$ was formed the present in common use $\alpha \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$, which then took again its own proper inflexion $\alpha \lambda \epsilon \xi \eta \sigma \omega$. In the same way the similar verb $\alpha^{\dot{\alpha}} \in \xi \omega$, $a \mathfrak{u} \dot{\xi} \omega$, arose from the root $A E \Gamma-A Y \Gamma-\rightarrow$, which beside that has produced only the Latin verb.
'A $\lambda$ é $\omega \ddagger$, I bruise or stamp to pieces, grind: fut. ả $\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$, Att. ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \hat{\omega}$; imperf. $\eta^{\prime} \lambda o v v$; perf. act. Att. ả $\lambda \eta \eta_{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \kappa a ;$ perf. pass. à $\eta_{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \mu a \iota$, [altered by Bekker in Thucyd. 4, 26. to $\dot{a} \lambda \eta \eta_{\epsilon}{ }_{\epsilon \mu \iota \iota}$, but still an undoubted form in Amphis ap. Athen. 14. p. 462 , A. and in Herodot. 7, 23.-Passow.] The later writers used in the present $\dot{a} \lambda \hat{j} \theta \omega$, which however was still an ancient form. See Piers. ad Moer. p. 17. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 151.
 doubtful. From this present we find $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \mu c \iota$ for -ov̂ $\mu \iota$, Theogn. 575.


 therefore is as to form undecided between the pres. and aor. At Od. $\xi$, 400. $\dot{d} \lambda \varepsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \tau a \iota$ is the conjunctive shortened according to the custom of

[^15][^16]the Epic poets＊；and at $\omega$ ，29．the same form standing instead of the future may serve for the pres．indic．as well as the conjunctive．

In the Attic poetry occurs also an act．$a^{\lambda} \lambda \in \dot{\omega} \omega$ with the regular aorist （ $\bar{\eta} \lambda \epsilon v \sigma a) ~ a \lambda \in \bar{\lambda} \sigma a \iota$ ．Its exact causative meaning，as deduced from that of a $\lambda \in \dot{v} о \mu a \iota$ ，is to snatch away，protect；and in this sense it is quoted from Sophocles in Lex．Seguer．6．p．383，4．（i入évo $\omega$ ，фu入á $\xi \omega$ ）．In Æschyl． Sept．141．also nothing is wanting to ädevzov but to supply $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \overline{\mu a s}$ ：while ib．88．and Suppl．544．have the accus．of the evil to be warded off；and at Prom．567．with ädeve either sense is admissible．

An Epic present is $\dot{a} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \omega t$ ，but with the meaning of the middle $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon_{-}$ одац．Compare épєєivш．

＂$\lambda \lambda \theta \circ \mu a 1$, to heal，i．e．become healed：［there is no known instance of the pres．act．or pass．－Passow．］imperf．pass．äd $\theta$ єто，Il．e，417．；fut． $d \lambda \theta \eta \sigma o \mu a \iota$, Il．$\eta, 405$ ．，but in this latter passage there are doubts both of the sense and reading：see Heyne．To this intransitive sense was added a causative one，I heal，i．e．I cure，which assumed different forms；$d \lambda$－
 $\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$, \＆c．；which forms are found in the Ionic prose of Hippocrates and others，but still need the help of the critic．See Foës．EEc．Hippocr．
＇A入ivóc．See Ku入iví $\omega$ ．
＇A入íбкодаı，I am taken：imperf．$\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \sigma \kappa о ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ．Of this verb the active is not in use，but its place is supplied by aipeiv， of which again $\dot{\lambda}$ तíконаt is used as the passive，and always in the same or a cognate sense．It forms its other tenses from＇ $\mathrm{A} \Lambda \mathrm{O} \Omega$（compare $\dot{a} \mu \beta \lambda \dot{i} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ），and with the additional irregularity，that aorist and perfect have the passive sense in the active form $\oint:$ aor．${ }_{\eta} \lambda \omega \omega \dot{v}$（Herodot．3，15．Xen． Anab．4，4，21．），Att．$e^{\prime} a \omega \omega \nu \|$ ，with $a$ long；the other moods with $a$ short，as opt．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda o i \eta v$（Il．$\chi, 253$ ．），and Ion．$\dot{a} \lambda \dot{\varphi} \eta \nu$ （Hom．sæpe），conj．$\dot{a} \lambda \hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi} \epsilon, \& c$ ．，infin．$\dot{a} \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu a t$, part．$\dot{a} \lambda o u ́ c ;$

[^17][^18]Perf．éan $\lambda \omega$ wa with a short［the usual form in Thucyd．and Demosth．］；Ion．and Att．ïdwкa．The fut．is from the


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

Homer has once（Il．$\epsilon, 487$ ．）the long $a$ in a form which has not the augment，the part．$\dot{e}$ 入óvre，which appears to be the original quantity： compare á $\nu \bar{a} \lambda i ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ ．
 rov $\dagger$ ，aor．mid．$\alpha \lambda \iota \tau o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ．The act．and mid．have the same meaning． ［Homer uses only the above two aorists．］

The Epic language has also a participle used like an adjective，ci入cí！－ $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 s \ddagger$ in an act．sense，sinning，Od．$\delta, 807$ ．Hes．$a, 91 \S$ ．This form may
 （like $\left.\beta \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu o s\right):$ as regards its active sense we may compare it with the similar passive part．$\pi \epsilon \phi v \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v o s$, ò $\lambda o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s$.

[^19]But considered accurately I cannot ac－ knowledge it to be such．The utmost we can draw from the Schol．of Tzetzes is that some old grammarians thought there was mean－ ing enough in the common reading $\alpha \lambda_{t}$－ Tinuevov to explain it as synonymous with $\gamma_{j} \lambda_{\ell \tau} \delta \rho^{\mu} \eta \nu 0 \nu$ ，which Homer uses with refe－－ rence to the same Eurystheus，）but not as an epithet，）so that $\alpha \lambda\left(\tau \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \operatorname{vos}\right.$ or $a^{\prime} \lambda \iota \tau \dot{q}-$ $\mu \in \nu o s$ might be each formed from $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$ ac－ cording to the difference of the rhythm， Let any one read now the gloss in the Etym．M．and he will see at once that the statement there given is the same，and that $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \ell \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \in \rho o s$ is an error of transcription ： for in the whole passage nothing is men－ tioned but the derivation from $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ ，where－ as if the etymologist had really used the other word，he must have given his rea－ sons for it ．
＇A入íw．See Kv入irod．
А $\Lambda \mathrm{K}-$ ，di入a入кєîr．See＇$\Delta \lambda \bar{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \omega$ ．
＇A $\lambda \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega,-\tau \tau \omega$, I change．［Aor．1．pass．$\grave{\eta} \lambda \lambda a ́ \chi 0 \eta \nu$ ，al－ ways in Herodot．，frequently in the Traged．，sometimes in Aristoph．］Aor．2．$\dot{\eta} \lambda \lambda a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$, common in Attic prose．
＂A $\lambda \lambda$ оган，I leap．Usage seems balanced between the two aorists，$\dot{\eta} \lambda a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，ä áa $\sigma \theta a \iota$（with a long），and $\dot{\eta} \lambda o ́ \mu \eta \nu, \dot{u} \lambda e ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$
 ä $\lambda$ отто，appear to have the preference＊．

The Epic language has the syncopated aorist，which takes the lenis，and
 and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ tád $\mu \epsilon$ ros $\dagger$ ．The long $a$ of the indicative of this form，which is shown by the circumflex，is an augment after the Doric manner；whence $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \bar{a} \lambda \tau 0$, not $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi a \lambda \tau \sigma$ ．The conjunct．，which does not admit of such a syncope，is the conjunct．of the regular aor．2．${ }^{4} \lambda \eta \tau a t$ ，and this short－ ened（according to note on＇A $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\rho} \mu a \iota$ ）becomes ä̈ $\lambda \epsilon \tau a t$ ，which some of the Grammarians have likewise written with the lenis，but on false grounds $\ddagger$ ．
＇A ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega, I$ thrash：fut．à $\lambda \frac{\eta}{} \boldsymbol{j} \sigma \omega$ ，and in the older Attics $-\dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$ ．The greater number of examples are in $-\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ：see
－See Fisch．ad Well．iii．a．p．29．On the 2．pers．$\ddot{\eta} \lambda \omega$ and $\ddot{\eta} \lambda o v$ see Erf．ad CEd． Tyr．1310．where Hermann now reads the imperf．，which is very harsh in that pas－ sage．
＋The Grammarians accounted for this lenis by the consonant following the $\lambda$ ； see Lex．de Spirit．p．210．Valck．Their rule，like everything similar，is bad：but when we consider that the same takes place in the metathesis $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \in i \nu, \eta \mu \mu \beta \rho o-$ rov，$\dot{\alpha} \beta$ рот $\dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ ，we see at once，without following the process throughout，that such changes had an influence on the aspirate ；other changes of the same na－ ture，though the reverse of the above（i．e． from the lenis to the aspirate），we may see
 Buttm．Lexil．p．300．No one with com－ mon sense will suppose that a gramma－ tical caprice can have produced this old and fixed tradition．
$\ddagger$ While the orthography of $\tilde{u} \lambda_{T}$ 信 has been handed down invariably the same， that of $\tilde{\tilde{\prime}} \lambda \eta$ rat has been uncertain from
the oldest times，as is clear from the Scholia on the Homeric passages（II．$\lambda$ ， 192．$\phi, 536$ ．）and the copies of the Gram－ marians．In this however it is to be observed，that those who wrote $\ddot{\lambda} \lambda \eta \tau a t d e-$ rived the word，inverting the usial way， from $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$ ；although they could not decide between the two spiritus；see Schol．on both the above passages：－but those who classed the word with $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \mathrm{a}$ ， did not change the aspirate；see Eustath． and Schol．Min．ad $\lambda$, 192．Now as the grounds for the spiritus of $\dot{\tilde{a}} \lambda \tau 0$ ，which were touched on in the last note，cannot （look at them in what light we will）be ap－ plicable to $\alpha \lambda \eta \tau \alpha t$ ，so neither is there any－ thing throughout to direct us to ä $\lambda \eta r a \ell$ with the lenis；and analogy therefore re－ quires us to write $\ddot{\mu} \lambda \eta \tau a l$ ，and to join it to the regular aor．2．，which had as good a title，through that $\tilde{a} \lambda \tau 0$ ，to be admitted into the Epic language，as ${ }^{\omega} \rho \in \tau 0$（to which belongs ö $\rho \eta \tau a \iota$ ）has through $\bar{\omega} \rho \tau 0$ ．Beside the above，Homer has also once the aor． 1. є́бй $\lambda a \tau 0$, Il．$\mu, 438$.

Valck. ad Ammon. 1, 4. p. 21. s. Lex. Seguer. p. 379, compared with p. 16. p. 270, 27. and Thom. Mag. in voc. [Att. à $\lambda o a ́ \omega ;$ Poet. á $\left.\lambda_{o} a^{\prime} \omega .-P a s s o w.\right] ~$

'Àvктє́ $\omega$ and (II. к, 94.) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda a \lambda \hat{\prime} \kappa \tau \eta \mu \alpha \iota, I$ am uneasy, full of anxiety. Beside Homer, Hippocrates, according to Erotian, used this present (compare Foes. Oec. Hipp. v. $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \dot{u} \zeta \epsilon \ell)$; and $\dot{a} \lambda v к \tau a i v \omega$ (Etym. M.),
 therefore all analogy when we attempt to make $\dot{\alpha} \lambda a \lambda \hat{v} \kappa \tau \eta \mu a \iota a$ present ; while as perf. pass. it can still have the sense of the present increased

 trust to a form of such a poet, is a nearer approach to the original theme. This verb must not however be classed with $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{v} \xi \omega$, but rather with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\nu} \sigma \sigma \omega$, which also mean a confusion and uneasiness of mind.
' $\Lambda \lambda \dot{\lambda} \sigma \kappa \omega, I$ avoid: fut. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\nu} \xi \omega$, \&c. [Homer generally uses the fut: and aor. 1. $\ddot{\eta} \lambda \nu \xi a$; in Hes. Fr. 22. we find $\ddot{\mu} \lambda \nu \xi \in \nu$; the midd. occurs only in Hes. $\epsilon$, 365.-Passow.]
This verb is evidently formed from $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \lambda$ eviouat: the $\kappa$ therefore is not a radical letter with $\sigma$ inserted, as in $\lambda$ dé $\sigma \omega$, , ruviokw; but it is the appendant verbal form in - $\sigma \kappa \omega$ (as in ф ф́ $\sigma \kappa \omega$, \&c.), which in its inflexion rejects the $\sigma$, as in $\delta i \delta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$.
The lengthened form $\dot{u} \lambda v \sigma \kappa a ́ \zeta \omega^{*}$ is a frequentative like $\dot{\rho}\left(\pi \tau a ́ \zeta \epsilon \nu^{\prime}\right.$, $\dot{e} p \pi \dot{u} \zeta \varepsilon / \nu$. But this idea does not suit the aorist $\dot{d} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa a \sigma \epsilon$, which has been the general reading of $\mathrm{Od} . \chi, 330$.; and Wolf was therefore right in adopting (from the Lex. of Apollon. and the Harl. MS.) the reading $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma k a v e$; for the context requires the imperfect, and $\dot{a} \lambda v \sigma \kappa \alpha \nu \omega$ is lengthened in a perfectly analogical manner without any change of meaning.
'A ${ }^{\prime} \dot{v} \omega, I$ am beside myself $\dagger$, has only the pres. and imperf.

[^20][^21]This verb must not be confounded with the former one, as its meaning is always decidedly different. But the Homeric present $\dot{i} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$ (Il. $\chi, 70$.) appears to belong to it, although with some deviation or additional force of meaning.
'A $\lambda \phi a^{\prime} \nu \omega$ or $a^{\lambda} \lambda \phi a^{\prime} \nu \omega$, I find, obtain. It forms its tenses from $\neq \lambda \phi \omega$ (see
 both $i \lambda \phi u i \nu \omega$ and $i \lambda \phi \dot{\nu} \nu \omega$ as presents, and cites in proof of the latter Eurip. Med. 301., the only passage of the Tragedians in which it is found ; adding, on the authority of Elmsley, that it is more frequent in the Comedians. The Grammarians have also $a^{\lambda} \lambda \phi \dot{u} \zeta \omega, \dot{d} \lambda \phi \alpha i \omega, d \lambda \phi \dot{a} \omega$, ù $\lambda \phi \in ́ \omega$, $̈ \lambda \lambda \phi \omega$, Dor. $\left.a^{\prime} \lambda \phi \dot{a} \delta \delta \omega.\right]$
 ${ }_{\eta}^{\prime \prime} \mu \alpha \rho \tau о \nu$, infin. $\dot{a} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath}$; [the fut. act. $\dot{a} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ is found only in the Alexandrians; the aor. 1. $\dot{\eta \mu} \boldsymbol{a}^{\rho} \rho \tau \sigma \alpha$ only in later writers, Lobeck. Phryn. p. 732._Passow.]

For $\eta \mu \kappa \rho \tau о \nu$ the Epic language has often $\eta \mu \beta \rho о \tau о \nu, \dot{u} \pi \dot{\eta} \mu \beta$ ротоу, formed by transposition, by the change of $a$ to $o$, and the necessary insertion of $\beta$. See Buttm. Lexilogus, p. 82. \&c. On the change of the spiritus compare the note on ${ }^{\circ} A \lambda \tau 0$.
'A $\mu a ́ \omega, ~ I ~(m o w ~ a n d) ~ c o l l e c t ~ t o g e t h e r, ~ b i n d ~ u p ~ i n ~ s h e a v e s . ~$ -Midd.

The first $a$ is long (Il. $\sigma, 551$. Hes. $\epsilon, 390$.) and short (Il. $\gamma, 359$. Hes. $\epsilon, 763$.), but the augment is always regular, $i^{\prime} \mu \omega \nu$, \&c. [According to Passow the first $a$ in Hom. is long in the act. and short in the midd., while in later writers, as in Theocr. 10, 7. 10, 16.11, 73. it is common.]
'A $\beta \beta$ íor $\omega$, I have an abortion, miscarry: fut. (formed from the less frequent $\left.{ }_{a}^{a} \mu \beta \lambda^{\circ} \omega\right){ }^{\dot{a}} \mu \beta \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$; aor. l. $\eta^{\eta} \mu \beta \lambda \omega \sigma a$; perf. $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \beta \lambda \omega \kappa а$.

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


 $\nu \in \dot{v} \epsilon \iota$. Butone who helps or injures may also be the subject, and then the production is generally the object expressed. In Plut. Arat. 32. metaphorically spoken of the fruits of the field, картò̀s $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \mu \beta \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$. In El .

 again in Plat. Theæt. 149. d. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda i \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda i \sigma \kappa o v \sigma \iota \nu$ seem to have the midwives as their subject. And so in the passage of Euripides the phrase ${ }^{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \mu \beta \lambda o u ̂ \nu ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \nu \eta \delta \dot{v} \nu$ is very intelligible, particularly as a poetical expression, without its following as a necessary consequence that $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\xi} \alpha \mu \beta \lambda o u ̄ \nu \gamma v \mathrm{rain} \alpha$ had been also made use of. However, in all the passages quoted above, and also in the common meaning to have an abortion, the verb may be considered as a causative, if we imagine to ourselves an immediative sense, to miscarry, whose subject shall not be the mother, but the child; and as such we actually find an aor. 2. (or by syncope) in
 avooic:*; which again is strongly confirmed by Pollux, in whose collection of the terms relating to this subject (II, c. 2.), instead of the untenable $\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda \hat{\nu}$ val, $\dot{\alpha} \mu \hat{\beta} \lambda \bar{\omega} \sigma a t$, we must read from the manuscripts $\dot{\alpha} \mu$ $\beta \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \iota, \dot{\mu} \mu \beta \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota$.
'A $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{i} \beta_{\omega}$, I exchange.-Midd. [The act. is seldom used by Homer, more frequently by the Attic writers.-Passow.]

' $\Lambda \mu \pi \lambda a к і \sigma к \omega$, I commit a fault, err: fut. $\boldsymbol{a}^{j} \mu \pi \lambda a \kappa \eta \sigma \omega$; aor. 2. $\eta^{\prime} \mu-$ $\pi \lambda \omega \kappa о \nu, \alpha \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \kappa \varepsilon i \nu \dagger$. The Doric dialect has $\alpha \mu \beta \lambda a \kappa i \sigma \kappa \omega$, \&c. $\ddagger$
' $\AA \mu \dot{v} \nu \omega, I$ ward off. The perf. is wanting both in the act.

[^22]editor has corrupted the old reading to $c i \mu$ $\pi \lambda a \kappa \in ́ o \nu \tau t$. Gaisford has given the whole paragraph from his manuscripts with ci $\mu$-$\beta \lambda a \kappa i \sigma k y$ (for so he reads it) three times; but in the first-quoted passage $i \mu \pi \lambda a k i-$ бкоעtı. The form $\alpha \mu \beta \lambda \alpha \kappa \epsilon i \nu \quad$ is also in Archilochus, 30. As to the other forms, $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \lambda a \kappa \epsilon i \nu$ and some that come from it, found in the Tragedians with the first syllable short, are now written in such passages $\alpha \pi \lambda a \kappa \in i ̄ \nu \& c$. in some ineasure from the representations of the old Grammarians. See Erf. ad Soph. ©Ed. T. 474. ed. min. Matth, ad Eurip. Iph. A. 124.
 formed from $\dot{\alpha} \mu v \nu \dot{a} \theta \omega$, a lengthened form of $\dot{a} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu \omega$, like $\delta \omega \omega$ $\kappa \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu, \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota v$.

On these forms Elmsley (ad. Eurip. Med. 186.) was the first to observe that the pres. indic. in -á $\theta \epsilon \iota v$ never occurs; but he was hasty in adding that they are always aorists, and must therefore be accented in
 have the momentary meaning of the aorist; but $\delta \omega \omega \kappa$ ídecv, Plat. Euthyphr. p. 15. d. and $\begin{gathered}\text { ét } \\ \omega \\ \kappa \kappa a \theta \epsilon s, ~ G o r g . ~ p . ~ 483 . ~ a . ~ a r e ~ q u i t e ~ a s ~ p l a i n l y ~ i n ~\end{gathered}$ duration the pres. or imperfect. This particular formation belongs therefore to those cases in which the preterit was not clearly separated into imperfect and aorist, and which consequently in this relation take a direction according to the nature of the verb; as for instance the idea of $\delta_{1} \omega \kappa \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ contains the duration in itself*.-More certain is it, that
 tuation of the infinitive of this verb $\sigma \chi \in \theta \in i \bar{y}$ is confirmed by the Homeric ${ }^{\sigma}{ }_{\chi} \epsilon \theta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota$. But I do not therefore think we are justified in writing
 observations on this verb in its place) ought to check such an arbitrary proceeding, and teach us not to hazard a decision on these traditionary points. See Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 272. Herm. ad. Soph. El. 744.


 less frequently $\dot{\mu} \mu \phi \epsilon \bar{i} \mu a c$. In prose the compound is more used than the simple.-Passow.] See "E $\nu \nu v \mu$.

## 'A $\mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta_{\eta \tau} \epsilon$, , I am of a different opinion, dispute. [He-

 rodot. 4, 14. : imperf. $\eta_{\mu} \phi \iota \sigma \dot{\eta} \tau о v \nu$; aor. $\eta_{\mu} \phi ь \sigma \beta \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \sigma a$, Demosth.-Passow.]As $\dot{a} \mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau \epsilon i \nu$ is compounded of $\dot{a} \mu \phi i s$ and $\beta u i \nu \omega$, $\eta_{\mu} \mu \downarrow \sigma \beta \hat{i} \tau o v \nu$,

[^23]in joining with the aor. 2. merely on account of the termination in $0 \nu$.-As to that part of Elmsley's observation that the pres. indic. of these forms was not in use, the non-occurrence of those in particular, when the others are so frequent, is certainly of great weight; for of the other forms in $\theta \omega$ the pres. indic. is found pretty frequently, for instance of $\pi \epsilon \lambda a \dot{\theta} \theta \omega$, the $a$ of which belongs to the root, $\pi \epsilon \lambda \boldsymbol{a}^{-}$ $\theta$ ets, $-\theta \epsilon \epsilon$, in Eurip. Rhes. 557. Aristoph. Ran. 1265. Thesm. 58.
$-\eta \sigma \alpha,-\eta \kappa \alpha$ are regular formations；but the custom generally observed in compounds with $\boldsymbol{a} \mu \phi \boldsymbol{i}$ caused quite early a false separation in the word，
 $\dot{a} \mu \phi \in \sigma \beta \dot{\jmath} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{v} \nu$ actually occurs I know not，but $\eta \mu \phi \in \sigma \beta \hat{\eta} \tau \circ v \nu$ has been uni－ formly restored to the text of Plato by Bekker from the best manuscripts， and in the Etym．Mag．p．94，37．it is quoted from Plato，though al－ tered by Sylburg without authority．And further，in the passage quoted there from Andocides de Myster．p．4，38． $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \phi \in \sigma \beta$ ßíroviv is the undoubted reading ；for the whole context shows that it was so in both passages， as also Fischer ad Well．ii．p．296．has observed，only that he，taking the words of the Grammarians still more literally，reads á $\mu \phi \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\eta} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$
＇Avaivo $\mu a \iota$, I refuse：［imperf．そ̉vaıvó $\mu \eta$ ，Poet．ảvaıvó $\mu \eta \nu$ ， and in later authors like Agathias frequently áv $\nu \nu o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ．－ Passow．］aor．ท̀ $\nu \eta \nu a ́ \mu \eta \nu, a ́ \nu \dot{\eta} \nu a \sigma 0 a t$ ，conjunct．ávض́vضтat．

This is a verb in aivı formed from the negation äv（see Buttm．Lexil． p．118．）；its aorist is therefore quite regular，like $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \nu \mu \eta \nu a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ．The other tenses are not in use；for in II．$\iota, 510$ ．Theocr．25， 6 ．，where $a^{2} \nu \eta$－ $\nu \eta$ rac is quoted as a perfect，it is the aor．conjunct．
＇Avä入ioкн，I employ，expend，consume：imperf．ávíлıбкоv． The older form ávà ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega$ is found in Thucyd．and the dramatic poets ：imperf．without augm．ává $\lambda o v v$, Thucyd． 8,45 ．The other tenses are formed entirely according to the old form， as fut．$\dot{a} \nu a \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$ ，while the aor．and perf．have sometimes the augment，sometimes not；thus the Att．aor．is $\dot{\nu} \dot{v}^{\prime} \lambda \omega \sigma a$ ， without augm．（Herm．Soph．Aj．1028．），in the non－Attic writers sometimes $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \sigma a$ ，sometimes $\dot{\eta} \nu a \dot{\lambda} \lambda \omega \sigma a$ ；in the same way the Att．perf．isávád $\omega \kappa \alpha$ ，the non－Att．áv $\dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \kappa \kappa a$ and $\dot{\eta} \nu a ́ \lambda \omega \kappa a, ~ V a l c k . ~ a d ~ P h œ n .591 * . ~ P e r f . ~ p a s s . ~ a ́ v a ́ \lambda \omega \mu a ı, ~ a o r . ~$ pass．$a^{\prime} \nu \bar{a} \lambda \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{a} \nu \eta \lambda \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \nu$ ．The pres．$a^{\prime} \nu \bar{a} \lambda o ́ \omega$ is rare．

This verb is distinguished from $\dot{a} \lambda i \sigma \kappa o \mu a \iota$ by the second $a$ being in－ variably long†．And thence arises also the uncertainty of the augment， as the long $\alpha$ was sometimes read without any（see＇A $\bar{\delta} \bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ ）．Which of

[^24][^25]the two forms was pure old Attic has been always a disputed point among the Atticists themselves, and one not easily to be decided: although among modern critics $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \lambda$ - was long the favourite. See Thom. Mag. with Hemsterh. note; Moeris. p. 25. Valck. ad Phœen. 591. Fischer ad Well. iii. p. 33 sqq. On the other side see Elmsl. and Herm. ad Soph. Aj. 1049. (1028.). In Isocrates Coray uniformly wrote, contrary to the preponderating authority of the manuscripts, ivad-; and Bekker, following the Codex on which he places most reliance, has uniformly restored $\dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \lambda$-. For $\dot{\eta} \nu \alpha{ }^{\lambda} \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha$ in this semi-compound form there appears to be no authority whatever; but кarŋvá $\lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}$ in Isocr. Euag. 22. (Bekker, 73), and кат $\begin{gathered}\text { ข } \alpha \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon ́ v a, ~ N i c o c l . ~ 9 . ~(B e k k e r, ~ 37 .), ~\end{gathered}$ are established firmly by the same manuscript.


 Herodot. 5, 39.; perf. $\epsilon$ éā̀ $a$. A passive voice does not occur ; but in the Doric dialect is found a synonymous middle $\dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\delta} \theta \theta a t$ in Fragm. Pythagor. p. 749. Gale. [We find also áróávetal, Archias Epig. 16.This verb is mostly Ion. and Poet.-Passow.]

The Homeric aor. evua¿ov is to be explained by the digamma E-FADON é-áduv éaíov. But F might be doubled on account of the metre, EFFA $\triangle O N$, and, as it could not therefore entirely disappear from the verse, it passed over into the cognate $\boldsymbol{v}$, $\epsilon \dot{\nu} a \delta o v$, as in kavásuus under ${ }^{\prime} \Lambda \gamma v \nu \mu u^{\ddagger}$.
 and therefore undoubtedly there were grounds for it in the old language, though hardly in the Homeric, in which the aor. was EFA $\triangle$ ON, EA $\triangle O N$, $A \triangle O N$. This was caused by the uncertainty of tradition in the old times of those dialectic forms; and from the same cause arose the confusion of éaiviave and ijpiave in Herodotus. The pure Homeric forms, as soon as the digamma disappeared, were without doubt éévouvev, and, where
 cording to the analogy of $\tilde{\omega} p \omega r$.

We have merely to add that this verb, which is used only in the dialects and poets, is properly the same as $\eta \dot{\delta} \omega$ (compare $\left.\lambda \omega \nu \theta^{\prime} \nu \nu, \lambda \lambda_{i}^{\prime} 0 \omega\right)$,

[^26]to tense, quantity, and accent, I can come to no decision.
\$ The idea of this form signifying well-pleasel, is not to be entertained for a moment, as the above analogy proves. Had this been the case, we must Jave met
 $\ddot{a} \dot{c} \in \nu$.
and distinguished from it by nothing more than a slight deviation of meaning and a difference of construction.
 Il. $\phi, 537$; ivé $\sigma a \iota \mu$, opt. aor. 1. act., Il. $\xi, 209$.-Passow.]. These Epic forms compounded with ává, and which, if we judge by their meaning, can be joined only with $\dot{\alpha} v i \eta \mu$, have this peculiarity, that they take $\epsilon$ instead of $\eta$ in the future, with which they unite the regular formation of the aor. 1. in $\sigma \alpha$ instead of $\kappa \alpha$. This form however appears to be used only where the preposition has the meaning of again, back, as to bring back, send back; while at Il. $\beta, 276 . \xi, 362 . \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon, \dot{a} \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ have merely
 of the old Grammarians the part. aor. 1. act. of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \in ́ \zeta \omega$, although both in form and meaning it belongs to the above.-Passow.]
'Av'ทooa, I press forward: a perfect with the sense of a present, the third person of which was also used as an aorist*. For its theme we must take $A N O \Omega$ or $A N E O \Omega$, a detailed account of which see in Buttm. Lexil. pp. 110. 133. \&c.
'Aviá $\boldsymbol{\prime}$ grieve or vex any one: fut. avtáow, Ion. -ñow. Passive with fut. midd. I grieve or vex (myself). ['Avẹ́aто, 3. plur. opt. pres. pass. in Herodot. 4, $] 30$. This form is more frequent in prose than áviáls. In Homer the $\imath$ is always long, in later writers short also. The a of the penult. in pres. is always short, in fut. \&c. always long; whence by the Ionic writers it was changed to $\eta$.-Passow.]

## - 'Avoír $\omega$. See Oírш.

'Avráw, I meet. In prose its compounds only are used, particularly á $\boldsymbol{a}^{2 \nu \tau a ́ \omega, ~ a ́ \pi a \nu \tau \eta ́ \eta o \mu a \iota ~(X e n . ~ H e l l . ~ 1, ~ 6, ~ 3 .), ~}$ $a \dot{\beta} \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \eta \sigma a, \& c$.

For the Homeric $\eta_{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon \sigma \nu$ we must not suppose any form in $\epsilon \in \dagger$ : like $\mu \epsilon \nu o i v \epsilon \circ \nu, \dot{\delta} \mu o ́ k \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu$, it is Ionic for $\eta_{i} \nu \tau \boldsymbol{c} o \nu$. -Of the barytone form in $\omega$
 aivtá $\omega$, but with no other tenses.

[^27][^28]'Avíu, Att. áv́v $\tau \omega^{*}$, I complete: fut. ávv́v, \&c. The pass. takes $\sigma$.-Midd.- [The $\boldsymbol{a}$ anduare always short.-Passow.]

A more restricted Atticism was $\dot{a} r \dot{v} \omega$ with the aspirate, $k a \theta a v \dot{v} \omega$. See Piers. ad Moer. v. $\eta^{\prime} \quad$ vad. Lex. Seguer. p. 14. Hesych. v. ka $\theta \alpha-$ vı́vas.

Theocritus, 7,10. has a syncopated form (or, which comes to the same, one formed from $\ddot{a} \nu v \mu$, , $\dot{a} \nu \check{v} \mu \epsilon s$, imperf. act., and at 2,92. ä̀vัго, imperf. pass. or midd. To the same formation belongs also the opt. pass. ävīo, on which see the following.

* $A \nu \omega$, an older form of $\dot{a} v i v \omega$ : used only in pres. and imperf. ă $\nu \epsilon \epsilon \nu$,
 369. ä voнає, I draw to a close, Il. к, 251. Æschyl. Choeph. 788. (795.)


This verb, with regard to quantity, is a solitary exception to the general rule, having its a uniformly long. Hence épyov ävouto, Od. $\sigma$, 473. must be left as an instance of Epic uncertainty : compare ci $\mu$ áw. But the opinion of Barnes is more probable, that the various reading $u \quad u \nu \bar{v} r o$ is the true reading, as optat. of ävvau (see the preceding), like
 тáde є̧̣̈a.
"Av ${ }^{\text {ara }}$, I command; an old perfect, but which never has the augment of the perfect. Of the sing. are found only the 2 . and 3 . pers.; of the plur. only the 1. pers. with syncope, äv $\nu \gamma \mu \epsilon \nu$, Hymn. Apoll. 528. -
 To the perf. belong, according to the general analogy of perfects, other
 perat. ävare, Eurip. Or. 119. Callim. Fr. 440. But the more common
 and again, by a similar formation, from $\dot{\alpha}^{\nu} \dot{\omega} \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ (Od. $\psi, 132$.) and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega-$ $\gamma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \omega$ (Od. $\beta, 195$.) came, by imitating the passive termination, ă $\nu \omega \chi \theta e$ (Hom.) and Eurip. and divíx $\theta \omega$ (Hom.) ${ }^{\circ}$.

The sense of the present introduced also the inflexion of a present; thus Homer and Herodotus (7, 104.) have 3. sing. pres. à $\omega$ '́ $\gamma \epsilon$, and
 or äv $\boldsymbol{\omega} \gamma \mathrm{\gamma} \boldsymbol{v}$ (Il. $\epsilon, 805$. Od. 九, 331.) is imperf. or rather aor., of which

[^29]form used only in pres. and imperf., just as $\gamma \lambda \dot{v} \phi \omega$ and $\gamma \lambda \dot{v} \pi \tau \omega$. On these verbs, as well as on the false way of writing them in-v́rt $\omega$, see Koen.et Schæf. ad Greg. Cor. in Att. 26., Hemst. ad Plut. 607., and the notes to Thom. Mag.
$\dagger$ See éypírop日e and note under ${ }^{2} \mathbf{E}_{\gamma} \in i \rho \omega$.
the 3. pers. $\eta^{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ stands full and complete in Hymn. Cer. 298. and Hes. $\epsilon, 68$. : elsewhere it is always without an augment, consequently
 were added a fut. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$ and aor. $\eta^{\prime} \nu \omega \xi a$, Od. $\pi, 404 . \kappa$, 531 . Hes. $a$, 479.

It were unnecessary to suppose a theme $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, from which to form
 394. we read also the 3. pl. $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \dot{\omega} \gamma \epsilon o \nu$. This form however certainly crept into the text after the digamma, which followed in eimeiv, had ceased to be perceived; whence Bentley proposed the simple alteration to


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

Among the singularities of this verb we would call attention to its striking analogy with oida. Both unite the sense of the present with the form of the perfect; neither of them has the augment, äv $\nu \gamma a$, ,as, $-\epsilon$, like oii $\alpha,-a s,-\epsilon$; the 1. plur. är $\quad$ н $\gamma \mu \epsilon \nu$ answers to $i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$, and in the
 $\tau$ into $\theta$ in the latter. The pluperf. with the force of an imperf. is ( $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \omega^{\prime}-$
 All these are original forms; the transitions to the pres. and imperf.
 usage. "A $\nu \omega \gamma a$ is therefore without doubt in sense as well as form an

[^30]$\dagger$ There would then remain of the pres. in $\omega$ nothing in Homer but the above-mentioned ávéyєrov, which again is very suspicious, as it is scarcely to be supposed that a writer who did not make use of ävwyas should have used ávíyarov.
old perfect like vicu，although it may be impossible to disentangle it ety－ mologically from the present，and diseover from which sense of the present it eomes．See Buttm．Lexil．p． 135.
：Aлuvтám．See＇Avtú $\omega$ ．
｀＾лаира́ш．See AYP－．
 di$\pi \dot{\prime} \phi \omega$, \＆c．：the middle has the active sense，as in the opt．aor．


 0,536 ．），as єípiok from єîpov，єipeìv；see note on＇A $\mu \pi \lambda a \kappa i \sigma \kappa \omega$ ：but of a new formation arising out of the same aorist（according to the rule laid down in a note on＇Акахі $\langle\omega$ ）nothing has been preserved except the aor．1． $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi a \pi \alpha ́ \phi \eta \sigma \epsilon r^{\prime}, \mathrm{Hymn}$ ．Apoll．376．All the rest disappeared before the new verb cinará $\omega$ ，$\dot{a} \pi a r i j \sigma, \dot{\eta} \pi a ́ r \eta \sigma a$ ，which are now the only forms in Homert．
＇Amo入av́w，I cnjoy：［fut．ámə入ávow in Dion．Hal．and Lucian，but more generally］ámoдávлонає，Xen．；aor． 1. $a \dot{\pi} \dot{\ell} \lambda a v \sigma a$ ，and aor．2．ámédavov，Thucyd．and Xen．：but in later writers these aor．took，in addition to the syllabic，the
 Demon．c．3．Ælian．V．H．12，25．Alciphr．3，53．It is true that Herodian in Hermann，p．315．，disapproves of these latter aorists；but when we see the other forms which that writer objects to，it only shows that these were very old and in common use．［An aor．midd．áтєлavбáرии no－ where occurs．The perfects are formed regularly，and are in Attic usage．A simple $\lambda u^{v} \omega$ is not found；and probably
 Passow．］
＇$\Lambda \pi$ oúpas．See AYP－．

[^31]than that these forms expelled at some later æra the old and genuine $\dot{\kappa} \pi \alpha \phi \dot{\jmath} \sigma$ ， ciாáфขтєע．Homer certainly had ouly the subst．cimár $\eta$ ，which was formed by
 p．117．），and from which again came the new verb $i \pi a \pi g ̧ v$ used in prose．
$\pm$ See note under Bori入opre．

"A $\begin{aligned} & \\ & \omega^{*} \text {, in both its senses, } I \text { set fire to and } I \text { fasten, is }\end{aligned}$ regular. From $\dot{c} \phi \dot{\eta}$ we see that its characteristic letter is $\phi$. Its second meaning is the causative one of to hold firm, which is the proper sense of the middle äлтонаt (Il. 0,67 .), and from which came the common meaning, to touch.
'Éá $\phi \theta \eta$, or $\mathcal{C}^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \phi \theta \eta$ (for the aspirate is doubtful), which occurs twice in Homer, viz. Il. $י 543 . \xi, 419$., appears to belong to this verb; for if we compare at II. $\beta, 15, \eta, 402 . \phi, 513$. the perf. $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \emptyset \eta \pi \tau \\ \text {, (necessity, }\end{gathered}$ evil, death) is fixed upon, we must then take for $\epsilon \in \mathfrak{i}-\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta \eta$ in both passages the physical meaning of inflicta est, was struck upon. But there are objections to this sense; and a very strong one as regards the form is this, that the separate augment $\epsilon a$ is found in those verbs only which had the digamma, of which there is nowhere any trace in $\tilde{a} \pi \tau \omega$, äтгорац. This form requires therefore a further examination. [It is fully examined in Buttm. Lexil. p. 242-246.]
'Apáopat, I pray, curse. The first $a$ in the Epics is long, in the Attics short $\dagger$.-Depon. midd.

There is one instance, Od. $\chi, 322$., of an act. infin. $\dot{a}^{\rho} \eta^{\prime} \mu \epsilon v^{\prime} a$, which, as the context requires a past tense, like $\mathrm{Od} . \delta, 378$. and $\xi, 134$., must be an aorist. And the only way in which I can arrive at such a one is by supposing an old depon. pass. from the simple root ( $\bar{\rho} \rho \boldsymbol{\mu} a \iota$ ), of which there remains nothing but this solitary instance of the aor. 2.
 uses elsewhere both the aor. pass. and aor. midd. of other deponents, of aiס仑́o $\mu$ a for instance.-'A $\rho \eta \mu^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \nu o s$ is a very different word: see it in its alphabetical place.
'Apapírк $\omega, I$ fit. The simple theme $A P \Omega$ is one of the most fruitful of the Greek radical verbs: from it are derived immediately the following,
 never occurs. Its meaning is both transit. and intransit. according to which the tenses may be thus divided :

[^32]meaning a prayer or curse (as at Il. o, 598. Od. $\rho, 496$.), and ápí with a short, in the sense of evil, destruction (as at 11 . $\mu, 334$.) We must however remark that a third Homeric form'á $\rho$ ei $\eta$, harsh words, threatening (II. $\rho, 43$ I.) has $\alpha$ short. [Passow makes the above difference depend not on the meaning but on the position of the word in the verse; viz. in the arsis long, in the thesis short.]
 infin. äpalı, part. ápoas, Hom. More used than the aor. 1. is the aor. 2.
 and from this aor. 2., which in Hom. is twice intransit. also, comes the transit. pres. ípapiбк (see note on $\dot{\pi} \mu \pi \lambda a к i \sigma \kappa \omega$ ), which we see in
 be joined both in formation and sense the new pres. dं $\rho \in \sigma \kappa \omega$; aor. 1. $\eta_{i} \rho \theta \eta \nu$, of which Homer has only 3. plur. áp $\theta \in \nu$ for ${ }_{\eta} \mu \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$, Il. $\pi, 211$. Of the midd. we find the aor. 1. part. «ं $\rho \sigma a ́ \mu \in v^{\prime} o s$, Hes. $a, 320$.
2. Intransit.-This sense, as arising from the continuity of action represented by the perfect, belongs to that tense almost exclusively ;
 pós, fem. ápäpviáa, but in the Epics deăaviâa§, with the second syllable short ; pluperf. ìpápetv (ā), Ion. and Ep. ápípetv or ѝpйpety. The perf. has generally the sense of a present, the pluperf. that of an imperfect. But beside the perfect we have also two instances of the aor. 2 with an intransit. meaning, viz. Od. $\delta, 777$. ijpapev $\bar{\eta} \mu \bar{\nu}$, was pleasing to us; and I1. $\pi, 214$., where we find both the meanings of this form within a
 both passages we must not overlook the momentary sense of the aorist ; in the former passage, "the proposal which was pleasing to us all," that is to say, recommended itself at the time of consultation : and in the latter it is a mere repetition of $a \rho \theta \in \nu$ which is in the preceding line, and which would have been literally repeated but for the intentional repetition of $\dot{\omega} s$ ápápp-wis äpapov; consequently the sense is, "so the helmets fitted themselves to each other" (compare Il. $\mu, 105$. oi $\delta{ }^{\circ} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{i}$ $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda o v s$ äpapov); and the description then follows correctly in the

"Aphevos, fitting, suited, is a syncopated aor. 2. midd., used as an adjective, exactly like the part. ápnp $\omega \dot{s}$, Hom. - And in the same way as ă $\rho$ $\mu \epsilon v o s$ and aip $\theta \in \boldsymbol{\prime}$ with a passive formation had an intransitive or reflective


[^33][^34]of which we find the part. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{v o s} *$ with the accent thrown back on the antepenult. according to the note on axijұє $\mu$ at under ' $A \times \alpha \chi i \zeta \omega$. The same perf. as a midd. with transit. meaning occurs in Hes, $\epsilon, 429$. $\pi \rho o \sigma-$ apíperac. $\dagger$

For the aor. part. áp $\quad$ áa $\mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ os see the last note.
The Greek verb, like the German fügen [to fit, and not unlike the English to fit and to be fitting], makes a metaphorical transition to the mind, with the meaning of to be pleasing. Thus Od. $\delta, 777 . \hat{i}$ in


 $\beta, 353$. and $\bar{\eta} \rho a \rho є \theta \nu \mu \grave{o} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \omega \dot{\delta} \tilde{\eta}, \epsilon, 95$. It is clear therefore that $\dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \omega$, á $\rho \in ́ \sigma \omega$, which is used in the same sense, comes from this AP $\Omega$ with the inflexion -є́ $\sigma \omega$.
"A $\delta \delta \omega, I$ water: fut. $a, \rho \sigma \omega, \& c$. It has no perf., and in the passive neither perf. nor aor. For its meaning see Buttm. Lexil. p. 157.
'A $£$ é $\sigma \kappa \omega$, I please (compare 'Арарі́бк $)$ : fut. á $\rho \in ́ \sigma \omega$ [midd. á $\rho \in ́ \sigma о \mu a \iota, ~ P o e t . ~ a ́ \rho є ́ \sigma \sigma о \mu a \iota ; ~ a o r . ~ 1 . ~ \eta ้ \rho є \sigma a, ~ m i d d . ~ \eta ’ \rho є \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu, ~$ Poet. ă $\rho \in \sigma \sigma a, ~ a ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$; aor. pass. $\left.\eta{ }^{\prime} \rho \in ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu\right]$; perf. $\eta^{\prime} \rho \in \sigma \mu a \iota$. -Midd.

Sextus (adv. Gr. 10, 266.) quotes the perf. act. ápípera as in common use.
'Apquévos, hurt, injured: a solitary part. perf. with a long, Od. ı, 403. $\sigma, 53, \& \mathrm{c}$. [The ancients explained it by $\beta \varepsilon \beta \lambda a \mu \mu \hat{\epsilon} v o s$. It is of

[^35]But in such a context as "after he...has fitted together," the perf. of the conjunct. is in Greek contrary to all analogy, and only the conjunct. aor. ( $\in \mathcal{v} \tau^{\prime} \hat{a} \nu \ldots . . a \rho a ́ \rho y$ ) is admissible. In this case a $\rho \eta \rho \in \tau \alpha \iota$ must therefore be the conjunct. of $\alpha^{\prime} \rho \eta \rho a \dot{-}$ $\mu \eta \nu$; which Brunck indeed thought he had found in Apollonius, though he had not only no grounds for it, but the sense was intransitive. If we look for an aor. which might supply the place of $\alpha \rho \alpha \rho p$ in the metre, a comparison of $\alpha \rho \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \nu 0$ s in Hes. Scut. 320. used likewise of fitting a piece of workmanship, will furnish us with $\tilde{a} \rho \sigma \eta \tau \alpha t, a \dot{a} \rho \in \tau \alpha \iota$ Perhaps therefore the
 ßoñi. Some Codd. of Lanzi have $\pi \rho o \sigma-$ aоíjєєта.
doubtfnl origin: the derivation from apáw, «ри́одси is very uncertain; but its connection with upacós undoubted.-Passow.]
'A $\rho ⿺ \sigma \pi c i \omega,-i j \sigma \omega, \& c$. Of this verb we find two remarkable forms used in familiar Attic quoted from some lost comedies by Athenæus (10.
 ¿є $\delta є \iota \pi$ vával, which appear to have been formed similarly because they were words of similar meaning; for the a in $i \in \delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu$ ívat cannot be regularly derived from $\delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \epsilon \in \omega, \delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \eta \kappa \in \in \nu a l$. See Mus. Antiq. Stud. I. p. 249.
'A $\kappa \kappa$ é $\omega, I$ suffice: fut. á $\kappa \kappa$ é $\sigma \omega, \&$. The passive, which has the same meaning as the active, takes $\sigma$.
'A $\rho \mu$ ótт $\omega$, and á $\rho \mu o ́ \zeta \omega$, to fit: fut. á $\rho \mu o ́ \sigma \omega, ~ \& c$.-MidD.
Many verbs with $\sigma \sigma$ or $\tau \tau$ have for their characteristic letter a labial instead of a palatic, which in most of them can only be known by their taking in the inflexion a single $\sigma$ instead of the $\xi, \gamma, \kappa, \chi$ of the other verbs in $\sigma \sigma \omega$. The principal verbs of this kind in prose are $\pi \lambda \mu \sigma \sigma \omega$, $\pi \dot{\iota} \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \tau i \sigma \sigma \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \rho \in ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \beta \rho \dot{́} \sigma \sigma \omega, \beta \lambda i ́ \tau \tau \omega$, and $\dot{\rho} \rho \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \tau$, for which last $\dot{\rho} \rho \mu \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$ is also used. In poetry кори́ $\sigma \omega \boldsymbol{i} \mu$ ' $\iota \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\lambda i \sigma \sigma o \mu a \iota$. To these we may

 word of which Homer has the fut. $\dot{u} \phi \dot{\jmath} \xi \epsilon \ell \nu$, but in the aor. $\eta^{\prime} \phi v \sigma a, ~ \& c$.
'A $\rho \nu$ є́онаи, I deny: depon. pass. with fut. midd. áрvíбоцаи (Eurip. Ion. 1026.), and aor. pass. á $\rho \nu \eta \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a t$; the aor. midd. a $\rho v \eta^{\prime} \sigma a \sigma \theta a t ~ i s ~ g e n e r a l l y ~ P o e t . ~ b u t ~ o c c u r s ~ a l s o ~ i n ~ H e r o d o t .3, ~ l . ~ . ~$ Eschin. Ctesiph. 81.
"A $\rho v{ }^{\prime} \mu a \iota, I$ acquire, gain by my exertions, a lengthened form of aip $\rho$, as $\pi \tau a \dot{\rho} \nu v \mu a \iota$ is of $\pi \tau a i \rho \omega$ : it is a defective deponent, used only in the pres. and imperf., and takes its other tenses from aı $\rho о \mu \alpha$, , fut. ápov̂ $\mu a t$ : compare Il. ц, 446. with $\sigma, 121$., and $\chi, 160$. with $\iota, 124$.
'Apóe, Iplow: fut. á $\rho o ́ \sigma \omega, ~ \& c . ; ~ b u t, ~ c o n t r a r y ~ t o ~ a n a l o g y *, ~$ it takes no $\sigma$ in the passive. It has the Att. reduplication.

 or á ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \mu \mu є v a \imath$, Hes. $є, 22 . \dagger$

[^36][^37]＇Aрлর́द̆ $\omega$, I carry off by violence：fut．Att．$\dot{u} \rho \pi \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$, Xen． Mag．Eq．4，17．，also fut．midd．$\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\sigma} \sigma о \mu a t$, Xen．Cyr．7，2， 5．Aristoph．Pac．1120．；aor．l．act．$\eta \not \rho \pi a \sigma a$ ，aor．1．pass． $\dot{\eta} \rho \pi \alpha \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu$ ．Also in common use，but later than the former， a fut．$\dot{a} \rho \pi \alpha^{\prime} \xi \omega$ ，aor．1．act．${ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \rho \pi \alpha \xi a$ ，aor．2．pass．$\dot{\eta} \rho \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \nu$ ．Ho－ mer has both formations．
 \＆c．）is found in the later poets，as in Nonnus and the Anthologia（Cod． Vat．pp．462．516．）．
＇A $\rho \tau \alpha \dot{\prime} \omega$, I hang，fasten on：fut．${ }^{\prime} \rho \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, \＆c．－Midd．
＇A $\rho^{\prime} \omega$ ，Att．á $\rho^{\prime} \dot{\tau} \omega, I$ draw or dip up：fut．á $\rho \dot{v} \sigma \omega$, \＆c． See note under＇Avíw．The pass．takes $\sigma$ ．－Midd．The $v$ is always short．
＂A $\chi^{\omega}$ ，I am the first，take the lead，command．The midd．has the same meaning；but in the Attics（with the exception of Soph．El．522．）that voice alone has the sense of to begin．The act．is common in Homer，Hesiod，Hero－ dotus and Pindar．
＇AP $\Omega$ ．See＇Apapítio．

＇Aб́óoua，I feel disgust or dislike：generally a depon． pass．［The aor．l．pass．á $\begin{aligned} & \theta \hat{\eta} \eta \mathrm{va} ~ o c c u r s ~ i n ~ H e r o d o t . ~ 3, ~\end{aligned} 4$ ．， the aor．1．midd．äбa⿱日aє фpéva in Theogn．567．］The act．áбáa is more rare，Theogn．593，Bekker．Galen．ap． Foes．in voc．＇Aббáo
＇Aбтáלoнаı，I greet：fut．à $\sigma \pi a ́ \sigma o \mu a \imath, ~ \& c .-D e p o n . ~ m i d d, ~$
A $\dot{v} \subset a ́ \omega$, I speak ：fut．－$-\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, Att．－á $\sigma \omega$ ．The tenses principally in use are the imperf． 3 pers．$\eta \dot{v} \delta a$ as aorist，and the aor．1．aiviñout．Pindar（OI． 2，166．）uses aúcóóout as a depon．midd．，as does Soph．Aj．772．Phil． 130． 852.

[^38]ting APOMENAI is to be read．Now surely the same criticism，which in Homer from ка入є́ $\omega, \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \omega$ wrote $\kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu a \ell$ ， could not in Hesiod from d́pów，ápóvew
 ing $\alpha \dot{\rho}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu a t$ ，which undoubtedly came from some old critic，deserves therefore，on account of its analogy with those Homeric forms，our maturest consideration．

As the Doric dialect is not used by Herodotus, avíásao0at, quióázaro in Ionic prose must be formed from a pres. ai $\delta \delta^{\prime} \zeta \rho \mu \mu$. The act. $a \dot{v} \delta \alpha{ }_{c} \zeta \omega$, - ${ }^{\prime} \varepsilon_{\omega}$, occurs in Lycophr. 892.
$A \ddot{u} \xi \omega$, and $a \cup \xi^{\prime} \dot{u} \nu \omega$, I increase, add to: fut. aj$\xi^{\prime} \eta \sigma \omega$, \&c. : see note under Aíबávoнaı. Pass. with fut. midd. I increase, grow. [Passow says the act. has a transit. sense, but in the Poets frequently intransit. Musgr. Soph. ©d. T. 1085. Erf. and in N. T. e. g. Luc. i. 80. The fut. midd. has a pass. meaning. The regular fut. act. av$\xi a v \hat{\omega}$ is found only in the LXX .]

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

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

1. $\dot{a} \pi a v \rho a ́ \omega, ~ I ~ t a k e ~ a w a y . ~ O f ~ t h i s ~ v e r b ~ w e ~ f i n d ~ o n l y ~ t h e ~ i m p e r f . ~$ (with the meaning of an aorist) $\dot{a} \pi \eta \dot{\cup} \rho \omega \nu, \dot{a} \pi \eta \dot{v} \rho a s, \dot{a} \pi \eta \dot{u} \rho a$, all three in Homer; and (from a theme AYPS) an aor. 1. midd. ám $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\dot{\prime} \rho a \tau o, ~ O d . ~}^{\text {O }}$ $\delta, 646$., but with a various reading $\dot{a} \pi \eta \dot{y} \rho a$. Connected by meaning with the above forms are also the participles aor. 1. act. a a ovo as, and midd. with a passive sense $\dot{a} \pi o v \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, (Hes. $\alpha, 173$.) by a change of vowel which never occurs elsewhere $\dagger$.
2. є́тavрі́ккоцає, I reap advantage or disadvantage from, enjoy; depon. midd.: fut. émavрท́боции, Il. Ч, 353.; aor. act. é $\pi \eta \hat{u} p o v$, Dor. é éâ̂pov, Pind. P. 3, 65. [of this aor. Homer has only 3. pers. conjunct. émaúpp, Il. $\lambda, 391$.
 Od. $\rho, 81$. ] ; aor. midd. é $\pi \eta \nu \rho o ́ \mu \eta \nu$, Eurip. Hel. 476. [of this aor. Homer has only the 2. pers. conjunct. ėmaúp émávpทृ, Il. o, 17. Od. $\sigma, 107$. and 3. plur. émávpovtat, Il. a, 410 .] ; infin. émavpéє $\theta a \iota$, Eurip. Iph. T. 529. and in nonAttic writers غ̇жavpaб日aı $\ddagger$, Hippocr. Jusjur. 3. and elsewhere.
[^39][^40] Hippocr. The pres. $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ \pi u \cup \rho o \mu a t, ~ w h i c h ~ w a s ~ s u p p o s e d ~ f o r ~ s o m e ~ o t h e r ~\end{gathered}$ purpose, (whence the accentuation éraípeatac,) does not occur; $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \dot{\dot{\varphi}} \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \mathrm{a}$ is conjunct. aor. The pres. act. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi a v \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega$ is found only in Theogn. 115.: no pres. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi a v \rho a ́ \omega$ or $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi a \dot{a} \rho \omega$ exists. Hesiod, e, 417. has $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a v \rho \in i \quad i \quad$ from $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha v \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$. The active forms are found only in the Epic and Lyric poets; the midd. passed over to the usage of the Attics also.

Compare the different tenses of this verb and its meaning with the verb eipiok $\omega$, which differs from it only in the diphthong, as eï $\chi o \mu a \iota$ and à̉ $\chi$ éo.

Aüu, I call out, sound aloud. This present occurs only as a dissyllable; but the other tenses (as if formed from $\dot{a} \hat{v} \omega)$ are fut. $\mathfrak{a} \hat{v} \sigma \omega$, aor. ${ }_{j} \dot{\eta} \dot{\sigma} a$, infin. $\dot{u} i \ddot{\circ} \sigma a t$, with $v$ long. From the subst. áüfi, a cry, comes in the Epic and Tragic poets a new pres. àüré $\omega$, also with long $v$.

Avíw, I kindle; Att. av̂̀ ; aṽoı, Od. є, 490. Aüทrat, takes fire, Arat. 1035. (Diosc. 333.) Thence in prose
'Evaúv, I kindle. Herodot. 7, 231. Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 22. The pass. probably takes the $\sigma$, whence évavбиa.-Midd. 'Evavá́ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ с, $\not \ldots l i a n$.

This compound has, I believe, no augment, a point however not proved by the instance from Herodot. 7, 231. oйтє oi $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ oviđ̌eis évave.

This verb is incorrectly supposed to be the same as avv $\omega$, or avico, $I$ roast, but which in the common language was $\epsilon \tilde{\omega} \omega$ : see this verb. Akin to aṽ $\omega$ is avaiv, *, $I d r y$; and therefore this third aṽ $\omega$ must be considered as a separate verb from the two others.
 writers $\dot{a} \phi \dot{a} \sigma \sigma \omega$, as we find the part. pres. áфá $\sigma \sigma o v \sigma a$, and the aor. 1. 3. pers. ì $\phi a \sigma \varepsilon$, imperat. ä $\phi a \sigma o v$, Herodot. 3, 69. A pres. á $\phi a \sigma \sigma a ́ \omega$, and some other forms which have not yet been examined critically, occur in Foes. ©Ec. Hippocr. in voc.-Compare 'Алифіткш.
 165., poet. also äфvaбa; aor. midd. 引ो申váá $\eta \eta$, Od. $\eta, 286$. For the

"A $\chi^{\theta o \mu a t, ~ I ~ a m ~ l o a d e d, ~ m e t a p h . ~ v e x e d: ~ p a s s . ~ w i t h o u t ~ a n y ~}$ act. in use; generally with fut. midd. á $\chi^{\theta \text { éco }}$,

[^41][^42]Nub．865．1432．Av．84．，but sometimes á $\chi$ Өíбонаt ；aor． 1. $\dot{\eta} \chi \theta^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu\left(\mathrm{Od}\right.$. o，457．），whence also the pass．fut．$\dot{a} \chi \chi_{\varepsilon \sigma \theta \eta-}$ бонає：see Piers．ad Moer．p． 21.

＊A $\omega$ ．This theme appears under four different meanings：－
1．I blow．3．pers．imperf．äєv，Apollon．Rh．1，605．But the pres．ä̈ $\eta \mu$ is more usual，of which 3 ．sing．ä $\eta \sigma \iota$ ，Hes．$\epsilon, 514$ ．，infin． $\dot{a} \eta ̄ \nu a \iota, \dot{a} \eta \dot{\mu} \mu \nu a \iota$ ，part．áés，ảévтos；imperf．3．sing．äך，Od．$\mu, 325$ ．but
 perf．ä $\eta$ rov．In the dual pres．á $\eta \tau \boldsymbol{\nu}$（II．८，5．）and the infin．pres．we find the $\eta$ retained，contrary to the analogy of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu c$ ．This passive form has the active sense except at Od．$\zeta, 131$ ．where it means to be blown through．

In the Etym．M．is quoted 3．pl．${ }^{\prime} \in \iota \sigma \iota$ ，and the explanation of its being ※olic for áeīt is proved by reference to Hes．$\theta$ ，875．Much the same is said by the Schol．Il．$\epsilon, 526$. ，in Heyne vol．5．p． 712. ＂A入入a८ äє七б was therefore an old－established reading there（see the various readings），and ácırı without doubt a genuine form．

2．I sleep ：aor．à $\sigma \alpha$ ，contr． $\mathfrak{a} \sigma a, \mathrm{Od} . \tau, 342 . \pi, 367$ ．［This verb． is the root of $\alpha v v^{\prime} \omega$ ，iav́v，$\dot{\alpha} \omega \tau \in \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ ．－Passow．］

3．I satiate．From the pres．come the following infin．act．＂ā $\mu \boldsymbol{r} a t$ ， （II．$\phi, 70$ ．）contr．from áé $\mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ for ảeıv；3．pres．pass．ätaı（Heysch．），and by resolution áăтaı，Hes．a．101．，where it stands as a future＊．Fut．${ }^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ， aor．$\dot{\tilde{j}} \sigma \alpha$ ，infin．$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota$ ；with the midd．$\ddot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, \ddot{a} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$ ；although the ac－ tive form also occurs in the intransitive or middle sense，$I$ am satiated， like the above－mentioned $\ddot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ and $\dot{a} \sigma \alpha \iota$, Il．o，317．$\psi, 157$, \＆c．Verbal adj．$\dot{a}$ rós，and with a priv．ăuros，contr．áros，insatiable．On these forms see Buttm．Lexil．p． 2.

By old grammatical tradition the conjunct．$\dot{\epsilon} \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \nu$ or $\bar{\epsilon} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$（Il．$\tau$ ， 402．）is attached to this verb，consequently it is for ${ }^{a} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ or $\omega^{3} \mu \in \nu$ ： see Etym．M．v．${ }^{\prime} \delta \eta \nu$ ，and Buttm．Lexil．p． 26.

There are no grounds for adopting the radical $A \Delta$－as is generally done；on which，and on the relations of this verb to $\dot{\alpha} \delta \bar{j} \sigma a t$ ，see Buttm． Lexil．p．22，\＆c．

4．I hurt；aor．1．à $\sigma \alpha$ ．See＇Aá $\omega$ ．
＂Awpro．See Aípo．
＊There are sufficient grounds for this future，but some doubts about the reso－ lution：see Buttm．Lexil．p．142，where
he has enlarged on the probability of the $\tilde{a} \tau a t$ of Mesych．being taken from this passage．
B.

Bú̧由, I speak: fut. $\beta$ á $\xi \omega$; and 3. sing. perf. pass. $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta a \kappa \tau a t$, Od. $\theta$, 408.

Baive, I go: fut. • $\beta_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma о \mu a t$, Dor. $\beta \bar{a} \sigma \epsilon \bar{\nu} \mu a \imath$; perf. $\beta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \beta \eta \kappa \alpha$ (whence the syncopated forms $\left.\beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{a ́ a \sigma \iota}, \beta_{\epsilon} \beta \hat{a} \sigma \iota\right)$; infin. $\beta_{c}$ $\beta_{a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu}$, part. $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{a ́ \omega}, \beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{a v i ́ a}$, contr. $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{\dot{\omega} \epsilon,}, \beta_{\epsilon} \beta \hat{\omega} \sigma a, \beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{\omega} \epsilon$, which forms are rare except in the poets: Homer has the Epic $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{a ́ a}^{a} \sigma l$, part. $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{a}{ }^{\prime} \omega ́, \beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{a ̆ v i \alpha}$, infin. $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{\alpha}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu$. The aor. 2. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \beta \eta \nu^{*}$ is like $\notin \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, therefore ${ }^{\prime} \beta \beta_{\eta \mu \tau \nu}$, \&c., imperat. $\beta \hat{\eta} \theta_{\imath}$, conjunct. $\beta \hat{\omega}$, optat. $\beta a i \not \eta \nu$, infin. $\beta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$, part. $\beta a ́ c, ~ \beta \hat{a} \sigma a$, ßáv. [Homer has also $\beta^{\prime} \dot{\tau} \tau \nu$ (ă) for $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \beta^{\prime} \tau \eta \nu$; and in 3.
 rarely é $\beta^{\prime} \eta$ бато.] Some compounds have also a passive, e.g.

The pluperf. ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \beta \in \beta \dot{\eta} \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu$ has in Homer almost always the sense of went, for which as imperf. the plainest passages are II. $\zeta, 313.495$. $513 . \pi, 751$. Od. $\rho, 26$.; while at Od. $\nu, 164$. it must be understood as an aorist; and the only clear instance of its pluperfect sense is in the expression äïòóo亢̀ $\beta \in \beta$ ĭkeє, Od. $\gamma, 410 . \zeta, 11$. Compare Heyne ad II. ¿, 492.
In addition to the perf. pass. $\pi \alpha \rho a \beta \dot{\varepsilon} \beta a \mu a \iota$ we must mention $\pi \alpha \rho a-$ $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} \beta a \sigma \mu a t$ in the spurious oration of Demosth. De Fœed. Alex. p. 214. extr., and in later writers $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, é $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\eta} \eta \sigma a$, in a causative sense and also in the common language; e.g. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \beta \dot{\jmath} \sigma \epsilon \tau \nu$, Lucian Dial. Mort. 6, 4.

On the unusual particip. pres. of fáw we have only to say, that it occurs in anaprestic verse in Cratinus ( $\pi \rho \circ \bar{\beta} \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ), and in a causative sense in the Doric treaty in Thucyd. 5, 77. (éк $\beta \hat{\omega} v \tau a s)$.

The 2. pers. imperat. of the aor. 2. was also shortened by the Attics in the compounds (as in ï $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$, ává $\sigma \tau a$ ) катá $\beta a$, Aristoph. Vesp. 979. $\pi \rho \dot{\beta} \beta a$, Acharn. 262.
 are formed from the perfect by omitting the $\kappa$, as in кєкафпи́s, тєтıŋи́s, кє$\chi^{\alpha} \rho \eta \dot{\omega} s, \beta \in \beta a \rho \eta \dot{\omega} s, \tau \epsilon \tau \lambda \eta \dot{\omega} s, \pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \omega \dot{s}, \tau \epsilon \tau \mu \eta \dot{\omega} s, \kappa \varepsilon \kappa \mu \eta \dot{\omega} s$ : this must therefore have been a rule in the Ionic language, as it is not done on account

[^43]$\dagger$ For the short $a$ in $\beta \alpha \dot{v}$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \beta a \nu$ see $\Delta i \hat{j} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \omega$ toward the end and note.
of the metre: and in the cases of $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta_{\eta} \kappa \alpha$, é $\tilde{\tau} \eta \kappa \alpha, \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \phi и к \alpha$, the vowel is

 found except in the dialects and poets. The conjunct. $\beta \in \beta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota$, part. $\beta \epsilon \beta \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha$, occurs in Plat. Phædr. p. 252. ( $\left.\varepsilon^{\beta} \mu \beta \varepsilon \beta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota\right)$ 254.; the infin. $\sigma v \mu-$


In the aor. 2. Homer has some forms with $a$ instead of $\eta$ short, $\beta$ ár $\eta \nu$ for ${ }^{\hat{\varepsilon}} \beta \dot{\eta} i \tau \eta \nu, \dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \beta a \sigma a \nu$ for $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \eta \sigma a \nu$; with these we may compare many other words in which the Ionians changed the $\eta$ into short $a$, as $\pi a ́ p \eta$ * for
 $\mu \eta \kappa \alpha$. On the other hand $\beta \bar{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon$ in Æschyl. Suppl. 206. in the iambics is one of the solitary instances of a Doricism $\dagger$ in the Tragic language. In Theocr. 15, 22. $\beta \hat{\sigma} \mu \epsilon s$ for $\beta \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ is an unusual Doricism. The 1. sing. aor. 2. conjunct. $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon$ and $\beta \epsilon i \omega$ for $\beta \bar{\omega}$, and 3. pers. $\beta \dot{\eta} \eta$ for $\beta \tilde{\eta}, \& \mathrm{c}$. are Ionic and Epic resolutions, like $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \omega, \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} s, \sigma \tau i \eta \eta \tau o \nu, \& c ., \theta \in i \omega, \theta \in i \omega \mu \in \nu$, \&c., $\delta a \mu \epsilon i ́ \omega$, \&c.

Beside the fut. midd. the Epics have also the aor. midd. in the same
 Of these the second would appear to be the only correct form in Homer, according to a note in Buttm. Lexil. p. 226. ; the first might have been used in a causative sense for $\epsilon \beta \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$, but for this 1 find no other authority in Homer than àvaß ${ }^{2} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota$, Od. o, 474.

See the form $\beta$ éo $\mu a t, \beta \varepsilon i o \mu a t$, in its place.
This verb has in the Ionic dialect and the Poets the causative sense also $I$ cause to go, i. e. bring, carry, remove, a meaning which otherwise belongs to $\beta \iota \beta$ á $\zeta \omega$. The fut. act. and the aor. 1. are the only tenses which have this meaning; but in the compounds it appears to belong also to the aor. 1. midd., as $\nu \grave{\omega} \dot{a} \nu \alpha \beta \eta \sigma a ́ \mu e v o t$, taking us into his vessel, Od. o, 475. Of other forms I know of only two instances, é $\pi<\beta \hat{\eta}$ rov, Od. $\psi, 52$., and катаßaive, Pind. Pyth. 8, 111 : for $\beta a i v \omega \pi$ á́ca and such kind of expressions (see Seidler on Eurip. El. 94.) appear to me only a liberty taken with the syntax, in which the Greek poets occasionally indulged themselves, and no change of meaning in the verb反aivw. The Epic sister-form ßá $\sigma \kappa \omega$ has also both senses; $\beta$ á $\sigma \kappa^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \theta$,


The Epic language has also the form $\beta_{\imath} \beta \beta_{u} \omega, \beta_{i} \beta \eta \mu \iota$, which it uses in the sense of I stride, of which however we have only the pres. $\beta \imath \beta \bar{q}$ (Hymn. Merc. 225), and the part. $\beta \iota \beta \bar{\omega} \nu, \beta \imath \beta \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma$, (Il. $\gamma, 22$. Od. $\lambda$,

[^44]539．）$\beta \imath \beta$ ás（Il．$\eta, 213$ ）．［To these Passow adds éßßßßarke，Ion．imperf． Hymn．Apoll．133．］Now if we take this as a present instead of $\beta$ aive， the whole verb corresponds exactly in formation with i $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$ ，and both have the fut．and aor．I．in the causative sense．

Bá $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ，I throw：fut．$\beta a \lambda \omega$ ，and sometimes（but not in the early writers）$\beta a \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \omega$ ，Aristoph．Vesp．222． 1482. with the aor．1．$\dot{e} \beta \dot{\beta} \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma$ ；the usual aorist is the aor． 2.
 $\mu a \iota^{*}$ ，Epic $\beta_{e} \beta o ́ \lambda \eta \mu a t$ also ；aor．1．pass．$\grave{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{\eta \nu}$ ．－Midd．
$\mathrm{B} a \lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu$ is an Ionic resolution of $\beta_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ；thus we find $\dot{i} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta a \lambda$－


From a syncopated aor．$\dagger{ }_{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \eta \nu$ come the Epic forms $\xi \nu \mu \beta \lambda i ́ \tau \eta \nu$（Od．




All these forms，beginning with the perfect $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ ，arise from the metathesis of $B A \Lambda$ to $B \Lambda A \S$ ；nor isit any objection to this that the optat．has the diphthong $\epsilon \ell$ ，as we see the same change from the vowel of the root $a$ in other cases，for instance in a precisely similar one under $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ and in $\chi \rho \rho^{\prime}$（хр́á $\omega$ ）．Besides in the verb before us the old original form was BEA（by metath．B $\Lambda$ E），as shown in the derivative $\beta \dot{e ́ \lambda o s, ~ a n d ~ m o r e ~ p a r t i c u l a r l y ~ i n ~ t h e ~ v e r b a l ~ a d j e c t i v e ~} \beta$ e入ét $\eta \mathrm{s}$ in ékarn $\beta \varepsilon-$


From the same old stem or root too，by that change of vowel which is the most usual，come the verbal substantive $\beta$ ódos，and the common Epic perf．pass．$\beta \in \beta \dot{\delta} \lambda \eta \mu a t$ ．

Ва́лт $\omega, I d i p:$ fut．$\beta \dot{\alpha} \psi \omega$ ；perf．pass．$\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta a \mu \mu a t$ ；aor． 2. pass．$e^{〔}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \phi \eta \nu$ ．The characteristic letter is $\phi$ ．

[^45]$\dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \eta \mu \eta \nu$ ，optat．$\beta \lambda \tilde{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ or $\beta \lambda \epsilon i ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ；but the connection of these passive with the corresponding active aorists，as shown in a note near the end of $\Gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma x \omega$ ，and the prevailing form of the optative $\sigma \beta \in i \eta \nu$ ， $\beta$ ai $\eta \nu, \gamma v o i \eta \nu$ ，are decisive in favour of $\beta \lambda \epsilon i \hat{0}$ ．Compare $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu$ under Пi $\mu$－ $\pi \lambda \eta \mu$ ．
 т $\dot{\theta} \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha(\theta \mathbf{A N}, \theta \mathrm{NA}):$ in $\theta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega, \theta \mathrm{o}-$ $\rho о \bar{v} \mu \alpha \iota$, हैं o $\rho \circ \nu(\Theta О \mathrm{P}, \theta \mathrm{PO}):$ in $\beta \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \kappa \omega$ ， $\mu 0 \lambda o \bar{v} \mu \alpha \iota,{ }_{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{O} \lambda о \nu, \mu \varepsilon \mu \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha$（МОА， MAO）．

Búpuve, I load, takes in the pass. the perf. of the otherwise nonAttic $\beta a \rho \epsilon \in \omega, \beta \in \beta$ á $\rho \eta \mu a \iota, I$ am loaded, Plat. Symp. 203. b., for which
 ticle on Baiv $\omega$, paragraph 6.

Baбтál $\omega$, I bear or carry: fut. $\beta a \sigma \tau a ́ \sigma \omega$, \&c.; but in the pass. it changes its formation, and makes the aor. 1. $\mathfrak{e} \beta a \sigma \tau u ́-$ $\chi^{0 \eta \nu .}$ Compare סıбтálu, vvoтálı.
$\mathrm{BA} \Omega, \beta i \beta \eta \mu$. See Baivш.
 there are quite as strong grounds for our explaining to be a real but irregular future, (like $\pi i o \mu a \iota$ or like $\kappa \epsilon \omega$, кeí $\omega$,) as there are for our calling it a conjunctive, for $\beta \dot{\beta} \omega \mu \mu \iota$, used like a future. A more important question is, whether it belongs to an old verb BEI $\Omega$, whence $\beta$ ios and $\beta$ 人ów ; or whether the passive of $\beta a i \nu \omega$ took in more ancient usage the sense of $I$ walk, i. e. live, in which case $\beta \epsilon$ io $\mu$ au will correspond with the active $\beta \boldsymbol{\beta} i \omega$ for $\beta \bar{\omega}$. This investigation will therefore prevent the necessity of altering, as Wolf has done, the traditionary form $\beta \kappa$ ó $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a$, (Hymn. Apoll. 528.) to $\beta \epsilon$ о́ $\mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a$.

Bıáלopaı, I force: depon. midd., from which however is not only formed with a passive meaning the aor. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \beta_{\iota} \sigma \theta \theta \eta v$, as in many similar verbs $\dagger$, but the other tenses (for instance the pres. and imperf. frequently, and the perf. perhaps always,) are used passively.

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

 Homer has $\beta \in \beta$ inxev actively.

В九 $\beta$ á $\omega, \beta i \beta \eta \mu \iota$. See Baivш.

## $\mathrm{B}_{\imath} \beta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$, I eat. From this synonym of the verb é $\sigma \theta_{i}^{\prime} \omega$

[^46]has been observed, and not without reason, that the words in that passage sound very poctical.

+ There are many deponents of which the poets use an active form with the same meaning, as $\beta \iota a ́ \zeta \omega$ for $\beta \iota a ́ \zeta$ „ $\mu a \ell$, סшрéє for סıрє́optat, $\mu \eta \chi a v a ́ \omega$ for $\mu \eta \chi a \nu a ́ o \mu a t$,
was formed in the Attic and common language neither future nor aorist. In the active voice the only tense in use was the perfect, in the passive all the tenses, $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} a$, $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta \rho \omega \mu \alpha t, \dot{\epsilon} \beta \rho \omega^{\prime} \theta_{\eta \nu}{ }^{*}$.

The future midd. $\beta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \rho \mu a \iota$ was used only by the later writers; see Lobeck. ad Phryn. p. 347. The future pass. $\beta \in \beta$ р $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \boldsymbol{\rho} \alpha \iota$ occurs in Od. $\beta$, 203. The Epic language had also a syncopated aor. $\dagger \tilde{\epsilon} \beta \rho \omega \nu$, Hymn. Apoll. 127. From the perf. part. $\beta \in \beta \rho \omega \kappa \kappa \dot{\omega} s$ was formed by syncope $\beta \in \beta \rho$ cús $^{\prime}, \beta \in \beta \rho \omega \bar{\tau}$ тos $\ddagger$, Soph. Antig. 1010.

The Homeric form $\beta \in \beta \rho \omega^{\prime} \theta_{0}$ s, II. $\delta, 35$. is not a perf. but comes from a poetic pres. $\beta \epsilon \beta \rho \omega^{\prime} \theta \omega$, I feed upon, devour, in which the stem or root $\mathrm{BPO} \Omega$ is formed in $-\theta \omega$, like $\kappa \nu \dot{c} \omega \bar{\kappa} \kappa \dot{\eta} \theta \omega, \dot{a} \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega \dot{u} \lambda_{i} \theta \omega$, and the reduplication prefixed to increase the force of the word, as in terpaive from трá $\omega$, тєтра́ $\omega$ and тєтрє $\mu a i \nu \omega$ from т $\boldsymbol{\rho} \epsilon ́ \omega$.

We find some forms from $\begin{gathered}\beta \\ \beta\end{gathered} \omega \xi a ;$ viz. ката $\beta \rho \omega \dot{\xi} \alpha \sigma a l$, Apollon. Rh. 2, 271., катаßрш́दєєє, Dionys. Perieg. 604. But in these passages the Harpys are described as swallowing a whole meal at once, and the seamonsters as devouring whole ships with their crews; while all the forms which come from BPO $\Omega$ have simply the sense of eating up with mastication, and, where they are used metaphorically, of the consumption or waste of property. Hence Struven's emendation kara-
 probable (see under BPOX-) ; particularly as Dionysius had undoubtedly in his mind the катаß $\rho_{0} \dot{\xi} \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ of Od. $\delta, 222$. For as all the Homeric forms with $o$ are used to express the swallowing or gulping down of fluids, they were the more calculated for the above sense, as we see from the analogy of катитteiv§.

Boów, I live, is but little used by the Attics in the pres. and imperf. ; these they borrow from $\zeta \hat{\omega}$, which again does not often occur in its other tenses. We find then in
 2. $\epsilon^{\prime} \beta^{\prime} \omega \nu \|$, optat. $\beta_{\iota} \varphi_{\varphi} \eta \nu$ (not-oi $\eta \nu$ ), conjunct. $\beta_{\iota} \hat{\omega}, \hat{\omega} c, \hat{\varphi}, \& c$.,

[^47][^48]infin. $\beta_{\iota} \omega \mathrm{vat}$, part. $\beta_{\iota o u ́ c}$; perf. $\beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{i \omega \kappa}$, and perf. pass. in the expression $\beta_{\varepsilon} \beta_{i \omega t a \imath ~}^{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ 。

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


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



I find but one instance of the aor. 1. in the pure Attic times, viz. in Xen. (Ec. 4, 18. $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\omega} \omega \epsilon \nu$, if he had lived. But in the participle this tense ( $\beta \iota \omega$ 'was, Hippocr. Coac. vol. 1. p. 559.) appears to have taken the place of the cases of $\beta$ coús (-óvoos, \&c.) which never occur : thus we find $\beta$ koús, Plat. Phæd. p. 95. e. and oi óvíws $\beta \iota \omega$ 'бavtes, p. 113. d. In the older language the aor. l. had probably, according to the analogy of $\ddot{\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a, ~} \ddot{\epsilon} \beta \eta \sigma a, \& c$., the causative sense of $I$ make to live, preserve life, and, to express that meaning, a present $\beta \iota \omega^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$, according to the analogy of $\mu \epsilon \theta \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega, \pi \iota \pi i \sigma \kappa \omega$. This supposition is confirmed by the pres. $\beta_{\omega} \omega_{\sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a u, ~ t o ~ b e ~ b r o u g h t ~ t o ~ l i f e, ~ r e v i v e, ~ A r i s t o t . ~ M e t e o r . ~ 1 . ~ c . ~ 14 . ; ~}^{\text {; }}$ and the aor. 1. (though in the middle voice like éßifoato, éozijfaro)
 hast preserved my life.
 under Béo $\mu$ a.

The compound of this verb with ává has only the aor. ${ }_{a} v e \beta i \omega \nu$, ávaßı $\bar{\nu} v a t$ to express the intransitive sense of $I$ revive; the causative meaning, I resuscitate, is expressed by the aor. 1. midd. áveßıఉбá $\neq \eta \nu$, Plat. Phæd. p. 89. b. Hence the pres. ávaßı́шкоцаı, being both passive and middle, has both senses ; as passive, I am brought to live again, I
 to life again, resuscitate, oi . . ávaßıшбко́ $\mu \in \nu$ о ăv, Crito p. 48. c.

The active voice in this causative sense, $\dot{a} \nu \alpha \beta \omega \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, is found in Schol. Eurip. Alcest. init.*, and diveßt $\omega \sigma \alpha$ in Palæph. 41.

Apollon. Rh. 1, 685. has $\beta \omega^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon_{\sigma} \sigma \theta \in$ for $\beta \omega \omega^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, an absorption of the iota which takes place also in $\sigma \omega \pi \bar{q} \nu$ for $\sigma \iota \omega \pi \bar{q} \nu$, and perhaps in $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \kappa \kappa$ also.

B $\lambda^{\prime} \pi \tau \tau, I$ hurt, harm: fut. $\beta \lambda a ́ \psi \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\imath} \beta \lambda a \psi a ;$ fut. midd. in passive sense $\beta \lambda a ́ \not q о \mu a \imath$, Thucyd. $6,64$. ; perf. pass. $\beta e ́ \not \beta \lambda a \mu \mu a \iota \dagger$; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda a ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$, Thucyd. $4,73$. Antiph. p. $61 .$, but more generally aor. 2. pass. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \beta \lambda a ́ \beta \eta \nu$. The characteristic of this verb is therefore $\beta$.

From the aor. 2. arose a new present $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta \omega$ of which we find only
 for $\sigma \tau \in \varepsilon$ á̧ $\omega$.

B $\lambda a \sigma \tau a ́ \nu \omega$, I germinate: fut. $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \omega$; perf. $\epsilon^{\beta} \beta \lambda^{\prime} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa a_{+}^{+}$, Eur. Iph. A. 594. ; aor. 2. é $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau \sigma v$, see note under Ai $\sigma$ Oáронат.

The aor. 1. ${ }_{\epsilon} \xi \in \beta \lambda$ á $\sigma$ rnae occurs in Hippocr. De Alim. 1. and in the later writers, for instance Aret. 6, 3. In Æschyl. Cho. 585. we read $\beta \lambda a \sigma \pi o v a t$, which, if the reading be good in other respects, must undoubtedly be accented $\beta \lambda$ á $\sigma$ coval, which brings it into analogy with

$B \lambda^{\prime} \pi \omega, I$ see : fut. $\beta \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \psi, \& c$. The aor. 2. pass. is irregular $\S$. This verb is not found in Homer.

B入itт $\omega$, I take the bees from the hive: fut. $\beta \lambda$ io $\omega$, Ion.


[^49]those beginning with $\gamma \lambda, \gamma \lambda \dot{u} \phi \omega$ is doubtful; for we have $\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi} \xi \gamma \lambda v \mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu o s$, Plat. Rep. 10, p. 616. d. $\Delta t \in \gamma \lambda v \pi \tau a t$, Athen. 3. p. 93. c. $\Delta t a \gamma \epsilon \gamma \lambda \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu 0$, Elian. V. H. $3,45$.
§ Some verbs, whose radical vowel is $\epsilon$, do not change their vowel in forming the aor. 2. pass: thus from $\phi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega, \beta \lambda \in \in \pi(\omega$, $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ we fiud $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \eta \nu$, and the participles $\beta \lambda \in \pi \epsilon i s, \sigma v \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon i ́ s ; ~ c o m p a r e ~ a l s o ~ \lambda e ́ \pi \omega$, $\pi \lambda$ е́к $\omega$, 廿є́ү $\omega$.
instance of the present with $\sigma \sigma$ ，probably because it was originally a pure Attic word．See Buttm．Lexil．pp．84， 189. BA－．See Bá入入
B $\lambda$ ńvow $^{\prime}, I$ go．This verb comes by metathesis from the root MOA－ （see Bád $\lambda \omega$ with note，and Buttm．Lexil．pp．84，189．），whence the fut． $\mu о \lambda о \bar{\mu} \mu \iota$ ；aor．$\epsilon_{\mu} \rho \lambda о \nu, \mu 0 \lambda \epsilon i v, \mu о \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu ;$ perf．$\mu \epsilon \mu \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha$ ．Of these tenses Homer uses the aor．and perf．，the Tragedians the future，Eschyl．Prom． 694．Soph．OEd．C． 1742.
That $\beta \lambda \omega^{\sigma} \sigma \omega \omega$ is the real present to those tenses we have proofs enough in the indexes of Homer，Aristophanes，and Euripides．Wherever the present $\mu \circ \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ occurs it is suspicious：see Schæefer on Soph．CEd．C． 1742.

Boá $\omega$, I cry out：Attic fut．ßónoopaı．
The Ionians always contract the o $\eta$ of this verb to $\omega$ ，making in the fut．$\beta \omega^{\prime} \sigma o \mu \mathrm{ct}$ ，and throw back the accent，as aor．1．${ }^{\text {en }} \beta \omega \sigma \alpha^{*}$ ．The same takes place in voé $\omega$ ．For that this is the correct explanation of these verbs may be learnt from comparing them with $\beta \omega \theta \epsilon i \nu$ for $\beta$ on $\theta \epsilon i v, ~ o \gamma \delta \omega^{\prime}-$
 in other similar cases．In the passive voice $\beta$ oá $\omega$ inserts the $\sigma$ in the aor．1．of this contraction，but not in the perfect ；$\beta \in \beta \omega \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu o s, \dot{\epsilon} \beta \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ， Herodot．3，39．6， 131.

Bórкш，I feed（in its active sense）：fut．ßобки́ $\sigma \omega \dagger$ ，ac－ cording to which the other tenses are formed．－Midd．I feed（in its intransit．sense）．

Boúdoцaı，I wish：depon．pass．；with fut．midd．$\beta$ ov $\lambda_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ aı （see note under Bóбк $\boldsymbol{\text { ）}}$ ；perf．pass．$\beta_{\epsilon} \beta_{o u ́} \lambda_{\eta \mu a t ; ~ a o r . ~}^{\text {l }}$ ． $\dot{\epsilon} \beta_{o v \lambda} \hat{i}_{1} \theta_{\eta \nu}$ ，also Att．$\dot{\eta} \Omega_{o v \lambda} \dot{\eta}_{\theta \eta \nu}^{+}$.

[^50]imperf．and aor．by the addition of the temp．augm．，and use both $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \nu \nu \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\eta} \delta \nu \nu \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu, \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\eta} \delta-$, é $\beta$ oú $\bar{\epsilon} \tau \sigma$ and $\dot{\eta} \beta-, \epsilon \beta \circ v \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\eta} \beta-, \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu$ and $\eta \mu$－．The aor．$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{e} \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$ ，which is found only in the sense of delaying，has never this augment．Nor is it confined to the Attics， but occurs in the Epic and Ionic dialects； see Hes．$\theta, 478,888$ ．Herodot．1，10．It does not however preponderate until the times of the later Attics，as it is never found in the Tragedians，and but little in the older prose or Aristophancs．Compare Poppo on Thucyd．vol．1．p． 225.

Homer has also a perf．$\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta$ oùa in the compound $\pi \rho o \beta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\beta}$ ov $\lambda a$, I prefer ：
 twice in Homer，see Buttm．Lexil．p． 196.

BO－．See Boá $\omega$ ．
B $\rho a ́ \zeta \omega$, more commonly $\beta$ рá $\sigma \sigma \omega,-\tau \tau \omega, I$ boil（in its in－ trans．sense），I ferment，I throw up（as the sea does），$I$ winnow：fut．ßpáбw；aor．1．éßpara．The passive has again frequently the intrans．sense．

Some wish to confine the sense of boiling and fermenting to the pres．$\beta \rho \dot{q}\{\omega$ ，but all the different meanings run too much into each other for this to hold good：B ${ }^{\prime}$ ítct appears to be the Attic form for all．See Ruhnk．Tim．p．64．，Stephan．Thesaurus and Schneider＇s Lexicon＊with the Supplement and the compounds with ává，á $\pi \dot{o}$ ，and दُ．

Bpađєiv，ëßpaxov，an Epic aor．with the meaning of to rattle，to crack，to roar（as the sea or a wounded combatant is said to do）．

В $\rho^{\prime} \notin \omega$ and $\beta \rho^{\prime} \notin \mu о \mu \iota$, ，fremo，I roar（as the sea or thunder does），I resound．Used only in pres．and imperf．

B $\rho$ є́ $\chi \omega$, I wet：fut．$\beta \rho \in ́ \xi \omega, \& c$ ．Pass．I am wet，$\beta \rho є \chi \chi^{o ́-}$ $\mu \in v o \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ g ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ o ́ \mu \phi a \lambda o ́ v, ~ X e n o p h . ~ I t ~ h a s ~ t h e ~ a o r . ~ 1 . ~$ $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \beta \rho \in ́ \chi \theta \eta \nu$ ，and the aor．2．є́ $\beta \rho a ́ \chi \eta \nu$ ．

Pindar has the perf．pass．$\beta_{\varepsilon} \beta_{\rho \in \gamma \mu \in ́ v o s, ~ O l . ~ 6, ~}^{20}$ ．- The doubtful

[^51]the compound $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \in \beta \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma о \nu \tau 0$ ，of vessels cast on shore，Herodot．7，188．Again $\dot{\varepsilon} \alpha v \tau \delta \nu \nu$ égé $\beta \rho \alpha \sigma \varepsilon$, たlian．H．A．6， 15. Also，to throw up and shake corn in order to winnow it，Ruhnk．Tim．p．64．Móo $\chi$ os $\theta \eta \lambda \hat{\eta} s \chi v i \sigma \iota \nu \beta \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$, sucks by pushing and shaking the teat，Meand．AI． 359. Lycophr．461．And in the passive，$\beta \rho \alpha \sigma$－ oó $\mu$ evos v̇тò $\gamma$ é $\lambda \omega t o s$, shaking with laughter，Lucian 5，p．213．Anecd．Bekk． 1，66．The passive voice has also the in trans．sense in $\theta \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \pi \nu \epsilon v ́ \mu \alpha \tau \iota \beta \rho \alpha \sigma-$ $\sigma o \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \eta$ ，Leonid．Tar．57．Apoll．Rhod．2， 323．ПóӨo兀бь $\beta \rho a \sigma \sigma o ́ \mu \in \nu 0 s$, Greg．Naz． Carm．20，4．But the compound diva－ Bpátre has an active sense，to boil up， крє́a，Aristoph．Batr．510．Pac． 1197. Ach．1005．＇Aváßpaбov v่ $\pi$ oкaí $\omega \nu$, Di－ oscor．；and so has the other compound i
 Hippocr．531，20．－ED．］
 BPOX-, below.

 is found in Il. $\delta, 223$. Hesychius has $\beta \rho \iota \sigma \theta$ eis.

Bpi0w, I am heavy: fut. $\beta$ piow; aor. 1. e้ $\beta$ pi $\bar{\sigma} a$, infin. $\beta$ iíat.

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

BPO-. See B८ $\langle\rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \kappa \kappa \omega$.
BPOX-: a stem or root from which we find only some forms of the aor. 1. act. and aor. 2. pass. in the Epics with the meaning of to suck

 under Bpvzáoнat. These forms are also treated of more at length in Buttm. Lexil. p. 200, \&c.
 to bite, feed on, the latter to gnash the teeth; but the distinction is not sufficiently certain : see Buttm. on Soph. Phil. 745. and compare $\dot{\rho} \epsilon \mathrm{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ and $\rho \bar{\epsilon} \gamma \chi^{\omega}$. Of these two verbs no other tenses are found $\dagger$ except that Hesychius has $\beta p u \not \xi a t, \delta a \kappa \epsilon i r$. [In Buttm. Lexil. p. 203. will be found a detailed account of these verbs as well as Schneider's articles


 pass. but we sometimes find also the aor. midd., Plat. Phæd. p. 117. d. B $\rho v \chi \eta \theta$ eic, Soph. OEd. T. 1265.

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

[^52][^53]treated of fully in Buttm．Lexil．p．200．，and the alternative left of con－ sidering it either a mere onomatopœia $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \rho \bar{\chi} \chi \epsilon$ ，it spouts forth，or an anomalous change of vowel $\dot{a} \nu \alpha \beta \epsilon \in \beta \rho \nu \check{\chi} \chi$ for $\dot{a} \nu a \beta \epsilon \in \beta \rho o \chi \epsilon$（itself an old reading）from $\dot{d} \nu \alpha \beta \rho \in ́ \chi \epsilon \iota r$ ，which also may mean to spout forth．

Bpíw，I am full，appears only in the pres．and imperf．
［＇Epvos ävөeï ßpícє，Il．$\rho, 56$ ．With gen．Soph．©Ed．C．16．But it has also a transit．sense，đ́́pıtes jóra $\beta$ púovaıv，produce in plenty， Anacr．37，2．－Passow．］

Bū̀é $\omega, I$ stop up，makes fut．$\beta$ и́vow，aor．1．$\notin \beta v \sigma a$ with $v$ long；but the passive takes the $\sigma$ ．

The pres．ßív was not used by the Attics．In Aristot．H．A．9，37， 3．Schneider＇s Codd．have $\beta u r o v \sigma \iota \nu$ ，and in Aristoph．Pac．645．the general reading of the text $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \dot{z}$ ovv is now from the best sources cor－



$$
\Gamma
$$

$\Gamma a \mu \epsilon ́ \omega$, I marry，i．e．take a wife，forms from ГАM $\Omega$ a future of similar sound with the present；thus，Ion．fut． $\gamma a \mu \epsilon \in \omega$ ，（Il．८，391．）Att．fut．$\gamma \alpha \mu \hat{\omega}$, （Xen．Cyr．5，2，12．）；
 －Pass．I am married，i．e．taken to wife（è $\gamma a \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu)$ ．－ Midd．I marry，i．e．take a husband．

The fut．$\gamma$ a ${ }^{\prime} \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \omega$ and aor．1．é $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \sigma a$ belong to the later writers． The older future（from ГАМ $\Omega$ ）was $\gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \in \sigma \omega^{*}$ ，fut．midd．$\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$ ， whence $\gamma$ анє́б $\sigma \epsilon \tau a \ell$, Il．$\iota, 394$ ．，which however has in that passage the causative meaning of to give a woman in marriage，in which sense Me－ nander used also the aor．1．é $\gamma$ á $\mu \eta \sigma r$ ：see Schol．Ven．ad Il．ィ，394．Lo－ beck．ad Phryn．p．742．Meineke Menand．Fr．303．p．274．Buttm．in Friedem．and Seeb．Misc．Crit．2，4．p．712．Compare also Reisig De $\ddot{a}^{\boldsymbol{a}}$ Partic．p．127．The $\gamma a \mu \epsilon \theta \varepsilon i \sigma a$ of Theocr．8，91．，for the aor． 1. part．pass．$\gamma \alpha \mu \eta \theta \epsilon i \hat{\sigma} a$ ，is grounded on the old future $\gamma a \mu \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$ ．
「ávvuat，I am glad：depon．Beside the pres．and imperf．it has a fut． रavíб⿱opuc［used only by the Epics and Anacr．8．and formed from an

[^54] Passow.] consequently it does not follow the general analogy of verbs in ${ }^{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{c}^{*}$.

## TA-. See TEN-.

$\Gamma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu a$, a perf. 2. with the meaning of a present†, I call aloud: infin.
 213.); imperat. $\gamma \in \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \boldsymbol{\jmath}$, used by the Tragedians. The 3. sing. perf.' 2. $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu \varepsilon$ is in Homer both pres. and aor. (see 'Avipvo日a and note.) The other tenses are inflected as from a pres. in - $-\epsilon \omega$, formed from the above perf. 2., as the infin. pres. $\gamma \in \gamma \omega \nu \in i \nu$ (Il. $\mu, 337$. Eurip. Hippol. 586.) and
 is to be classed with these, although it may with the same sense be the pluperf. also. The fut. $\gamma \in \gamma \omega 1$ infow is used by Euripides; the aor. $\gamma \in \gamma \omega \nu \bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ by Æschyl. Prom. 989., and the verbal adj. $\gamma \in \gamma \omega \nu \eta \tau \in \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma$ by Pind. Ol. 2, 10. Even Xen. Ven. 6, 24. has the imperat. $\gamma \in \gamma \omega \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i} \tau \boldsymbol{r}$. And lastly was formed a pres. $\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \omega \nu i \sigma \kappa \omega$, used by the Tragedians and also by Thucyd. 7, 76 .
$\Gamma \epsilon \lambda a ́ \omega$, I laugh, with fut. midd. $\gamma \in \lambda$ áбодаı, more rarely $\gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{a} \sigma \omega$, Monk Eurip. Alc. 158. Popp. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 16. Bornem. Xen. Conviv. 1: 16. The $a$ is short in the inflexion. The pass. takes $\sigma$.
 form all verbs in $-\zeta \omega$ with a fut. in $-\xi \omega$, we have the Dor. fut. $\gamma \in \lambda a \xi \omega$ and the Dor. aor. $\varepsilon^{\prime} \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda a \xi a$.

- The regular contr. part. is $\gamma \varepsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$, plur. $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon s$, but in some contracted verbs the $\omega$ is resolved into $\omega_{0}$ : which takes place only where a syllable long by position follows the $\omega$, or it has the $\iota$ subscript, in
 $\dot{\eta} \beta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s, \dot{\gamma} \beta \bar{\psi} \mu($ (from -áovtes, -áo $\mu \mu$ ), and for $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ may stand ac-


[^55]most usual, and the most common mode of lengthening a syllable was by changing it
 became $\gamma \varepsilon \lambda o i ́ \omega \nu$ whenever the verse required it (Eust. adv. 347.). Butin that case we must read $\gamma \epsilon \lambda o i \omega \nu \tau \epsilon s$ at Od. $\sigma, 110$. also, where there is no such various reading. We are led to view the word however in another light by the meaning of $\gamma \epsilon \lambda 0 \iota \dot{\eta}-$ $\sigma a \sigma a$ at Hymn. Ven. 49, where the context points not to mere laughing, but rather requires laughing and joking, ( $\gamma$ e-

IEN－．This stem or root，which answers to the Lat． verb．gigno，genui，unites in Greek the causative meaning to beget，with the immediate or intransitive to be born，to become．The forms are mixed together anomalously．Of the active voice the perf．2．yé ${ }^{\prime}$ ova is the only tense in use； all the others，in both meanings，belong exclusively to the middle．The whole may be classed from usage under the following two presents ：－

1．$\gamma$ eivouat has the proper and simple sense of to be born； its present，which belongs to the Epic poets only，is used in both meanings，to be born（Il．$\kappa, 71$ ．），and to beget（Od．$v$ ， 202．where we have yeiveat the 2．sing．conj．aor．1．midd． for yeivnaı）．The aor．1．midd．éyєıvá $\eta \nu$ ，infin．yeivaa0at，is transitive，to beget，bring forth，and belongs to both prose and poetry．

2．$\gamma$ íyouat，old and Attic ；in the common language

 forms are without exception intransitive，not only in their proper meaning to be born，but also in the general sense to become，fieri，and in which they are most commonly used． To these we may add the meaning of to be，as è غєvó $\mu \eta \nu$ and $\gamma^{\prime}$＇⿴ova serve at the same time for preterites of the verb
 also taken as a present，I am；yet so that the meaning al－ ways comprehends the more exact idea of $I$ have been，$I$ have been born $\ddagger$ ．Compare $\pi$ е́фика．

[^56][^57]With these we may join the verb $\gamma^{\boldsymbol{c} \nu \nu} \mathfrak{a} \omega$, which takes entirely the causative meaning to beget, as well as its more general sense to produce; while the above-mentioned aor. éyєшáanv is used only with the strict and simple idea of begetting and birth, and for that sense is the higher and better expression.

From the root TEN- arise in strictness of analogy no other presents than $\gamma \epsilon i \nu \rho \mu a \iota$, like $\tau \epsilon i \nu \omega$ from TEN-, and $\gamma^{i} \gamma \nu \circ \mu a t$, like $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega, \mu i \mu \nu \omega$. The form rivoual might indeed, as $\epsilon \iota$ and a were in very ancient times almost the same, be reckoned identical with $\gamma$ fivopat; but the analogy of $\gamma \boldsymbol{v} \dot{\omega} \sigma \mathrm{\sigma} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ shows that it arose in the course of pronunciation from rirvouau. That grammatical decision appears therefore to have been correct, according to which the old Epic poets admitted those two forms only, and used $\gamma$ кivouat, on account of the established usage of $\gamma$ єiva$\sigma \theta a \iota$, in the sense of being born, yiyvouac in that of to become. With re-

 ad Phœn. 1396.: but we learn from Athenian inscriptions that the other mode of writing these verbs was likewise an old and Attic usage.

In the Doric dialect the verb $\gamma$ i $\gamma, \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ was a depon. pass., therefore $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ was used for ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 108. and Archyt. ap. Gal. p. 674. ( $\gamma \in \nu \alpha \theta \bar{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ) ; and thence it came into the common language of the later writers. But the future $\gamma \in v \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (occurring twice in Plat. Parmen. p. 141.e.) presents difficulties of another kinds see Heind.
 facta est. With this 1 join the particip. $\gamma \in \nu$ á $\mu \epsilon \nu$ os, which Archimedes has frequently, p.48, 28.35. 38. p. 127, 23. The form which Callimachus uses is therefore nothing more than an Epic lengthening of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v}$ 人ato's and the same kind of formation as ci入á $\mu \eta \mathrm{r}$, eӥpato, \&c.
 Pindar and other poets. Theognis, 640. has $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \tau 0$.


[^58][^59]


With these are united three other forms: 1.) $\gamma \in \gamma \dot{\operatorname{co}} \boldsymbol{a} \tau \epsilon$, Batrach. 143. Hom. Epigr. ult. for $\gamma \in \gamma$ ă̈̆тe, on account of the metre, perhaps formed according to a false analogy from $\gamma \in \gamma^{a} \bar{a} \sigma \iota$ : see Buttm. Lexil. p. 142.2.) ékrєýáovata, they will be born, Hymn. Ven. 198., a future which
 like the latter as a simple but express future, and formed without the $\sigma$

 Pind. Ol. 6, 83 ., which supposes the existence of the more complete perfect $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \eta \kappa \alpha$ (as $\beta \dot{\beta} \beta \eta \kappa \alpha, \beta \dot{\beta} \beta a \alpha$ ) of which Hesychius quotes the conjunct. $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ и́кш.

「év $\boldsymbol{\prime}$, he took, an old verb in Homer, of which we find only this one form. It appears to be a dialect of $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \tau \sigma$, as $\kappa \in \nu \tau \tau v$ for $\kappa$ é $\lambda \epsilon \tau o$ is quoted from Alcman by Eust. ad Il. 九, 756, 32. Rom. (658, 29. Bas.) The $\gamma$ instead of the aspirate is preserved in many glosses of Hesychius and others.

Г'v́u, I cause to taste, give to taste: Midd. I taste, enjoy: Perf. pass. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \mu a$, Eurip. Hipp. 663. : aor. 1. pass. probably with $\sigma$; for though we find $\gamma \epsilon \bar{\jmath} \mu a$, we say also $\gamma \epsilon v \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \nu$, үєиатıко́с, \&c.; and some verbs have the $\sigma$ in the aor. pass. although they have none in the perf., as $\pi a v(\omega, \pi \in ́ \pi a v \mu a t$,


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

 $\chi^{\theta a}$.
$\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega-(\dot{e} \pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \mu \eta \nu) \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \tau \sigma$.
$\ddot{\partial} \rho \nu v \mu$, ОР $\Omega-\omega ँ \rho \mu \eta \nu$, $\omega \rho \tau 0$, infinit.

[^60]There is no authority for a present $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \theta \omega^{*}$; consequently none for $\gamma^{\prime} \theta_{\epsilon \epsilon}$, a various reading of $\gamma \eta \theta_{\epsilon} \hat{i}$ at $\mathrm{II} . \xi, 140$.; on the other hand we

 quotes $\gamma \eta \theta$ ó $\mu$ eros, which is found also in the later Epics $\dagger$ who probably had some older precedent for it: this however proves nothing in favour
 кขре́ш ки́үодаи.
 inflected regularly according to the first form; only the Attics have in the infin. aor. beside $\gamma \eta \rho a \hat{\sigma} \sigma a t$ a syncopated form $\begin{array}{r}\text { npâvat } \S, ~ p r e f e r r e d ~ b y ~ t h e ~ A t t i c i s t s . ~\end{array}$

This infin.either comes from an aor. 2. or is formed by syncope similar-
 In the older language this was undoubtedly the only aorist; hence also
 certainly the 3 . pers. érifpa (II. $\rho, 197$.), and кaтeqipa (Herodot. 6, 72.), are not imperf. but this same aorist ; for in both passages the sense requires, to make it complete, that "he did grow old in it :" whilst in Herodot. 2, 146. кateripaigar may quite as well be the 3 . plur. of érípar. The long $a \|$ in érípa and $\gamma \eta \rho \bar{a}$ rat answers to that in éspav, and corresponds as in all 9 such aorists with the vowel of the perfect.A particip. in eís, évoos, consequently as coming from a sister-form in $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \omega$, is quoted in the Etym. M. from the later Ionic poetry of Xenophanes. Compare the note on $\Pi i / \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu$.

The aor. 1. érifpara occurs in Esehyl. Suppl. 901. in a causative sense, to make a person grow old; while the infin. $\gamma$ Infágat is used in Xen. Mem. 3, 12, 8. as intransitive. Aceording to Passow there are doubts of the reading in exsehylus; but even supposing it to be true, there are many instances of the aor. 1 . having a causative sense, while

[^61]|| It is true that the only historical evidences in favour of this quantity are the circumflex on $\gamma \eta \rho \bar{a} \nu a \iota$ in correct editions (see Oud. ad Tho. M. in v.), and the $a$ in both the iambic verses quoted by Pierson ad Moer. in $v$. falling in the place where a long syllable is admissible: but the above analogy makes it certain.
 éкта, $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \kappa a \dot{e} \dot{\delta} \rho \bar{a} \nu: \phi \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$ is the only exception, which see.
the pres. was intransitive, and vice versa: for instance $\mu \mathrm{c} \theta \dot{v} \omega$, I am druak; ब $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega, I$ am full ; aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \theta v \sigma a, I$ have intoxicated, $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\pi} \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha, I$ have filled; thus also vaíw and $\not \subset \nu a \sigma \sigma a, \kappa \dot{v} \omega$ and $\ddot{\epsilon}_{\kappa}^{\prime} v \sigma \alpha$; and instances of the opposite

 reading of the infin. $\gamma \eta \rho$ é $\sigma a \varepsilon$ in Xen. Mem. [both Moeris and Tho. M. prefer y $\eta$ peivaı, and] certainly nothing was easier than the change of this latter word to the common form, as in Herodot. 7, 114. ríparav might have been easily corrupted to the present reading $\gamma \eta \rho a \dot{\sigma} \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$. Sce a similar case in the aor. of dićpíonw.

Гíyvoцяи, үігоцси. See ГEN-.
Ciүvíaкн, old and Attic, in the common language $\gamma_{i-}^{-}$







The $\omega$ in é $\gamma \nu \omega \nu$ corresponding with the vowel of the perfect (according to the preceding note) continucs through the aorist with the exception of the optat. and participle. Indeed $\gamma^{2}$ oin $\nu$ is become the established reading even in Homer, where however we find $\dot{\AA} \lambda \dot{\varphi} \eta \nu \quad$ (see 'A入íбко $\mu a \iota$ ). Hence $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \nu \notin \eta$ in the old Atticism Aschyl. Suppl: 230. deserves our attention. In the later Attics this is again found: see Lobeck ad
 correct) an exception : for when the syllable - oav is abbreviated to $\nu$, the vowel preceding is always shortened; thus $\beta \dot{\alpha} \nu$ for $\ddot{\epsilon} \beta \eta \sigma \omega \nu$ is short,
 137. Isthm. 2, 35. Érvev stands without any various reading; but as

[^62]$\delta \iota \delta \rho a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega, \delta \in \dot{\epsilon} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \kappa \alpha-\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \rho \bar{a} \nu, \tilde{\epsilon} \delta \rho \bar{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu$, לןâvat, $\delta \rho a i ́ \eta \nu, \delta \rho a ́ s$.
 кта́ขаt, ктаїŋ̀, ктás.

Other instances equally or even more complete may be seen under $\dot{a} \lambda i \sigma \kappa о \mu a$, $\beta_{\imath} \beta \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \omega$, ßıów, ঠv́ш, тє́тодаı, бкє́ $\lambda \lambda \omega$, т入ท̄vat, $\phi \theta a ́ \nu \omega$ and $\phi \dot{v} \omega$; while single forms of this aorist will be fonnd under $\beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \gamma \eta \rho a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega, \kappa \lambda a ́ \omega$, ои̇тá $\omega, \pi \lambda \in ́ \omega$, $\pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$; and some imperatives, as $\beta \hat{\eta} \theta t$,

the syllable is long in both cases by position, we cannot in cither of these instances attain perfect certainty from the metre. [Passow however, in hisLexicon, quotes at once érrov as from Pindar, without stating whether on any authority.] In Æschyl. Pers. 18. $\notin \beta a \nu$ is by its position in the anaprstic metre long. See Lachm. de Chor. Syst. p. 28.-The occurrence of the passive aor. opt. ovjyvoito*, and of the active aor. $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \nu \stackrel{\iota}{\eta} \eta$, both in the same passage of Æschylus (230.231.), and in the same active sense, is very singular.

- The compound a ava sense of to persuade, particularly in the Ionic writers (see Hemst. ad Tho. M. in v. and Koen. Greg. p. 503.) ; and in this alone, as being a causative meaning, do we find the aor. 1. «'є́ $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \omega \sigma$, Herodot. $1,68$. 87. and in many other passages of this author $\dagger$.
$\Gamma \lambda \dot{\phi} \phi \omega$, more rarely $\gamma \lambda \dot{\pi} \pi \tau \omega$, Eurip. Troad. 1306. On the augment of the perf. see note under Bдaбтíva.
 \&c., the former, which is the more simple present, is the more usual, while the latter, which is the more forcible one, was indeed formed but not in general use.
 aor. ézoov, Il. $\zeta, 500$. [which Passow calls an imperf.]
$\Gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega$, I write.-Midd. The aor. 2. pass. є́ $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \eta \nu$ is formed, not regularly from the aor. 2 . act., but from the

 2. is preserved, that the long vowel becomes short.
 chim. De Spiral. Procem. extr.) which, when occurring in the common language of the time, is censured by the Grammarians : see Phot. v.

[^63]stance, $\dot{\in} \beta \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\ell} \nu$ optat. $\beta \lambda$ єí $\eta \nu$-from $\xi \beta \lambda \eta \nu(\xi \nu \mu \beta \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \nu)$ : see $B a \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \omega$. $\dot{є є т a ́ \mu \eta \nu, ~ к т а ́ \sigma \theta a \ell, ~ к т а ́ \mu є \nu о s-f r o m ~}$ êctav: see Kтєivw.

See also oúcó $\mu \in \nu$ os, and $\kappa \lambda \bar{v} \theta \iota$ with the old particip. $\kappa \lambda v \mu \in \nu 0$ s.

+ The quotation of the aor. 2. in this sense by some of the Grammarians (see Hemst. Hesych. Erot. Galen.) arises from false readings in Herodot. and Hippocr.See Steph. Rec. Voc. Herod. in v. and Fœs. EEc. Hippocr, in v.

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

Грпүоре́є. See 'Eүєípw.
$\Gamma \Omega N-$. See $\Gamma$ é $\gamma \omega v a$.

## $\Delta$.

$\Delta \mathrm{A}-, \Delta \mathrm{AI}$-. The verbs belonging to these roots have four leading senses; to divide, to give to eat, to burn, to teach.
21. Saí $\omega$, I divide, has in this form and meaning the pres. and imperf. only, and is exclusively poetical. To the same sense belong, from the root $\Delta \mathrm{A}-$, the fut. $\delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma v \mu a t$, the aor. é $\sigma a \sigma a \dot{\prime} \mu \nu$ with a short, both used in prose as well as verse, and the perf. סé $\delta a \sigma \mu a \iota$ with a passive meaning, I am divided, (Il. a, 125. Herodot. 2, 84.) of which the 3. pl. on account of the sound follows again the root $\Delta \mathrm{AI}-, \delta \in \delta a i a r a t$,
 that the Lexicons have no occasion to bring forward a pres. $\triangle$ AZOMAI from which to form dérouat, \&c. This pres. is nowhere found, but another poetical one does occur, $\delta a r$ éo $\mu$ aı (see it in its place), which bears the same relation to those forms as $\pi$ aréo $\mu a \iota$ does to $\pi \alpha ́ \sigma u \sigma \theta a \iota$.
2. jaivv $\mu$, I receive at my table, give to eat. Mind. סaívv $\mu$ a, I eat at table as a guest, feast on (¿̇aîra,' крéa, \&c.), forms according to the analogy of all verbs in $\nu v \mu$ its tenses from $\delta a i \omega$, which however in the pres. never has this meaning. Therefore fut. act. $\delta$ aírw, aor. l. é $\delta a \iota \sigma a(H e-$ rodot. 1, 162.), fut. midd. $\delta$ aíбo $\mu \alpha$, aor. I. é $\delta a \iota \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu, ~ \& c$. As to whether we may add édaía $\theta \eta \nu$ also see note on $\Delta a^{\circ} \zeta \boldsymbol{\zeta} \omega$. -The Ionics, without any contraction, omit the $\sigma$ in the second pers. sing.; thus imperf. ©aivvo ${ }_{+}$,

3. $\delta$ aí $\omega, I$ burn, set fire to§. Mind. I burn, am on fire. [Of the act. the pres. and imperf. only are in use.-Passow.] Of the midd. we find the pres. and imperf., the aor. 2. $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta a o ́ \mu \eta \nu$, whence 3 . sing. con-


[^64] pai(v, кєסai$\omega, \sigma \kappa \in \delta \dot{c} \nu v v \mu$, and in prose кขаí $\omega$, 廿аí $\omega$.
$\ddagger$ This form occurs indecd only in 11. $\omega$, 63. $\Delta a i \nu v$ ' Ex $\chi \omega \nu$, where there is a various reading $\Delta a i \nu v \sigma^{\prime}$ : but it is one so little worthy of credit, that it is justly disregarded: compare $\bar{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma v o$.
$\S$ The intrans. sense, to blaze, has been given to the active voice from a misinterpretation of $11 . \epsilon, 4$. and 7. Compare II. ब, 206.227.
|| See note under "A $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \nu v \mu$.
$\delta \in \delta i \epsilon t y$, belong to the intrans. meaning of the middle, with the sense of the pres. and imperf. The future, which is nowhere found, appears, according
 in Simonid. ap. Etym. M. v. $\delta a u ́ w$, and (by a very good emendation) in Callim. Epig. 53. (28.)
4. $\Delta$ - -, with the ideas of to teach and learn. To the former belongs the aor. 2. act., of which é $\delta$ ne occurs in Theocr. 24, 27. Apollon. 4. 989 ., and the same form with the reduplication $\delta \hat{e} \dot{\varepsilon} a \epsilon$ is found oceasionally in the Odyssey*. The perf. has the sense of to learn, of which Homer has only the particip. iedaw's. (one who has learnt), other writers have ièóáaot. To this we may add the aor. pass. ह̇óinv (I was taught, $I$ learned); from which comes, according to the note under 'Araxi ${ }^{i} \omega$, a
 Homeric form iédáa $\sigma a \iota$, to try and learn, inquire into, examine, (Od. $\pi$, 316.) can only be a pres. in -úoput formed from $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} a$ (just as from
 which we find no other trace of the present of this merely poetieal verb; though it is the stem from which branches the common verb icióasio, having its own proper inflexion: see below.

The Epic future $\delta \dot{\eta} \omega$ ( $\delta \dot{j} \epsilon \epsilon$, $\delta i \neq \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta i j \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ ) belongs to this stem or root $\Delta \mathrm{A} \Omega, I$ learn $\ddagger$, consequently has the meaning I shall learn, find out, and comes undoubtedly from the future $\delta a$ éw by contraction of the two first vowels, as the similar Epic future reiw or $\kappa \in \epsilon \omega$ is formed from кєє́шई: see Кєīциц.
$\Delta a i \zeta \omega$, I divide, cut in two, kill: fut. iait $\omega$, \&c.
 where besides, even in the Tragedians, we find $\delta a i ̈ \theta \theta \epsilon i ́ s, \delta a i \xi a s$, \&c. Elmsley reads, to answer with the verse in the antistrophe, $\delta a \iota \sigma \theta e i s$, thinking to form it from סaiw, I burn, but which appears to me contrary to the above analogy. Nor are there any grounds for forming ict$\sigma \theta \varepsilon i$ from $\delta n i \zeta \omega$, as there was nothing to hinder the use of $\delta a \iota \chi \theta \epsilon i$, like ieioaly $\mu$ éros in Pind. Pyth. 8, 125. (see Hermann and Boeckh on that passage.). If then we read inureicis, I can place it only under $\delta$ oni$\nu v \mu u t$; and I see no reason why the language of Lyric poetry might not have formed from the transitive sense of this middle voice, to eat, consume, an aor. passive, was consumed.

[^65][^66]$\Delta$ nipw. Sec $\Delta \dot{e} \rho \omega$.
$\Delta{ }^{\prime} \kappa \nu \omega, I$ bite : from $\Delta H K \Omega$ come the fut. $\delta_{i}^{\prime} \xi$ о $\mu a t$, perf. ס́́ $\delta \eta \chi$ रa, \&c. ; aor. є́ $\delta a \kappa o \nu^{*}$, infin. $\delta a \kappa \epsilon i v$. [In the passive the perf. $\delta \in \in \delta \eta \gamma \mu a t$ is the tense most in use.--Passow.]

هaкри́w, I weep, has no passive ; but the perf. pass. $\delta \varepsilon$ ঠа́крӥдан takes the idea of I am weeping, I am in tears, II. $\pi, 7 ., \delta \epsilon \delta a ́ \kappa \rho v v a a t$, (the eyes or cheeks) are suffused with tears, Il. v, 204. х, 491. ; part. סєঠакрvие́roс, weeping, in tears, Plut. Paul. Æmil. 10. See the note on Пєфиү ${ }^{\prime}$ voc.
$\Delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega, \delta \alpha \mu \dot{a} \omega, \delta \alpha \mu \nu$ víw. See $\Delta \varepsilon ́ \mu \omega$.


The Poets transpose the letters of the aorist, making é $\delta \rho a \theta o v$.
We find also in the shape of an aor. pass. катаסapӨ'́vta, Aristoph. Plut. 300., and кara $\delta a \rho \theta \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \nu$ (which however depends entirely on the accent) Thesm. 794. Again кaré $\hat{\rho}_{\rho} \alpha \theta_{\epsilon} \nu$ for - $\eta \pi a \nu$, Apollon. Rh. 2, 1229. We may suppose these forms (as Bekker does in his criticism on Wolf's Homer) to have taken a passive shape merely from mistaking the $\theta$. But as they occur principally in the compound with кará $\dagger$, the aor. of which certainly has in itself something of a passive nature, as in German ich habe geschlafen, and ich bin eingeschlafen, in English $I$, have been asleep, and $I$ was fallen asleep; I would rather suppose this to be the true reason: and kuтedóp $\theta \eta \nu$ will then be the perfectly regular form of the aor. 2. pass.; and thus the traditionary reading катаípa0 $\hat{\omega}$ (Od. є. 471.) appears to me unobjectionable, i. e. I believe it to have been the reading in the time of the Attics $\ddagger$.

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

[^67][^68]me sleep a little.' Kacaópp(eıv may therefore very possibly be an Attic sister-form of ката $\delta \iota \rho \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, like $\alpha i \sigma \theta о \mu \alpha \iota$ or $a \hat{\xi} \xi \omega$.
$\Delta a \tau$ éopą, depon., used only in pres. and imperf., while the other tenses are taken from $\Delta a i \omega$, No. 1., which see. Hesiod $\epsilon, 795$, has the
 $a \sigma \theta a \iota$ from à $\lambda$ е́о $\mu a \iota$.
$\Delta$ éaral, it appears, occurs only once, Od. $\zeta, 242$. סéaro. But to this verb belongs also the aor. with its vowel changed dociovaro, conj. Eociagerat (for - $\eta$ rai). In that passage of the Odyssey the common reading was סóuro, but the unanimous consent of Grammarians and manuscripts has now restored $\delta$ énto. Both forms however indisputably belong to each other, as $\epsilon-o$ is a common change of vowel. Apollonius uses the 3. optat. act. סoća $\sigma \sigma a t$ and ióí $\sigma \sigma a$ po personally, and writes also $\delta o \iota \alpha \zeta \epsilon \iota v,-\epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$; as he, with the majority of the Grammarians, derived the Homeric verb from $\delta o h$, , doubt, and understood it in the sensc of to conjecture, reflect. But in the Homeric passages either there is no doubt, or, if there is one, it lies in the former part of the sentence ; and
 account of these forms in Buttm. Lexil. p. 212, \&c.
$\Delta \epsilon \delta t \sigma \sigma о \mu а t,-\tau \tau о \mu a \iota, I$ affright: depon. midd. [Poet. for
 Demosth. de Fals. Leg. 291 .-Passow.]
In Homer we have $\delta e i \delta i \sigma \sigma o \mu a 1$ frequently, and in a transitive sense; but once it occurs intransitively, to be afraid, Il. $\beta, 190$. The verb comes from $\delta \in i ̄ \sigma a \iota$, $\delta \in ́ \delta \iota a, \delta \epsilon i \delta \iota a$. Another form is $\delta \in \delta i \sigma \kappa o \mu a \iota$ (see Piers. ad Moer. p. 119.), which must not however be confounded with the Homeric $\delta е i \delta i \sigma к о \mu a t, \delta \in \delta i \sigma \kappa о \mu$ и, on which see the note to $\Delta$ еік $\nu v \mu$.

## $\Delta \epsilon i$. See $\Delta \in ́ \omega$.

$\Delta$ eíd. See $\Delta$ eîбal.

The Ionians spoke all the forms which came from the simple root
 154.* That is to say, all these forms preserve their original length by position, like $\mu \epsilon ́ \zeta \omega \nu$, кре́ $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu$. Compare also $\pi \epsilon i \kappa \omega$.
 additional meaning of to salute, welcome, drink to $\dagger$. Consequently to it

[^69]Compare Kœn. Greg. Cor. in Ion. 36. Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. iu $\delta \in i x \nu$. and itroieík.
$\dagger$ [In this sense Homer uses only the perf. and pluperf.-Passow.]
belongs the perf. $\delta \in i \delta \varepsilon \gamma \mu u \iota$, which has the same meaning, and is used as a present: 3. plur. $\delta \in \iota \delta$ é $\chi$ atat, 3. sing. pluperf. (as imperf.) $\delta \in i \delta \in \kappa т о$. The syllable of reduplication $\delta_{\epsilon \iota}$ is found here, merely because $\delta \epsilon \iota$ is also the syllable of the stem or root, as in ieioul*.
$\Delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \in ́ \omega,-i ́ \jmath \sigma \omega, \& c$. On the Att. perf. סé $\delta \in \iota \pi \nu a$, infin. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu a ́ v a \iota$, see 'Apıatá $\omega$.
 fut. $\delta$ eiow is found only in Aristid. 2. p. 168.-Passow.]. Homer has the present $\delta e i \delta \omega$, but only in its first person : instead of it we find the perfect (with the meaning of the present), with two forms in use, $\delta$ é סouka and $\delta$ é $\delta$ ta, the choice of which depended on the one or the other sounding more agreeably to the ear $\dagger$. Of $\delta$ édoa and its pluperfect the plural takes the syncope ; thus $\delta \in \delta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta^{\prime} \delta \iota \tau \epsilon$, for $\delta \in \delta i-$
 $\mu \epsilon \nu,-\tau \epsilon$, éde $\delta \dot{\prime} \epsilon \sigma a \nu$; imperat. $\delta \in ́ \delta \iota \theta$.

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

In Homer the $\delta$ is always doubled after the augment or the preposition in composition, as ée $\delta \delta \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \delta \delta$ ei $\sigma a s$. Now as this verb, with its compounds and derivatives, very frequently makes thepreceding short

[^70]+ The form iedivía deserves our attention, which the Antiatticist p. 90, 1. quotes from the Comic writer Eubulus, and which Bekker from evident traces in the manuscripts has restored to the text of Plat. Phædr. p. 254, extr. But the form of the optative $\delta \in \delta \iota \in i \eta$, which that critic has adopted from nearly the same manuscripts, at p. 251. a. of the same work, 1 cannot admit. If the optative be there indispensable, analogy requires $\delta \in \delta \iota o i \eta$, like $\pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon v \gamma o i \eta, \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda v \theta$ oí $\eta, \dot{\epsilon} \delta \eta \delta o \kappa o i ̀ \eta$, $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta o i \eta$. But the syntax of the common reading, $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \delta \epsilon \delta i \epsilon \iota$ (imperf.)... $\theta \dot{v} 0 \iota$ üv... appears to me admissible.
syllable in the cexsura of the old hexameter long (c.g. Il. $\lambda, 10 . \xi, 387$.); and the $\delta$ of its stem or root is scarcely ever* preceded by a short syllable, it is clear that there must have been something peculiar in the old pronunciation of this verb to have produced such a general coincidence: and Dawes with great probability suspects this to have been the digamma after the $\delta(d w)$, to supply the place of which the $\delta$ was afterwards doubled. See Dawes Misc. Crit. pp. 165. 168. and Buttm. Lexil. pp. 355. 375.
 the reason of which was, as in $\delta \in i \delta \epsilon \kappa \tau 0$ under $\delta \in i \kappa \nu \nu \mu$, that the diphthong was in the stem or roott. Now as the fem. particip. of deidia could not be admitted into an hexameter, Apollonius Rh. (3, 753.) has, and undoubtedly not without a precedent from some older poet, ieidiviat. There arose also a regular present $\delta \epsilon i \delta \omega$, which however is found only in its first person§.

On the 3. pers. of the perf. סeicic used as imperf. see 'Avijuota and note. $\Delta \varepsilon \delta o i i \omega$ is a Doric pres. formed from the perf. in Theocr. 15, 58., like $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\jmath} k \omega$ in the Ionic epigram of Posidippus ap. Athen. 10. p. 417, e.
$\Delta$ éouka is formed from the theme $\Delta E I \Omega$, with the change of vowel usual in the perf. 2.; and $\delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} 亢 a$ is shortened from it, as $\pi \epsilon ф \dot{v} u \sigma \iota$ is from $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \phi \bar{\psi} \kappa a$, $i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$ from oii $\delta a$. But that theme also was still in existence in

[^71]ready touched on in the last note but one.
§ In the epigrain of Antagoras, Cod. Vat. p. 379. n. 147. (in Brunck. Simonid. 62.) we ought undoubtedly to read $\delta \in i \delta \iota \tau \epsilon$ instead of $\delta$ eidere. Compare the various readings $\delta \epsilon \iota \delta i \mu \epsilon \nu, \delta \epsilon \iota \delta \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$, Od. $\iota, 274$. As the verse can in every instance dispense with the form $\delta \in i \delta \omega$, the poets appear to have been swayed in their preference of that or $\delta$ cioica by merely metrical reasons. Compare II. к. 39. with $\phi, 536$.-On $\delta e i \delta \omega$ we have only further to observe that in many Lexicons [Schneider's and I'assow's for instance] it serves as the theme for the whole verb: but our statement must have made it sufficiently clear that it originally took its rise from $\delta$ cioita. And it is equally clear from the above-mentioned $\delta \in \iota \delta v i ̄ a$, (as a substitute for which $\delta \in i \delta o v \sigma \alpha$ must have been at once apparent,) and from $\delta e \delta i a \sigma u y$ in so old a poct as the anthor of II. $\omega$. must at all cvents have becn, and who would therefore certainly have used ieifovat, that this present was unknown to those old writers further than in its first person.
the Epic language in this its shortened form, whence Homer has more than once the imperf. $\delta i \epsilon$ ( $\dot{\delta} \delta \epsilon \epsilon$ ), e. g. Il. $\lambda, 556$. $\rho, 666 . *$

This Epic $\delta i i^{\omega}$ contained also the idea of to fly, run, $\delta i o v$ Il. $\chi .251$. Hence the causative idea of to frighten away; but this is expressed in Homer, contrary to the analogy of other writers, by the passive form $\delta i \epsilon \sigma \theta a t, \delta i \omega \mu \mu t, \& c$. (II. $\mu, 276, \eta, 197$.). But there must have been also an active transitive $\delta i \eta \mu c t$, pretty nearly corresponding in meaning with this, from which two Homeric forms come: 1. 'evciecar, they urged (the dogs) on, Il. $\sigma, 584.2$. Dievzat, pass. or midd. with a neuter sense, they run, Il. $\psi, 475$. Hence the infin. $\delta i \epsilon \sigma 0$ ac may belong to both forms and both meanings, as in Il. $\mu, 276$. and 304.

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


 $\mu \eta \nu$; perf. 1. $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \mu \eta \kappa a_{i}^{i}+$, perf. 2. $\delta \hat{\varepsilon} \delta \partial \mu a$, perf. pass. $\delta \hat{\varepsilon} \delta \mu \eta \mu a \iota$.

The pres. and imperf. are rare even in the poets. The pres. is

 in Od. $\psi$. 192.; but the aor. act. and midd. occur in the Ionic writers, and later in common prose. The perf. pass. is used by Herodot. 7, 200. The form $\delta \in i \mu \rho \mu \epsilon$ ', Il. $\eta, 337$. is the conjunct. aor. l. act, shortened from |  |
| :---: |$\mu \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$.

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


[^72]\&c. under $\delta i \eta \mu l$, which he says is contracted from $\delta$ cí $\eta \mu$..]
$\ddagger$ It may be doubted whether this perf. be formed by metathesis like $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \eta \kappa a$ (see Bád $\lambda \omega$ and note), or by a mere syncope : on the former hypothesis it will run thus, $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega$ ( $\triangle \mathrm{EM}, \Delta \mathrm{ME}$ ) $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \mu \eta \kappa \kappa \alpha$; by the latter, like $\nu \epsilon ́ \mu \omega \nu \in \nu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta \kappa a$, $\delta^{\prime} \notin \omega$ $(\delta \in \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \kappa \alpha) \delta \in \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$.
§ Many dissyllable barytone verbs, which have $\epsilon$ in the syllable of the stem or root, make sister-forms by changing the $\epsilon$ to $n$, and taking the termination ćw; as, ф' $\rho \omega \phi \boldsymbol{o}^{-}$


The same stem or radical word $\Delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$ has also the meaning of to tame

 formed the present in the following manner: 1. $\delta a \mu \dot{\jmath} \zeta \omega$ and $\delta u \mu \dot{\omega} \omega$. 2. by the insertion of the syllable $\nu a, \delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \eta \mu \iota$ and $\delta \alpha \mu \nu i(\omega \dagger$. Of these $\delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega$ has become the usual form in prose as well as verse, and is inflected regularly through all its tenses like the derivative verbs in $\dot{a} \zeta \omega$ : $\delta a \mu a ́ \omega$, as a present, is the Epic sister-form of $\delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega$ (like ¿̀vrcci $\omega$ for $\dot{a} \nu \tau \dot{\prime} \dot{\zeta} \zeta(\omega)$, Il. $a, 61 . ;$ but its forms are at the same time the Ionic and Attic future of $\delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega ; ~$ e. g. $\delta a \mu a ́ q$, Il. $\chi, 271 . \delta a \mu o ́ \omega \sigma \omega$, Il., $368 . \ddagger$. Midd. $\delta a \mu \dot{\zeta} \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, \delta a \mu a \dot{\sigma} \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$, Eurip. Hom. \&c. $\delta a ́ \mu \nu a \sigma \theta a \iota$, Hom. Hes.
 Lexil. p. 202. note,) I see, look. Aor. by transposition édpăiov, which act. form is used particularly by the Epics; the other poets use the two aorists belonging to the deponent $\delta \dot{́} \rho \kappa о \mu a t$, viz. $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \rho \chi^{\theta \eta}$ י, Soph. Aj . 425. and $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta} \rho \alpha_{к} \eta \nu$, Pind. On the short a in $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \rho a к o v$ see Пép $\theta \omega$.

There are no grounds for a pres. act. ¿́́pкш. The perf. $\delta$ é $\delta o \rho к a$ has in Pindar (Ol. 1, 153, \&c.) a pass. or intrans. meaning also, фé $\gamma$ ros, ф́áos $\delta \dot{\varepsilon ́ \delta o \rho к є, ~ i s ~ s e e n, ~ s h i n e s . ~}$
$\Delta \dot{e} \rho \omega, I$ skin, I beat, is inflected regularly according to the rules of verbs whose characteristic letter is one of the four liquids, $\lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho$. Thus it has no fut. 1. but a fut. 2. $\delta \in \rho \hat{\omega}$; its aor l. is not formed in $\sigma a$ but in $a$, as édetpa; its perfect $]$. is (with the change of $\epsilon$ to $a$, like $\pi \epsilon i \rho \omega, \pi \epsilon \rho \bar{\omega}$,



An Attic sister-form of the present is $\delta$ ai $\rho \omega$, [whence the infin. aor. ס $\bar{p} \rho a \mathrm{a}$, ] Aristoph. Nub. 442. Av. 365. See Heind. ad Plat. Euthyd. 35. Passow mentions also a later Ionic pres. $\delta e i \rho \omega$, as probably formed from the aor. édeєpa. Verbal adj. סaptós, Ep. ipatós.

[^73]$\nu \eta \mu \iota, \pi i \tau \nu \eta \mu \iota$ and $\sigma \kappa i \delta \delta \nu \eta \mu \iota$ from $\pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \omega$, IIETAS, $\mathbf{\Sigma K E} \triangle A \Omega$. These derivatives occur mostly in the dialects and poets.
$\ddagger$ Thus we have as futures $\tau \epsilon \lambda \in \in \epsilon$, Il. $\theta$, 415. $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \bar{\imath}$, Plat. Protag. p. 311 . b. $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon \bar{\imath}$, Xen. Symp. 1, I5. калєї $\sigma \theta \epsilon$, Demosth. Lept. 5. корє́єts, 11. v, 831: These futures in $\epsilon \omega-\omega$, and $\dot{a} \omega-\omega$, with a similarly sounding present, are not very numerous. Compare $\epsilon \lambda \lambda u ́ \nu \omega$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho a ́ \omega$.
§ The aor. 1. also did however exist; sce $\delta a \rho \theta$ eís in Lex. Seguer, 2. p. 89, 5.
 I am wanting.


 $\delta \in \chi \theta e i c$, (in a pass. sense) taken.

The perf. $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \varepsilon \gamma \mu a t$ has in the Epics another peculiar sense of a pre-
 ticularly of one who stands to receive an attack, or waits for game; e.g.
 to which belongs with a similar active sense the fut. $\delta \in \delta \in \dot{\varepsilon} \xi_{0} \rho a \iota$, Il. $\varepsilon, 238$. But $\delta e i \delta \varepsilon \gamma \mu a t$, I welcome, similar as that idea may seem to be to the above meaning, belongs to $\delta \varepsilon i \kappa v v \mu$, as we have shown under that verb.
 tioned before in a note under the root IEN-. According to the analogy there laid down it has the sense of an aorist, and therefore means received, exactly synonymous with $\begin{gathered}e \\ \varepsilon \\ \ell \\ \ell\end{gathered}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$; compare Il. o, 88. with $a$, 596. It happens however that the 1. sing. $\begin{gathered}\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta} \hat{\gamma} \gamma \mu \eta \nu \text { does not occur in }\end{gathered}$ thismeaning but only with that of an imperf., I was waiting for, expecting, (e. g. Od. ı, 513.) and in the same way the particip. ס'é $\gamma \mu$ evos, пoriéé$\gamma \mu e v o s$, has only the sense of waiting, expecting (e. g. 11. ı, 191. $\eta, 415$.),
 graph ; in which therefore these forms differ from the analogy of the syncopated forms laid down in the above-mentioned note under FEN-. But since at II. $\mu, 147$. סéxarae, which is not an historical form, is used in speaking of the waiting for an attack, consequently in the exact
 culiar sense (as a present), which sense the present $\delta$ éxouat never has, was able to throw off the reduplication,-a rare occurrence, of which we find but two or three instances, and those in the later writers*; we must therefore lay down for $\delta \dot{\chi} \chi \rho \mu u$ in the old Epic writers a twofold usage : viz.-


 ¿ंé $\gamma \mu \in \boldsymbol{v o s}$.

From the form $\delta e ́ r o \mu a \iota ~ w o u l d ~ c o m e ~(s e e ~ t h e ~ s e c o n d ~ n o t e ~ u n d e r ~ \Delta e ́ ~ \mu \omega †) ~$

## * See 「'v́v.

$\dagger$ That is to say, according to the analogy laid down in that note from סéso $\mu$ ą
might be formed $\delta о к є о \mu a t$, from which would come regularly $\delta \in \delta о \kappa \eta \mu \in ́ v o s$.
also the Epic perf. $\delta \in \dot{\delta o r i n \mu} \boldsymbol{e} \gamma o s$, , Il. o, 730. Hes. a, 214. in the sense of the above-mentioned $\delta \in i \in \gamma \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \nu o s$. We find in Apollon. Lex. $\delta \in \delta o \kappa \eta$ -


 perf. pass. $\delta \in \in \delta \epsilon \mu a t ;$ aor. 1. pass. $\epsilon^{\delta} \delta \in ́ \theta \eta v .-M i d d . T h e f u t$.
 writers the place of the non-Attic fut. 1. pass. $\delta \in 0_{n}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \mu a$, which however is occasionally found, e.g. Demosth. c. Timocr. 126.131. 190.-Dissyllable contracted verbs do not in general take the contraction, except in $\epsilon_{1}$ : thus we have
 an exception; for we find $\tau \grave{\tau} \delta o \hat{v}, \tau \hat{\psi} \delta_{0} \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \iota$, Plat. Cratyl. (o) àvaס̄̄v, Aristoph. Plut. 589. סıaסov̂mat, \&c. ; in which respect it differs from סé $\boldsymbol{\omega}, I$ am in want of, which makes $\tau \grave{o}$ סéov, סéoual, and even sometimes $\delta \in ́ \varepsilon \tau a \iota$.

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

Instead of $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ the older Ionic and Attic language had a present of a moredistinct and intelligibie sound, $\delta i i \delta \eta \mu$; e. g. imperf. $\delta i \delta \eta$, Il. $\lambda, 105$.; $\delta_{i} \delta \hat{e} \nu \tau \omega \nu, \mathrm{Od} . \mu, 54$. according to the reading of Aristarchus; $\delta i \bar{c}$ éa $\tau$, Xenoph. Anab. 5, 8, 24. as taken from the most credible sources. See Porson. ad Schol. Od. l. c.
 which Homer has once $\delta \bar{\eta} \sigma \epsilon v$, II. $\sigma, 100$. This verb is generally impersonal ; $\hat{\delta} \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, it is wanting, it is necessary, (il faut), conjunct. סén (contr. $\delta \hat{y}$ ), optat. סéot, infin. סeiv,
 é ס́́ñє. Pass. סéouat (as depon. I am in want of), סév or
 This voice is never impersonal.

[^74]This verb, with respect to its contraction, differs from the preceding merely in the forms which in $\delta \varepsilon i v$, to bind, are contracted to $o v^{*}$. But the contraction also to $\epsilon \ell$, which is regularly found in all verbs of this kind, was partly omitted in the one before us; for instance in the 2. pers. sing. (which is of rare occurrence) тобои́тои סє́єєs, Isocr. Busir. 5, p. 222.; and Xenophon uses $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau a \ell, \delta \in ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a \ell$, perhaps always, as it is still preserved in many passages $\dagger$.

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

The Grammarians mention as a contraction of a peculiar kind the neut. part. of the two verbs icir, to be in want of, and $\delta$ oceiv; that is to say for $\bar{i}$ éov (which is otherwise never contracted) $\delta \varepsilon i \nu$, and for coséve $\hat{c}$ oceiv, the same in sound as their infinitives, and which they

[^75]every one pronounced $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a t$, is a single affected initation of Xenophon. Among the instances of similar resolution in other verbs mentioned by Lobeck 'ad Phryn. p. 220. sqq. are only two from pure writers of $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, which may be seen under that verb. These make it probable that the Ionicism was still tamiliar enough in those short verbs, to cause it to be preferred in the case before us.
$\ddagger$ Dobree (on Aristoph.Plut. 216.)rejects much too disdainfully this precept given in the Hort. Adon. 187. b., for the truth of which I certainly cannot answer, but which is undoubtedly taken from one of the older Atticists: for this writer quotes (cxactly as Phrynichus often does, e. g. pp. 70. 84. 120.250. Lob.) the $\dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \tau о \rho \in s$, that is to say the later ones, as using the common form. If now we compare civ入óct indot, we have an analogy for $\delta \in ́ y$ dei. The passages quoted by Reisig from Aristophanes Plut. 216. Ran. 265., where the reading in many, and those the best manuscripts, is $\kappa \tilde{\alpha} \nu \nu \dot{\delta} \varepsilon \hat{\imath}$, "and even if it must be," give the above-mentioned precept great weight. Still this usage, if I have stated it correctly, cannot be the same as a similar one in $\kappa \in i \bar{\mu} \alpha \iota$, as $\mu \dot{\eta}$ Stúxetpat does not arise from contraction.
even call Attic forms. See Greg. Cor. in Att. 72. with the notes. Apollon. de Adv. p. 542, 33., and the Exc. Paris. at the end of Schæfer's Gregorius, p. 678. Phavor. vv. סeiv and $\pi \lambda$ eiv. But there are no instances quite free from doubt; which warrants our suspecting that the existence of these forms arose entirely from the syntax of the sentences being mistaken, and that the forms are really infinitives standing elliptically or used as substantives*.

Homer has this verb with the stem or root $\Delta \mathrm{E} Y$ - instead of $\Delta \mathrm{E}$-,
 active $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \eta \sigma \varepsilon v$, Od. $\iota, 540$., both voices in the sense of to be wanting; so that the poet, in speaking of a momentary event, appears to have used the aor. act. instead of the common prose form $\delta e \eta \theta$ $\bar{\eta} \nu a t$. In the midst of this great unanimity of meaning in the root $\Delta \mathrm{EY}$-, we find two passages which are very striking: 1. II. $\iota, 337$. which has the impersonal $\delta \in \hat{i}$, whereas in all the other passages $\chi$ pí is used in a similar sense : 2.
 $\eta_{\sigma \epsilon \nu}$, where the common form $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ therefore is shortened in a way which we meet with nowhere else. $\dagger$

* In the first place, it is very remarkable that the Lexicons of Atticists and rhetoricians which have come down to us, and which do not overlook the comparative $\pi \lambda \epsilon_{i} \nu$ for $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ éo , have not the two forms in question: beside which, some of the manuscripts, even that of Gregory, mention only $\pi \lambda \epsilon i v$, and have not the addition of סєiv ávтi tov̂ $\delta$ '́o $\nu$ : while סoкєiv depends entirely on the most uncertain authorities, Phavorinus and the above-mentioned Exc. Paris. Hence it is highly probable that some of the very late Grammarians were the first to make use of the well-known case of the comparative $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ for $\pi \lambda \epsilon \in \nu$, in order to understand $\delta \in i \nu$ and $\delta o x \in i \nu$ in certain phrases as participles. Whence under the word $\Delta \in i v$ in the Etym. M. we find after that explanation the following, $\hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \boldsymbol{\partial} \tau \bar{v} \dot{\delta} \epsilon \in \epsilon \nu, \delta \in i v$. The gloss inself may be compared with those on $\Delta \epsilon i \nu \not\langle\dot{\eta} \dot{\theta} \eta \nu$ and $\Delta \epsilon i ̄ \nu$ in Hesychius. And how suitable the article is to the infinitive тò $\delta \in i ̂ \nu, ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \delta e ́ o v, ~ i n ~ t h e ~ l a t t e r ~ L e x i c o-~$ grapher, is clear. Under these circumstances the example from Lysias c. Alcib. 1. p. 140. 12. (the only one which has been hitherto adduced, ) is of no weight, as the passage is otherwise corrupted, and those manuscripts which are well known have only $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$, while $\delta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ as well as $\delta \dot{\delta} \in \nu$ is an arbitrary correction : one of these
we must choose, and our choice will of course be regulated by a consideration of all that has been brought forward. As to $\delta 0 \times \varepsilon i v$, I have no doubt that it depends entirely on a comparison of the expression
 comparison is most uncertain; for the meaning of the latter is, "since it seems good and pleasing to him," that of the former "as it appears to me," which in Herodotus is evidently an infinitive, $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \mathrm{m}^{\mathbf{i}}$ סoкéєt (see Herm. ad Vig. not. 204.). We have now therefore to consider the contraction as stripped of all analogy; for $\pi \lambda_{6 i \nu}$, if that be the only instance, is sufficiently explained as shortened from $\pi \lambda \epsilon \overline{0} \nu$, which in a phrase of daily oc-
 conceivable. But in $\pi \lambda$ diov the pure sound of the stem or root is $\varepsilon \ell$, which in $\delta$ ©́o $\nu$ or $\delta o x \in ́ \in \nu$ is unheard of even in the Ionic dialect. Further, the name K $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ $\sigma \theta$ é $\nu \eta s$, which the Grammarians introduce also in the comparison, is compounded not of $K \lambda \epsilon 0-$ but of $K \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota$-, from $\kappa \lambda$ éos, as ó $\rho \in i \nu 0 \mu$ os fromőpus; and, not to omit anything bearing on the question, the name Neidews is not from Neódews, but a dialect from the old name $\mathrm{N} \eta \lambda \in \dot{\operatorname{s}}$, the head of the family of that old colonist.
+ If criticism were not bound to consider as sacred whatsoever the old rha-
$\Delta H K-$ See $\Delta$ ánıш。 $^{\text {. }}$

$\Delta$ saı ${ }^{\prime} \omega, I$ arbitrate : pass. with fut. midd. I live in a certain way, lead a certain kind of life. The only irregularity in the formation of this verb is in the augment, as it makes sometimes édıaí $\eta \sigma a$, sometimes $\delta \iota \eta \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \sigma$, and has even the double augment катє $\delta \not ŋ i \tau \eta \sigma a$. Compare the following.
 the preceding verb its irregularity consists in the augment:


On the derivation of this word, which is indisputably not compounded of סtá, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 231.
 fut. $\delta \in \delta a ́ \xi \omega$; aor. 1. édída $\xi a$; perf. $\delta \in \delta i ́ \delta a \chi^{a}$; perf. pass. infin. $\delta \in \delta \iota \delta a ́ \chi \theta a \iota, ~ I l . ~ \lambda, 831 . ~ \& c .-M i d d$.
It comes from $\Delta \mathrm{A} \Omega$, and is exactly like á $\lambda \dot{\partial} \sigma \kappa \omega$, which may be compared with it. In the poets we meet with another future $\delta_{i} \delta a \sigma \kappa i / \sigma \omega$, e. g. in Hes. $\epsilon, 64$. Hymn. Cer. 144.
$\Delta i o ̄ \eta \mu$. See $\Delta$ é $\omega$, I bind.
$\Delta$ © $\delta$ а́бк $\omega$, I run away, generally occurs in composition


 \&c. ; optat. סрaiŋv ; imperat. סpầı ; infin. סрâvaı ; part. סрác, ठра́vтос (not $\delta \rho a \hat{\nu \tau о c) ; ~ I o n . ~ \epsilon ้ \delta \rho \eta \nu,-\hat{\eta} \nu a t, ~ \& c . ~: ~ b u t ~ \delta \rho a i ̀ \eta \nu, ~ \delta \rho a ́ c, ~}$ retain the $a$, according to the analogy of $\begin{gathered} \\ \\ \sigma \\ \tau \\ \end{gathered}$
> psodists and critics have handed down as the text of those primæval monuments of antiquity, it would be easy to alter the one passage to $\chi \rho \bar{\eta}$, and the other to $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \bar{\nu}$ $\delta^{\prime} \in \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma \boldsymbol{\nu}$. If however the Homeric formation $\delta \epsilon v \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ be compared with the common $\delta \epsilon \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, there will be great probability in the conjecture of some moderns, that this verb had originally a digamma, which in some cases produced the diphthong $\varepsilon v$, as in $\epsilon \tilde{v} a \delta \in \nu$; while in others it was en-

[^76]The form ámodiopávat in Thucyd. 4, 46., which would come from $\delta i$ i$i \rho \eta \mu c$, Bekker has now amended (from the reading of several manuscripts)

 on such a precedent as the above passage of Thucydides.
 that of $\delta i \delta p u \sigma^{\circ} \omega$ in the common dialect, and after the time of Aristotle in the written language ; here and there it is found also in some copies of the earlier authorst.
The formation of the aor. 2. in $\bar{a} \nu, \& c$. detailed above not only arises completely from the analogy laid down in the note under $\Gamma$ г $\gamma \nu \omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \kappa \kappa \omega$, but is also expressly given in the same way by Phrynichus in the Appar. Sophist. p. 11. Two instances of the 1 . sing. occur also in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 419,31 . The quantity of the $\bar{\alpha}$ is evident from the Ionicism é $\bar{\circ} p \eta{ }^{\prime}$, and from the following conclusion of an anapæstic verse of Aristoph. in
 may join the unquestionable amendment of Reiske in Eurip. Heracl.
 3. plur. Eifpar should be short, is only according to the general rule of the aor. 2. of verbs in $\mu$, with which this aorist corresponds $\ddagger$. We have only to add one remark, that according to the grammarians Phrynichus and Herodian this form must have been used by the Attics also; Thucydides and Xenophon however have only the regular à $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\rho}$ aral.



Homer has in the pres. 2. and 3. sing. $\dot{i}$ ioiois, $\delta i \delta o i ̂$, as formed from dióow, 11. ८, 164. 519., which forms occur also in Herodot. and Hippocr. But $\dot{c} i \delta o \iota \sigma \theta a$, or rather $\delta i \delta o i \sigma \theta a$, is found only in Homer, e. g. Il. т, 270. The following forms are also Homeric only ; the imperat. pres. $\delta i \delta \omega \theta_{l}$


[^77]\&c. The same takes place in other anoma-
 € $\beta \eta \sigma a \nu$, Hom.
§ This irregular aorist in $-k \alpha$ is princi.pally used in the sing. in good writers: in the plur., particularly in 1 and 2 pers., the Attics generally preferred the aor. 2. There are neither moods nor participles of the form in $-\kappa \alpha$, except the participle of the middle, which however with its indioative belongs to the Ion. and Ior. dialects. Except this indic. and particip. the other moods of the middle are never met with. In Attic prose we find, of the middle, the aor. 2. only.

 -The imperat. pres. $\begin{gathered}\text { ióou, as from } \\ \delta i \hat{c} o u \\ \text {, }\end{gathered}$, is an unusual Doricism for סicov, in Pind. O1. 1, 136. The infin. pres. $\delta i \delta \bar{\omega} \nu \dagger$ (Theocr. 29, 9.) is
 Hymn. Cer. 328, 437. On the unusual accentuation of the conjunct.
 (Fischer quotes some instances from Ionic writers,) see the second paragraph under $\Delta$ v́rafal.

The form $\delta \dot{\delta} \hat{\ell}$, and $\theta \dot{\epsilon}$ tı from $\tau i \hat{i} \eta \mu t$, are never used. The former was once the reading in Nicand. Th. 562 ., but is now rejected by the discovery of better manuscripts. $\Delta \hat{\varphi} \sigma \iota$ is 3 . sing. of the conjunct. for
 is again resolved by the Ionics; thus for $\delta i \hat{i} \omega, \delta \hat{\omega}, \delta \bar{\omega} s$, \&c. they use $\delta_{\delta} \delta \dot{\omega} \omega, \delta \dot{\omega} \omega, \delta, \delta \hat{\eta} \hat{\eta} s, \delta \dot{\omega} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \delta \dot{\omega} \eta \tau \epsilon, \& c$. : and in this resolved form the Epics shorten the vowel, thus $\delta \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\rho} \epsilon \nu$ for $\delta \omega \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, \&c.
$\Delta i \zeta \eta \mu(\iota, I$ seek, an Ionic depon. midd. according to the formation in $\mu$, but retaining the $\eta$ in the passive: thus $\delta i \zeta \eta \mu u \iota$, ${ }^{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} \zeta \eta \tau 0,{ }^{\prime} \dot{\delta} i \zeta \eta \nu \tau o$,
 11. The shortened forms $\delta i \zeta$ cau (Theocr. 25, 37.) and $\delta i \zeta$ eo (in an hexameter in Etym. M. v. á $\sigma \epsilon \lambda$ yaive(v) are perfectly regular. But the forms of the proper theme in -o $\mu \iota_{\ddagger}+$ are also frequently found. In Herodotus however those in - $\epsilon$ rat, $-\epsilon \tau 0,-\epsilon \theta \theta a \ell$, are now, according to the manuscripts, universally changed into those with $\eta$ : and in Callim. Epig. 17., where hitherto has stood $\delta i \zeta$ ovata, Jacobs has adopted from the Vatican manuscript (vii, 459.) $\delta i \zeta \eta \nu \tau a t$, so that the other formation in general, at least in the older writers, may be doubted§. Fut.
 adv. Colot. 20. p. 1118.
The verb $\delta i \zeta \omega$, which occurs in Il. $\pi, 713$. and in an oracle in Hero. dot. 1,63 . with the meaning of to doubt, is supposed to be the same stem or family as $\delta i \zeta \eta \mu a \iota$. Compare 'E $\zeta_{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$ preserved in Suidas from some lost writer.

Aıceiv, infin. to ëd̀oxr, I threw; a defective poet. torist [found in the lyric and tragic poets, with no other tenses except the aor. 1. $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{0} \delta_{\xi} \xi_{\varepsilon}$ in
 $\delta_{\text {encoús. }}$.]

[^78] Moschus 2, 28. stands undisputed, as it does in the following fragment, perhaps of Callimachus, in Suid. v. äך кos; $\pi$ об $\sigma i \delta^{\prime}$ ćvє $\lambda-$
 to mention (see Ind. Gesn.) the Orphic poems.
$\Delta \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \zeta \omega, I$ doubt，（like $\beta a \sigma \tau a ́ \zeta \omega$ and $\nu v \sigma \tau a ́ \zeta \omega$ ）seems to partake of the two formations of verbs in $-\zeta \omega$ ；its future is סıotá⿱⿻上丨𣥂⿱一一 mation in $-\xi \omega,-\gamma \mu a t, \& c$ ．，yet the verbal substantive is

 $\Delta i \omega$ ．See $\Delta \in i ̂ \sigma a t$ ．
$\Delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega$, I pursue，has the fut．$\delta \iota \omega \xi \iota$ in Xen．Cyr．6，3， 13．Anab．1，4，8．and Demosth．p．989．；but the general Attic fut．is $\delta \iota \omega \xi_{0} \mu a \iota$, Aristoph．Equ．368．Elmsl．Ach． 278. Plat．Thert．p．168．a．On．é $\delta \iota \omega ́ \kappa a \theta o v, \delta \iota \kappa a ́ \theta \epsilon \iota v$ ，from $\delta \iota \omega-$ $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$ ，see＇$A \mu \dot{\prime} \nu \omega \omega$ and note．
$\Delta \mathrm{ME}-$ ．See $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega$ ．
$\Delta$ á́⿱㇒木ато，סóaral．See $\Delta$ éaza．
$\Delta$ окé $\omega$, I seem，appear；also I think：it forms its tenses from $\triangle \mathrm{OK} \Omega$ ，as fut．$\delta o ́ \xi \omega$, aor．］．$\varepsilon \in \delta o \xi a$ ；but takes its perf． from the passive $\delta^{\prime} \delta \delta o \gamma \mu a t, I$ have seemed．
 Thus $\delta \in \delta \dot{\delta} \kappa \eta \mu a t ~ i n ~ P i n d . ~ N e m . ~ 5, ~ 36 . ~ E u r i p . ~ M e d . ~ 761 . ~ A r i s t o p h . ~ V e s p . ~$ 726．（also Herodot．7，16，3．）must be distinguished from the Epic $\delta \varepsilon$－ סокэне́vos under $\Delta$ é $\chi$ оцси．

For a full account of the supposed neut．part．$\delta$ oneiv for $\delta o \kappa o v ิ \nu$ ，see $\Delta^{\prime} \omega^{\prime}, I$ am in want of，with note．

Dová́ $\omega, I$ sound heavily，I fall：fut．$\delta o v \pi \eta \sigma \omega ;$ perf．סéסoovata；aor． 1.

 ти́ $\pi \tau \omega^{*}$ ．
$\Delta \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，Att．$\delta \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega$, I seize，grasp；but the middle is more usual in the same sense．

Hence the 2．pers．perf．pass．$\delta \dot{\delta} \delta \rho a \xi a t$ is used in Eurip．Tro．745．as a middle．［So also $\delta \in i \rho a \gamma \mu$ évos，Il．$\nu, 393$ ．Soph．Antig．235．－ Passow．］

[^79]and hence that $\delta 0 u \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ came to signify the falling of such a body，тט́лтєty the beating it．
$\Delta \rho a ́ \omega, I d o$ ，is inflected regularly with a long；hence the perf．$\delta \in ́ \delta \rho \bar{\delta} \kappa a$ is common to this verb and to $\delta \iota \delta \rho a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ ．

Beside $\delta \in \dot{\varepsilon} \hat{\rho} \rho a ̈ \mu a \iota$ we find $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta} \rho a \sigma \mu a \iota$ ；see Thucyd．3，54．Hence the verbal adj．ía $\quad$ ттós，ípaotéos．
［ $\Delta \rho \dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{o} \mu \mu$ is an Epic form produced from the optat．pres．act．$\delta \rho \bar{\varphi} \mu \mu$ ，（Od． 0,317 ．），and the only instance in Homer of this verb in its simple form： it was most frequent in the Doric dialect，in which it was used like the Attic $\pi \rho$ átт $\omega$ ，Aristot．Poet．3，6．－Passow．］
$\Delta \rho \in ́ \pi \omega$, I pluck，is inflected regularly；thus fut．$\delta \rho^{\prime} \notin \omega$, \＆c．The midd．is frequent：［aípa $\delta \rho \in ́ \notin a \sigma \theta a t$ is an unusual expression in Æschyl．Sept．720．Verbaladj．$\delta \rho \in \pi \tau$ тóc．－ Passow．］

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

That aimoঠ́íøot in Il．$\omega, 21$ ．cannot be an aorist，as some have ex－ plained it to be，is evident from the construction of the sentence．It must therefore be the pres．optat．of a sister－form ámodpú申w；and we know that it is not unusual for the more simple form of a verb to have been retained in the poets only，or formed by them on account of the metre，while the other passed into general use＊．
 depon．with fut．midd．$\delta v \nu_{n} \sigma o \mu a t ;$ aor．1．pass．é evvín $\theta_{\eta \nu} \dagger$ ，
 others）never takes the augment ；aor．1．midd．$\dot{\varepsilon} \delta u \nu \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ， Hom．；perf．$\delta \in \delta \dot{v} \nu \eta \mu a \iota$ ．Verbal adj．$\delta v \nu a$ тóc，possible．

In the passive of all verbs in $\mu$ there are instances in the common language of a formation in the conjunctive and optative moods，by which they assimilate，sometimes in sound but always in accent，to the common conjugation．Instances in тitє $\mu \iota$, íтга $\mu \iota$, ，$i \delta i o \mu a \iota$ may be seen under

[^80]their respective verbs : in the present case we have as proparoxytons,
 which have undoubtedly been introduced into Homer from the common language.
 not apply to this verb, which took rather the Ionic form $\delta$ ourn $\dagger$ (Ion. סivecu) and was used thus by the Tragedians (Eurip. Hec. 253. Androm. 238. Soph. Phil. 798. ed. Buttm. with the notes). In prose iuraacu only was in use. But in the imperf. the Attics preferred even in prose the form $\dot{e} \delta \dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime} \omega, \mathfrak{j} \delta \dot{\delta} \nu \omega$, to that in -aбo. Moeris, p. 182. Xen. Anab. 7, 5, 5.

Of the three forms of the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta u v^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ is the only one in Homer: it is preferred by Herodotus (see Wessel. on 7, 105.), and is frequent in Xenophon. The Attics prefer the double augment ijuvá$\mu \eta v, \dot{\eta} \delta v \nu i\{\eta \eta$; the former occurs also in Herodot. 1, 10. But in Thucyd. and Xenoph. the simple augment is the more common. Homer generally uses the nor. midd. $\delta$ uríato.
$\Delta \dot{v} \omega$. Of this verb some tenses have the immediate meaning to go into, and others the causative meaning to put into, envelope in; while in all essential points it follows the examples of 'i $\sigma \tau \eta \mu t$ and $\phi \dot{v} \omega$, and the analogies laid down in sect. 113. of my Grammar $\ddagger$. The pres. act. $\delta \dot{v} \omega$, ката $\delta \dot{v} \omega$, \&c. has the causative meaning to envelope in, to sink anything, and retains it in the fut. and aor. l. act. $\delta \dot{v} \sigma \omega$, $\neq \delta \bar{v} \sigma a$.
 є̇ठvaá $\mu \eta \nu$ has therefore the meaning to wrap oneself up in, which then very naturally makes a transition to the intransitive or immediate sense, to go into, go under, sink under. But this again takes a transitive meaning, e.g. to put on

[^81][^82](a garment). All these meanings belonging to the immediate sense join with the middle voice the active perf. סéduкa and the aur. 2. $e^{\circ} \delta \bar{\nu} \nu^{*}$. In addition to the above comes a new active form $\delta \dot{v} \nu \omega$, which properly speaking is synonymous
 yet so that in certain constructions and in the compounds these active forms are preferred.

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

The aor. 2. of this verb $\epsilon \in \bar{i} \bar{v}{ }^{\prime}$, like $\bar{\epsilon} \phi \bar{v}{ }^{\prime}$, retains the $v$ long through
 and Doric writers for $\varepsilon \bar{\varepsilon} \delta \bar{v} \sigma a v$, has the $v$ short according to the regular
 tive and optative moods we must however make particular mention. To form a conjunct. according to the analogy of $\check{\varepsilon \quad} \sigma \tau \eta \nu, \sigma \tau \bar{\omega}$, is not possible, luat it may follow that of the resolved form até $\omega$ or $\sigma \tau \in \dot{e} \omega$, orimps :

 ivin, Plato Cratyl. 64. p. 413. b.; which forms therefore must not be derived from the present $\delta \dot{v} \omega$, nor must we attribute to this latter an immediate sense. Of the optat. $\delta v_{\eta} \eta(\bar{v}$ for $v i$ ) I can produce but one example, viz. $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \delta, \bar{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \dagger$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta v i \eta \mu \epsilon \nu($ like $\sigma \tau a i \eta \nu-\sigma \tau a i ̄ \mu \epsilon \nu)$ in Il. $\pi$, 99. But according to Bekker's observation, the construction in Od. 九, 377. $\sigma, 348 . v, 286$. requires the optative, and consequently in those passages instead of $\delta \dot{v} \eta$ we must write $\delta \dot{\prime} \eta$.

The Epic $\delta \dot{\delta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$, Il. $\theta$, 271. is the 3. sing. aor. 2. act. for $\bar{\epsilon} \dot{c} v$, and formed according to the regular analogy of iteratives, like ofá $\sigma \kappa \circ$, ठórкov, \&c. consequently it means, he drew back each time.

The Epic sister-forms of the aor. 1. midd. $\dot{e} \delta \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \tau 0_{\ddagger}^{\ddagger}$, imperat. © $\dot{v} \sigma \epsilon 0$,
 aor. 1. taking the termination of the aor. 2., or, which is the same thing, the aor. 2. taking the characteristic $\sigma$ of the aor. 1., of which the most complete instance is the well-known aor. ënє $\pi \sigma \nu, \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i v, ~ \& c$.

[^83][^84]See Buttm. Lexil. p: 226. note. The Epic participle $\delta v \sigma \dot{j} \mu \in \nu$ vs, used in the sense of a present in Od. $\boldsymbol{a}, 24$. Hes. $\epsilon, 382$., is certainly not a future; and as it does not describe one in particular, but the general setting of some of the heavenly bodies, it may be explained as coming


Later writers form from ovirw an aor. 1., at least in the participle, inhiou
 dotus inflects the form $\delta \dot{v} \nu \omega$, as he does many other barytones*, as if it were a pres. in $-\boldsymbol{\epsilon \omega}$; thus 3,98 , $\mathfrak{e} v \delta \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime}$ éovat, they put on.

## E.

## 'Eá申 $\theta \eta$. See "А

'Eá $\omega$, I permit, \&c. : fut. $\grave{\epsilon} a ́ \sigma \omega$; but in the augment it changes the $\epsilon$ not into $\eta$, but into $\epsilon \iota \dagger$, e. g. imperf. $\epsilon \omega \omega \nu$; aor. 1. є $\epsilon^{\prime}(\bar{\sigma} \sigma a, \& c$.
 for $\epsilon i a \sigma a$, Hom. who has also a pres. $\epsilon i \dot{c} \omega, \epsilon i \omega$, Il. $\delta, 55$. The fut. midd. éáбoнat is used in a passive sense, Thucyd. 1, 142.-Passow.]
'Eyरuáw, I give, as a pledge; Midd. I pledge myself. This verb is inflected regularly, but is uncertain in its augment: thus we have in general use the imperf. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \boldsymbol{v} \omega \nu$, and the aor. 1. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma^{u} \eta \sigma a$, yet the perf. is equally common as є́үүєү́́ŋка; and again we find without any augment at all

 perf. with Attic redupl. é $\gamma^{n} \gamma є \rho \kappa a$; perf. pass. é $\gamma^{n} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \rho \mu a$. Midd. I waken (myself) ; to which we must add the syncopated aor. ทуро́дทv.

[^85]Lucian. Lexic. v. évє $\gamma \gamma v \underset{q}{\nu}$ explains this to be merely the augment; which is singular, as analogy would require $\dot{\in} \nu \epsilon \gamma v \dot{\eta} \sigma a$. Others place it as without the augment under éveyjvąv. I consider it to be an anomaly in the augmentation ; and that daily pronunciation, deceived by ear and sense, strayed from $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \gamma \dot{v} \eta \sigma a$ into the double compound $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \gamma-$ . $\begin{array}{r}\eta ́ \eta \sigma . ~\end{array}$

This aorist has been mistaken by the Grammarians, at least the later ones, who, as we see in Thom. Mag., supposed a present ê'yoo $\mu$ aı. Such a one however is never met with, and the remaining forms are in every
 $\mu \epsilon ' \sigma \eta \mu \beta \rho \iota \nu o ̀ s, ~ o i \delta \delta \epsilon i ́ s ~ \sigma^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \iota$, Aristoph. Vesp. 774. In the same way the infin. also expresses universally the moment of waking: and hence it was a very easy step to substitute the accentuation of éypé $\sigma \theta a l$, and ascribe $\tilde{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \ell$ to the above-mentioned mistake of the Grammarians. But in a form which has always remained in the common language, and of which the infin. for instance occurs frequently (Od. $\nu$, 124. Apollon. Rh. 4, 1352. Lucian Dial. Mar. 14, 2.), more than usual circumspection is necessary. In a similar case under á $\gamma \boldsymbol{\ell} \hat{\rho} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$, where
 latter but once, grammatical decision was necessary, and the perfectly regular aorist form required the accent agreeably to the general rule. Here on the contrary it is possible that the form being altered by syncope had caused a deviation from analogy even in the earlier times, an instance of which we shall see in the unquestionable and very similar aorist êלє $\epsilon \theta a \iota$ under "I $\zeta \omega$. Compare also Пє́ $\phi \nu \omega \nu$.

The perf. 2. є́ $\gamma \rho \dot{\eta} \gamma \circ \rho a$,
whose anomalous reduplication was probably caused by the
 immediate meaning, and expresses the being in a certain state or situation, I am watching*. The pluperf. '́ypŋ ${ }^{*}{ }^{\text {ó- }}$ $\rho \in \iota \nu$ has the force of an imperfect.

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

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

[^86][^87]róp $\theta$ at. We find also in the same poet a very peculiar deviation in the active form of the 3. plur. (likewise with the $\theta$ ), $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \theta a \sigma \iota \nu . *$
${ }^{*}$ E $\delta \omega$. See ' ${ }^{\text {E } \sigma \theta i \omega . ~}$

Ебодає. See"I $\zeta \omega$.
' $\mathrm{E} \theta \in ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ and $\theta_{\epsilon ́ \lambda} \lambda \omega$, I wish, am willing: fut. é $\theta \in \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ and $\theta_{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \omega$; but aor. 1. $\eta^{\prime} \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda_{\eta \sigma a}$; imperf. $\eta_{\epsilon} \theta_{\epsilon} \lambda_{o v}$; and perf. $\eta_{\eta} \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \eta \kappa a$ in good prose writers ; $\tau \in \theta \in ́ \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ is an Alexandrine perf. ; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 332.
[These two verbs are the same in meaning, and differ only in form : $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$ is not found in any Epic poet before the Alexandrine æra, $\dot{\theta} \theta \in \dot{e} \lambda \omega$ on the other hand never occurs in the iambic trimeter of Attic tragedy: the latter is the regular form in Attic prose, although the former is occasionally met with in the best writers, in such a combination as $\varepsilon i$ $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \in \epsilon$ s, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 7. Hence the Attics naturally preferred the imperf. $\ddot{\eta} \theta \in \lambda o \nu$ and the aor. 1. $i_{1} \theta^{\prime} \lambda \eta \sigma a$, in which the augment comes regularly from $\dot{\theta} \theta \dot{\hat{e}} \lambda \omega$; consequently these forms are not to be compared with $\hat{\eta} \beta o v \lambda \lambda_{i} \theta \eta \nu, \eta \dot{\eta} \delta v v_{i} \theta_{\eta \nu}, \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu$. On the difference of meaning between ßuvìouaı and $\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$ see Buttm. Lexil. p. 194. \&c.-Passow.]
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} 0^{\prime} \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\omega}, I$ accustom, is regularly inflected; e. g. fut. $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \theta^{\prime} \sigma \omega$, Att. - $-\hat{\omega} \hat{\omega}$, Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 53. ; but it takes $\epsilon \iota$ for its augment, like $\epsilon \in a ́ \omega$, which sce with its note. Compare also the following.
"E $0 \omega$. From this old present (of which we now find no remains in the Epic writers except the participle é $\theta \omega \nu$, being accustomed to,) comes the very common perfect ci $\omega \theta$, 1 am accustomed to. The other tenses are furnished by the passive of $\dot{\epsilon}_{i}^{\prime} \zeta \omega$, of which the perf. pass. $\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime} \theta_{i \sigma \mu a t}$ is nearly the same as $\epsilon^{\prime} \omega \theta$ a.
$\gamma \epsilon ́ \tau \omega$, came $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \chi \theta \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\omega} \chi \theta \omega$; and this
seems the most natural way of accounting
for the Epic $\pi \in ́ \pi o \sigma \theta c$ (see $\pi a ́ \sigma \chi \omega$ ), viz.
$\pi \epsilon \in \pi о \nu \theta a, \pi \epsilon \pi$ о́v $\theta a \tau \epsilon, \pi \in ́ \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon$. See
under "A $\nu \omega y a$.

* Thesc forms do indeed appear in their
external relations like a series of anoma-
lies; but I think I can point out a general
regularity running throngh the whole.
The transition of é $\gamma \boldsymbol{\rho} \gamma$ ópace to the pas-
sive form éypíyoo日e was justified by the
neuter meaning of $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \dot{\eta} \gamma \circ \rho a$, which suited

[^88]The perf. ei ${ }^{\prime} \omega 9 a^{*}$ is a lengthening of the stem or radical form, exactly as we see from $\epsilon i \delta \omega, \eta \eta \delta \epsilon \iota \nu, \eta \eta i \eta$, the lengthened form $\bar{\eta} \epsilon i \delta \bar{\eta}$. The object in the formation of this perfect was to preserve both the augment and the change of vowel; it was therefore properly eiota: hence arose, by transposing the quantities, the Ionic $\dot{\epsilon} \omega \theta a$ in Herodotus, and thence again came the common $\epsilon^{\prime} \omega \theta \theta$. The Doric writers had another formation, similar to the perf. 1. but with the change of vowel, e $\theta 0$ wкa. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 138. 'E $\omega^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon$ (like $\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \pi \dot{\omega} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \text { ) is according to the }}$ regular Ionic formation a pluperfect, and so it is used in Herodot. 4, 127.; but both are used also as perfects, the former in 2,68 . the latter in 3,37 . It has been wished to do away this irregularity by substituting in these cases the regular perfect in $\epsilon$; but as we find also in Herodot. $\epsilon \not \psi_{\epsilon \epsilon, ~ e ́ v e ́ ' \chi \epsilon \epsilon, ~ a n d ~}^{\omega} \phi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, it appears to me most probable that the Ionics, accustomed to insert their $\epsilon$ not according to well-known analogies, but from a dark and uncertain feeling, lengthened the hi-
 true analogy. Compare "E $\downarrow \boldsymbol{w}$.

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

1. to see: the only tense which retains this meaning is the aor. 2. eîov, and Epic without the augment íiov; infin. îeciv, Ep. i文étv; conjunct. $i \delta \omega \omega$, Epic i $i \delta \omega \mu t$; part. $i \delta \omega \omega \nu$ : all these forms are Homeric. The aor. 2. midd. has the same meaning, eiióo $\mu \eta \nu$, in Hom., more frequently
 i $\delta 0 \hat{v}$. See also 'Opá $\omega$.
2. to know: oi i $\mathrm{a}_{\ddagger}, I$ know, to which we may add the part. $\epsilon i \delta \omega$ 's; infin. $\epsilon i \delta \hat{\delta} \nu \alpha \iota$, Ep. $i \bar{\delta} \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ and $i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$; imperat. $i \sigma \theta_{\iota}$; conjunct. $\epsilon i \hat{i} \omega$,
 frequently and mostly Epic eiofí $\sigma$. The aor. and perf. are supplied from $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$.

Of the regular persons of oica, the 2 . sing. and the three persons of the plur. oiiõaev, oiîure, oiioant, occur but seldom, and, with regard to Attic usage, are disapproved of by the Atticists, while their places are supplied

[^89]$\ddagger$ Properly the perf. 2. of eid $\omega$ with the augment thrown aside (like cilk ễo兀ка, Ion. oika), but always used as a present, and consequently its pluperf, has the force of an imperfect. For the very remarkable analogy between the formation of this perf. and éouka see last note but one under Ei̋k
by syncopated forms : we will therefore first give the pure Attic usage


## ATTIC USAGE.



Fur. eirouat, less frequently ciion $\quad \omega \dagger$.

Verbal adj. (neut.) iatéov.
In both the Ion. and Dor. dialect we find the regular oifas, Od. a, 337.; in the Att. sometimes oir月as, Cratin. AB. 3. p. 1295. Piers. Moer. p. 283. Br. Aristoph. Fr. 143. Meineke Menandr. p. 122. The Ion. and
 $i \delta \partial \mu \epsilon$ as shortened from $\varepsilon i \delta \bar{\delta} \dot{\mu} \mu \nu a \iota$. They have the same shortening of the radical vowel in the conjunct. $i \delta \dot{\delta} \omega$ (II. $\xi, 235$. where however others read cioiéw as a dissyllable) for cioiw, and in the fem. part. iסvia for
 for $\epsilon i \delta \bar{\delta} \mu \epsilon \nu$, Il. $a, 363$. For ${ }_{\eta}^{n} i \in \epsilon \nu$ the Epics have a lengthened form, by which the separation of the augment from the radical syllable is made more distinct (compare $\eta_{\eta} \epsilon \nu$ under $\mathrm{E}^{i} \mu \iota, I$ go), and of which we find 2.
 Rh. 2, 822., and Herodotus (1, 45.) has with the termination short $\eta \mathrm{\eta} \epsilon \mathrm{i} \delta e$ for $\tilde{\eta} \delta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \|$. To these we must add a form as quoted in this verb only,

[^90]§ The Ion. $i \delta \mu \in \nu$ did not come from i$\sigma \mu \in \nu$; general analogy requires just the converse : $\imath \delta \mu \in \nu$ and the infin. $i \delta \mu \in \nu a \iota$ belong evidently to $\epsilon i \delta \omega$, and not to $i \sigma \eta \mu \mu$. See last note but one under cilkw, êotca.
|| This shortened termination is certainly remarkable in a dialect which in other cases adds vowels without reason or ana-

ที้ $\delta \epsilon \omega$ for 1700．On the other hand Homer has（Il．$\sigma, 405$ ．Od．$\delta, 772$ ．）the 3. pl．icap，in sound the same as the 3．plur．imperf．of $\varepsilon i \mu \iota$ ；and it is to be explained in the same way，for it bears the same relation to the syn－
 Lastly Homer uses both futures，less frequently however $\epsilon i \delta \eta \sigma \sigma$, Il．$a$ ， 546．The Epic infin．єíi $\eta \sigma \epsilon \in \epsilon \nu$, Od．$\zeta, 257$.

In order to distinguish correctly where forms of this verb belong to the one or the other meaning，we must observe that many ideas which really relate to internal knowledge，but which we express by the sense of seeing，are given by the Greeks to the verb ci⿱亠乂́éval．So in particular， $i \dot{i} \varepsilon \in i \delta \bar{\eta} s, ~ i \nu$＇$\epsilon i \delta \bar{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ ，in many combinations，where there is danger of our being influenced by custom to alter it to＇cins，＂i $\delta \eta \tau \varepsilon$ ，e．g．in Demosth．

 （p．541．init．）：see other examples in Sturz．Lex．Xenoph．under eió $\varepsilon \iota \nu$ 6．To the above we may add also the verbal adj．iovéov，which is never used properly of seeing，though there are cases where we cannot translate it otherwise；see Heind．ad Plat．Theæt．141．In the same way the Homeric conjunct．ei $i \delta \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，which always stands for $\epsilon i \delta \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ， （as at Il．$\nu^{\prime}, 327$. Od．$\zeta, 257$ ．where we should say＂that we may see．．． let us see．．．）＂would be more accurately translated by know；nor can there be any doubt that the only passage where cioij $\sigma \omega$ according to the context might express the physical idea of seeing，Od．$\zeta, 257$ ．， belongs，like all the other cases，to cióévat；＂Thou wilt there know the most illustrious of the Phæacians．＂The later poets were the first， from misunderstanding perhaps the Homeric language，to use ci $i \delta \omega$ in the exact sense of to see；eídoues，as a present，Theocr． 2,25 ．，or they


But there is one part of the verb which really belongs to $\epsilon^{\prime} i \delta \omega$ ，video， viz．the Epic middle $\epsilon i \delta o \mu a \iota$ ，$\epsilon i \sigma u ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，used exactly as the Latin verbs appareo and videor，as at I1． $0,555 . a, 228 . \mu, 103$ ．；and by a particular deviation it is joined with a dative in the sense of to be like to，eidó $\mu \in v o s$ ＇Ака́ $\mu a \nu \tau \iota$, Il．є，462．єírato víl Прıá $\mu о$ ，$\beta, 791$.

As cijw had originally the digamma，which we see in videre and the frequent hiatus in Homer before eiioos，i¿єeiv，eiסéval，\＆c．，it had also the syllabic augment．This is the true explanation of the aor．cidov， $i \delta \epsilon \bar{i} \nu$ ，in the common language；thus $\epsilon i \delta \omega$, ë－i $\delta o \nu$ ，$i \delta \epsilon i \nu$ ，like $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega$ ，
logy．It is easy enough to conjecture that Herodot．wrote jंєídeє：but the va－ rious reading $\eta \ddot{j} \delta \epsilon$ ，from which this must
be deduced，is very doubtful．The best manuscripts have $\tilde{\eta} \in \epsilon \hat{C} \varepsilon$ ，the others tide．

ध̀ $\lambda \iota \pi \cap \nu, \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon i \nu$ : and (after the total disappearance of the digamma) by cond traction $\boldsymbol{e i \delta o v . ~ T h i s ~} \epsilon$ is therefore different from that in the pres. $\epsilon^{i} i \delta \omega$, where it was added to strengthen the radical syllable io- as in $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega$ from $\lambda_{\iota \pi}$. . Hence in the Epic language the aor. $\varepsilon i \sigma$ á $\mu \eta \nu$ occurs with that augment é $\varepsilon \iota \sigma$ ć $\mu \eta$ י. But Homer has also the particip. é $\in \iota \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon-$ vos, Il. $\beta, 22$., and Pindar (Nem. 10, 28.) éeiर́ó $\mu \in r^{\prime} o s$, for which it is necessary to suppose a theme $\epsilon \in i \delta \omega$, as such an $\epsilon$ is found in many verbs which had the digamma according to the analogy of $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\dot{j}} \dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{*}$.

Eiкáţ $\omega$, I conjecture, is regular, except in sometimes taking the augment, contrary to the analogy of verbs in $\epsilon_{\imath}$ :
 and compare Ruhnk. ad Tim. v. єiкáद,ur. In Plato it is found thus augmented in good manuscripts. See the following.

Eík $\omega$, I yield, is regular, and like other verbs in $\epsilon \iota$ does not take the augment: thus imperf. єîкnv; aor. l. єi\}a, where the place of the augment is supplied by the accent. The same is still visible in many compounds; thus ä äetpye can only be the imperat. of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon i \rho \gamma(\omega$, the imperfect is $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon i \rho \gamma \varepsilon$. But wherever in the written text of Homer the augment can be known only by the accent, it necessarily depended on the Grammarians whether to express it or not : and some of these appear to have been induced by an Ionic analogy
 is the present reading of Il. $\pi, 305$. in Wolf's Homer, though he reads in every instance 佁ev and éфïle. See Etym. M. v. ка0п̃бто.

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


Eikw. We never find the present of this verb in the sense of to be like to, to appear, but the perf. 2. éorka $\dagger$ with the force of a present is used in its stead; pluperf. é $\omega^{\prime} \kappa \in \iota \nu$,

[^91]and in Homer（Il．$\nu$, 102．）once，3．pl．є́oiкєба⿱ ；perf．infin． éoкє́val，part．є́oぃќ́c，－vîa，－óc，beside which Homer has once éoıкиiat，Il．$\sigma, 418$ ．The Attics preferred a sister－ form of this part．єiкќc，（like êotóa，ėotóćc，eiów $c$ ，particu－ larly in its neuter éкóc，although éookóc still remained always a good form．Homer has once єiкќc，Il．$\phi, 254$. and very frequently the fem．eiкvia：the Ionics，but not Ho－ mer，always use oiкка，oiкш́c，oiкóc．Fut．єiそ̆（Aristoph． Nub．1001．）．

The same abbreviation which we find in eiкés takes place on account of the metre in other forms of this perfect；as，$\varepsilon \boldsymbol{i} \kappa \in \nu^{*}$ ，he is like（Ari－ stoph．Av．1298．），$\pi \rho 0 \sigma \epsilon \iota$ кévaı（Eccl．1161．）；hence this infinitive is now written so in Nub．185．and Eurip．Bacch．1273．，although it is pos－ sible that in all these passages it might have been written in the usual way and pronounced thus to suit the verse．

The Homeric eixe（II．$\sigma, 520$. ）is imperf．，and the only instance of the pres．or imperf، of єiкк
 in Soph．and Eurip．，ëiктov 3．dual for éoíкatov，Od．$\delta, 27$ ．，and étiкт $\eta \nu$ 3．dual pluperf．for $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \psi \kappa \varepsilon i \tau \eta \nu$, Il．$a$, 104．This perfect made a further transition（without however changing its meaning）to the passive form $\dagger$ ，

 post－Homeric poets，but with an irregular augment：thus $\pi \rho o \sigma \eta i \xi a \iota$ Eurip．Alc．1066．，тробіїктає Hesych．§．
radical vowel $\epsilon$ ，and the $\epsilon$ at the beginning is the syllabic augment instead of the re－ duplication，like $\varepsilon \in \sigma^{\prime} \alpha$ and some others；
 $\delta$ é $\delta o \rho k a$ ．Again in the three pluperfects co－would by the temp．augm．be クo－，which again by Attic and Ionic analogy would become $\epsilon \in-$ ，as $\chi \rho a ́ o \mu a t$, lon．хрє́шرat， $\nu \eta o ́ s$, Att．$\nu \in \omega \dot{s}$ ，and many others．
＊［Whether the perf．cira be a good Atticism or not，has been doubted；see Piers．ad Moer．p．148．or Brunck Ari－ stoph．Nub．185．－Passow．］

+ Compare the same thing in éyp＇ryopa

$\ddagger$ In order to understand clearly the augment of the pluperf．in these forms غ́ч́кєє and ぞккт，we must recollect that
this is not the way of writing them which existed in Homer＇s time．Etxw is one of those verbs which had originally the digamma；the perfect therefore with the reduplication was FE－FOIKA，conse－ quently є́ $\notin ́ \kappa є \iota$ was in his language $\operatorname{FEFOI-}$ KEI，and éikto，ÿiкто were FEFIKTO， EFEFIKTO；which forms，if substituted for the others，suit the verse in every in－ stance，by merely throwing aside occa－ sionally a separable $\nu$ ，as in $11 . \psi, 107$.
§ These torms appear to have arisen out of the old Epic $\bar{\eta} i x<0$ by analogies imperfectly understood．For if it were wished to form at once from cikw， without going through the perfect éouxa， a perf．pass．$\tilde{y} y \mu a t$ ，in order to resolve it into $\ddot{\eta} i \gamma \mu a \iota$ ，the leading analogy which

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

To this stem or root belong also ${ }^{\imath} \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\begin{gathered}\text { ét } \sigma \kappa \omega \text {, which see in their }\end{gathered}$ places.

Eìíw, I envelope: fut. $\in i \lambda \bar{\nu}^{\prime \prime} \sigma \omega$; perf. pass. $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \bar{\lambda} \mu a \iota$; aor. 1. part. єi入voӨeís, Hom. Post-Hom. є̌̌̀v̌бa, Com. ap. Athen. 7. p. 293. d.
regulates such cases would be destroyed without sufficient reason. Whilst a language still exists in its vigour and purity, it is easy and not uncommon for an old analogy to be inaccurately understuod: but to spin out new analogies on mere theory could have been only done by the later grammarian-poets.

* If we compare the different forms arising out of the two perfects cotca and oilda, we shall find a very close analogy between them. From cikw, ciliow, came ëousa, êotioa; of the former a shortened form oika is found in the Ionic dialect, of the latter oi $\delta a$ was in common use: the one has a part. cikćs, the other cióws. Of eotca the pluperf. (with the augm. after the analogy of $\dot{\varepsilon} о \rho \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \omega \rho \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \boldsymbol{\zeta})$ was éúкєty; but there existed also the regular pluperf. with merely the ot shortened, as is clear from the 3 . pluperf. pass. ÿ้̈кто, (without the angm. є̈̈кто,) which must come from a perf. ei $i \gamma \mu a$, , pluperf. ', $^{\prime} \gamma \mu \eta \nu$. In the same way from exoi $\delta a$
 syncope from éouk were formed éoty $\mu \in \nu$
 $i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu, i \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu, i \sigma \tau \epsilon$; and in the pluperf. from $\hat{j} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu-\hat{j} \sigma \mu \in \nu, \tilde{y} \sigma \tau \epsilon, \tilde{j} \sigma \alpha \nu$. From this $\tilde{j} \sigma \alpha \nu$ (for $\eta \delta-\sigma a \nu$ ) comes therefore the Homeric i$\sigma \alpha \nu$ (for í $\cdot . \sigma \alpha \nu$ ) by the mere omission of the augment : so that it is not necessary to suppose for this single word that Homer was acquainted with " $\sigma \eta \mu$,
of which there is no other instance. And lastly,

 both Attic forms instead of the regular éoik $\alpha \sigma \iota \nu$, oil $\hat{0} \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$; and both terminating in $\sigma \iota \nu$, according to a mutual analogy, in which they differ from all other perfects. Whereas if this 3. plur. came from $\bar{t} \sigma \eta \mu$, why is it not accented like i$\sigma \tau \bar{\sigma} \sigma \iota$, and lengthened in the Ion. dialect like ioté$a \sigma t$ ?
$\dagger$ The great difference between the terminations of the principal and of the historic tenses ${ }^{2}$ is this, that by the augment $\epsilon$ and the consequent throwing back of the accent toward the beginning of the word, the terminations of the latter were shortened; e.g. тv́mt-ovtı (Dor. for -ovat) Evvir $\tau=0$; and consequently from the historic ending $\sigma a \nu$ we may conclude that there was in the principal tenses the ending $-\sigma \alpha \nu \tau \iota(-\sigma \bar{u} \sigma \iota)$. In this remark I agree exactly with that acute philologist Landvoigt of Merseburg, who has thus resolved to my complete satisfaction a diffictilty mentioned in my Grammar, in a note on the 3 . plur. pres. indic. of the verbs in $\mu \iota$; namely, that in the most ancient mode of inflection the 3. plur. of the pres. and imperf. ended thus, $\tau \iota \theta \dot{\varepsilon}-\sigma \alpha \nu \tau t$, éti $\theta \epsilon-\sigma \alpha \nu$. The $\sigma$ in the former dropped out, leaving rı日́avтi тו$\theta$ '́a $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$, which were shortened to $\tau \boldsymbol{\imath} \theta \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ í $\sigma \iota$ тєӨ่́ขть.

[^92] used in Homer with the single $\epsilon$, is distinct from the above, and means, 1.) to compress or draw oneself up together, Il. $\omega, 510$. Od. є, 433. 2,) to be thrust or pushed, II. $\psi, 393$. The old Homeric language seems to have made a distinction between the forms beginning with $\epsilon i$ and those with $\dot{\varepsilon}$, using the former in the sense of to envelope, cover up, the latter in that of to compress and to push; but later poets confounded both forms and meanings. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 272.
$\mathrm{E}_{i \prime}^{\prime \prime} \lambda \omega$, $\epsilon_{i}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ or $\epsilon_{i}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$, and $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \omega$ or $\epsilon_{i} \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon$, I press together, shut in, envelope, roll up : all the remaining forms, which occur in the common language, come exclusively from the form in é $\omega$; as, ei $\lambda_{n}^{\prime} \sigma \omega$, eil $\lambda \eta \mu a t$, ei $\lambda \eta \theta \in i(c$.

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

In Homer, beside the pres. and imperf. eileiv and the part. pass. ei入ó $\mu \in v o s$, the rest of the formation comes from the simple stem or root $\mathrm{E} \Lambda_{-}$; as, the 3. pl. aor. 1. é $\lambda \sigma a \nu$, the infin. é $\lambda \sigma a t$, and (according to the
 with the meaning of to strike, on which, and on the relation which
 pass. ${ }^{\text {é }} \lambda \lambda \mu a t$, é $\in \lambda \mu$ évos.
To this verb and to the same simple stem or root belong, according to all analogy, the aor. pass. $\in \in ́ a \eta \eta \nu$ and the 3. pl. without augm. ä $\lambda \in \nu$

 tain, and the editions and passages vary between the lenis and éa $\lambda \eta \nu$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu a c t, \& c$.

The imperf. éó $\lambda_{\epsilon}$ in Pind. Pyth. 4, 414. (according to Bæeckh's undisputed emendation) and the pluperf. pass. éód $\eta$ тo in Apollon. 3,

[^93][^94]471
. are sister-forms of eidet and éedro with the meaning of to press upon, disturb, which bear the same relation to $\mathrm{E} \Lambda \Omega$, єì $\lambda \omega$, as тро $\mu^{\epsilon} \omega$ does to $\tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega$, éкт $\dot{v} \eta \eta \kappa \kappa$ to $\kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \omega$, and other similar forms*.

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

Eípaptal. See Meípoдая.
Eí $\mu$ i, $I$ am, a defective verb in $\mu$, from a radical form $\mathrm{E} \Omega$. Beside the pres. and an imperf. $\dot{\eta} \nu$, it has only a fut. $\begin{gathered}\text { éroual, Poet. } \\ \text { érooual; }\end{gathered}$ the other tenses are supplied by $\gamma \boldsymbol{i} \gamma \nu o \mu a \iota$; verbal adj. évotov. From the middle comes the 2. sing. imperat. éro, Epic and also Dor. érao; and the 1 . sing. imperf. $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta \eta$, rejected indeed by the Atticists, but found occasionally in the older writers, and more frequently in the latert. Its other persons are never met with in any of the better authors. The most surprising is єiaro for ipro, Od. v, 106., where however others read eíato.

The 1. pers. sing. $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \mu i$ was Dor. for $\varepsilon i \mu i$ : the 2. sing. pres. $\epsilon i$ is is only Ionic (Hom. and Herodot.), from which by leaving out the $\sigma$ came the common $\varepsilon \hat{\imath}: \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \hat{i}$ is Dor. and Ion., nor is it quite unknown to Attic poetry, Eur. Hel. 1246. The 3. pers. $\dot{\varepsilon} v \tau i$ is Dor. for both ' $\sigma r i$ and
 comes the unusual poetical form $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, Brunck. Soph. El. 21. The 3.


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

This participle has in some Doric writers a particular feminine éãõ. The conj. is sometimes in the Epics strengthened by the diphthong el, as $\varepsilon i \omega$, eins, eim (from which it is often confused with the optative), Il. $\iota$, $245 . \sigma, 88$. Od. o, 448. $\rho, 586 . ; \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon i \omega$, Il. $\psi, 47 . \ddagger$. In the optative the

[^95][^96]abridged forms $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu$, cire, are more rare than the others; $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu$ is found however in Plat. Rep. 8. p. 558. d., and has been restored by Bekker in some other passages : єïc occurs in Od. $\phi$, 195., and the dual eirnv is found, according to Bekker, in several passages of Plato.

The 3 . sing. of the imperat. $\eta_{i} \tau \omega$ for $\check{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \omega$ is found frequently in the N. T., e. g. 1 Cor. xvi, 22., and once in Plat. Rep. 2. p. 361.c. which is the more striking as he so frequently uses $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \omega$. The 3 . plur. has also an unusual sister-form (corresponding with the gen. plur. particip.) övт $\quad$ v, Plat. Leg. 9. p. 879. b. Ionic and Dor. éóvtur, éóvtw.
 last is the most common in Homer. The Dorics use $\bar{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$ or $\eta \mu \epsilon s$, both which are at the same time 1. pl. imperf.-also ei $\mu \epsilon \mathrm{l}$, $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon s$, differing from 1. pl. pres. indic. only in the accent.

The imperfect has numerous sister-forms : e.g. from the radical form $\mathrm{E} \Omega$ the 1 . sing. $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ for ${ }_{\dot{\eta}} \nu, \mathrm{Il} . \psi, 643$., but none of the other persons: éroov, - $\epsilon$, $-\epsilon$, in Hom. is a mere imperf. as Il. $\eta, 158$, but in Herodot. a real iterative like the other forms in - $\sigma$ oov: and lastly the true Ionic form according to the formation in $\mu$, éa, éas, and 2. plur. éare; or
 $\lambda, 762$. only, where it is most probably false for êov; but as 3 . sing. it is more common, and found in Ionic prose; Homer has also sometimes $\eta ँ \eta \nu$, and in 2. sing. ë $\eta \sigma \theta a$ for $\dot{\eta} \sigma \theta a$ : the 3. plur. $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \sigma\end{gathered} \nu$ for $\bar{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ occurs both in the older and later Ionic, as well as in the Doric dialect. In Hes. $\epsilon$, 825. and $\theta, 321$. $\dot{\eta}_{\nu}$ also appears to stand for $\dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu$, but it is there rather a peculiarity of syntaxt. From the Ionic éa arose the old Attic 1. sing. $\tilde{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ for ${ }_{\eta} \nu$, which with regard to the extent of its usage requires still further critical examination ${ }_{\ddagger}{ }^{2}$. For the 3 . sing. $\eta \nu \nu$ the Dorics have



All the persons of the pres. indic. are enclitical except the 2 . sing. $\varepsilon i$, which always retains the accent; perhaps also eis, used enclitically by Wolf in Od. $\delta, 611$.

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

[^97]$\ddagger$ See Fisch. 2. p. 498. 499. Heind. ad Plat. Protag. 5. In which it is particularly remarkable that Chœerobosc. (MS. ap. Bekk. fol. 242. v. and 348. v.) proves from Aristoph. Plut. 29. and Menander the usage of the l. sing. $\bar{i} v$.
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* Homer has also cio $\theta a$, Il. $\kappa, 450$.

 - دVoIani
[The middle voice of this verb is entirely rejected by some modern critics, as Elmsl. Soph. CEd. T. 1242. and L. Dindorf. Eurip. Supp. 699., who instead of it write í $\epsilon \mu a \iota$, íєvzal, \&c. See however Schæf. Plut. 4. p. 326.-Passow.]

In meaning, this verb has the singular anomaly of its present having often the force of a future. In Homer it stands sometimes as a present, sometimes as a future; but in Ionic prose and in the Attic writers it is, with a very few exceptions*, a real future, $I$ shall go: nor does it again take the force of a present until in such late writers as Pausanias and Plutarch. This however can only be said in its full extent of the indicative mood; the others are used sometimes as futures, sometimes they retain their natural meaning: and thus this verb supplies the place of some tenses of ép $\rho о \mu$ uc which are not much in use.
 lévat is doubtful, as жрogeivac in Hes. $\epsilon, 351$. may come from єiцi I $a m \dagger$. The 3. sing. opt. ein for 'oo occurs in II. $\omega$, 139. Od. $\xi, 496$. The conj. $\varepsilon i \omega$ for $' \omega$ is quoted from the Doric writer Sophron in the Etym. M. p. 121, 29. and 423, 23. Homer has contracted the Ionic imperf.
 which we find the 3. plur. "ïov in the Od., the 3. sing. itev, it, the 3. dual í i$\eta v$, and the 3. plur. "ïaav, which, though imperfects, have also the force of aorists. Lastly we find in the Epic poets a fut. midd. eiro-
 a 3. dual $\dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, II. $o, 415.544 . \ddagger$. A peculiar form, the 3. plur. pres. iot for ica $\sigma \iota$, is found in Theogn. 716.

Eimeiv, to say, an aorist: indic. єīmov ; imperat. єimé $\oint$, compound $\pi$ рóє $\tau \pi \epsilon, \& c$. Beside these the forms of the aor. 1 . ci $i \pi a$ were also in use; in the Attic language the most common were єīinac, єímaтє, єimáтн, but these were constantly exchanged for the forms with the $\epsilon$, so that after all the speaker appears to have been generally guided by his ear. The most unusual are the l. sing. eitall, which is rather

[^98]§ On the accentuation of this imperat. see the second note under"Epхo $\mu$ ac. It is used also for $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, like $\dot{a} \gamma \epsilon$, particularly by Aristoph. see Elmsl. Ach. 328. Reisig Conj. p. 35. Demostlı. Phil. 1. p. 43, 7. Cherson. p. 108, 13.
$\|$ Xen. Mem. 2, 2, S. ov゙ $\tau^{\prime}$ єima ov̋t', єлоinga: the use of the aor. 1. is here evidently intentional. "Eסєıక̆ каi-єiтa, Demosth. c. Euerg. p. 1151. Bekk. and Philem. Inc. 51. a. Eurip. Cycl. 101.

Ionic, and the 2. sing. imperat. єimov, which, with the optative*, is perhaps the rarest of all. The part. eimac, $-a \sigma a,-a \nu$ is peculiarly Ionic. The Midd., which however occurs only in the compound $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon i \nu$ ( $t o$ refuse, to despair of) in the same sense as the active, has always the form of the aor. 1. ámeimaб0at. Fut. à $\pi \epsilon \rho \circ \hat{\mu} \mu a \iota$, Posidipp. Epigr. 2.

The 2. sing. imperat. eimov has been accented always in the grammars and generally in the text of different writers thus, eimóv; but it is proved in Buttmann's Excurs. 1. on Plat. Meno p. 70. that this latter accentuation was unknown to the pure Greek writers.

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

According to this the verb has in common language no augment: originally it had the digamma, and hence in the Epics the syll. augm. éeitov. For the same reason the compounds have the hiatus, ámoeireiv: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 130. note.

With this aorist eireiv usage has joined, so as to form but one verb, the Ion. fut. $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\omega}$, Att. $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \hat{\omega}$, from the pres. eipes, which in the sense of $I$ say is Epic; also the perf. $\epsilon_{i \prime \rho \eta \kappa a, ~ p e r f . ~ p a s s . ~ \epsilon i ́ p \eta \mu a \iota ; ~ a n d ~ l a s t l y ~ t h e ~ a o r . ~ p a s s . ~ e ~}^{\text {é } \rho \rho \eta \eta \eta \eta, ~}$ pronounced also $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \rho e^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$, but probably by those only who were not Attics $\ddagger$. Verbal adj. $\rho \eta \tau o ́ c, ~ \dot{\rho} \eta \tau \in ́ \sigma c$. The fut. 3.
 fut. pass. instead of $\dot{\rho} \eta \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \mu a \iota$, which is found but seldom in Attic writers (Isocr. Philipp. init.).

The pres. eipe occurs in Od. $\lambda$, 137. : and thence undoubtedly comes

[^99]$\ddagger$ This form is found written in various ways in the manuscript copies of the older writers: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 447. Bekker ad Eschin. 2, 34.124. But the best manuscripts have it not unfrequently in its regular shape; sce l'lat. Gorg. 36. Theæt. 65.
§ This fut. appears to have been used only in its participle. Thuc. 8, 66. Plat. Phædr. 9.

the fut. $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega$. But the aor. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \theta_{\eta \nu}$ points to a theme PE, , to which we may refer the perf. $\begin{gathered} \\ \rho\end{gathered} \boldsymbol{\eta} \kappa \alpha$ also, on account of the syllable $\epsilon \iota$ which stands instead of the reduplication*. The Ionians and the common prose language had also $\varepsilon i \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ or $\epsilon i \rho \in ́ \theta \eta$, (see Schweigh. Lex. Herod.
 non-Attic aorists $\epsilon i \lambda \imath \jmath \phi \theta \eta \nu, \delta \iota \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon ́ \chi \theta \eta \nu \dagger$.

By some é $\rho \in ́ \omega$ also is considered a present, but in the Epic writers it is always either a future, or, if a present, it is used with the sense of to ask, instead of $\epsilon_{\rho}^{\prime \prime} \mu a \iota$, which see ${ }_{\ddagger}^{\dagger}$. Yet Hesiod $(\theta, 38$.) has a verb eip. produced to éc, in which eipev̄ซaь is the fixed traditionary reading, though the metre would admit eipovoac quite as well.
$\Phi \eta \mu i$ was used as the present of this verb, but with certain limitations, which will be seen under it : in the compounds however we find sometimes áyopé́धєv (which pro-



The expression with $\kappa \alpha \kappa \omega \bar{s}$, to speak ill of, was treated in this respect as a compound, for instead of $\epsilon i \pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \varepsilon$ какw̄s, the present was ayopev́є $\mu \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \kappa \omega \hat{s}$.

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

The poetical verb $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \hat{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$, or $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \nu \dot{\prime} \pi \omega$, is shown in Buttm. Lexil. pp. 123. 131. to be no compound, but a strengthened form of the root or stem of
 (according to form) is ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \pi \sigma \nu, \notin \nu \nu \epsilon \pi o \nu$ : the aor. $\epsilon ้ \nu \iota \sigma \pi o \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \iota \sigma \pi \epsilon i \nu$,
 aorist as compared with the present is, by its long syllable, at variance with general analogy, but still not without example; see è $\sigma \sigma \dot{\rho} \mu \eta \nu$ under"E ${ }^{\prime \prime}$

[^100][^101]The circumflex over $\dot{e} v i \sigma \pi \varepsilon i \nu^{*}$ shows too that in old grammatical tradition this form was considered an aorist. The future was formed, as is frequently the case, from this aorist, and that in two analogous ways: for in $\dot{e} v i \psi \omega$ the $\sigma$ is dropped, as in the fut. of $\dot{\delta} \delta \delta \dot{\delta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega \dagger$. From this future was formed again another present $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu i \pi \tau \omega$ in Pind. Pyth. 4, 358., which however must be distinguished from the Homeric évintw, to revile, which see hereafter.

The preterites $\notin \nu \in \pi o v$ and $\notin \nu \iota \sigma \pi o \nu$ are always found without the augment, and where the metre would have required $\eta \nu \in \pi o v$, there ย้ $\nu \nu \epsilon \pi \frac{}{\prime}$ was introduced. The double $\nu$ in $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu \epsilon \in \pi \omega$ is besides frequent in the Tragedians; but $\notin \nu \nu \epsilon \pi o \nu$ seems not to occur, generally speaking, in their writings. We have supposed this preterite to be, according to form, an imperfect, like $\epsilon \not \epsilon \eta \nu$ under $\Phi \eta \mu i$ : but in usage they are both aorists, and the former is used in narration promiscuously with eimov and
 use of this form in the Hymn to Pan, 29., where $\tilde{\epsilon} \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \dot{\nu} \nu$, answering to the preceding $\dot{v} \mu \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \iota$, stands for $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \in ́ \pi o v \sigma \iota$. That is to say, as the indicat. of the aor. has in general, beside its meaning of a preterite, that of doing a thing usually, so this imperf. converted by usage into an aorist has the same secondary meaning, exactly like ëk $\lambda v o \nu$, Il. $a, 218$.

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

[^102]this circumstance, that we find in the common dialects merely such monosyllabic imperatives as $\theta$ és, סós, ës, $\sigma \chi$ és, $\phi \rho$ és, with their compounds. To prove $\tilde{\nexists} \nu \in \sigma \pi \in s$ to be no compound by comparing it with そarés, á $\gamma$ ćs, in Hesychius, would throw that form into a most improbable dialect, which could only be justified by indications much surer than any we have to guide us.
the lemmata of Villoison are to be depended on) évione. I would not therefore recommend the adoption of this form with a view to strengthen the last syllable of the hexameter.

Eif $\rho \gamma \omega$, I shut out, eí $\rho \gamma \nu v \mu \iota$, I shut in, are distinguished from each other in their tenses merely by the breathing; thus, єíp $\xi \omega$, єíp $\xi a$ : єi $\rho \xi \omega$, єip $\xi a$. This verb, according to the analogy of verbs beginning with $\epsilon$, does not take the augment, which is supplied by the accent : see Eiкк, Iyield.

 language, as we shall see below, had the digamma, and consequently corresponded exactly with the same stem or root under $\dot{\rho} \epsilon$ ¢ $\zeta \omega$. The distinction of out or in is not marked in Homer by the absence or presence of the aspirate, because in that early stage of the language the word had instead of the aspirate the digamma, the loss of which was supplied in the dialects by the one or other of the breathings; in the Epic language, according to general tradition, by the lenis; consequently the sense of Od. $\xi, 411$. was to shut in, fàs $\mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu$ (the swine) äpa äp $\xi_{a \nu}$ кaтà $\eta \theta \epsilon a$. Originally therefore the meaning of the verb was undefined; it meant nothing more than to separate, shut off, and the context showed whether it was in or out. But in the Ionic dialect of He-
 ката⿱кќтovs éévzas, and no doubt from old tradition: whence the same writer has $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \kappa \tau \bar{\eta}$ for the Att. eipkгí, a prison. In the Attic and in the common language it was also a standing rule: see Eust. ad Od. a, 27. (p. 14, 25. Bas.), and the directions of an old grammarian in Hermann (at the end of De Em. Gr. Gr.) p. 337.†. Nor is $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ (with the exception of äфepkros in the last note) ever found with a $\phi$; on the contrary, the compound with rarí, the most usual in the sense of to

[^103]Bekker on Thuc. 1, 35.): the reason of which was, that other grammarians ascribed cip $\rho \omega$ without distinction to the Attics, but eifoy to the cotyois (see Etym. M. 377, 48.), as is indeed the case in many other words. And certainly ä $\phi \in \rho-$ кros, shut out, quoted in the last note from Eschylus, leads to the same conclusion. If now we suppose (as was said before, and is certainly the more probable) that originally there was no distinction, but that one established itself by degrees, yet without ever becoming universal, all that can occur is satisfactorily explained.
shut in, is almost always written with the $\theta$; while in Thucyd. 1, 76., where kareipyecv has the general sense of to constrain, keep down by force, the $\tau$ stands without a various reading. Further, that the sense of shutting in is expressed by the pres. $\epsilon i \rho \gamma \nu v \mu t$, is evident from the grammarian above mentioned, who observes that "eip $\omega \omega$ in the present is not used;" for e'pg is a very common present.

As to the digamma, the same conclusion results from the Epic augment in ë́epoov, éépyvv, and again from the Epic sister-form (with its superfluous $\epsilon$ in the present) $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \gamma \omega$, in the same language, from which is contracted the common cip $\rho \omega^{*}$. The digamma is therefore very
 Epic compound áтоє́руєє. The Homeric perf. pass. єैє $\rho \gamma \mu a \iota, 3$. plur. pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \in \rho \chi a \tau o$ does indeed seem by its syllabic augment to have the same marks of the digamma: but there is one point opposed to it; namely, that in both passages where it occurs the digamma with reduplication is inadmissible, because in Od. $\kappa, 241$. it is preceded by a consonant, in Il. $\epsilon$, S9. by a shortened diphthong. These two passages belong however to the numerous instances where the digamma has
 more striking, particularly in Od. 九, 221. $\kappa$, 283., where they begin the verse, and where consequently a slight emendation is not to be thought of. Here then the syllable of reduplication has quite disappeared, which in cases of the true syllabic augment (as if tev́Xatal were put for $\tau \in \tau \epsilon v^{\prime} \chi a \tau a 1$ ) is never the case. Hence in the history of the digamma, and its gradual disappearance, this verb would be a remarkable
 mon lenis, and is therefore a regular perfect, but without the temp. augm. : and this too contrary to Epic usage, but as it occurs in a syllable long by position it is free from suspicion $\dagger$.

Eipúa. See 'Epún.
Eïpw. See Eíreìv.
E'fow, I string in a row: aor. 1. cipa (Herodot. 3, 87. éteipas, exserens) and ép $\rho \alpha$ (Hippocr. de Morb. 2, 33. סıépaas). Perf. pass. in the
 the digamma is not obliterated, for in the only two passages where the pluperf. éєрто, and the perf. éep伦vov occur, (Od.o,460. $\sigma, 296$.) it is pre-

[^104][^105]ceded by the separable $\nu$. In Herodotus on the contrary we find the common form, but with the temp. augm. omitted, as is always the case in the Ionic dialect. Suidas quotes from some writer évєєpuévos $\pi \in ́ \delta a \iota s$, consequently with the augm. $\varepsilon \iota$; although it may be taken for the unchanged diphthong of the present, as in the verbal subst. cip $\mu$ ós, on the aspirate of which see Buttm. Lexil. p. 300. For áло́є $\rho \sigma \epsilon$ see "Eрбаи.

Eíca. See ${ }^{\circ} E \Omega, 2$.

Eícta. See ${ }^{*}$ E $\theta \omega$.
'E $\Lambda$-. See Aifé́w.
'E $\Lambda$-. See Eíl $\omega$.


 In non-Attic writers the passive takes a $\sigma$, as $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda a \sigma \mu a \ell$,
 are in the Attic prose a future, according to the analogy of verbs whose futures end in $-\breve{a} \sigma \omega$ or $-\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$, and which form a new Attic future by rejecting the $\sigma$ and contracting the re-
 last note under $\Delta \hat{e} \mu \omega$.-Midd.

The forms in $-\hat{\omega},-\bar{q} s, \& c$. occur also as presents from the simple theme $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha ́ \omega$. In prose however there is only one example, the imperat. $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha$, Xenoph. Cyr. 8, 3, 32. In poetry there are several ; $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$, Il. $\omega, 696$.,
 819.

In Od. $\eta, 86$. is a 3. plur. pluperf. pass. é $\lambda \eta \lambda$ é $\delta a \tau o$, for which Wolf writes ép $\dagger \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \delta a \tau 0$, the reading of the old editions. This latter has however by far the fewest manuscripts in its favour, and it seems to me clear that the true reading must be some form of é $\lambda a v v^{\prime} \omega$, as the expression is much the same as we find in v. 113. in Il. $\sigma, 564$. and Od. $\zeta, 9$. But the reading é $\lambda \eta \lambda a \dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ aro is likewise found in very few manuscripts, while by far the majority has é $\lambda \eta \lambda \epsilon \in \delta a \tau o$, and some $\epsilon \in \eta \lambda$ éaro. This last has been adopted by Alter; and when we consider that it is the regular Ionic form, according to the analogy of $\pi \epsilon \pi r \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ for -avial, and that it does not offend the metre, I cannot but think that it is the true reading of Homer.

In the Epic language we find some participles proparoxytons, as ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta$ -

 Thom．Mag．v．é $\lambda \eta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon$ vos．In Apollon．2，231．the modern editors have altered this accent，because it was not supported by a scholium，like the passage in Aratus．See note under＇Aках ${ }^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ ．
 pres．and imperf．It is found once in a passive sense，Il．$\pi, 494$. Both forms are exclusively poetical．
＇E $\lambda^{\prime} \gamma \chi{ }^{\omega}$, Irefute ：fut．$\xi \omega$ ；perf．with redupl．$\epsilon_{\eta} \lambda_{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi^{a}$ ； perf．pass． é $^{\prime} \eta_{\eta} \lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \mu a \iota$ ．

 syncopated aorist．See Buttm．Lexil．p． 287.

## EイEYO－，E $\Lambda$－

 In this last perf．three things are to be observed：1．）that the simple augm．$\epsilon i \lambda \iota$ г $\mu$ a was also in use ：2．）that the augm．$\epsilon \iota$ does not take place with the reduplication：3．）that the syllable of reduplication does not admit of the aspirate $\ddagger$ ．
${ }^{\prime} E \lambda \kappa \omega, I$ draw：fut．$\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \xi \omega$ ；aor．1．єî $\lambda \xi$ ．It borrows also from a theme ${ }^{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{E} \Lambda \mathrm{K} \Upsilon \Omega$ ，which is not used in the pres． or imperf．，and even in the，fut．${ }_{\epsilon} \mathrm{e} \lambda \xi \omega$ is preferred：see Piers．ad Moer．p．134．But in the aor．єí入кй $\sigma a$ ，é $\lambda \kappa \dot{v} \sigma a \iota$ is far more common than $\epsilon \hat{i} \lambda \xi a$ ，and in the passive $\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime} \lambda$－ $\kappa v \sigma \mu a \iota, ~ \epsilon i \lambda \kappa v \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ are the only forms in use．－Midd．

The regular imperf．eincov is never found in Hom．nor in Ionic prose，
 （with $\eta$ as augment），$\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \wedge \eta \theta \varepsilon i$ ，has in Homer the stronger meaning of to drag along．
${ }^{" E \lambda \pi \omega, I ~ e n c o u r a g e ~ t o ~ h o p e: ~ O d . ~} \beta, 91 . \gamma, 380$ ．But it is generally used in the midd．${ }^{\text {én }} \lambda \pi о \mu a \iota, I$ hope；perf．ë́e入 $\pi a$ with the force of the pres．； pluperf．éw $\begin{gathered}\text { tetr } \\ \text { with the force of an imperfect：see êora and note }\end{gathered}$ under Eiк $\boldsymbol{k}$ ；also the second note under＂$A \gamma \nu v \mu$ ，and a note in Buttm．
 ${ }^{2}$ E $\lambda \delta o \mu a \iota$ and note．

[^106][^107]'Eגúw. See Eiגúw.
'E $\mu$ '́ $\omega$, I vomit, has $\varepsilon$ in the inflexion and $\sigma$ in the passive : it takes also the Attic reduplication.
 vomit, while Xenoph. (Anab. 4, 8, 20.) has the imperf. act. in the same intrans. sense.]
'Е $\mu \nu \nu^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\mu} \nu \kappa \varepsilon$. See 'Н $\mu$ и́ш.
'Evaípw, I kill: fut. évăpū; aor. 2. ท̈vapov, Eurip.: infin. évapeìv. -Midd. with är. 1. év $\eta \rho \alpha^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$, Hom. [This verb is not a compound : see Buttm. Lexil. p. 119.]
'Evav́w. See Aǘw.
ENETK-, ENEIK-. See Фép $\omega$.
'Eле́тн. See Eiteìv.
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \nu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{v} \circ \boldsymbol{\theta} a$ a a perf. with the force of a present, found in the Epic writers in composition only, and in the third person; used at the same time as
 we must suppose $\operatorname{EN} \Theta \Omega$, $\operatorname{ENE} \Theta \Omega$ : see this more fully explained in Buttm. Lexil. p. 110. \&c.

'Evítuc, I reproach, has in Homer two forms of the aor. 2., viz. 1.) évévītov, for which two false readings évéventov and (11. $\psi, 473$.) évérıãov have crept into the printed text of Homer, as I have shown in Buttm. Lexil. p. 123. \&c. This form is the reduplicated aor. 2. with the radical vowel long, which we know from the subst. éviñi! was long in the root also. 2.) the 3 . sing. $\bar{\eta}$ ímüne, formed by a peculiar reduplication in the middle of the word, like úpúкаког, infin. épuкакéєєr from épúкш.

Homer has another sister-form $\dot{e} \nu i \sigma \sigma \omega$, which bears the same relation to $\dot{\varepsilon} \cdot \boldsymbol{r} i \pi \tau \omega$ as $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \omega$ to $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \omega$. None of the forms, which are here placed together, ever stand absolutely in Homer with the meaning of to say, but they are sometimes used so with the sense of to reproach;

 it most probable that they belong to a particular family of verbs, of which a more accurate examination will be found in Buttm. Lexil. p. 123. \& c.

 aor. 1. midd. é $\sigma \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$; perf. pass. єí $\mu a t$, єifat, eitrut, \&c., whence 3. pl.

${ }^{*} \sigma \mu a \iota$, é $\sigma \mu \eta \nu$ ，（which never occurs in its simple form in the first person，） come the 2 ．and 3 ．sing．of the pluperf．é $\sigma \sigma o$ ，ë $\sigma \tau 0$ ，and the compound $\dot{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \mu a$, \＆c．The forms with the syllabic augment（which takes the
 Epic only．
 proves that the $\epsilon$ in the Homeric eivvov（II．$\psi, 135$ ．）is not the augment． The temp．augm．is found neither in the imperf．nor the aorist：the perf．only has the augment $\varepsilon$ ．Homer has not the temp．augm．in any tense，but the syllab．augm．only，which is to be accounted for by the digamma．
The simple $\ddot{\epsilon} \nu \nu v \mu c$ is never used in prose，but principally the com－


 Nor do the other compounds generally reject the vowel of the preposi－ tion before the $\varepsilon$ ，as é $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \iota \varepsilon \in \sigma a \sigma \theta a \imath$ ．

 the augm．in the second syllable é $\dot{\omega} \rho \tau a \zeta o v$, according to the

＇Eォaîw，Herodot．3，29．See＇Aíw．
＇Ета⿱䒑䶹єiv，\＆c．See AYP－．
＇Eлєєi $\gamma \omega$, I press；pass．I hasten．For proof that this verb is no compound，see Buttm．Lexil．p． 118.
＇Eтiбтацає，I understand，depon．pass．with fut．midd．； imperf．$\grave{\eta \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \mu \eta \nu: ~ f u t . ~} \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \circ \mu a \iota$ ；aor．$\dot{\eta} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ ；verbal adj．énıбтทтóc．In the optat．the accent sometimes follows the regular conjugation of barytone verbs，e．g．íवтato，


This verb is distinguished from éфioraдą，the proper compound of ïгтацая，by the $\pi$ ，by the augment，and by the aorist retaining the $\eta$ of the formation before the $\theta$ ．
 Eum．86．578．），the Ionics émiorṇ＇（Theogn．1043．or 1085．Bekk．1081．）

[^108]Gaisf. Sce Buttm. on Soph. Phil. 798. The usual form in the imperf. is $\dot{\eta} \pi i \sigma \tau \omega$ and in the imperat. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \omega$, e. g. Xen. Mem. 3, 4, 9. Cyr. 3, 2,16. See Moer. 163. 182. Homer has the imperf. without the augm. émioturo. The pres. and imperf. are conjugated like î́тгацаи.
'EIIS, évét $\boldsymbol{t} \omega$. See Eiteìv.
"E $\pi \omega$, I am employed or busy about anything: imperf.
 $\sigma \pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$, part. $\sigma \pi \dot{\prime} \nu \nu$; compound $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \pi \sigma \nu, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath}, \mu \epsilon \tau a \sigma \pi \dot{\omega} \nu$. The augment is $\epsilon \ell$, as $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon i \pi \epsilon v$, Xen. Mem. 2, 9,5. This verb in its simple form is found only in $\mathrm{Il} . \zeta, 321 . *$, but its compounds are used both in verse and in prose, $\pi \epsilon \rho t \in \epsilon \pi \omega$, $\delta_{\iota \in ́ \pi}^{\pi} \omega, \& c$.

These aorists seldom occur except in poetry: though Ionic prose has frequently $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \in \sigma \pi \epsilon$, Herod. 1, $73 ., \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \pi \epsilon i v \mathrm{ib}$. 115., and the passive of
 єфӨй $\sigma \in \theta a t, 2,115.7,119$.

Midd. ётонац, I follow: imperf. єiтó $\not \eta \nu$, and Poet. without augm. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi o ́ \mu \eta \nu$; fut. $\left.\begin{array}{c} \\ \psi\end{array}\right) \mu a t$, infin. ${ }^{\epsilon} \psi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$. The aorist has this peculiarity that the augment is aspirated, $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi o ́ \mu \eta \nu$,
 Eurip. Hipp. 1307.) $\dagger$, and as a proof that it is merely the augm. it disappears in the other moods: infin. $\sigma \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, imperat. $\sigma \pi \frac{1}{}$, é $\pi i \sigma \pi o v$ Plat. Theæt. p. 169. a., è $\pi i \sigma \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ' Plat. Crit. p. 107. b. \&c. The Ion. imperat. 2. pers. is $\sigma \pi \epsilon ́ о$, Ep. $\sigma \pi \epsilon i ́ o$, Il: к, 285.
 and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu \quad$ ré $\sigma \theta a u$, we see at once that the former arise from the same syncope as the latter. That is to say, the aspirate in $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$ and 'EX $\Omega$ ( $\tilde{\varepsilon} \xi \omega)$ passed (as it does in so many other words) into a $\sigma$, which immediately attached itself to the consonants following, therefore
 insertion of a $\sigma$ according to another analogy in the root 'EIT, and thus $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \delta \dot{\prime} \mu \nu, \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$, ế $\sigma \pi \omega \mu a t, \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$, became anomalous aorists. From

[^109]$\dagger$ A singular form is é $\pi$ é $\sigma \pi$ ovto in Pind. Pyth. 4, 237. which can hardly be joined with the Pindaric forms in the note following.
these, and not from the $\dot{\delta} \pi \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu$ belonging to the former analogy, came the indicative which passed into the common language, while the other moods $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon \in \theta \theta a \iota$ \& . remained in the usage of the Epics (II. $\epsilon$, 423. Od. $\mu, 349$. Il. $\mu, 395$. \&c.). But from the very circumstance of $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \dot{\jmath} \mu \eta \sum_{\nu}$ being an aorist, the pres. $\ddot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi e \tau a \iota$ which is a various reading for épxerat at Od. $\delta, 826$. ought not to be allowed to displace the present old and unobjectionable reading of the text*.
'Epú $\omega$, I love, is used only in the pres. and imperf.; having
 form éparat, like íवтанаt, is a deponent synonymous with the active, and in the pres. solely poetical. The aor. pass. however, $\dot{\eta} \rho a ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, fut. é $\rho a \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \quad \mu a t$, with an active sense, is used in prose ; part. épa⿱日eic.

 Parthen. The 2. pers. pres. Epic with double $\sigma$, éparoat occurs in Theocr. 1, 78. The Dor. conj. épätaı for ép ${ }^{\prime}$. to the analogy of barytone verbs, Pind. P. 4, 164. compare émiotauaı and $\delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\imath} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \iota$. Lastly $\dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\cos } \boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta \varepsilon$ in an act. sense, Il. $\pi$. 208. is probably a false reading $\dagger$.
'Epác is used only in its compounds, and with the re-
 єрấait to pour or throw together.
'EpyáLoнat, I labour, work, depon. midd.: fut. ép 'áбонаı ; $^{\prime}$

[^110]there seems to be no doubt of a twofold ancient usage : at the same time it seems hardly possible that such a distinction as that between simple and compound could have existed in Homer's language. Bekker's supposition therefore, if confined to Homer, has great probability.
$\dagger$ That is to say, the depon. $\epsilon \rho a \sigma \theta e$ is no more capable of resolution than " $\sigma \tau \alpha-$ $\sigma \theta \epsilon, \delta \dot{v} v a \sigma \theta \epsilon \& c . ;$ and $\epsilon \in \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ can be only passive. The reading must therefore
 [Passow however seems to think it may be defended by supposing a theme $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{a}$ онає from which will come épäтaı, Sappho Fr. 59. Theocr. 2, 149.]
$\ddagger$ Isocr. Phil. p. 110 h. as restored by Bekker. Aristot. de Gen. Animal. 3, 1. extr.

 sense of the aor. midd. єipүaбá $\mu \eta \nu$, Valck. Phœn. 1069. Lob. Soph. Aj. 21., but this tense is also found as a true
 Charm. p. 173. c. Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 9. Conviv. 5, 4. EEcon. 19, 8., \&c. And even the indic. of this perf. is found in a passive sense, at least in its compound $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon i \rho-$ үaбтal, Plat. Legg. 4. p. 710. d. The fut. pass. '́ $\rho \gamma^{\prime} \sigma \theta_{1}-$ бонat is seldom found with a really passive meaning which it has in Sophoc. Tr. 1218., Isocr. Epist. 6.-Passow.]
${ }^{\text {" }}$ E $\rho \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$. See Eípy $\omega$.

'Ерєєivш. See"Eродац.
' $\mathrm{F} \rho \dot{\mathrm{c}} \theta \mathrm{\theta} \omega$, I excite, irritate, is used only in pres. and imperf., but we find
 more used.
'Epeiow, I support by placing one thing against another: fut. $\in \rho \in i \sigma \omega, \& c$. It has the Att. redupl.; thus perf. act. $\in \rho \dot{\eta}-$ $\rho є \iota к a$, perf. pass. є́рŋ́рєєбцає; of this latter Homer has the
 $\eta, 86,95$.; for which Apollon. Rh. uses épípeıvтaı. Homer
 бато.-Midd. I support myself; є́ $\rho \epsilon i \delta o \mu є v o c, ~ e ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \sigma a ́ \mu є v o c, ~$ \&c. Hom.
'Ерєікш, I tear, break: imperf. йрєєко⿱; aor. 1. йреє $\xi$ а. Midd. I tear my clothes in pieces. Pass. I am torn or broken ; perf. é $\rho \dot{\rho} \rho \iota у \mu a \iota, ~ H i p p o c r . ~$

To the intransitive sense of the pass. (e.g. I1. $\nu, 441$.) belongs the Epic acr. 2. act. їрıкоу, I1. $\rho$, 295.* Compare the last paragraph of İŋрáw.



[^111][^112] find in Herodian Hist. 8. 2. катерípeєтто.

In this verb as in the last the passive makes a transition to the intransitive meaning to fall over, fall down, and this, as being the immediate sense, belongs to the aor. 2. act. $\quad$ ip $\rho \pi \frac{1}{}$, and the perf. épipina (see note under Teí $\left.\mathbf{\chi}^{( }\right)$, which however occur only in the poets*. In Pind. Ol. 2, 76. Boeckh has shown from the manuscripts and from Apollon.
 the true reading.
The Epic middle $\dot{a} \nu \eta \rho \epsilon \iota \psi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ belongs unquestionably to this verb, although in this compound its sense is somewhat different: Homer has frequently à $\eta \rho \rho \in \dot{\psi} \psi a \nu \tau o$, they have torn away, carried off, Il. $\nu, 234$. Od. $\delta, 727$. \&c. and Hesiod $\theta, 990$. has ávepeє廿a $\mu \hat{\epsilon} v \eta$, having carried off $\dagger$.
'Eрє́ттоцаı, I feed, graze, eat, occurs only in the pres. and imperf.
 $\delta \rho \dot{\phi} \phi \omega$ \&c. : compare $\gamma \lambda \dot{\prime} \phi \omega$. This form was long regarded with suspicion in Pind. P. 4, 240. but has been satisfactorily defended by Boecklı.
 ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma a$ and ${ }^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma a$, Il. $\iota, 361$. Od. $\lambda, 78$. The compound Sińpéa occurs in Od. $\mu, 444 . \xi, 351$. From é $\rho \in ́ \tau \eta c$ and $\mathfrak{e} \rho \epsilon-$ $\tau \mu \sigma^{\prime}$ we may conclude that its characteristic letter was $\tau$.

 whence épu日aiveтo, he became red: purely Homeric forms. The subst. $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{v} \theta \eta \mu a$ comes from the formation in - $\eta \boldsymbol{j} \sigma$, which belonged to $\dot{\epsilon} \rho v-$ $\theta a i \nu \omega$ as it did to $\dot{\mu}^{2}$ eraive, in which the termination -aive is a mere extension of the original present, according to the analogy mentioned

[^113]
#### Abstract

you have undertaken, Orph. Arg. 292.). In the old Epic usage there is nothing to lead us decidedly from $\dot{\text { épeíme. What- }}$ ever in the word $\dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \rho \epsilon \iota \psi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ seems opposed to the sense of $\varepsilon \rho \in i \pi \omega$ lies merely in the preposition $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha}^{\text {and }}$ the midd. voice. The idea of a $\dot{\rho} \iota \pi \dot{\eta}$ is in $\dot{\rho} i \pi \tau \omega$, in $\epsilon \rho \epsilon i \pi \omega$, and in $\alpha \nu \eta \rho \in \iota \psi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$. What is torn away, falls to the ground; hence the simple $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon i \pi \omega$ and $\bar{\eta} \rho \iota \pi \sigma \nu$ contain in themselves this collateral meaning: if we add to this $\dot{\rho} \iota \pi \dot{\eta}$ or tearing the sense of $\alpha, \nu \dot{\alpha}$ in composition and the middle voice, we have $\dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \rho \in \iota \psi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu, I$ have seized and carried up for myself, a very proper verb to express such a transaction as the rape of Ganymede.


in note under Ai $\sigma$ 告vopaı．On the other hand in the later form $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho v-$ $\theta \rho a i \nu \omega$＇－aiv ${ }^{\prime}$ is a derivative termination from é $\rho v \theta \rho i s$, as $\lambda \epsilon v \kappa \alpha i v \omega$ is from $\lambda \epsilon v \kappa o ́ s$ with the regular flexion $\lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \alpha \boldsymbol{a} v a \iota$ \＆c．And the Alexan－ drine poets treated $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \rho v \theta a i \nu \omega$ in the same way，e．g．＇́ $\rho \dot{\prime} \theta \eta \nu \epsilon$ ，Apollon． Rh．l，791．Compare кєрঠaivш．
 Eur．Bacch．323．Aristoph．Vesp．1294．See also＇Ерé $\pi \tau \omega$ ．
> ＇Epé $\chi \theta \omega$ ，I torment，torture；used only in pres．and imperf．

＇Eрє́ш．See Eirєív and＂Eроцан．
 This verb has in the Epics a middle synonymous with the active，Il．$\epsilon$ ， 172．Od．$\delta, 80$ ．Hes．$\theta, 534$ ．，to which belongs the perf．pass：with Att．
 not belong to this verb but comes from the pres．＇́pidaivw，according to the analogy laid down in note under Ai $\sigma \theta$ ávopaı：only that épı $\delta \dot{\eta} \sigma a-$ $\sigma \theta a \iota$ in the passage above mentioned has the second syllable long， whence it has been written with double $\delta \dagger$ ．
＂EPOMAI，I ask：fut．є́ $\rho \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor．$\quad$ クоо́ $\mu \eta \nu$ ，imper．

 mon Attic use in all its moods，and the fut．is occasionally found in the best writers，Plat．Lys．p．207．c．211．d． Apol．p．29．e．Xen．Hell．4，5，6．but of the infin．pres． ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \in \sigma \theta$ ai there are great doubts，and even in Homer it is most probably the aor．and ought to be accented as such． The other tenses are supplied by é $\rho \omega \tau a ́ \omega .-P a s s o w] ~ I o n i c$. prose has on the other hand a present $\epsilon i \rho \circ \mu a \iota$ ，of which the imperf．єi $\rho^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ with its other moods єí $\rho \omega \mu a \iota$ ，єi $\rho \in \sigma \theta a \iota, ~ \& c$ ． are，like the above，used as aorists ：fut．єip $\quad$ бооцаı．

[^114][^115]We often meet with the accentuation êper $\theta a t$, which is considered as a present; but as we nowhere find an indicative $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\rho} \rho \mu a \iota$, épєтаt, \&c., this is not conceivable. Now as the manuscripts frequently give us the aoristic accentuation $\dot{e}^{\rho} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a t, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \ell$, there is no doubt that this alone is the true way of writing it, and that the other arose from the grammatical custom of supposing a pres. ёрории. Compare $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\gamma \rho \rho о \mu \eta \nu}$ in e $\gamma$ eipow. This supposition was very much supported by the actual existence of the Ionic pres. eipopat, which was considered to be a mere Ion. production of the common épopac. But if we examine carefully all that is quoted on the subject and the analogy of the language, there can be no doubt of the Ion. eipouat being the true theme, and épéroat the regular aor. from it (compare áyєpé $\theta \theta a t$ ), which thus takes its natural augment $\dot{\eta} \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \eta \nu$. Now when we explain the Ion. eípeto \&c. to be an imperf., it is not to be denied that we look to its exterior only, as with regard to the meaning there is no room for the exercise of any grammatical acuteness; because, as we see in the syntax, all these verbs belonging to the conversational narrative of the lan-



 being used in his poems I nowhere find any mention; and as the sense there is not more decisive than it is in Herodotus, we must consider the forms with $\epsilon$ and those with $\epsilon_{l}$ to be in the Epic language the same, and therefore leave the accentuation of $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \ell$ untouched. Again at Il. $a, 513 . \phi, 508$. we must remain in doubt between the reading of eiрєто and ijpeто; the best manuscripts are in favour of the former. Of this old verb therefore common prose has retained only the historic tense, which by the quantity of the stem and by the accent was pronounced as an aor. 2., whilst the present could be dispensed with on account of $\hat{e} \rho \omega \tau \bar{q} \nu$.
,
Later writers, mistaking the aoristic meaning of éрíнєขos, have used ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, Paus. 4, 12.† The fut. in the Ion. form eipíqонut was liable to be confounded with the passive fut. єipíбoна» under eireiv; whence perhaps $\mathfrak{e ́ \pi \epsilon є ь i ́ \sigma o \mu a c ~ w a s ~ p r e f e r r e d . ~}$



[^116][^117]which give émeiрó $\mu \in \imath o s ~ a r e ~ n o t ~ d e s e r v i n g ~ o f ~ a t t e n t i o n . ~ T h e ~ E p i c ~ l a n-~$ guage had also in this formation the active $e^{\rho} \rho \in \in \omega$, Il. $\eta, 128$. Od. $\phi$, 31. $\lambda, 229$. which must not be confounded with the future $\dot{e}^{\rho} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ from
 lengthened present in the same language is $\hat{\varepsilon} \rho \in \epsilon i \nu \omega$. Compare $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \omega$.
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \rho \pi \omega$, I creep along, go along: fut. $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \not \psi \omega$, \&c. The augm. is $\epsilon \iota$. It is used only in pres. and imperf. [The latter meaning was the prevailing one in the Doric writers, Valck. Adon. p. 400. but not unknown to the Attic tragedians, Brunck. Eurip. Hipp. 561. Metaph. in Eurip. Cycl. 422. Passow.]
 perf. й $\rho \dot{\rho} \eta к а$.
"E $\rho \sigma \alpha \subset$ is an old aorist, of which we find in Hom. the compound $\dot{a} \pi \dot{o}-$ $\epsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \pi о є ́ \rho \sigma \eta$, á $\pi о є \in \rho \epsilon \iota \epsilon$ with the sense of to wash away, sweep away. II. $\zeta, 348 . \phi, 283.329$. The present for this may be either ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \rho \rho \rho \omega$ with a causative meaning, or $\mathrm{EP} \Delta \Omega$; see Buttm. Lexil. p. 156. \&c.

The more simple theme épeú $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ does not occur in an active form; on the contrary Homer, Herodotus, and the non-Attic writers of a later
 has, like the Attics, inpuyov. The meaning of this verb has modifications which may be seen in the Lexicons, in which however sufficient attention is not paid to the difference of the forms. Sce Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 63. 64.

 Æschyl. Sept. 1075. Ep. ếpuそ̆, Il. $\gamma, 113$.

The Epics have also a peculiar aor. 2. with the reduplication in the middle of the word, йри́кӑкov, Il. e, 321. Infin. épuкакєєєเv, Hom. Compare ìviтated under 'Evintw.
'Epv́w and cipúv, I dravo, a verb used only by the Ionics and Epics, has $v$ short in the inflexion. 'Epv́c has the fut. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} p \dot{v} \sigma \omega$, Ep. $\mathfrak{c} \rho \dot{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$, but also
 piow, \&c. The Midd. passes over to the meaning of to save; see Buttm.

[^118]it is by mere chance that I have not been able to find any instance of its actual occurrence.

Lexil. p. 303. \&c., and in this meaning only we find a form without the $\epsilon$, viz. $\dot{\rho} \dot{v} o \mu \iota^{*}$. This verb is also used in Attic prose, and has in Attic poetry the $v$ always long in the inflexion, $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \bar{\sigma} \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$. Butin the Epic poets it is short even there, as $\dot{p} \sigma \sigma$ ń $\mu \eta \nu$, Il. $o, 29$. ; hence, when the metre requires it long, this form also ought to be written by them with $\sigma \sigma$ : but
 is required to be long $\dagger$.

In the passive form of this verb it is sometimes difficult, particularly amidst the difference of meanings, to distinguish the tenses correctly. The perf. pass. has necessarily by virtue of the reduplication, even if it be formed from $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{v} \omega$, the syllable $\epsilon \iota$ as augment. To this tense belong, with some degree of certainty according to the sense, the forms єípuvzaı or єipúatal, pluperf. єïpvvтo, єípv́ato, I1. §, 75. a, 69. o, 654. of the ships which have been or were drawn up on land. In the passage of Od. $\chi, 90$. it may be doubted whether єїри̃o be pluperf. or syncop. aorist $\ddagger$. In either case there is this certain result, at least for the Epic language, that as the radical syllable of the syncop. aor. always corresponds with that of the perf. pass., the 1 . sing. of this last tense was not formed with the $\sigma$, but with the $v$ long $\S$.


* Not that I mean by this expression, "without the 6 ," that this form is the later of the two; I rather think there are good grounds for concluding it to be the older, and that the $\epsilon$ was added afterwards as in $\theta \in ́ \lambda \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \theta \in ́ \lambda \omega$.
$\dagger$ Because $\dot{\rho} \bar{v} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ with $v$ long was usual in the Attic and common language, this quantity was supposed to be the ground of the Epic usage also, and $\dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma a ́-$ $\mu \eta \nu$ to be an Epic shortening of the syllable. Again in épv́ $\alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$ the earlier editors made a distinction between é $\rho$ v̌$\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota, ~ \in ́ \rho v ́ \sigma \sigma a \sigma \theta a t$, to draw, and '́pv̄$\sigma a \sigma \theta a t$ to save. See Buttm. Lexil. Thejustice of the conclasions which I have drawn both there and here is evident; and there is but one alternative, either to suppose with me a radical shortness through all the meanings, and to write the lengthened syllable in all instances with $\sigma \sigma$, or to explain $\dot{\rho} v \check{\sigma} \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \nu$ to be a corruption (sce Spitzner's Prosody, p. 68.), a mode of proceeding which the moderate critic will never wish to encourage. That the difference of quantity might have in time produced a difference of meaning is certain; and Attic usage shows it to have done so: but that it was not so at an earlier period
is proved by the verbals $\varepsilon \rho ข ้ \mu a$, є́ $\rho \check{v} \sigma i-$ $\pi \tau o \lambda$ es, \&c. having the meaning of to protect, while $\dot{\rho} \bar{v} \tau \dot{\eta} \rho, \dot{\rho} \bar{v} \mu o ́ s, \& c$. have the meaning of to draw. That the Epic language belongs to that period is in itself probable; the above-mentioned $\dot{\rho} \breve{v} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ gives it critical certainty.
$\ddagger$ The passage runs thus, 'A $\mu \phi i \nu o \mu o s$

 oi єїそєєє $\theta v \rho a ́ \omega \nu$. Here єípvто appears to stand in exactly the same situafion as
 But we may understand the times of the action thus, " he rushed on Ulysses with the sword which he had draun," and then cïрvто is the pluperf. of the same middle of which cipvo poet had wished to use the aor., he might
 deed he has done at $\delta, 530$. If this argument be not conclusive, it will at least show that this is a solitary instance of the syncop. aor. cïpvto as a middle with transitive sense for cipv́ббaro, whereas all other instances of those syncop. aorists have a connpletely passive meaning.
§ Of єípvб $\mu a \iota$, єipv́ $\sigma \eta \nu$, as required by the grand analogy of verbs which
eíputo, \&c. with $v$ long ; but they cannot be reckoned as perf. and pluperf. according to sense, nor, where there is no long syllable for the augment, according to form. Aorists they could only be (i.e. syncopated aor.) where they meant a saving or snatching away completed in a moment ; but the majority of these passages are decisive for the duration of the action. Thus cipūro, ĕpüro, 2. pers. ëpūбo are plainly imperf., Il. $\omega, 499 . \delta, 138 . \nu, 555 . \chi, 507$. in all which instances the sense is thou didst protect, he protected, exactly corresponding with the
 way eipviro, póvaro are used of protecting bolts, walls, guards, Il. $\mu, 454$. $\sigma, 515$. Od. $\rho, 201$. : and a similar meaning of duration is always found
 It is clear therefore that all these forms belong to the syncope of the
 itself is used, not only by Apollon. 2, 1208. द̈pūtat, he watches over, but by Homer also, in as much as the 3. plur. eipúatu in the passages of Il. $\alpha, 239$. Od. $\pi, 463$. stands in the sense of to watch over, observe, and consequently as it cannot in accordance with the above-quoted passages be explained from the meaning of the perfect, it can be only a present.

There remain some passages in which the sense of the aor. appears to suit better than that of the imperf., as êputo, Il. $\epsilon, 23$. and 538 . $\epsilon$ ép $\rho v \tau o$ (lyric), Soph. ©d. T. 1352.: these however are sufficiently accounted for by the greater liberty taken in the older language in the use of the historic tense.

We have mentioned before in the last paragraph of the article on $\gamma^{\prime}$ vo $\mu ル$ and in Buttm. Lexil. p. 305. that in the Epic language the future of épúv becomes épúw again*. We must consider in the same light the middle épúє $\begin{aligned} & \text { act, Il. } \xi, 422 . ~ \iota, ~ 248 . ~ v, ~ 195 . ; ~ f o r ~ H o m e r ~ w h e n ~ s p e a k i n g ~\end{aligned}$ of a hope or intention to do some certain thing, never puts the verb following in the present, but always in the fut. or aor. ; as we may see by comparing Il. $\sigma, 174 . \chi, 351$. where in a similar combination and meaning we find as in other cases the aor. '́pvóactat.

There are still two other Hesiodic forms to be mentioned : 1.) e, 816 . infin. eipú $\mu \varepsilon \nu a<$ with $v$ short, for épúcı, to draw; therefore exactly

shorten the vowel in the inflexion, I find no instance. Only in very late writers $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} v \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ is quoted from $\dot{\rho} v \dot{v} \sigma \theta a t$, to suve. See Stephan. Thesaur.

* Some similar futures of verbs in -ćw and -í $\omega$ will be found in the last note
under $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega$, with which these Epic futures in $-v \omega$ correspond exactly; thus $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho v ́ \omega$, fut. $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \check{v} \sigma \omega$, and dropping the $\sigma$, غ́pú $\omega$ épúovat, 11. $\lambda, 454$. тavíovot, Od. $\phi, 174$. Compare also $\sigma \omega \in \omega$ under $\Sigma \dot{L}^{\varphi} \omega_{s} \omega$.

304. Ëpvoo likewise with $v$ short, and with a passive sense, was watched, guarded.
 its aor. Ep. $\eta^{\prime} \lambda v \theta o \nu$, Att. $\dot{\eta} \lambda \theta_{0} \nu^{*}$ (from which all the other moods are formed, imperat. $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \theta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \dagger$, inf. $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$, part. $\left.\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu\right)$, its perf. é $\lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda \ddot{\partial} \theta a$; and verbal adj. è̉evoтéoc ( $\mu \in \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \cup \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma c)$.

The Epics lengthen the first and third syllable of this perf. thus, $\epsilon i \lambda \hat{\jmath} \lambda o v \theta a \ddagger$; and in plur. this form suffers the syncope $\epsilon i \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda o v \theta \mu \epsilon v$, Il.
 the pluperf. Homer has only the 3. sing. єi $\lambda \eta \lambda o v i \theta \epsilon t$, II. In Hephæstion
 $\lambda \nu \tau \epsilon$, in which the Attics transferred, it would seem, to the language of the common people the same syncope which they applied to $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\prime} \lambda \nu \theta a$, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{v} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$, but dropped the analogy of the perf. passive.
 фìtatos for $\beta \dot{\text { édtiotos, }}$ фi入tatos.
lt has been mentioned under $\epsilon \hat{i} \mu t, I$ go, that in usage it is connected with this verb. That is to say, instead of the collateral moods of the pres. of $e^{e} \rho \chi \rho \mu \iota$ those of $\epsilon i \mu \iota$ are generally used; instead of the imperf. $\eta \rho \chi^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ the imperf.
 pres. $\epsilon i \mu t$ : so that if we consider as the ground of our conjugation the almost universally prevailing usage, we shall join these two verbs together thus: pres. ${ }^{\text {é }} \chi \chi$ о $\mu$, imper. ${ }^{i} \theta_{\imath}$, conj. $i \omega$, opt. $i \omega \mu \mu$, infin. iévat, part. $i^{i} \omega \nu$. Im-
 aor. $\grave{\eta} \lambda \theta \omega \nu, \dot{\epsilon}^{\lambda} \lambda \theta \epsilon$, \&c.; fut. $\epsilon \hat{i} \mu$, of which the other moods will be found under that verb.

[^119]nothing more than the proper sound of this perfect, which without the Attic reduplication would be $\boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \mathrm{\lambda} 0 v \theta a$, the o $v$ being the analogous change from the $\epsilon v$ which we see in $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma o \mu a \iota$. The supposed perfect $\boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \boldsymbol{v} \theta a$ would therefore be contrary to analogy, and there can be no reason for introducing it into Hes. $\theta, 660$, where the aor. is quite as good: the reading therefore of the old editions and of Gaisford's two manuscripts (Baroce. Medic.) should be restored to the text, $\dot{\eta} \lambda \dot{v} \theta o \mu \in \nu$.

It is evident that the forms of ci $\mu \iota$ were preferred on account of their slightness (particularly in their numerous compounds) to the corresponding heavy-sounding forms of $\epsilon \rho \chi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$, in addition to which there was the ambiguity of $\dot{\eta} \rho \chi \dot{\chi} \mu \eta \nu$. Still however the latter were never eutirely obsolete, but always introduced where they contributed to the perspicuity or fullness of the sentence. Thus we find $\pi \epsilon \rho$ inf $\rho \in \tau \sigma$,
 C. 1206. \&c. See Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 210., Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 37.38.

To this mixture of forms we must add, in adapting it to the custom of other languages, a mixture of the meanings go and come. The forms of é $\lambda \theta$ eiv have a decided preference for the meaning come, so that $\dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ for instance very seldom occurs in the sense of going, going away*; and those of $\epsilon i \mu t$ are as seldom found in the sense of come $\dagger$. But ${ }^{\text {é }} \rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ partakes almost equally of both meanings. In their compounds on the other hand, where the preposition generally defines the relation, all three themes have no distinction of meaning $\dagger$.
'E $\sigma \theta \eta \mu$ évos, clad, clothed, a defective part. perf., properly Ionic, occur-

[^120]pleted, looks to the point or place at which it is to arrive at last, for which we therefore can only use the word come, "when he came," be it thither or here. In the Future, he will go, and he will come give indeed two different ideas of time, in as much as the latter again looks only to the place where the arrival is to be. To express this two forms are therefore necessary; fiol means he will go, and for he will come, the Greek language has recourse to the verb \#̈к $\kappa$, I come, (i. e. I amarrived, I am there); therefore $\ddot{\boldsymbol{j}} \xi_{\epsilon c}$; he will come. In the compounds these distinctions generally disappear, because the point or place of arrival is expressed by the preposition; $\pi \rho o \sigma$ ќ $\chi \chi \in \sigma \theta a t$ in all its tenses gives the idea of coming to us; its contrary $\alpha \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho-$ $\chi \in \sigma \theta a \ell$ never has that sense : $\alpha \pi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 \nu$ expresses a point of time quite as well as $\dot{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 \nu$, but it is always the moment of departure, consequently never a coming or arrival. What I have said may suffice to give a general idea of this subject; particulars and exceptions will be seen by individual observation.
 in Eurip. Hel. 1555. We meet with $\ddot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta r o$ also in the sense of was clad in, had on, in Elian. V.H. 12, 32.13, 1. For some other instances from the later writers see Stephan. Thesaur.
'E $\sigma \theta_{i}^{\prime} \omega, I$ eat, has from the old $\epsilon \in \delta \omega$ a fut. $\epsilon \in \delta o \mu a \iota$ or $\epsilon \in \delta o u ̄-$ $\mu a \iota$ and less frequently $\epsilon \in \delta ́ \in \sigma \omega$; perf. 2. é $\delta \dot{\eta} \delta o \kappa a ;$ perf. pass.
 Plat. Crito p. 47. b. Aor. act. é фayov, infin. фayєìv.

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


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


'Eatıáw, I receive as a guest, entertain at my table. The augm. is $\boldsymbol{\epsilon l}$. [Pass. with fut. midd. (Plato de Repub. 1. p. 345. c.), I am a guest, feast upon (anything, $\left.\tau \iota \nu^{\prime}\right)$, Lycophr. 1411. Casaub. Athen. 7. 1.-Passow.]

Evàre. See 'Avóave.
 with augm. єن́ $\delta \circ \nu$, $\kappa a \theta \epsilon \hat{v} \delta o \nu$, but also $\eta \dot{u} \delta o \nu, \kappa a \theta \eta u ̂ \delta o \nu$, and éкá $\theta$ evoov. Generally the compound is more used in prose than the simple.

The forms with $\eta v$ are more properly Attic ; $\eta^{i} \delta \in \nu$, Plat. Symp. p.

[^121]the paraphrast of Dionys. de Aucupio (Schneid. Oppian. p. 179.) and фaүéots in the false Phocylides 145.
 479. Av. 495. : éxá $\theta$ evoiov is used by Xenoph. and most good writers.
 imperat. є́v $\rho^{\prime}{ }^{*}$, infin. є́veєiv; aor. 2. midd. є́vó́ $\mu \eta \nu$; perf.
 verbs beginning with $\epsilon v$ the augm. $\eta v$ is generally rather Attic: but in this verb $\eta \ddot{\nu} \rho \iota \sigma \kappa \sigma \nu, ~ \eta \dot{u} \rho \dot{\varepsilon} 0 \eta \nu$ are seldom found even in the Attics ; the common way of writing them is $\epsilon \ddot{\nu} \rho \iota-$


Non-Attic writers, as the Alexandrine and others of a later period, form the aor. 2. midd. as an aor. 1., єípá $\mu \eta$, for єivó́ $\eta \nu$ : see the last paragraph under aipé $\omega$. Wolf. Lept. p. 216., Jucob. Anth. Poet. p. 880., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 139.
 $\eta \cup \mathfrak{\xi} a \not a \eta \nu$. The augment follows the general analogy of verbs beginning with $\epsilon v$; compare єipioкш.
 in Schol. Soph. CEd. C. 1375. The pluperf. $\ddot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \mu \eta \nu$ is in Soph. Tr. 610.
 Hom. In prose generally áфєív, áфєv̂бa, and $\dot{\eta} \phi \in \nu \mu \in ́ v o c, ~$ Æschyl. ap. Athen. 9. p. 375. e.
In the dialects we find also $\dot{\text { d }}$ điv́w. In Aristophanes the reading is uncertain, but the better authorities are in favour of áфevecv. So we have $\dot{a} \phi \in \varepsilon \bar{\sigma} \alpha$ in Simon. Fr. 136. and áфévoats in Nicand. ap. Athen. 2. p. 61. a. The pronunciation with the lenis $\epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ and $a v \omega$ is known from single forms and derivations, among which are $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon v \dot{\eta} \kappa a \sigma \iota \nu$ (Hesych.) in the sense of $I d r y u p$, avaiva, $I d r y, \& c$. But the forms which belong here must not be confounded with aṽa, I kindle (see that verb), as the radical idea is essentially different.
"Ex $0 \omega$, I hate, used only in pres. and by the poets $\ddagger$; hence $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \chi^{\theta} \dot{a} \nu \rho \mu a t, ~ I ~ a m ~ h a t e f u l ; ~ f u t . ~ a ̀ \pi \epsilon \chi \chi^{\theta} \sigma \sigma \mu a t$. The aor. $\eta^{\prime} \chi^{\theta o ́-}$

[^122][^123]$\mu \eta \nu$ is Poet., but ${ }^{\prime} \pi \eta \chi 0^{0}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ is more generally used. Perf. $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\eta} \chi \chi^{\theta n \mu a \iota}$, I am hated. We find also a perf. $\eta \chi \chi^{\theta \eta \mu a \iota, ~ p a r t . ~}$ $\dot{\eta} \chi \chi^{\theta} \eta^{\prime} \epsilon ́ v$ ос in Lycophr. 827.

Some have wished to reject the above relation, which has always been supposed by grammarians to exist between the forms of this middle verb, and they adopt, beside a $\pi \tau \chi \theta$ ávo $\mu \alpha \iota$, a present, answering to the active, $\epsilon_{\chi} \chi \theta o \mu \alpha \iota, \dot{a} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta o \mu \alpha \iota$, of which $\dot{\eta} \chi \theta \dot{o} \mu \eta \nu, \dot{a} \pi \eta \chi \chi^{\theta} \dot{\mu} \mu \nu \nu$ would be imperfect. Now the true relation of which we are in search must be grounded on the usage of the older writers. And first then $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \chi^{\theta \dot{o}} \mu \eta \eta$, when standing in immediate connexion with the present, cannot be an imperfect; it can only be an aorist. Thus in Od. $\xi, 366$. oî̉a ö $\tau^{\top}$ ण $\chi \chi \theta \epsilon \tau \circ$ $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota$ Өeoî $\iota \nu$, "that he has been hated," consequently "is hated :" the

 same way the conj. is plainly an aorist in Il. $\delta, 53$. Tàs $\delta \iota a \pi$ époat, örav
 hateful to thee." Compare also the following passages in Plato's Apologia : and first the present, p. 24. "I tell you everything without con-
 myself hateful to you by these very things." Again p. 21., Socrates relates his going round to those who appeared to be wise, and his endeavouring to convince one of them that he was not so, and then he adds,


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

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

## 111

I am waiting for manuscript examples of this accentuation*. Notwithstanding what has been said we need not be surprised at finding the in-
 ascertained to be a false reading for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a ́ \chi \theta o \mu \alpha \iota:$ and the usage of Theocritus ( $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \chi \chi^{\theta \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota, 7.45 .) \text { is not of sufficient authority. }}$
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E}_{\chi \omega \dagger} \dagger$, I have, hold: fut. é $\xi \omega$ with the aspirate; imperf.
 $\pi a \rho a ́ \sigma \chi \in c$ ), optat. $\sigma \chi^{\circ}{ }^{i} \eta \nu$, conj. $\sigma \chi \hat{\omega}, \sigma \chi \hat{\eta} c, \&<$., (comp. $\pi a-$ $\rho^{\prime} \sigma \chi \omega, \pi а \rho a ́ \sigma \chi \eta c, \& c$.), infin. $\sigma \chi^{\epsilon \in \imath \nu}$, part. $\sigma \chi^{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$. Pass. and
 midd. é $\sigma \chi o ́ \mu \eta \nu \S(\pi a \rho a ́ \sigma \chi o v, \pi a \rho a \sigma \chi \in ́ \sigma \theta a \iota)$. From the aor. $\sigma \chi \in \hat{\imath} \nu$ comes a new fut. act. $\sigma \chi^{\prime} \sigma \omega \|$, and fut. midd. $\sigma \chi^{\eta} \bar{\sigma}-$ $\mu a \ell$, whence perf. act. $\epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \chi \eta \kappa \alpha$, perf. pass. ${ }^{\ell} \sigma \chi \eta \mu a \iota$, aor. pass. є่ $\sigma \chi \dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \nu$, verbal adj. е̇кто́с and $\sigma \chi є \tau о ́ c$ с.

From the aor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \neq \nu$ comes also a new pres. ${ }^{i} \sigma \chi \omega$, which with its future $\sigma \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ is principally used when the more definite ideas of to hold firm, stop, seize on (which are contained in the less expressive $\left.\epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu\right)$, require force and elevation. The aor. ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi^{\circ} \nu$ also (as the duration naturally implied in the idea of to have little suits the aorist,) belongs rather to these more definite meanings, when they are supposed to be transitory, as seized, held on, \&c. 'In its compounds ${ }^{\text {é }} \chi \omega$ has generally one of these more definite senses, whence also the aor. mápє $\chi^{\circ} \boldsymbol{v}$ \&c. is found much more commonly in these than any other meanings.

Notwithstanding that the great difference of formation in the passive and middle aorist contributed necessarily to keep up a distinction between their respective meanings, we still find cases of the aor. midd. used instead of the passive; the most common are $\sigma \chi^{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a c$ in the sense of to

[^124]§ [This aor. sometimes loses the augm. in Hom. in its 3. sing. $\sigma \chi$ є́то, Il. $\eta, 248$. $\phi, 345$. We find also its imperat. $\sigma \chi \cap \bar{v}$, infin. $\sigma \chi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$, part. $\sigma \chi o ́ \mu \in \nu 0$ s.-Passow.]
|| [We find a rare form of the 2. sing. fut. $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta a$, Francke Hymn. Cer. 366. like $\overline{\text { Ë }} \boldsymbol{\chi} \epsilon \iota \sigma$ mantioned above. Passow.]
be seized, held, Od., e̋ $\sigma \chi$ оуто Herodot. 1, 31., катє́ $\chi$ Єто Od. $\gamma, 284$.
 $\sigma v \sigma \chi \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon$ os Plat. Theæt. p. 165. b.

The way in which ${ }^{\check{\epsilon}} \sigma \chi^{\circ \nu}$ comes from ${ }^{\circ} \chi^{\omega}$ may be seen by comparing it with $\begin{gathered} \\ \sigma \\ \sigma\end{gathered} \nu$ from ${ }^{\varepsilon} \pi \omega$. In ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \chi \omega$ the $\iota$ supplies the place of a reduplication, as we see fully exemplified in $\mu i \mu \nu \omega$, $\gamma^{i} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \mu \alpha \iota$ \&c., where $\mu \nu$, $\gamma \nu$ are the syncopated stem of those verbs as $\sigma \chi$ is of the one before us. This \& would have the aspirate, as in í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu c$; but here again, as in ${ }^{\prime} \notin \omega$ itself, it passed on account of the $\chi$ into the lenis, a change more frequent in the older times of the language : compare $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \hat{j} \mid s$ from $\ddot{\varepsilon} \nu \nu v \mu$, モ̈бro, vestis; á $\theta \rho o ́ o s$ and $\dot{a} \theta \rho o ́ o s ; ~ \dot{a} \theta \dot{u} \rho \omega$, Att. á $\theta$ v́p $\omega$.

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

The language of poetry has from a theme $\Sigma \mathrm{\Sigma XE} \Theta \Omega$ the forms ${ }^{\varepsilon} \sigma \chi \chi \in \theta o v$, $\sigma \chi^{\epsilon} \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu, \sigma \chi \dot{\epsilon} \theta \omega \nu$, on which see $\dot{a} \mu v v^{\prime} \omega$.

On єỉХєє, Herodot. 1, 118. for $\epsilon i \chi є$, see $\epsilon \not \psi \epsilon \epsilon$ under $\epsilon \notin \omega \omega$, and com-
 may conclude that there was an old Epic part. oै $\chi \omega \kappa \alpha$, of which the following seems to be a satisfactory explanation. The simple perfect of É $\chi \omega$, with the usual change of vowel, would be oै $\chi \alpha$ (compare the subst. ixí); which reduplicated becomes, according to the common ana$\log y$, ov $\omega \omega \chi$. But since of two aspirates the second may be changed, it is very possible that this became oo $\chi \omega \kappa \alpha$, particularly as such a change made the derivation from $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \chi \omega$ more sensible to the ear. And it is clear from the Hesychian gloss $\sigma \nu \nu$ ок $\dot{\omega}$ Хотє, either that the old Grammarians explained the Homeric form in this way, or that both stood side by side as old various readings. That a reduplicated form of this kind did exist is certain at all events by the subst. ór $\omega \chi$ 亿, as all similar
 with really reduplicated forms of their respective verbs. Compare also the exactly similar formation of oix $\omega \kappa \alpha$ under o' $\chi \omega$.

In the passage of $\mathrm{Il}, \mu, 340$. the reading $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\sigma}^{\omega} \chi a \tau o$ (i. e. $\pi v ́ \lambda a \iota)$ with the explanation "were shut" has very much in its favour, both from the sense and construction as well as from the antithesis at $\theta, 58$. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \iota \delta^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \dot{\prime} \gamma r v \nu \tau o \pi v ́ \lambda \alpha \iota$. If with Wolf we adopt it, the only way of analogous explanation is this : 'Oxev's, $a$ bolt, has its meaning
 to hold together, shut, is grounded on analogy, like $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma a r$ \&c. But as we have shown above that öк $\omega \chi$ व was the perf. act., so is $\omega \gamma \mu r<$ formed as correctly as $\dot{\eta} \gamma \mu a \iota$ with $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\eta} \circ \chi a$, and with
the change of vowel continuing into the passive like áwpro. According to this $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\omega} \chi$ aro is the Ion. 3. plur. of the pluperf. pass. from $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon ́ \chi \omega^{*}$.

The following compounds of ${ }^{\text {é }} \mathrm{X} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ have other peculiarities:
 to bear, its imperf. and aor. have a double augm., $\eta_{\nu \in \iota \chi o ́ \mu \eta \nu, ~}^{\text {, }}$


The simple augm. does however occur in this meaning of the verb, sometimes in the middle, as in $\dot{\operatorname{a}} \boldsymbol{\nu \epsilon \sigma} \chi^{\delta} \mu \eta \nu$ (Aristoph. Pac. 347.), sometimes at the beginning, as in $\eta_{\nu \in \chi о ́ \mu e \sigma \theta a, ~ w h i c h ~ e x c e l l e n t ~ e m e n d a t i o n ~ o f ~}^{\text {a }}$ Küster for the unmetrical $\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\nu} \epsilon \sigma \chi^{\dot{\prime}} \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a$ (Aristoph. Lys. 507.) has been rejected through a mistake of Porson and others as not Greek.

 Thave round me, have on me; fut. á $\mu \phi^{\prime} \xi^{\prime} \xi^{\prime} \mu a t$; aor. $\eta \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi$ о́ $\mu \eta \nu$.

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

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

[^125][^126]before*. Now that $i \not \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi^{\sigma \nu}, \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \tau \sigma \chi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, is really an aorist, we learn from the passages of Aristoph. and the following glosses of Hesych.

 therefore it is clear that this form is not resolvable into $i \mu \mu \pi-\iota \sigma \chi o r$, $\dot{a} \mu \pi-\iota \sigma \chi \epsilon i \nu$, but into $\ddot{\eta} \mu \pi \iota-\sigma \chi^{\circ \nu}, \dot{a} \mu \pi \iota-\sigma \chi \epsilon i \nu$; because instead of $\check{a} \mu \pi-$ $\epsilon \sigma \chi \rho \nu$ the augm. passed over to the preposition, $\eta \mu \pi t-\sigma \chi \chi^{1}$.
$\dot{v} \pi \iota \sigma \chi^{\nu \in ́ o} \boldsymbol{\prime}$
 perf. ímé $\sigma \chi \eta \mu a t$.
${ }^{\prime} E \psi \omega, I$ cook: fut. $\dot{\varepsilon} \psi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, \&c. Verbal adj. $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi \theta \dot{c} c$, or $\dot{\varepsilon} \psi \eta-$ тóc, é $\psi \eta \tau$ т́oc. A remarkable form of the aor. is $\sigma v \nu \tilde{\eta} \neq q$ ac in the comic writer Timocles ap. Athen. 9. p. 407. e.
We find in Herodotus ( $1,48.1,118.8,26$.) a resolution of $\epsilon \epsilon$ for $\epsilon$

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


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

[^127]$\dagger$ An imperat. pass. $\dot{v} \pi o \sigma \chi \dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \tau \iota$ has been hitherto the reading in Plat. Phædr. p. 235. d., but there are only weak grounds for it in the manuscripts. See Bekker.
$\ddagger$ The unanimity of the reading sometimes of all, at other times of the majority, of the manuscripts as to these three forms is so convincing, that I am not only unwilling to meddle with them, but I even suspect that $\in \pi \epsilon \bar{\imath} \chi \in \dot{\epsilon} \tau \in$ in Herodot. 1, 153. where $\tau \epsilon$ is injurious to the context, is a corruption of $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \chi е \epsilon$.
root of $\epsilon i \mu i, I \mathrm{am}$ ．The third，＇$I \Omega$ is the root of $\epsilon i \mu \ell, I$ go．As these two last will be found in their alphabetical places，we have here to treat only of the three derivates of ${ }^{\circ} E \Omega$ ．

## 1．in $\mu \iota, I$ send，throw．

The conjugation of this verb scarcely differs from that of ri0n $\mu$ ； whatever tenses the one forms from TIOE $\Omega$ ，the other borrows from ＇IES．The « stands，for instance，instead of the reduplication；in the Attic language it is long＊，in the Epic generally short．When the short radical vowel $\epsilon$ begins the word，it is capable of receiving the augment by chan－ ging to $\varepsilon$ ．The simple verb is not of frequent occurrence，and a large proportion of the undermentioned forms occur only in the compounds．

## Active．

 iєíŋv．Conj．ī̂．Infin．iévaı†．Part．ieís．
 й申íєбал．
Fut．ท゙ $\sigma \omega$ ．
Perf．єîk $\ddagger$（like $\tau \epsilon \in \theta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$ ）．Pluperf．єîkє七ン．
Aor．1．$\tilde{\eta}^{\circ} \kappa \alpha$ ，Ion．$\check{\epsilon} \eta \kappa \alpha$ ．
Aor．2．$\eta^{\prime \prime}, \& c$ ．（not used in sing．but its place supplied by aor．1．），

 $\epsilon i \epsilon \nu$ for $\epsilon i ̈ \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，\＆c．Conj．$\omega^{*}$ ．Infin．єivac．Part．cìs．The com－ pounds follow the simple，e．g．̇ंфєîvat，á $\phi \hat{\omega}$, ä $\phi \in s, ~ \& c . ~ O p t . ~ p l . ~$ $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\dot{a}^{\nu} \varepsilon \epsilon i \eta \mu \epsilon \nu^{\prime}, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．

## Pass．and Mrdo．（compare Tí向 $\mu$ c．）

Pres．í $\varepsilon \mu a$ ．
 Apoll．Rh．2，372．belongs to the middle of $\epsilon i \mu$, i iє $\mu \alpha$ ．
Aor．1．pass．$\tilde{\varepsilon} \theta \eta \nu$ ，generally with the augm．cï $\eta_{\eta}$（ $\dot{\phi} \phi \epsilon i \theta \eta \nu$ ，part． á $\phi \epsilon \theta \epsilon i ́ s, \& c . ;$ üфєi $\theta \eta$ ，Plut．Sylla 28．）．

[^128]$\chi \leftharpoonup \mu_{0} \nu$ ，but the sense requires a perfect $\dot{a} \nu \in i v \tau \alpha t$ ，they are given to，devoted to， vacant．What therefore was a mere con－ jecture of Stephanus，dُ $\nu \in ́(\omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ ，now de－ serves our highest consideration，as the valuable Florentine Codex of Schweig－ hæuser actually has this reading．
§ In these forms of the aor．2．act．and those of the aor．2．pass．є́єєivto，\＆cc．the accent is not thrown back to the beginning of the word because the $\epsilon \ell$ arises from the augment．

Aor．1．midd．ijкú $\mu \eta \nu$ ，which in the indicative is used even in prose＊； the other moods do not occur．
Aor．2．midd．$\tilde{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \nu$ ，generally with the augm．єí $\mu \eta$ ，єiбo，єíтo

 ё $\mu \epsilon \nu o s(\dot{\beta} \phi$ é $\mu \epsilon \nu o s)$ ．
Verbal adj．ètós，ètéos（äфєтos，\＆c．）．
Instances of the imperf．sing．in $-\eta \nu$ are rare，and those which do occur are suspicious；in the 2．and 3．sing．we generally find íecs，ïe九 （contracted like éri $\theta$ cis），and in the 1．sing．was formed，at least in the Ion．and Att．dialect，an anomalous form in－$\epsilon \iota \nu$ ，as $\pi \rho o i t \iota \nu$ ，Od．$\iota, 88$. $\kappa, 100 . \mu, 9$ ．（Wolf＇s ed．）；ท́申íєıv，Plat．Euthyd．p．293．a．Libanius 1， p．793．；áviєıv，Lucian．Catapl． 4.

On the Attic conj．and optat．，which imitate the regular conjugation of the barytone verbs in accent if not in form，as $\pi \rho o ́ \omega \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \rho o ́ \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ ，iocto， $\pi \rho \dot{o} \circ \boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta \in, \& c$ ．，see the second paragraph of $\Delta \dot{v} \boldsymbol{y} \mu \mu \alpha$ ．We find in the active voice of this verb corresponding forms，but only in the present，e．g． áфioure，Plat．Apol．p．29．d．；á $ф i \not p$, Xen．Cyr．8，1，2．（6．）；but the ge－ nuineness of these two is doubtful ${ }_{+}$．The other dialectic forms of both moods correspond exactly with those of riӨך $\mu$ ，as á $\phi \in ́ \omega$, á $\phi \in i \omega$ for conj． $\alpha \dot{\phi} \hat{\omega}$ ；$\eta_{\hat{\imath}} \sigma$ for 3．sing．conj．$\eta_{\hat{\prime}}, \& c$ ．

From the $\iota$ of the pres．iéval arose a new theme，＇IS久，of which we find many forms，but always in the Ion．dialect，as $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\iota} \in \iota$ for $\dot{a} v i \eta \sigma \iota$,
 imperat．Theogn．1240．Bekk．$\mu є \tau і є \tau о$ or $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \epsilon \tau і є \tau о$ for $\mu \epsilon \theta i є \tau о$, He－ rodot．1，12．and the augm．perf．$\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \tau \iota \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s$ frequently used for $\mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon ́ v o s$, ：see also 3．pres．$\mu \epsilon \tau i \epsilon \iota$ in Schweigh．Lex．Herodot．There are many other such forms which vary only in the accent，and conse－ quently are not to be depended on§．

Lastly we have some Epic forms compounded with ává，which ac－

[^129]$\pi \rho o t e \ell$ is sometimes pres．sometimes im－ perfect．See Brunck on Sophoel．Ed．T． 628．and Heyne on I1．$\zeta, 523$ ．The impe－ rat．گ́v́vı $\operatorname{in}$ Theognis becomes suspicious when compared with the Homeric $\xi v \nu i \epsilon \iota$ ， Od．$a, 271$ ．and elsewhere；while the 3. plur． $\boldsymbol{\xi} v$ viviov is rendered doubtful by the various reading $\xi^{\prime} v i \in \nu$ for $\xi v \nu i \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$（see Heyne on 11．a，273．）．We have quoted these points to show the great uncertainty of the readings，not to recommend an uni－ formity，which is impossible if we pay any regard to manuscripts．
cording to meaning can only belong here，and which have this pecu－ liarity，that they take $\epsilon$ instead of $\eta$ in the future，and have the regular
 Il．$\xi, 209 . \phi, 537$ ．Od．$\sigma, 265$ ．But this form appears to be used only where the preposition gives the idea of again，back：compare Il．$\beta, 276$. $\xi$ ，362．where $\dot{\alpha} v \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \iota, \dot{\alpha} \nu \bar{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu$ have merely the sense of to stimulate．

## 2．є $\mathfrak{i} \sigma a, I$ seated，placed ；${ }^{j} \mu a \iota, I$ sit．

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



some of which are liable to be confounded with similar forms of $\tilde{\varepsilon} v v v \mu$ ．

Perf．pass．${ }^{j} \mu a t$ ，\＆c．which see below．
Of these forms ciáá $\mu \eta \nu$ only occurs in Attic prose in the sense of to lay the foundation of，found，erect；the others belong to the dialects and to poetry，particularly to the Epic．The defective parts of this verb are supplied by ic $\rho^{\prime} \omega$（which is complete in all its moods and tenses）， and by ка⿴i $\zeta \omega$ ，a word of still more general occurrence．The indispu－ table connection of this verb with $\ddot{\ddot{ } \zeta} \zeta \omega$ and $\cdot \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \zeta_{\varepsilon \sigma \theta a t}$ has induced many grammarians to place the above forms under $\bar{\epsilon} \zeta \omega$ ，the pres．act．of which however is nowhere found．But in that case the augm．$\epsilon$ ， which does not occur in $\dot{\epsilon} \zeta \dot{\zeta} \mu \eta \nu$ ，would form in Attic prose a deviation for which there are no grounds．Now as $\dot{\eta}^{\dagger} \mu a \iota$ seems to presuppose a radical form ${ }^{\text {＇}} \mathrm{E}$ ，it is more natural to leave all the above forms in this thcir simplest formation，distinguish them from $\bar{\epsilon} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$ ，（which we shall see presently to be a word in very limited use），and class this latter as a form belonging to $\grave{\iota} \zeta \omega, \quad$ z $\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \tau^{*}$ ．

The $\epsilon$ in $\varepsilon i \sigma a$ ，$\epsilon i \sigma$ á $\mu \eta \nu$ ，is indisputably the augment，for we see it dropped in the other moods ë $\sigma a t, \& c$ ．which double the $\sigma$ on account of the metre in Epic poetry ；hence the imperat．eirov which occurs but once（Od．$\eta, 163$ ．）is very remarkable．In a later period however the $\varepsilon t$ of the augment certainly does become，and that too in prose，an in－ tegral part of the word，in order to strengthen the syllable；whence

[^130][^131]єiŕú $\mu \in \nu o s$ not only in Herodot. 1, 66. but also in Plut. Thes. c. 17. and many other passages. In Thucyd. 3,58. غ́ $\sigma \sigma$ á $\mu \epsilon v o s$ is scarcely genuine, and the various reading è $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu$ os is undoubtedly the true reading. Lastly we find in Od. $\xi, 295$. $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \sigma$ uto with the syllabic augment*,


In Athen. 4, p. 142. is quoted from Phylarchus, a prose writer of the time of the Ptolemies, a fut. єïधтa८, he will seat himself, in which meaning none of the forms belonging to this verb are found elsewhere. It is probably an Alexandrian provincialism, written in the N.T. cati$\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ and $\kappa \alpha \theta_{i}^{\prime} \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$.
The following forms are in use with the meaning of to sit:

 fin. र्j$\sigma \theta a \iota$. Part. ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mu \epsilon v o s$.
 much more used, which takes no $\sigma$ in the 3 . sing. except when in the imperf. it has no augm., as-




 compound.

Instead of the 2. sing. in - $\sigma a<$ and $-\sigma o$ we find also the shortened forms of the compounds, viz. pres. кá $\eta \eta$ for кí $\theta \eta \sigma a t$ and imperat. кá $\dot{\theta}$ ov for кí $\theta \eta \eta \sigma$, which however are not so good Attie as the others.

Instead of $\dot{\eta} v \tau a \iota, \dot{\eta} v \tau o$, the Ion. have ëacat, éaro (the ending of the Ion. perf. pass.), and the Epics eïuтal, eiuaz. In the compound the Ion.


The same form ${ }^{i} \mu u \alpha$ is also the true perf. of cioa, as used in the sense of ìppvaı of inanimate objects, e.g. Herodot. 9, 57., Callim. Fr. 122.: these passages, with the Ion. 3. pl. eiarat, Lucian. De Dea Syr. 31. prove decidedly that the reading of Od. $v, 106$. is ciaro with the

[^132]more probable. Compare Kєīцас.
$\ddagger$ The accentuation of the opt. and conj. moods, from the rarity of their occurrence, is not to be depended on; I have accented these according to the general analogy of barytone verbs.
§ We must not overlook the difference of the accent in $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha \iota, \kappa \alpha \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a c$, but compare the same appearance with the observations made on it under Keipac.
aspirate，not（as it is sometimes written）eiaro the midd．of $\varepsilon i \mu i$ ． See also＂$\Sigma \omega$ ．

3．$\tilde{\varepsilon} \nu \nu v \mu$ ，to put on，which see in its place．


## Z．

 it is used by old writers principally in the pres．and im－ perf．，as $\beta_{t} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ is in the remaining tenses：thus pres．$\zeta \hat{\omega}$ ， そथ̂c，低；imperat．$\zeta_{\hat{\eta}}$（Herm．Soph．Ant．1154．），or $\zeta \hat{\eta} \theta_{l}$ ；


The forms with the $\eta$ ，particularly the imperf．é $\langle\eta s$ ，eै $\zeta \eta$ ，soon drew the usage aside to the formation in $\mu$ ，so that $\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \eta \nu$ as well as $\varepsilon$ é $\zeta \omega \nu$ was used in the imperf．，and $\zeta \hat{\eta} \theta c$ in the imperative．Herodian attempted indeed to defend the former against the latter（see Fr．42．Herm．or p．
 however $\check{\epsilon} \zeta \omega \nu$ as the usage of Aristophanes，while Euripides，Plato，Xe－ nophon，\＆c．have no other form；and the question is decided by the 3．plur．which never occurs otherwise than $\tilde{\varepsilon} \zeta \omega \nu^{*}$ ．Hence it is remark－ able that the same Herodian（Fr．43．），immediately after having pro－ nounced the above opinion，rejects $\zeta \eta \theta_{l}$ ，which is necessarily connected with $\bar{\epsilon} \zeta \eta \nu$ ．This imperat．occurs in the LXX．and sometimes in the Anthologiat；but $\bar{\zeta} \bar{\eta}$ is found in Eurip．Iph．T．699．and Fr．Phrixi，and ＇in Soph．Fr．Danaës．

Beside the pres．and imperf．there was in common use among the older writers a future，as $\langle\dot{\jmath} \sigma \epsilon \omega$（Aristoph．Plut．263．），弓ínooval（Plat．Rep． 5.

[^133]reading．All things considered $I$ very much doubt whether Herodian ever gave it as his opinion that $\begin{gathered} \\ \zeta \\ \eta\end{gathered} \nu$ was used for $\epsilon \zeta \omega \nu$ ． Pierson first took it from a manuscript（see his note p．460．and Lob．post Phryn．p． 457．）；but there is another manuscript in which $\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \omega \nu$ is by no means rejected，and nothing more is stated than that ${ }^{\prime \prime} \zeta \eta \nu$ ， which belongs to ${ }^{*} \zeta \eta s$ ，$\overparen{\epsilon} \zeta \eta$ ，is used by Demosthenes．

+ That is to say，in the Epig．Incert． 242．where the first six hours of the day are allotted to labour，and then the
 said，by a play on the letters，to bid us enjoy life．
 form in use among the later writers) in Dem. c. Aristog. I. p. 794, 19. In these last we find also the aor. 1. $\varepsilon$ é $\zeta \eta \sigma a$ and the perf. $\ddot{\epsilon} \zeta \eta \kappa \alpha$.

The Ion. and Dor. formed this verb with the vowel $\omega$, and that not

 shortened to $\zeta \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \tau v$, see Simonid. Gaisford. 231, 17. Herodot. 7, 46. Theo-
 restored from the manuscripts to the text of Herodot. 1, 120.*.

Z $\epsilon \in \omega, I$ seeth, boil, retains the $\epsilon$ in the inflexion. From the examples given by Stephens it appears that $\zeta^{\prime} \epsilon \omega$, generally speaking at least, has an intransitive, and $\zeta^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \nu \mu \iota$ a transitive sense ; the other tenses have both meanings in common. The pass. takes $\sigma$, e. g. $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \zeta_{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu \epsilon \in \nu о с, \dot{a} \pi о \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon i c$.

 Midd. L'́vivuat, \&c.

According to Suidas (v. $\sigma$ éowarat) the older Attics bad no $\sigma$ in the perfect. This he proves by the authority of Thucyd. 1, 6. $\delta t \epsilon \zeta \omega \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \iota \iota$, where however all the Codd. have $\delta \iota \epsilon \zeta \omega \sigma \mu$ éror. Compare $\Sigma \dot{\alpha} \zeta \zeta$.

ZŹv.

## H.

'Hßáw, I am in the bloom and vigour of manhood, pubeo; $\dot{\eta} \beta$ áбкш, I am coming to manhood, pubesco. The aor. ${ }^{\eta} \beta \eta \sigma \pi$, I have arrived at manhood, belongs to the second form.

See Moeris p. 180. with Pierson's note. In the compound however the form in á $\omega$ has the sense of to become, ár $\eta \beta \bar{a} \nu \mathrm{v}$ to become young again.

When the $\omega$ is followed by a syllable naturally long it is lengthened by the Epics to $\omega \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, and when it has the ، subscript it becomes wot;

'Hy'́онає, Ilead; I consider as such: depon. midd. [The

[^134][^135]act. $\dot{\eta}$ у́c is found only in its compounds, as $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \eta \gamma^{\epsilon} \epsilon$, Schæf. Mel. p. 114., but it is better to derive these from the adj. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \eta \gamma \dot{n} c, \& \mathrm{c}$. ; I doubt therefore whether $\dot{\eta} \gamma^{\epsilon} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega}$ was ever really in use.-Passow.]

The Ion. and Dor. use, principally in the sense of to consider in a certain light, the perf. $\ddot{\eta} \gamma \eta \mu a$ instead of the pres.; it is common for instance in Herodotus, see Schweigh. Lex. Herod. v. íy $\bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \theta a t$; Fragm. Pythag. Gale p. 711. (ăy $\left.\boldsymbol{q}^{2} \nu \alpha \iota\right)$; whence it came into the language of
 appear frequent until the later writers*. In the sense of to precede
 is the same as $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon v o \mu \tau \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ r c$, that which is usual, Orac. ap. Demosth. adv. Macart. p. 1072, 25. In two of the passages of Herodot. there is
 and it is very possible that this form had the Ion. short $a$ for $\eta$ with a different breathing.
${ }^{\prime} H \delta \omega, I$ delight : but little used in the active. Pass. I am


Homer has once the midd. $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma a r o$ for $\ddot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta$, Od. $\imath, 353$.
'H ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon$, I strain, filter: fut. in general use $\eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega, \& c$. But Galen quotes from Hippocrates $\eta \sigma a c$ from $H \Theta \Omega$.
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H}_{\kappa \omega}, I$ come, am arrived (see 'Iкขє́онає), has (in the older writers) only the present, the imperfect $\tilde{\eta}_{\kappa o v}$, and the future $\ddot{\eta} \xi \omega$.

The form $\delta \iota \bar{\eta} \xi a$ belongs to $\delta \dot{\text { átric }}$; but later writers have also from
 pp. 743. 744.
${ }^{\imath} \mathrm{H} \mu \alpha \iota$. See ${ }^{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{E} \Omega, 2$.
' $\mathrm{H} \mu \boldsymbol{i}$, iv. See $\Phi \eta \mu$.
${ }^{\prime} H \mu \dot{v} \omega, I$ sink: fut. $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \dot{\prime} \sigma \omega$, \&c. The regular perf. of this verb was $\ddot{\eta} \mu v \kappa a$; to this was prefixed the reduplic. with the shortened $\varepsilon$ in order to preserve the relation between the first and second syllable: but on account of the verse the first syllable was to be again made long, for

[^136]374. d. (ク̈ךŋaat for $\dot{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon i)$, and in Clitophon 407.c. ( $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ). Better examples perhaps may be found in Plat. Tim. p. 19. e. Legg. 8. p. 837. c.
which purpose $\mu \nu$ was taken instead of $\mu \mu$ ，as in the instances of $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\alpha}-$ $\lambda a \mu \nu o s$ from $\pi \Lambda \lambda \alpha \mu \eta_{1}, \nu \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu \nu o s$ for $\nu \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu o s$ ；thus was formed an Epic perf．é $\mu \nu i ́ \mu \nu \kappa a$ ，and its comp．í $\pi \in \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \kappa \alpha$ ，Il．$\chi, 491$.
 the pure language only in the passive form．Fut．$\dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \eta \theta_{n}^{\prime}-$ бо $\mu a \iota$ ，occasionally $\dot{\eta} \tau \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a t$, Lys．c．Ergocl．9．，pro Polycr．

 Herodot．The later writers thought they might also form an active（to overcome），which Diodorus has occasionally（see Schæfer on Ari－ stoph．Plut．p．525．）．The only passage in which it occurs in any of the older writers（Isæus 11，31．p．86，3．）has been corrected by the
 $\nu \kappa \bar{q} \nu^{*}$ ．

## $\Theta$ ．

$\Theta^{\prime} \lambda \lambda_{\iota}, I$ germinate：fut．$\theta a \lambda \hat{\omega}$ ，also $\theta a \lambda \lambda_{n}{ }_{n} \sigma \mu a \iota$ ；perf． 2．т $\epsilon \theta \nexists \eta \lambda a$, Dor．т $\epsilon \theta \bar{\theta} \lambda a$ ．

Hom．has not the pres．$\theta$ á $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ，but in its stead uses $0 \eta \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ ；the Epic formation therefore is，$\theta \eta \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ ，－$\eta \sigma \omega$（Il．a，236．）\＆c．；perf．$\tau \hat{\ell} \theta \eta \lambda a$ ，part． $\tau \in \theta a \lambda v i ̂ a ;$ with a rare aor．2．$\theta$ áde，Hymn．Pan．33．The form $\theta a \lambda \lambda e ́ \omega$ ， wherever it occurs，is only a corruption of the Doric $\theta \bar{a} \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ ．The later Epics，as Quint．Sm．11，96．，have $\theta a ̈ \lambda \epsilon ́ \epsilon \omega$ ．The pass．$\tau \in \theta \eta \lambda \eta \mu$ éros in Hippocr．Insomn．5．is remarkable．

日AN一．See 日víбкш．
$Ө^{\prime} \pi \tau \omega, I$ bury：fut．$\theta a ́ \psi \omega ;$ perf．тє́тӑфа；aor．2．pass． é $\tau \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \nu$（but Herodotus has the aor．1．$\epsilon \theta a ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$ ）；perf．pass． тє á $_{\mu \mu a t, ~ \tau \epsilon Ө a ́ \phi 0 a t . ~ T h e ~ r o o t ~ o f ~ t h i s ~ v e r b ~ w a s ~ t h e r e f o r e ~}^{\text {a }}$

[^137]and it would have been a most unnatural mode of speaking to have brought in the
 The neuter ideas＂to get the better，to win，＂are here contrasted with＂to be worsted，to lose，＂and it was therefore ne－
 $\nu t \kappa \underset{\imath v}{\nu}$ ，exactly as had been said a little
 $\tau \hat{y} \ddot{\eta} \tau \tau \eta \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma y ;$ where $\nu \iota x \underset{\nu}{\nu} \nu$ is taken in a judicial sense and stands absolutely，not having the opponent following it in the accusative case，as when it means to con－ quer any one in battle．
$Ө А Ф$, as we see one or both of the aspirated letters in all the above forms. See below $Ө А Ф$.

Thus we have $\tau \in \theta^{\prime} \phi \theta \omega$ in Lucian Dial. Mar. 9, 1. $\tau \in \theta$ ádataı in Herodot. 6, 103. Compare Tpé $\phi \omega$, with note.
$Ө А \Phi-$. Perf. used as a pres. тé $\theta \eta \pi a$, I am astonished, where the second aspirated letter of the root is changed into the tenuis; on the contrary in the aor. ধ̈raфov the first undergoes that change*. Compare Өátitw.
$\theta A \Omega$, an Epic defective verb, of which the act. has the causative sense to give suck to, the midd. the immediate sense to suck. Of the former we know nothing more than the aor. $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \sigma a \iota \text {, and that only from Hesy- }\end{aligned}$ chius. Of the latter Hom. has the infin. pres. $\theta$ $\bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota \dagger$ with the collateral meaning of to milk (Od. $\delta, 89$.), and the aor. 1. midd. '́Qifoato, he sucked (Il. $\omega, 58$.). [So éध日írao, Callim. Jov. 48. and $\theta_{\eta} \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s$, Hymn. Cer. 236. But in Hymn. Apoll. 123. 0ifgaro has the causative sense she gave suck to.-Passow.]

See another ө́apat in the following Өса́ода.

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

The following different formations from this stem or root have been preserved in the dialects :
1.) $\theta$ áo $\mu a \iota$ in the following Doric forms; $\theta \bar{a}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a_{\ddagger}^{\ddagger}$, Sophron ap. Apollon. de Pron. p. 359. a. Imperat. Ácoo, Nossidis Epigr. 8., Anytes Epigr. 10. $\theta \hat{a} \sigma \theta \epsilon$, the Megarean in Aristoph. Ach. 770. Fut. and aor. Өaбópeval, Theocr. 15, 23. ӨátaбӨat, 2, 72. Өấaı (imperat.) 1, 149. And the Epic $\theta$ п $\sigma$ aiato, Od. $\sigma, 191$.
2.) $\theta a \dot{\epsilon} о \mu a \imath$ Doric, Pind. Pyth. 8, 64. $\theta_{\eta}$ о́дає Ion. whence $\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \eta$ -

3.) Ocíomaı Attic and common dialect.

Of these three formations the first and second have in Homer always
 pears to be the oldest, whence $\theta a \bar{v} \mu a$; and the second merely the common lengthening of it, $\theta$ a-є́онає, Ion. $\theta \eta$-є́г $\mu \iota$. From the oldest form arose the simple verbal subst., properly $\theta$ áa, but soon changed into $\theta$ ća, like $\mu \nu u ́ a$ into $\mu$ 'é $a$; and hence first came the form $\theta$ eáo $\mu a t$, which

[^138]$\dagger$ This verb is contracted in $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ instead of $a$. See Záw.
$\ddagger$ This is more of an Æolic than a Doric contraction: here the $o$ is swallowed up by the $a$ preceding it, which consequently becomes long; thus the part. $\gamma \in \lambda \hat{u} \nu$ for $\gamma \epsilon \lambda a ́ \omega \nu, \phi v \sigma \bar{a} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ for $\phi v \sigma a ́ o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \gamma \epsilon-$ $\lambda a i ̄ \sigma a$ for $\gamma \in \lambda a ́ o \iota \sigma a, \mathbb{S} c$.
does not occur in Homer. In Herodotus we find indeed both forms, e.g.
 seem to arise more from traditionary corruptions of the text. He has also constantly recurring as various readings $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \tau o$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \bar{\eta} \tau o$, of which the latter is perhaps according to the analogy of some verbs in áw contracted by the Epics in $\eta$ instead of $a$, as $\dot{\rho} \rho \bar{\eta}$ a 2 2. sing. pres. and $\dot{\rho} \bar{\eta} \tilde{r o}$ 3. sing. imperf. of ópá $\omega, \dot{o} \mu a \rho \tau i ́ r \eta \nu$ dual of ó $\mu a \rho \tau \in ́ \omega:$ verbal adj. $\theta a \eta \tau o ́ s$, $\theta \eta \eta t u ́ s, ~ \theta e a \tau u ́ s . \quad$ Compare Zán and $\theta A \Omega$.

Өcirw, I beat. This pres. is constantly used by the Epic poets and tragedians in both the act. and pass. voice. Beside this the Attic
 for instance in Aristophanes, and consequently belonging to the common language of the time. But there is no instance of a pres. indic.; for in Acharn. 564. the manuscripts give, and the context requires, the fut. $\theta$ eveis. Hence our latest critics have shown that those forms are aorists, (excepting occasionally that the fut. $\theta \epsilon \mathrm{r} \hat{\omega}, \theta \epsilon r \bar{\omega} \nu$ ought to be restored, ) and therefore that the infin: and part. must undoubtedly be accented $\theta \in \nu \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu, \theta \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{*}$. All those passages certainly express a momentary beating, $\theta \in i v \in i v$ on the contrary (e.g. $\theta \in\{\nu$ vetac,
 $\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$, Hom.) continued blows, or the proper imperfect. Of the indic. of this aor. $\begin{gathered} \\ \theta\end{gathered} \epsilon$ rov no instance has yet been found. The Epic language has the aor. 1. eै $\theta \in i \nu a$, part. $\theta \epsilon i v a s$, Il. $v, 481$. Hence we can point to ${ }^{\mu} \theta \in \epsilon \nu \epsilon$ as evidently an imperf. at Il. $\pi, 339$., and as an aor. at $\phi, 491$. The perfects and the aor. pass. are wanting.

Өе́̀ $\lambda \omega$. See 'E0́̀̀ $\lambda \omega$.
Өépoцat, I warm myself: used in prose in the present and imperfect only.

Homer has, beside the above, a fut. Aép $\sigma o \mu a \iota$ and an aor. pass. (é $\theta e ́ p \eta \nu$ ) conj. $\theta \in \rho \hat{\rho} \omega$. The act. $\theta$ ép $\rho, I$ warm, stands in the lexicons without any good authority.

Quite as defective is the derivative form of which we find in Homer only $\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \mu \epsilon \tau \varepsilon$ and $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \rho \mu \epsilon \tau \sigma$. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 546. note.

O $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma a \sigma a t$, to beseech; a defective aor. of which we find only $0 \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma a \nu \tau o$ (Pind. N. 5, 18.), and part. $\theta \in \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s$, Hes. Fr. 23. : see Schæf. Schol. Par. Apollon. Rh. 1, 824. The verbal adj. would be $\theta \epsilon \sigma \tau$ ós, from which come $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau o s$ and $\pi o \lambda \dot{u} \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau o s$, Hom.

[^139][^140] Dor．The other tenses are defective．Compare T ${ }_{\rho} \rho^{\prime} \chi$ $\chi$ ．

For the imperf．é $\theta$ धov Hom．has $\theta$ é $\varepsilon \sigma \kappa 0 \nu$ ．We find also an act．fut． $\theta \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \omega$ in Lycophr．119．There are some forms from $\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ ，the root of тi$\theta \eta \mu$ ，which we must take care not to confound with those of $\theta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega I$
 midd．$\theta$ єіто，and тоті白ı for motiӨєs，Theocr．14， 45.

Өŋ入е́ш．See Өá $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ．
ӨНП－．See ӨАФ－．
Өŋ̄бөaı．See $\Theta A \Omega$ ．
 under Aí大日ávo $\mu$ at．

Beside $\theta_{\imath} \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \nu \omega$ a pres．$\theta i \gamma \omega$ is generally adopted，of which ë $\theta_{\imath}$ yov would be at the same time imperf．and aor．，and $\theta i \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ would be different from $\theta$ l $\gamma \in i v$（compare $\kappa \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ ）．But there are not sufficient proofs of the indic．$\theta$＇$\gamma \omega$ or of ${ }^{\prime} \theta$ tyou as a decided imperfect．The accentuation of $\theta_{i} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \theta \iota \gamma \epsilon i \nu$ ，and $\theta_{i} \gamma \omega \nu \theta_{\imath} \gamma \omega \nu$ ，is indeed generally confounded in the manuscripts；but when for instance we read in Hesychius $\theta i \gamma \epsilon \iota r^{*}$ ب̧av－ $\sigma a \iota, \tilde{\alpha} \psi a \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \tilde{\alpha} \pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，we see how little dependence is to be placed on these accents．If we were to accent in every passage of our text $\theta_{\iota} \gamma \in i \nu$, $\theta$ of $\omega$ ，as aorists，we should not find the sense disturbed in any one instance ${ }_{4}^{\dagger}$ ．
$\theta \lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega, I$ contuse，bruise，crush ：fut．$\theta \lambda \dot{a} \sigma \omega$, \＆c．It has $a$ short in the inflexion，and in the pass．takes the $\sigma$ ．

The part．perf．pass．is $\tau \epsilon \theta \lambda \alpha \gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{e} \cdot o s$ ，Theocr．22，45．；as in the Doric dialect all verbs ending in $\zeta \omega$ and some in á $\omega$ ，which have $\alpha$ short in

[^141]look at the passages，we shall see a plain difference between these aorists and the sense of $\mu \in i \lambda i \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \%$ in the former and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \alpha \phi \bar{\omega} \nu$ in the latter，which express a du－－ ration of the thought；nay in the passage of Aschylus we shall find them contrasted，
 $\nu$ o $\nu$ ．［There are a few other instances in the Tragedians，but none to be de－ pended on：e．g．in Soph．Phil．9．the Ald．ed．has $\pi \rho o \sigma \theta \iota \gamma \epsilon i \bar{\nu}$ ．compare also Æschyl．Agam．1049．Soph．Aj． 1410. Elmsl．and Herm．OEd．C． 470 ．Schæf． Eurip．Or．p．12．Greg．Cor．p．990．Monk Eurip．Alc．1136．Elmsl．Eurip．Bacch． 304．Wunderl．Obs．Critt．p．151．－Pas－ sow．］
the inflexion, change to the other formation with the $\xi$; as ко $\boldsymbol{\text { ri }} \boldsymbol{\xi} \omega$, Dor.

$\theta \lambda i \beta \omega$, I press, squeeze : fut. $\theta \lambda i \not \psi \omega$; aor. 2. pass. $e^{\theta} \theta \lambda i-$ $\beta_{\eta \nu}$ (like $\tau \rho i \beta \omega$ ).

In Homer we find the fut. midd. $\theta \lambda i \notin$ етal, Od. $\rho, 221$. The pass. part. pres. $\theta \lambda \_$८óreevos is in Dioscor. Epig. 37., and the part. perf. pass. $\tau \epsilon \theta \lambda \iota \mu \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta$ in Leon. Tar. Epig. 70.
 $\theta \nu \eta \kappa a$ : compare $\beta \notin \beta \lambda \eta \kappa a$ and note under Bá $\lambda \lambda \omega$. Of this perf. the following syncopated forms are in common use : $\tau \in ́ \theta \nu a ̆ \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\tau \in ́ \theta \nu a ̆ \tau \epsilon, ~ \tau \epsilon \theta \nu a ̄ \sigma \iota$, and 3. plur. pluperf. é $\tau \in ́ \theta \nu a ̆ \sigma a \nu ;$
 gen. - $\boldsymbol{\omega} \tau о \varsigma$, fem. $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon \hat{\omega} \sigma a$, neut. $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon \omega$ c, but in Herodot. 1, 112. $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon$ óc, which is perhaps preferable. From $\tau \in \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa$ кa
 or $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau^{\prime} \eta \xi$ о $\mu a \iota$ ), the latter of which is not to be considered in the light of a passive, but as a fut. midd. with an active sense. Verbal adj. Өขךтóc.

That the $a$ in the infin. $\tau \in \theta y$ ával was short in the common language is evident from Aristoph. Ran. 1012: but we find in Æeschyl. Agam. 550. te日vâvat which was perhaps a contraction of te日vaévat. The Epics have also $\tau \in \theta \nu$ á $\mu \epsilon \nu$, and Homer $\tau \in \theta \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu a$. The Ion. and Hom. lan-
 è $\sigma \tau \eta \omega$ 's under " $1 \sigma \tau \eta \mu$, , for which Homer has sometimes $\tau \in \theta \nu \eta$ óros, and once $\tau \in \theta \nu \epsilon \bar{\omega} \tau \iota$, as a trisyllable, Od. $\tau, 331$. For $\tau \in \theta \imath \eta \bar{\eta} \tau 0 s$ there is also a frequent various reading $\tau \in \theta \nu \epsilon \epsilon \omega \bar{\tau} o s$, and for $\tau \in \theta \nu \eta o ́ r o s ~ s o m e t i m e s ~ \tau \epsilon-~$ $\theta v \epsilon$ óóros. To preserve Homeric uniformity Heyne wrote all the above with $\epsilon$, whilst Wolf for the same purpose preferred $\eta$ : of the two the latter seems to have made the better choice; but after maturely examining every part of the question, I think there are the strongest grounds both internal and external for the following as the Epic usage; $\tau \in \theta \nu \eta \dot{\omega} s, \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \ddot{i} a, ~ \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta o ́ r o s$ and $\tau \in \theta \nu \epsilon \epsilon \bar{\omega} \tau o s$.

In usage this verb is so mixed up with its compound $\dot{a} \pi o \theta v i, \sigma \kappa \omega$, that
 the contrary the perf. ré $\theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$ with its derivative forms scarcely ever occurs compounded with $\dot{a} \pi \boldsymbol{j}$. Moreover of the perfect we find hardly any but syncopated forms: the part. זe $0 \cdot \eta \kappa \omega$ 's is indeed interchanged
with $\tau \in \theta \nu \epsilon \omega$ 's, yet so that of the latter the masculine only occurs in prose. The usage of prose is therefore the following:

 $\tau \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{q}$ and $\tau \in \theta \nu \epsilon \omega \dot{\epsilon}, \tau \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa v i ̂ a, \tau \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa o ́ c$.
The part. $\theta a \nu \omega{ }^{\prime} \nu$, oi $\theta a \nu \dot{\rho} \nu \tau e s$, is however common in prose as an adj. in the sense of dead.

The infin. perf. $\tau \epsilon \theta$ vávac is used generally in its natural meaning : bat not unfrequently it stands also for the aor. $\theta$ areiv, e. g. in Plat.
 $\mu_{e}$; and such is its meaning in the familiar hyperbolical expression $\pi 0 \lambda$ $\lambda a ́ k \iota s, \mu \nu p ı a ́ k \iota s ~ \tau \epsilon \theta \nu$ ávaı : whence it is clear that in some other passages we must not force it to mean to be dead, as Plat. Crito 14. ei סéor $\tau \epsilon$ Orávat $\sigma \epsilon$. A wish to add force to the expression introduced the perfect, as a form of a more decided and more certain sound, in the place of the present.
The same was the case with the fut. $\tau \in \theta v \dot{\eta} \xi \omega$ or $\tau \in \theta v \eta$ goura, of which we may first observe that the active form appears to be the older Attic : see Dawes p. 96., Buttm. notes on Plat. Gorg. p. 469.d., and Elmsl. ad Aristoph. Ach. 597. This fut. has evidently the meaning of the futurum exactum in the above passage of Plato, where $\tau \in 0 \nu \nu_{1}^{\prime} \xi \in \tau a t(\tau \epsilon \theta v i \xi \xi \varepsilon \iota)$ "he will be dead immediately" is a parallel case to such perfects as that mentioned above. But like the common fut. 3. of the passive (paulopost fut.) this also passes over into a simple fut. with the idea of immediately or certainly. See Thom. Mag. in v. and the passages in Brunck ad Aristoph. Ach. 590., Fisch. ad Well. 3. p. 106.*.

The compound with kará is likewise synonymous with the simple verb, but occurs only in the poets: and the forms of the aor. are never found but with the syncope, as кат $\theta a v \in i ̂ v, ~ к a \tau \theta u r ' \omega \prime$, \&c. : hence in the Attic poets, who do not willingly omit the augment, the indic. (kárசave) seldom occurs (Æsch. Agam. 1553.), while the other moods are frequent in Euripides and others.

Өрáббш. See Tapá⿱㇒日ш.
Өpav́ $\omega$, I break in pieces. The passive takes $\sigma$. The old perf. pass. $\tau$ é $\theta \rho a v \mu a t ~ h a s ~ b e e n ~ r e s t o r e d ~ b y ~ B e k k e r ~ t o ~ P l a t . ~$ Legg. 6. p. 757. e. (425, 7.).

[^142]$\tau \in \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \xi_{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \alpha$, where we always contrast to live with to die, whereas the true contrast is between to live and to be dead.

Өри́лtт, I break in pieces: fut. 0pú $\neq \omega$; aor. 2. pass. غ̀т $\dot{\prime} \phi \eta \nu$. Compare $\Theta^{\prime} \pi \tau \tau \omega$ and T Té $\phi \omega$ with note.
[This verb seems to have been scarcely used in its simple form and literal meaning by any good writers; but in a metaphorical sense it is very common, particularly in the passive, as $\mu a \lambda \alpha \kappa i ́ a ~ \theta \rho v ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a t, ~ X e n o p h .-P a s s o w]$.

Өрஸ́бкн, I leap: fut. 0opov̂
 under Bá $\lambda \lambda \omega$.

The pres. Aop $\hat{\epsilon} \omega$, which is in all the lexicons, is scarcely to be found even in the later writers; and where we do find it, $\dot{a} \pi o \theta$ opoûy $\tau \in s$ is a false reading for $\dot{a} \pi \Delta \theta o \rho o ́ r \tau e s$ or something similar: see Stephan. Thesaurus*. That $\theta \rho \omega \omega^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ and $\theta$ opei» are connected in usage was allowed by the old Grammarians : see Eustath. ad Il. $\beta, 702$. p. 246, 47. Basil.
 6,134 ., where the aorists $\mathbf{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta$ opé $\epsilon เ v, \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta$ opóvta are used of leaping
 ing down) $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \mu \eta \rho \grave{\nu} \nu \sigma \pi a \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha,$.

Among the forms of this verb we may with safety class the perf. $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \theta o \rho a ;$ as it would not be easy to find an emendation more certain than this of Canter in a verse of Antimachus in Poll. 2, 4. 178. ' $\Omega$ s
 cated..." instead of $\theta o v p i \eta s . .$. "̈ $\xi$.

In the collateral sense of copulating (see $\theta_{\rho} \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$ and $\theta_{o p e i v}^{\nu}$ in Hesych.) the depon. $\theta \dot{\sigma} \rho v v \mu a t$ is more common.

өरф-. See Túpw.
$\theta^{\prime} \omega$, I sacrifice: fut. $\theta \bar{v}^{\prime} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\imath} \theta \bar{\theta} \sigma a$; perf. $\tau \in ́ \theta \breve{v} \kappa a \dagger$, Chœrobosc. p. 1286., Draco pp. 45, 26. and 87, 25.; aor. 1. pass. $\epsilon_{\tau} \bar{v}^{\prime} \theta \eta v$, part. тv $\theta$ eíc.-Midd.

Oúw, and a sister-form $\theta \dot{v} \nu \omega$, have also the sense of I rage; and with this meaning we find a syncop. part. aor. midd. $\theta \dot{v} \mu$ eros in Pratinas ap. Athen. 14, p. 617. d. according to the reading as now corrected.

> I.


[^143][^144]i， pres．imperf．and aor．l．$i^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \eta \eta \nu$ ，Ion．$i^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ ，Hippocr．De Arte 20．In the older writers from Homer＇s time the $\iota$ and $a$ are long through all the moods and tenses：in the later au－ thors，particularly in the Anthologia，a became common．
 is contracted irregularly in $\omega$ and $\omega$ ，instead of ov and ot；thus i厄$\rho \bar{\omega} \sigma a$ ，
 hold good of the Ionic dialect only，as in Xen．Hell．4，5，7．the best

＇İpúv，I place，build：fut．iठpúб $\omega$ ，\＆c．－Midd．
The aor．1．pass．iipu $\theta \eta \nu$ ，regular with $v$ long，is recommended as ex－ clusively the Attic form ；on the other hand ioipúvө $\nu^{*}$（which supposes a theme in－v．$\cdot \boldsymbol{w}$ ，which occurs in Homer，and came into use again in a later period，）is rejected by the Atticists ：see Thom．M．in voc．It is found however，and sometimes even without a various reading，in the best writers．See Lobeck ad Phryn．in voc．p．37．note．Oudend．ad Thom．M．Fisch．3．p． 108.
＂I I $\omega$ ，more generally ка⿴囗⿱一一 ${ }^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ ，has in the active voice both the causative meaning to seut，place，and the immediate or neuter to sit．The simple verb appears to occur only in the pres．and imperf．$\dagger$（Hom．and Herodot．8，52． 71. ）； but of ка $\theta_{i}^{\prime \zeta} \iota$ we find a fut．каӨı $\omega$ ，an aor．1．є́ка́ $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\iota \sigma a}$ ，and perf．кєка́ $\theta$ кка．The Middle has the sense of $t o$ sit，and its future is generally ка0ı咲只at．

With regard to the accentuation of this verb，we know that the vowels 1 and $v$ when short can be augmented only by being made long，as＂iкє－ тéve，aor．＇itétevoaa；but where they are already long by position，the augment can be marked only by the difference of pronunciation and accent；thus in $i \zeta \omega$ the imperat．pres．is $i \zeta \epsilon$ ，the imperf．is $\lceil\zeta \epsilon$ ；though from errors of transcription this rule is very frequently broken in the manuscripts，and consequently in the text of all writers．The older

[^145][^146] Buttm．Lexil．p．122．Dindorf．ad Aristoph．Ran．921．Bekk．Thucyd． $6,66.7,82$ ．with the various readings．

The later writers，from the time of Aristotle，have also a pres．i弓ívo， каӨı̧̆́va．

With this verb is intimately connected the verb éheo $\begin{gathered}\text { at，} \\ \text { ，}\end{gathered}$ каӨ＇єєєб⿴al，which never occurs in the older writers except

 $\mu а \chi о \hat{v} \mu a \iota$ and $\pi \iota o \hat{\nu} \mu a \imath$ ）．The defective tenses are supplied by єíбa，í $\omega$ ，and $i \delta \rho \dot{\jmath} \omega$ ，with the comp．кá日eiбa，\＆c．
The general supposition is，that there are two synonymous verbal forms
 $i \zeta \delta \mu \eta \nu$ ；whereas we can prove，not from the Homeric language，which is in this respect uncertain，but from Attic prose，that it is invariably

 perf．is not to be thought of，and the sense runs plainly thus，＂he sat himself down by us，＂\＆c．Again in Xen．Anab．5，8，14．（6．）kai à̀－
 ＂while I was seating myself，＂nor＂while I was sitting，＂but＂after having sat a considerable time，＂\＆c．And in confirmation of this comes the strong inductive conclusion，which every one will draw for himself，
 the narrative of the momentary action of sitting down，as is also ка $\theta$ ह́－ $\zeta \omega \mu \alpha \iota, \& c$ ．：those passages，therefore，where the context does not neces－ sarily show this，must be understood in the same sense．And thus the few instances where the pres．каӨє $\zeta_{0 \mu \alpha c}$ is found become very suspicious $\ddagger$ ．

[^147][^148]We can now then join together as the usage of common prose all the forms of this family of verbs which belong to the meanings to sit and to seat, together with $\begin{gathered}i \\ i \\ \\ \text { a }\end{gathered}$


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

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

"I $\eta \mu \iota, I$ send. See under ${ }^{\text {' } E \Omega} 1$.
'I $\theta \dot{v} \omega$, I go straight on: fut. $i \theta \dot{v} \sigma \omega$; \&or. 1. ${ }^{i} \theta \bar{v} \sigma a$, \&c., to which be-
or we seated ourselves, consequently $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \kappa a-$ $\theta \epsilon \zeta \zeta \rho \mu \epsilon \theta$. Again in Phœn. 73. and Helen. 1587. ка $\begin{gathered}\text { ć } \zeta є \tau \text { ' is 'є } \kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\epsilon} \zeta є \tau о . ~ W h e-~\end{gathered}$ ther in a later period a usage was formed from this, according to which $\kappa a \theta$ é $\zeta_{0} \mu \alpha$, as a present, was the same as к$\dot{\theta} \theta \eta \mu a \iota, I$ sit, I will not take upon myself to determine. We certainly find in Pausan. 10,5 init., in speaking of the official sitting of a board or council, кaféלovtaı; and again the same expression, which I own surprises me, in a work probably of antiquity, the dialogue of Axiochus, p. 371. c., where the various reading ca $\theta$ iGovial is of no assistance, the context requiring кáӨŋขтaı. However the language of this dialogue, in which we find $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\eta}$ for $\bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a, \pi \in \rho \iota \in ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha s$ (see ï $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$ ) p. 570. d., and $\delta \iota \psi \underset{q}{\text { p. }}$. 366. a., with many other unusual words and phrases, gives ample scope for critical examination.

I explain the point thus: The radical form of all these verbs was evidently ' $E \Delta \Omega$, as proved by $\dot{\epsilon} \circ \circ \bar{v} \mu a t$, $\epsilon \delta \delta o s$ and sedeo. Now as $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ come from "̈ $\pi \omega$ and ' $\mathrm{EX} \Omega$, so $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ coines from ${ }^{\circ} E \Delta \Omega$ : and here even better than in $\dot{\epsilon}-$ $\sigma \pi \dot{c} \sigma \theta a \iota$ we can see the augment which in the common language had become equally fixed throughout all the moods, $\check{\varepsilon} \sigma \delta \omega \mu \alpha t$,
"̌̌ $\omega \mu \alpha \iota$, غ̇そó $\mu \in \nu$ оs. To the above we may add the pres. $\ddot{\sigma} \delta \omega$, " $\ddagger \omega$, exactly like $i \sigma \chi \omega$ to $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \chi 0 \nu$. In кaөíל $\omega$, кaөє́לєто this origin naturally enough ceased to be heard anylonger, and thenwere formed ék $\dot{\theta} \theta \iota \sigma a$, $\kappa \alpha \theta \iota \omega$ : каӨ乇́לєго received a new augment at the beginning: and as to the aoristic accentuation of the infin., there is still less reason for insisting on it in the case of $\kappa \alpha \theta c ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ than in that of other aorists, which we have seen mistaken in a similar manner. But it is now clear also that $\epsilon i \sigma \alpha$ and $\bar{\eta} \mu \alpha$, , whose connection with ๕̋ $\zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ we acknowledged (see p. 117.), and yet separated them from it on practical grounds, do not come from 'ES, but from this same ${ }^{`} \mathbf{E} \Delta \Omega$; that is to say $\tilde{\eta}_{\mu} \mu \ell$ was softened down from $\eta \bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$, of which latter there are still remains in $\eta \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ and in єioa, ei $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, both formed with that oldest of augments $\epsilon \iota$, which being misunderstood in this case also was carried on to some forms to which it did not belong.

* See Lobeck. ad Phryn. p. 269. The reading $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \kappa \alpha \theta_{\iota} \zeta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ there proposed for Æschin. c. Ctes. p. 77, 33. has been now adopted by Bekker from evident traces in the Codd. The conj. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \bar{\omega}$ in Soph. ©Ed. C. 195. was indeed still more improbable: see Brunck and Reisig.
longs also in Homer and others $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta^{\prime} \omega$ ，with the ${ }^{\prime}$ long．But $i \theta^{\prime} v \omega$ is Ionic and Epic for $\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v} \nu \omega, I$ direct or guide straight forward：aor． 1. ＂$\theta 0 \nu v a$ ；also in the midd．i日iveto in the act．sense，Od．$\chi, 8$.
＇Iкvéoнає，more generally áфıкข́́о $\alpha \iota, ~ I ~ c o m e, ~ d e p o n . ~ m i d d . ~: ~$


The Ion．3．plur．perf．pass．áтiката in Herodotus is remarkable as the only known instance of the tenuis in the stem being retained．But ikтo in Hes．$\theta, 481$ ．is a syncopated aorist：and to this belongs also in $\mu \varepsilon v_{0}$ for iкó $\mu \varepsilon v o s$ in Soph．Phil．494．：see note in Buttm．edit．

The Epic language has the pres．and imperf．of the active，î $\omega$ ，inor， with the aor． EEOr $^{\prime}$ ；on which last，as a mixture of the aor． 1 ．and 2. see $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \%$, p．73．，and oī $\sigma \epsilon$ under Ф́́pw．

In the pres．ikw the $\quad$ is long throughout，while in the aor．iкó $\mu \eta \nu$ it is，according to the root，short，but becomes long by the augment；
 short ：and accordingly in the Epic language the indicative iкó $\mu \eta r$ ， from the augment being moveable，is both long and short．The form iкvov̂цaı（Eurip．Or．670．679．\＆c．）has the ıshort．Another poetical present is iкávw，with 九 short and a long．

The pres．iкァoüraı occurs in its simple form in particular senses only； in Hom．to go through，travel from one place to another，Od．九，128．$\omega$ ， 338．：in the Attics，to go to as a suppliant（iкérys），implore，and to be suitable to．The true pres．as to meaning is in the Epic language is $\kappa \omega$
 $\xi \xi_{0 \nu}$ is solely Epic ；but $i \kappa o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ and $i \xi_{o \mu} \alpha \iota$ are common to all the poets．

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

[^149][^150]principally to them，including Pindar；see Bockh ad Pind．Ol．4，11．） had the dialectic form i＇$\kappa \omega$ ，which，like our come，was used of being already arrived at a place，e．g．in Il．$\sigma, 406$. ；but the language of the succeeding period，i．e．the Ionic and Attic prose with Attic poetry，in which ijkw had become established，limited the usage of the latter verb to that particular meaning，while the lengthened forms iná⿱⺌兀，á $\phi \iota x$ ov $\mu a \iota$ ， retained the more general sense of to come to，arrive at a place．In the
 （to you）and be with you＇；$\dot{i} \phi i \xi$＇rual，＇I shall set out from hence and come to you．＇



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

In the old language the active voice had the sense of to be gracious， kind，whence the Epics took an imperat．i $i \lambda \eta \theta_{l}$（Od．$\gamma, 380 . \pi, 184$. ${ }_{i}^{\lambda} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta t$ ，Theocr． 15,143 ．）from $i \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ ，and a conj．and opt．from i入ík $\omega^{*}$ ．
 of this fut．see＇Ар $о$ о́ттш．
${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I} \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, I draw up（a rope or water）：fut．iци $\sigma \omega$, \＆c．The Att．infin．pres．is i $\mu \hat{\eta} \nu$ ：compare $\zeta^{\prime} a^{\prime}, \theta a^{\prime} \omega$ ．－Midd．
＇I $\mu \varepsilon$ є $\rho \omega$ and $i \mu \varepsilon i \rho о \mu a \iota, I$ desire，wish for．The aor．opt．midd．is i $\mu$ сiриıто（Il．$\xi, 163$. ），and the aor．1．pass．$i \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \theta \eta$（Herodot．7，44．）． The $\imath$ is always long．
＂І $\pi т \alpha \mu \alpha$ ．See Пе́тоции．
＂I $\sigma \eta \mu$ ，I know．［Of this verb we find only the Dor．pres．i$\quad i \bar{\pi} \mu \iota$ in Pind．and Theocr．，the 2．sing．i＇$\sigma \eta s, 3$ ．sing．$i \sigma \bar{\alpha} \tau \iota$ ，and 1．plur．＇i $\sigma \tilde{\alpha}-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ，Pind．N．7，21．，and the part．ías，Pind．P．3，52．The forms which only appear to belong to this verb，such as i$i \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu$ ，$i c \rho \mu \varepsilon \nu^{\prime}$ ，i$\sigma u \sigma \iota$ ，io $\sigma$ ， ＇íav，will be found under Ei＇icu．－Passow．］
${ }^{" I} I \sigma \omega \omega$ ．＂I $\sigma \kappa \in \nu$ ，he spoke，is a defective imperf．（Od．$\chi, 31$ ．），differing


[^151][^152]in the pres. and imperf., Il. $\lambda$, 798. $\epsilon$, 181. Od. $\delta, 279 . \nu, 313$. ), and arising from the insertion of the $\sigma$ in IK- the root of eunco, like 入á $\sigma \times \omega$ from $\lambda a \kappa \varepsilon i v, ~ \tau \iota \tau \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega$ from $\tau \epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \omega$, \&c. With respect to $\mathfrak{e ́ - i \sigma \kappa \kappa}$ see note

${ }^{\star} I \sigma \tau \eta \mu$ : imperf. ï $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$; fut. $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\text {é }} \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a$; perf.
 dic. ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \tau \nu$ is seldom used before the time of Polybius; its other moods are found in Homer. Pass. í $\sigma \tau a ̆ \mu a \iota$; imperf.

 $\sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$; fut. 3. (paulo-post) $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \xi \omega$ old Att., and $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \xi о \mu a \iota$ later, Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 597., like $\tau \epsilon 0 \nu_{\eta}^{\prime} \xi \omega, \tau \epsilon 0 \nu^{\prime} \xi \xi$ о $\mu \iota$,


The 2. and 3. sing. of the indic. pres. in - $\bar{\varphi} s$ and $-\bar{q}$ are found only in the later writers. The 3. plur. iotâat is the Attic form, iarécot the Ionic, iorave the Doric. In the optat. is an abridged form of the dual and plural by dropping the $\eta$, and in the 3 . plur. changing - $\eta \sigma a \nu$ into $-\epsilon \nu$, thus returning to the regular optat. of the barytone verbs ; as dual,
 in the optat. of the aor. 2. as $\sigma \tau a i ̈ \tau$ for $\sigma \tau a i \eta \tau \varepsilon$; but here the abridged form is not so usual as the other, while in the imperf. it is preferred by the Attics, who sometimes use it in the 3. plur. pres. In the imperf. we find an Epic 3. sing. Ïбтa⿱кe (Od. т, 574.) with a sister-form in $-\omega \nu$, -as, -a, peculiar to the Ionic dialect and the later writers: Homer has also an aor. 2. $\sigma \tau$ ćaкor. In the aor. 2. imperat. instead of $\sigma \tau \bar{\eta} \theta_{l}$ we have in the compounds $\pi a \rho a ́ \sigma \tau a, \dot{a} \pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau a^{*}$, as from a theme $\Sigma \mathrm{\Sigma T} \Lambda \Omega$. In the infin. pres. are iocá $\mu \varepsilon \nu$, ioтá $\mu \varepsilon \nu a t$, with $a$ short, for iocávat, but in the aor. 2. the long vowel remains, as $\sigma \tau \bar{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau i \mu \epsilon \nu u$, Od. $\epsilon, 414$. Il. $\rho, 167$. In the middle the fut. and aor. 1. are Homeric ; the latter is also in common use: but an aor. 2. é $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$ is nowhere found in any of its moods or.tenses. In the passive the Ion. 3. plur. is íaréaral for ïбтarтı.

In the conjunct. we find in the later writers the 2 . and 3 . sing i $\sigma \tau \bar{\mu} s$, $-\hat{q}$, instead of iortins, $-\hat{\eta}$, in which case they belong to the inferior form ioráw. The Epics for the 3. sing. iorî have iorijiou. And as the conj. is a contracted form the Ionics resolve it, using for i $\sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$ and $\sigma \tau \bar{\omega},-\hat{\eta} s, \& c$.


[^153][^154]Epics vary to suit the metre, using oreíw, orings, orin! , orinquor, \&c.,
 indeed to distinguish some of the above forms from those of the optative. In the conjunct. and optat. of the passive voice of all verbs in $\mu<$ a formation has been introduced into the common language, by which they assimilate, sometimes in sound but always in accent, to the regular conjugation (compare $\delta \dot{v} \nu \mu \mu \iota$ ) : thus we find in all writers ïбтato,



The tenses of this verb, like those of $\delta \dot{v} \omega$, фv́ $\omega$, and many others, are divided between the causative meaning of to place, and the immediate one of to stand. In the active voice we find, with the meaning of to place, the pres. and imperf. í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$, ĩ $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$; fut. $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ê $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a$ : whence therefore the whole of the passive voice has the sense of to be placed; and a middle (íqтaцat, $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \mu a \iota, ~$ é $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ), answering to the above tenses of the active, has the meaning of to place for oneself, cause to be placed or erected.

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

To suit this present meaning of the perfect was formed

[^155] which, though a passive form, is not to be regarded as properly such (for in meaning it corresponds with the active), but as a fut. midd. with an active sense, like $\theta_{a v o v}^{\mu} a t, \lambda \dot{n}_{-}$廿онаи, \&c.

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

Of all the syncopated forms of this perfect the infin. é $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu a \iota^{*}$ is most used, and é $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa$ évat perhaps not at all. Of
 $\sigma a \nu^{\cdot} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\omega} c,-\hat{\omega} \sigma a$, gen. - $-\hat{\omega} \tau \sigma c$.

In this abridged form the pluperf. has never its proper augment et, but remains ẽ $\sigma \tau a \sigma \alpha \nu$ : hence the two first persons, as being similar to the perfect, seldom occur in prose $\ddagger$. Beside these syncopated forms the complete forms of $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta к a$ are also in general use: $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha i \eta \nu$, ë $\sigma \tau a \check{\theta} \theta_{6}$ are perhaps exclusively poetical: while of the conj. are found only those persons which have an $\omega$, e. g. غ̇ $\sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$, Plat. Gorg. 52. p. 468. b.

 a syncopated form $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\omega} s, \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha, \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \omega \dot{\omega}$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\prime} s$ (of the last we shall speak hereafter), gen. $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau o s$. There is also an Ionic form érréss,
 has frequently a gen. غ̀धrăóros, an accus. è $\sigma \tau a ̆ o ́ r a, ~ a n d ~ a ~ n o m . ~ p l u r . ~$
 dropping the $\kappa$ (like $\tau \epsilon \tau \lambda \eta \dot{\prime} \omega$ and others; see under Baiv $\omega$ ), is found in Hes. $\theta, 5,19$., and a gen. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\omega} \tau o s$, with a fem. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{u} a \mathrm{a}$ in Apollon. Rhod. Again, like $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \prime \omega s$ for $\dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \tau \eta \kappa \dot{\omega} s$, we have a singular form in Hom. $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \tau \epsilon \|$

[^156]mation : the regular part. was e $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \dot{c} s$, whence by dropping the $\kappa$ came $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \omega s$ : the Ionics changed the $\eta$ into short $\alpha$ (see under Baív( ), whence غ̇бтáws; while again in $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \boldsymbol{j} \omega \mathrm{\omega}$ the length of the $\eta$ passed oninto the following vowel, making éarc$\omega^{\prime \prime}$, though the origin of this change was not visible in the nom. as it is in the gen. غ́ $\sigma \tau \eta o ́ т o s ~ غ ̀ \sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{\omega} т о s, ~ l i k e ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \eta ́ o \rho o s ~ \mu \epsilon-~$ тéwpos.-Ed.]

II This reading, according to the correct criticism of the grammarian in the scho-
 pated 3. plur. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \bar{a} \sigma \iota$ the Ion. resolved form $\grave{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \in \mathfrak{\varepsilon} \alpha \sigma_{\iota}$ in Herodot. 1,
 5,49 . is genuine, notwithstanding the various reading $\pi \rho \sigma$ éбтate has crept in from the common language.

If we follow analogy the neut. part. of $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\omega} s$, contracted from è $\sigma \tau \alpha o ́ s$, must be the same as the masc., and this is the reading of most of the manuscripts and editions wherever the word occurs. But the oldest and best manuscripts have generally the unanalogous $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau o \dot{s}$. Hence it is very probable that in this case the language of the Attics followed apparent analogy, and formed from $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma$ г $\omega$ s the neuter $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau o ́ s$. Still the geu. and other cases are $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \omega \hat{\tau} \tau o s, \& c$.*

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

In Homer we find $\epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$ (for the accent and breathing must be determined by criticism) in both a transitive and intransitive sense: the plainest instance is in Il. $\mu, 55$. and 56 . where it has the two meanings in two succeeding verses. In the description there given of the ditch round the Grecian camp we read, кр $\eta \mu \nu о i . . . \mathrm{E} \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu \dot{a} \mu \phi о \tau \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$,
 the first is beyond a doubt $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau a \sigma \alpha \nu:$ for there is no other form to express the imperf. they stood or were standing. It seemed therefore most natural to write the same in the second instance also, and to suppose that the old language used the perfect in both senses : and the context is much in favour of this, "which the Greeks had placed." But there are other instances of eava $\sigma \alpha \nu$ in a transitive sense, as Il. $\beta, 525$. Od. $\gamma, 182 . \sigma, 306$. in all which it is evidently an aorist; whereas the pluperf. (which necessarily is and remains $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma r a \sigma \alpha \nu$, if we deduce it in a transitive sense from the perfect have placed) cannot stand in these

[^157]reading is defended in Alb. Hesych. 1, p. 503.

 according to which therefore, if we find in the same writer éqéot $\begin{aligned} \\ \text { es in a transitive }\end{aligned}$ sense, it must be altered. See Fisch. 2. p. 368. Schaef, ad Dionys. De Comp. 22. p. 331 ., and compare Reisk. ad Dem. Phil. 3. p. 117, 26. (Reisk. Appar. p. 251.).
passages, particularly in Od. $\sigma, 306$, without the greatest violence. But if eбтaбal be an aorist, it must be a shortened form of $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$ : and this opinion of Aristarchus, which Wolf has followed in his last edition, appears to me undoubted, particularly when I compare it with a similar case in Hesiod, $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \epsilon$ for $\ddot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon *$ (see $\Pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu)$ ).
'Епібтадас sce in its alphabetical place.
${ }^{" I} \tau \chi \omega$. See" ${ }_{\chi}{ }^{\omega}$.
$1 \Omega$. See Ei $\mu$.

## K.



 Өāpa also), infin. каӨâpaı, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 25.-Midd. This verb is no compound; see Buttm. Lexil. p. 119.

Kаөє́боцає. See "I $\zeta \omega$.
Kaөєú $\delta \omega$. Se Eṽ $\delta \omega$.
KáӨ $\eta \mu \alpha \iota$. See ${ }^{\text {T}} \mathrm{H} \mu a \iota$.

Kaìvpal, I am distinguished, excel: defective depon. without fut. or aor., and occurring only in pres. and imperf. There is however a synonymous perf. кє́каб $\mu \alpha \iota$, Dor. кє́каঠда兀; pluperf. є́кєка́ $\sigma \mu \eta$. That these forms are correctly classed under one verb both'sense and construction plainly show. For as in Od. $\gamma, 282$. we read '́kaivvto $\phi \tilde{v} \lambda$ ’


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

[^158][^159]as кeкarдat, and no doubt would have been if it had occurred more frequently. It is found however only three times, and in its simple form but once through the whole of Homer. We must therefore join kaivy $\mu a \imath$ with кéкса $\mu \alpha \iota$, to which and to the Doric кéкад $\mu$ at it bears exactly the
 pared with each other as pres. and perf. they are like our expressions $I$ distinguish myself and I am distinguished: and the radical idea is undoubtedly that of shining, glittering $\dagger$, as in the Pindaric passage é $\lambda \bar{\varepsilon}-$
 ivory, but composed of it, of which therefore the poet could say, it shone with ivory, or in Latin candebat. To this verb, as to so many others in the middle voice, was joined the accusative of the person, or $\mu \epsilon \dot{a}$ roîs, $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau o i s$, together with the dative of the thing; and sometimes (as in Od. r, 82. 8, 725. Il. $\omega, 546 . \ddagger$ ) this dative stood alone.
 The perf. is wanting. In the passive the pres. and imperf. only are in use.

This verb is a sister-form of $\kappa \tau \in i \nu \omega$, ктaveiv, to which it bears the
 common both in the Poets and Tragedians and found also in the best Attic writers.-Passow.]

Kaíw, I burn (transit.), Att. кá $\omega$ with a long and without

 каибто́с, каибтє́oс.

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

The Epics have also an aor. 1. act. (without $\sigma$ in the termination) ëкпа §; many forms of which fluctuate between $\eta$ and $\epsilon$, while a third

[^160]a deviation in every respect from the usage of Homer, of which it is a partial imitation. § Some verbs form their aor. 1. in $\alpha$ instead of $\sigma \alpha$. In the common language
 from $\chi \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$, єīa from cinciv, ที้ $\nu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha$ from $\phi \in ́ \rho \omega$. The poets have also ér raiw and $\varepsilon$ ह̈ $\sigma \sigma \varepsilon v a$ from $\sigma \varepsilon v i \omega$. As these aorists go over into the middle voice also ( $\dot{\varepsilon} \chi є a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, غ́ббсv́ato, \&c.), the Epic
 may be considered as belonging to the sainc.
with $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ has been retained by the Tragedians only，e．g．néévies Æschyl． Agam．858．，éknétuvzes Eurip．Rhes．97．；but this last can scarcely be considered in any other light than as derived like the others from the old Epic language．The forms ëк $\kappa a, \notin \kappa \eta \epsilon$ ，and the optat．3．sing．ки́ac，plur． кíruє $\nu$ ，have no various reading with the $\epsilon \iota$ ，as all the others have：e．g．
 176 ：conj．кeiopev and kílouev，Il．$\eta, 333$ ．and 337 ：indic．midd． 3. plur．кєiavio and кíuvzo，Il．九，88．，and the same in the participles
 compare with this the exactly similar appearance in the Epic conjunc－ tives of the form in $\mu t$ ，－those for instance from $\check{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \nu, \ddot{\varepsilon} \beta \eta \nu^{*}$ ，－it is evident that when the $\eta$ before the other vowel had been shortened in the old language into $e$ ，it was again lengthened by the Epics into $\varepsilon \iota$ ，like ßei $\omega$ ，$\sigma \tau \epsilon i o \mu \epsilon \nu$, \＆ c ．in the two verbs above mentioned．Now as in some of these forms the various reading does not appear，while in others it is supported by the greatest authority of the manuscripts（see Heyne on the passages of the Iliad quoted above），I have no doubt of the reading кєiavто，кєioper，кєīut，\＆c．in all those passages being the genuine one，i．e．having the oldest tradition in its favourt．Compare a similar case of the text fluctuating between $\tau \in \theta \nu \epsilon \epsilon \bar{\omega} \tau o s$ and $\tau \in \theta \nu \eta \bar{\omega} \tau 0 s$.

Some have also supposed a present $\kappa \varepsilon \in \omega$ and $\kappa \eta \omega$ ，on account of $\kappa \alpha-$ такєєє́ $\mu \epsilon \nu$（var．reading катакทє́ $\mu \epsilon \imath$ ），11．$\eta$, 408．and ёкךоv，Od．८， 553. To place this kijw as an Ionicism by the side of the Attic các cannot be satisfactory，as кait is the Ionicism like $\kappa \lambda a i \omega$ ， $\begin{gathered}\lambda \\ \lambda a i a \\ \text { ；nor is it easy to }\end{gathered}$ perceive what grounds there are for those forms，when we have кalé $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ， I1．$\xi, 397$ ．and éreruov，Od．$\chi, 336$ ．As therefore in the one passage ëкnov has been already expelled from the text by the reading of the manuscripts ékatov，so in the other катиканé $\mu \epsilon \nu$ is undoubtedly the old reading，and the corruption was produced by confounding it with the forms of the aorist．

That the iota subscript with which кó $\omega$ and $\begin{gathered} \\ \kappa \\ \eta\end{gathered}$ editions，new as well as old，rests entirely on a false opinion，is evident without further investigation．See Piers．ad Moer．p． 231.

Kàє́ $\omega, I$ call：fut．калє́ $\sigma \omega$ ，fut．midd．ка入є́боцає（Ep．


[^161]See Aristoph．Fr．1133．and compare Piers．ad Moer．p． 321.
$\ddagger$ The fut．$\kappa a \lambda$ é $\sigma \omega$ ，or，as the Attics spoke it，$\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}_{3}$ is indisputably the fut．of the simple stem or root $K A \Lambda \Omega$ ，and the common pres．кa入é（s arose out of that fut． as the Ionic pres．$\mu a \chi$ éo $\mu$ at came from
 $\kappa а \lambda є \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu)$ ；perf．кє́клпка；perf．pass．кє́клдиая（I am
 $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ ；fut．pass．к $\lambda_{\eta} \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma о \mu a t$ ；fut．3．（paulo－post）кєк $\lambda_{\eta}-$ бонат，I shall be called，named．Ion．and Hom．imperf． кадє́єөкоข．

From this verb came also by metathesis an Ionic sister－form кєк入if $\sigma \kappa \omega$ ， used by Homer in pres．and imperf．only；see note under Ké̀доца兀．On

 fin．канєі̀ ；aor．2．midd．е̇кано́ $\mu \eta \nu$ ；perf．by metathesis
 under Ka $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ ，with the note underneath．

Sophocles（Trach．1215．）has the 2．sing．fut．канеi．In the Epic part．perf．the $\kappa$ is dropped as in $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \phi \eta \omega$＇s，$\tau \epsilon \tau \lambda \eta \omega^{\prime}$ and others；thus

 The Epics have also very frequently the aor．2．act．and midd．with the reduplication，which then remains in all the moods；thus $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda a \theta o v, \lambda \epsilon-$
 the conj．кєка́ $\mu \omega$ ，кєка́ $\mu \eta \sigma \iota$ ，кєка́ $\mu \omega \sigma \iota$.

Káцлтт，I bend：fut．ка́ $\mu \notin \omega$ ，\＆c．In the perf．pass． when the 1．pers．has $\mu \mu$ ，one is naturally dropped，as кé－ $\kappa а \mu \mu а t, ~ к е ́ к а \mu \psi а t, ~ \& c . ~$
 $\sigma \theta u t$ Att．（Aristoph．frequently）；a defective verb found only in the fut．$\ddagger$ ，

[^162][^163]and in such expressions as oi кaтaupoi $\xi \in \epsilon$, 'thou shalt not have done it for nothing' (i. e. not without being punished for it). A deviation to the aor. кататроíac日at is very possible, but it occurs only in Themist. Or. 14. init.* In the Etym. M. we find also a verb $\pi \rho o$ í $\sigma \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ a,$I$ beg, quoted from Archilochus, from which comes $\pi \rho 0$ ôntys in Homer: but the etymological connection of the two is not clear $\dagger$.

Kaváłaıs. See"A ${ }^{2} v \nu \mu$.
Kavđáopat, I talk big. Dep. midd. Pindar uses it with infin. Herodotus 7,39 . has the aorist.

КАФ-; whence perf. part. кєкӓфпш́s, -о́тos, breathing short and with difficulty, Il. $\epsilon, 698$. Od. $\epsilon, 468$. Of this root or stem we find no other trace except that Hesychius las кék $\eta \phi \epsilon, \tau \in \in \vartheta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon$ : probably with the sense of expirare. [This perf. seems to be formed from an obsolete theme $\kappa а ф \dot{\epsilon ́ \omega}$, akin to ка́ттш and катív.-Passow.]

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



 retains the accent on the syllable of the stem or root, катакeioधal. So also є́тікєции, \&c.

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

[^164]Whereas to beg is, it is true, the correlative of to make a present of, but on that very account not fit to be joined in the same idea, because language rather strives to make the distinction between such words clearly perceptible. Otherwise it would be easy enough to have recourse to the idea of stretching out the hand as belonging to both actions.
$\ddagger$ Homer always uses кєīซaı, кєĭто, but we find in the Hymn. Merc. 254. as 2. sing. катáketal.
§ Whether кє́ $\omega \mu$ a८ was a genuine Attic form may be doubted. In an inscription in the Corp. Inscript. I. n. 102. p. 10. stands $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \in i=\omega \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha$.
self down, consequently I lie, ) with the redupl. dropped, by which the accent in the compound кала́кєєци, катакєїөөt is accounted for in the most natural way, like $\kappa^{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, ка $\theta \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$. . From the shortening of $\varepsilon \iota$ to $\epsilon$ arose naturally the change to the form in - $-\omega$, whence in Homer кéerval, in Herodot. 1, 178. кéeтає, and in Hippocr. de A. A. L. 9, p. 333. kє́є $\epsilon$ Out.

Instead of the 3. sing. neĩal Herodotus has rétrat, and later writers кéєтає*: instead of the 3. plur. кeî̀тaı Homer has néovtą, and very
 which is found only in Homer and the later Ionics. In the 3. plur. imperf. Homer and the Ionics for ếкєитo have кеі́ăтo and кéăтo, with an iterative $\kappa$ ќधкeтo. Od. $\phi, 41$. In the infin. pres. we find in Hippocr.


In Il. $\tau, 32$. Od. $\beta$, 102. Wolf has altered according to the Venet. manuscript the old reading of the text ceital (which as an indicat. would be certainly incorrect) to a conjunct. кฑ̄rat. But this was unnecessary, as by an old usage кeì $\alpha \iota$, кeita served for both conjunct. and indicat. Thus in Plat. Phædo p. 84. e. $\mu \eta ̀ \delta$ да́кєє $\mu a \ell$ is conjunct., and in p. 93. a. stands $\dot{\epsilon} \xi_{\xi} \omega^{\nu} \nu$ åv $\sigma v \gamma \kappa \dot{\varepsilon} \eta \tau a \iota$ with a various reading in the
 on the other hand, Bekker in Isocr. $\pi$. 'A 1 prio. 278. has corrected from

 $\Delta \in ́ \omega \dagger$.

Homer has also an infin. кecé $\mu \epsilon \nu$ and part. кéi $\omega \nu$, $\kappa$ cé $\omega \nu$ (from KEI $\Omega$ ) as future, Il. $\xi, 340$. Od. $\eta, 342$.; which undoubtedly come from the fut. кée $\omega$ contracted to кeíu and again shortened to кém. That this form should pass into a desiderative was very natural, Od. $\theta, 315$. Compare a similar future in $\delta \dot{y} \epsilon \epsilon$, $\bar{y} \dot{\jmath} \neq \mu \varepsilon \nu$, $\delta \dot{\jmath} \epsilon \tau \varepsilon$ from a fut. $\delta a \in ́ \omega$ and $a \operatorname{root} \Delta A \Omega$.

Kєiрш, I shear: fut. кєри̂; perf. pass. кє́кириає ; яог. 2.


The Epic language forms the fut. $\kappa$ ह́ $\rho \sigma \omega$, aor. 1. ëккрба. Pindar (Pyth. 4, 146.) has the aor. 1. pass. éкép $\hat{\theta} \eta \eta$.
Keíw. See $\delta i j \omega$, p. 56.; also Kai and Keì $\mu \iota$.

[^165] $\rho \epsilon \tau a l$, \&c. is preferred for Homer: and it certainly appears to be an old reading; for at Il. $\tau, 32$. the small Schol. have the gloss Kéerat àvтi той кêtrat, which shauld be đivтì тоขิ кヒ́ŋтat.

Kèaî $\epsilon \omega$, I sound, roar, is regular; but the Epic language has the
 used only as an adjective. [Passow has also $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\delta} \omega$, which he calls the original form of $\kappa \varepsilon \lambda a c i e ́ \omega$, and from which he derives the above participle.]

 aor. 1. $\kappa \varepsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, Pind. O. 13, 113. The Homeric aor. ह́кєк $\dot{\lambda} \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$, éке́клєто, кєкло́яєчos is most naturally considered as the aor. 2. of this verb with syncope and reduplication (according to the analogy mentioned under Ká $\mu \mathrm{r}(\omega)$, and with the augm. like éné́фpaiov: it has also exactly
 them fly. In most other passages however it means merely I call to, although there is generally the collateral idea of $I$ exhort and command implied in it*.
"Еклєo see under К $\lambda \epsilon$ é $\omega$.
Kєvтé $\omega$, I prick, is regular. But Homer (Il. $\psi, 337$.) has the aor. 1. infin. $\kappa^{\prime} \nu \quad$ al from the stem KENT- which shows itself in kovtós, a pole.
 omission of $\nu$ before $\sigma$ in the one case, and of $\sigma$ between $\nu$ and $\tau$ in the others $\dagger$.

 forms are affected by syncope or rather by the metathesis (which we may see exemplified in $\beta \in ́ \beta \lambda \eta \kappa a$ under $\mathrm{Ba}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$,) joined with a contraction into $\bar{a}$ : thus perf. кє́кра̄ка; perf.
 $\mu \eta \nu$; but there is also an aor. 1. pass. є́кєра́ $\sigma \theta \eta$ י.

In the perfect pass. is found also кєкє́ $\rho a \sigma \mu \alpha$, but only in a later period, to which belongs also Anacr. 29, 13. On the other hand, Homer

[^166][^167] For the Ionians have the $\eta$ in кéкопиция, кр $\eta$ 㕸s, \&c. (KEPA, KPEA, KPH ), but in the Attic and common language the $\eta$ is changed on account of the $\rho$ into $\bar{\alpha}$ in this and other similar cases.
 кєра́кәөє, кєро́шンто. Comicus ap. Athen. 2. p. 48. а. кє́ра. Otherwise $\kappa \in \rho \hat{\omega}$ is the Att. future: see Hesych.
[In the fut. and aor. Homer doubles the $\sigma$ of the regular form, making кєр́́ $\sigma \sigma \omega$, éкє́рггбба.-Passow.]

The Homeric conj. képolvtaı, Il. $\delta, 260$. is not to be traced back to a theme KEP $\Omega$, but more analogically to кépapaı, like $\delta \dot{v} \nu \omega \mu$ иє conj. of


Lastly at Il. ८, 203. the text had until very lately the imperat. кє́paıрє, but now has from better sources кépate: see under $\Delta a i \omega$.

Kepoaive, I gain, is regular in the Attic language, and in the aor. takes the a like коь $\bar{a} \nu a \iota, ~ \lambda є v к a ̂ v a ı, ~ a n d ~ o t h e r s: ~$ thus fut. кєр $\delta a \check{\nu} \omega$; aor. 1.infin. кєрঠâvat. But the Ionics and many of the later writers form кєр $\delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu a \iota$, éкє́ $\rho \delta \eta \sigma a$.

This Ionic formation is undoubtedly the older, and -aive was originally nothing more that one mode of lengthening the present, as in
 original stem, and tò rép $\delta o s$ the verbal subst., as the analogy which it brings with it confirms. But in a very early period some imagined that
 $\lambda \epsilon v \kappa o ́ s, \& c .$, and they accordingly inflected all the tenses in the termination - aivw. Herodotus has both inflexions; the older кєє $\delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ 3, 72., є́кє́ $\rho \delta \eta \sigma a \nu 4,152$., the other кєр $\begin{gathered}\text { avéo } \mu \epsilon v, 8,60,3 \text {. This latter }\end{gathered}$ has in the Ion. dialect the aor. éкé $\rho \delta \eta$ ra, Hom. Epig. 14, 6.

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

Keí $\theta \omega$, I envelope, hide: fut. кєv́ $\sigma \omega$; perf. (synonymous with pres.)

pavyúw are formed like other verbs in $\mu_{t}$ (see "A $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega,{ }^{a} \gamma \nu v \mu t$ ) by changing the $\omega$ of the barytone form into $-\nu v \mu \iota$ or $-\nu v \dot{v} \omega$, only that when $\omega$ is preceded by a vowel, the $\nu$ is doubled, thus $\kappa \in \rho \alpha \dot{c} \omega$, $\kappa \in \rho \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \nu v \mu$.

Again $\kappa \iota \rho \nu a ́ \omega$, xíp $\nu \eta \mu$ are formed from $\kappa \in \rho \alpha ́ \omega$ by changing -á $\omega$ into $-\nu \dot{\alpha} \omega,-\nu \eta \mu \iota$, and in some verbs changing the $\epsilon$ of the
 compare $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega$, and $\Pi i \lambda \nu \eta \mu \iota$ from $\pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \omega$.
éxüov and 3．sing．without the augm．кú $\theta \epsilon, \mathrm{Od} . \gamma, 16$ ．，aor．2．conj： with the Ep．redupl．кervi $\theta \omega$ ，Od．$\zeta, 303$ ．Homer has also the aor． 1. conj．in the compound érıкє́voņs，Od．o，263．Of the passive we find only the pres．and imperf．Sophocles repeatedly［and Æschylus once］ use the active кєvi $\theta \omega$ ，and кéкєv $\theta$ ，as intrans．，I am hidden＊．

Kéw．See Keipat and Kaíw；also $\Delta \dot{\eta} \omega$ under $\Delta \mathrm{A}-$ ．
K $\eta \delta \delta \mu a \iota, I$ feel care and anxiety，occurs in prose merely in pres．and imperf．

The Epic language had at first an active in a causative sense，nij $\delta \omega$ ， I fill with care，fut．кךоঠŋ $\sigma \omega$ ，Il．$\omega, 240$ ．；afterwards a perf．кє́кク $\delta \alpha$, Tyrt． 3,28 ．synonymous with the pres．кńoouat．

The middle with a short vowel in the inflected syllable is found in Eschyl．Sept．138．in the imperat．кinfeaat：and the derivative verb
 from áк ${ }^{\prime} \delta \eta \sigma^{\prime}$ ：see Heyne．

In Il．$\theta, 353$ ．we find $\kappa є \kappa \alpha \delta \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ，which some commentators，look－ ing only at its exterior，have classed with кéкаঠоу，кєкаঠíjш（see Xá弓o－ $\mu a t$ ）；but the sense when critically examined is opposed to that deriva－ tiont，and in favour of the old one from кijסоцаи．And since the perf． кé $\kappa \eta \delta a$ is synonymous with the last－mentioned present，it is quite as agreeable to analogy to have a future formed from the one as from the other；and equally analogous is the shortening of the radical vowel re－ quired by the rhythm；and which takes place in the $\alpha$ ，because，as we see from the Doric кádoual（Pind．），$a$ is properly the vowel of the root： in this case therefore it is the Ionic $\check{a}$ ，as $\pi \alpha ́ \rho \eta$ for $\pi \eta \rho \alpha, \dot{a} \mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \ddot{\alpha} \tau \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega$ for


Kíivqut．See $\Sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \dot{\sigma} \nu \nu v \mu$ ．
KIK－．See Kıұávш．
Kє»入ı́бкш．See Ka入є́ш．

## Kıvé $\omega$ ，I move，is regular．

[^168]gods；or we must take it without the in－ terrogation（see Heyne），and understand ои́кє́тı $\chi$ áל̧є $\sigma$ aí тıvos in the sense of not deserting，and this said by those who， after having long deserted their friends， at last assist them．
$\ddagger$ I adopt this mode that I may not take кє́кa $\delta o \nu$ twice，once from $\chi a ́ \zeta \omega$ and once from $\kappa \eta \delta \delta \omega$ ，but that I may ground my ar－ gument on two actually existing forms，
 $\kappa \eta \delta a$ for кєка $\delta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a t$ from к $\boldsymbol{\eta} \delta \omega$ ．

In the passive it has an Epic sister-form kivuั $\mu \alpha \iota$, with a long like the active. This form must not be classed with kiw (which will be found below), for that verb never gives the idea of continuous motion as kcvú$\mu \epsilon v_{0}$ most plainly does at II. $\xi, 173$., where it is used of oil moved about or shaken : and in other places where civvpac is used of a crowd of combatants pressing on to battle, it does not express their moving forward, but only the tumult and bustle of their motion; compare Il. $\delta, 281.332 .427$. with Od. $\kappa, 556$. I consider it therefore more correct to give it a root for itself, KIN-, quatio*.

## Kípv $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. See Kєрávvv $\mu$.

 кix $\omega$, \& c. These are the only tenses found in the Attic poets; but the Epic language has (beside a new aor. midd. éкı$\chi \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu,-\sigma a \tau o)$ a very common preterite, which according to form is an imperf. of KIXE $\Omega$, KIXHMI, without however this pres. ind. having been ever actually in use. Hence come ékíxєıs (Od. $\omega, 283$.), 2. sing. imperf. for ékíx ${ }^{\prime}$, like
 - $\chi$ ér $\boldsymbol{i}$; to which we must add the moods of the present, as the opt.
 $\kappa \iota \chi \eta \mu \in \nu o s$; in which formation in $\mu$ therefore the $\eta$ is retained quite as far as it is in $\dot{a} \eta{ }^{\eta} v a \iota$ and $\delta \dot{\zeta} \zeta \eta \mu a \iota$. We find then (including the imperf. érixavor) four historic forms, which, from the momentary meaning that the verb has in itself, can with difficulty in the Epic language be divided according to the sense into aorist and imperfect, and which therefore in the narrative are interchanged with each other principally for no other reason than the metre. With this corresponds the circumstance, that the Epics have not the other moods of either $\kappa \iota \chi$ áv $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ or ếкıхov, but only those above quoted; consequently beyond the indicative they have no distinction between present and aorist. The earliest occurrence of the conj. кi$\chi{ }^{\omega}$, кi$\chi \eta s$, \&c. is in the Tragedians( Soph. Aj. 657. Eurip. Suppl. 1069.).

In all the above forms the Epics have the 1 short: and eercxov has this quantity in all the poets $\dagger$. But in $\kappa \iota \chi^{\prime} \nu \omega$ both the principal syllables are different in the Epic and Attic poets, the former having the $\iota$ short and the $a$ long, the latter the $\iota$ long and the $a$ short. Now as


[^169]> \&c.) comes under the analogy of those verbs which affix merely $-v \mu a \iota$ to the stem or root.
> + It was impossible therefore that Si monides could say êkǐé, a reading which Brunck (in Gnomicis) in Sim. Fr. 7. preferred to eैфїке.
some moderns have explained that to be the true Attic way of writing this verb, and even introduced it already into the latest editions of the Tragedians*.
 has been the cause of the general supposition that the stem of the verb is in ëкı$\chi^{0 \nu}$. Everything appears to me to lead to a form кíx $\eta \mu$ ( $\kappa \iota$ being a reduplication), with $\kappa \iota \not \subset a, \nu \omega$ as a sister-form, which in the present prevailed over the former. "Ekixov arose from écíx $\eta \nu$ by a shortening of the syllable, just as $\xi \dot{\nu} \nu u v$ did from $\xi \nu v^{\prime} \eta \nu$; and metrical causes confused the one with the other. According to this supposition the true stem or root is XE- or XA- (compare the note on $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu, \pi \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu)$, from which came $\kappa \iota \chi \bar{\alpha} \nu \omega$, like $\phi \theta \bar{a} \nu \omega$ from $\Phi \ominus A-$.

There is a Doric aor. 1. $\begin{gathered}\text { Ex } \\ \text { K } \\ \text { a }\end{gathered}$, moved away, pushed away, which Schneider in his Lexicon deduces from кi$\chi$ w. There is certainly nothing to hinder this new aorist being formed from ëxixov; but the grounds which I have laid down in Schol. Od. $\lambda, 579$. make me think it more eligible to give it a stem or root of its own KIK $\Omega$ : and this last supposition is confirmed by a fragment of Simonides, although as it now
 and Herodian in Bandini Bibl. Laur. Med. (Greca) p. 146. See Blomf. ad Callim. pag. ult. $\dagger$

## Кіхрпй. See Xра́a.

Ki $\omega$, I go; used only in pres. and imperf.; indeed the indic. pres. seldom or ever $\ddagger$ occurs (kiees, Escchyl. Ch. 676.); the other moods of the present however, as the optat. кiot $\mu$, part. кıw', \&c., together with the imperf., are in frequent use in Homer and the other poets. The part. pres. кiw'y has the accent on the last syllable, like i $\omega^{\prime} \nu$, but is not therefore an aorist; and the verb itself is to be considered as a sisterform of ' $1 \Omega, \varepsilon i \mu t, I g$.

To be satisfied that éstov is an imperf. we have only to look at Il. $\beta$,

[^170]duction of it. The above supposition that $\mathrm{ct}_{\mathrm{t}}$ - is a syllable of reduplication, agrees both with the fluctuation of the quantity, (as the Epics had both $\pi \check{\iota} \phi a v \sigma \pi \omega$ and $\pi \bar{\imath}$ $\phi a v \sigma \kappa \omega$, ) and with the form $\kappa \iota \gamma \chi a \dot{a} \nu \omega$, which has its analogy in $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu c$. That $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu t$ and кi$\chi a \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ were preferred to $\pi i \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ and $\kappa \iota \gamma \chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, (the two latter being also in use,) corresponds with other euphonic observances.
$t$ [Passow mentions (from kiкw) a rare poet. aor. êкі̌кор, infin. кєкєīข, and a Dor.

$\ddagger$ [Passow says that the indic. pres. is not used at all.]

588．$\zeta, 399$ ．；and that к火火$\nu$ is not an aor．we may be convinced by such

 usage of the participles $i \omega \nu$ ，${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu$ ，$\phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$ ，stated in the construction of participles in the syntax ；according to which therefore that sentence

 The verb kìvpua see above under Kıvéш．

K $\lambda{ }^{\prime} \zeta \omega, I$ sound，scream，\＆c．：fut．$\kappa \lambda a ́ \gamma \xi \omega^{*}$ ；aor． 1. ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \kappa \lambda a \gamma \xi a$ ；perf．кéклаүүa synonymous with the present；

 fut．кєк入áy $\left.\begin{array}{c} \\ \hline\end{array}\right)$ at，Aristoph．Vesp．929．930．Both futures are quoted by Suidas．There are other presents formed from some tense of $k \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$ ； for instance $\kappa \lambda a \gamma \gamma$ ét whence $\kappa \lambda a \gamma \gamma \in \hat{\nu} \tau \tau \iota$ ，Theocr．Epigr．6．and $\kappa \lambda a \gamma-$ $\gamma^{\alpha} \boldsymbol{a} \nu \omega$ ，which however is doubtful $\dagger$ ；see Schneid．ad Xen．Ven．4， 5.

In the Epic language this verb is also inflected with one $\gamma$ ．In the oldest poets however this is found only in the perf．к $\kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \gamma a$ ，used as a present，of which the part．masc．кєє $\lambda \eta \gamma \omega \dot{s}$ changes in its oblique cases to кєк入íyortos，as though formed from a new present кєк入íy（Hom．），
 ék $\lambda$ a yov is found in Hymn．Pan．14．and Eurip．Iph．A．1062．in the chorus．But the aor．1．$\check{\kappa} \kappa \lambda a \xi a \ddagger$ belongs merely to the Doric inflexion of $\kappa \lambda \epsilon i \omega$ ．［The regular aor．1．${ }^{\text {en }} \kappa \lambda a \gamma^{\xi} \xi a$ is used in a transit．sense in Pind．Pyth．4，40．Compare Æschyl．Sept．388．Agam．48．The presents $\kappa \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ or $\kappa \lambda \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \omega$ never occur．－Passow．］

K $\lambda a a^{\prime} \omega$, I weep，Att．к $\lambda a^{\prime} \omega$ with $a$ long and without con－ traction：fut．$\kappa \lambda a v \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota \S(\kappa \lambda a v \sigma o v ̂ \mu a \ell$, Aristoph．Pac．1081．）；
 Verbal adj．клavбтóc and клavтóc，кдаvбтéoc．－Midd． ［Passow remarks that the middle voice is used by Reschy－ lus Sept．903．but otherwise seldom found in the older writers．］

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

[^171][^172]ëk $\lambda a e \nu$ standing in the text of Theocr. 14, 32. but occurring nowhere else, has been altered by Hermann to ér $\kappa \lambda a i$; and no doubt correctly, for that imperf. exactly suits the passage, as it does also 23 , 17. in both which the description is that of a continuous-weeping.

K $\lambda a ́ \omega$, Ibreak: fut. $\kappa \lambda{ }^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ (with a short) ; aor. 1. ế $\lambda \bar{\alpha} \sigma a$; aor. l. pass. $\in \in \kappa \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; perf. pass. кє́к $\lambda \alpha \sigma \mu a \iota$. Thus the $a$ is short in the inflexion; and the passive takes $\sigma$.

In Anacr. Fr. 16. we find a syncopated aor. 2. part. úmokतís as from


K $\lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \omega, I$ shut, is regular: thus fut. $\kappa \lambda$ ei $\sigma \omega$, \&c. But the perf. pass. is both кéк $\kappa є \iota \sigma \mu a \iota$ and кéклєєцає; while the aor. 1. pass. is $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ only.

The Ionians pronounced this verb ${ }^{\lambda} \lambda \eta^{i} \omega$, and formed it $\dot{e} \kappa \lambda \bar{\eta} \tilde{i} \sigma a$, $\kappa \lambda \ddot{\eta} i \sigma a \iota, \kappa \in \kappa \lambda i \ddot{i} \mu a \iota$ without the $\sigma$, but always $\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \eta \dot{i} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$. These forms had therefore, like the corresponding ones from ric, $\mu \eta v i \omega, \& c$., the 1 according to the rules of formation long; consequently those editions of
 forms, from being written thus, are erroneously given to $\kappa \lambda \eta_{i}^{i} \zeta \omega$, which verb has, it is true, in the lexicons, the meaning of to shut, but improperly so; for the old writers know $\kappa \lambda \eta \eta_{i}^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ éc $\kappa \lambda$ jíca in no other sense than that of celebro, and $\kappa \lambda \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \omega$ éк $\lambda \dot{\prime} \bar{i} \sigma \alpha$ in that of claudo. Hence arose again an Attic form $\kappa \lambda \eta_{j}^{\prime} \omega$, ë $\kappa \lambda \eta \eta \sigma a$, which occurs frequently in the text, and still more frequently as a various reading in the manuscripts. Valckenaer's (ad Phoeniss. 268.) opinion, that $\kappa \lambda e i\left(\omega\right.$ must be older than $\kappa \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \omega$ because in the earlier times the $\eta$ was not yet come into use at Athens, is nothing to the point ; for the question here is, not how it was written, but how it was spoken : now as $\kappa \lambda$ eíc was the general form in use at a later period, $\kappa \lambda \eta_{i} \omega$ certainly appears to me, wherever it is found, to have great authority as a critical form of the oldest grammarians, who knew that the earlier Attics spoke it so. This decision is however very difficult to be supported through all writers. And equally difficult is it in the
 Theodosii Canones p. 1020, 25. Chœorob. in Ind. Bekk. v. кéклєє $\mu$ ィ: and among the moderns Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 729. Matth. ad Hecub. 482. Androm. 495. Schneid. v. клeíw*.

[^173]
 from кéкл $\eta \mu a \iota$ ：see ámокєкле́aтo，Herodot．9，50．and кєк入éarat（from ка入є́ $\omega$ ），2， 164.
 Dor．for $\kappa \lambda \eta i ́ \zeta \omega$ ：compare $\Gamma \epsilon \lambda a ́ \omega$ and $\theta \lambda a ́ \omega$ ．
There is one instance of a fut．2．$\kappa \lambda \omega \hat{\omega}$ as used by the Comic poet Eu－ polis according to a remarkable observation of Chœroboscus（F．279．v．） in Bekker＇s Excerpta．＂Herodian，＂it is there said，＂tells us that there is no fut．2．act．in use．Apollonius quotes some，but they are either invented by him，like $\phi v \gamma \omega \bar{\omega}, \delta \rho a \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ ，or they are presents．＂And then is added，＂solitary exceptions there are in $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \chi^{\epsilon \hat{\omega}}$ and in катaк $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \bar{\imath}$ from

 pass．кéк $\lambda_{\epsilon} \mu \mu \alpha \iota$ ，Att．кéк $\lambda_{\alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota: ~[a o r . ~ 1 . ~ p a s s . ~ e ́ к \lambda e ́ ~} \theta_{\eta \nu}$ ；］ aor．2．pass．є̇є $\lambda a ́ \pi \eta \nu$ ．

К $\lambda$ é $\omega \dagger$ ，$\kappa \lambda \epsilon \in i \omega, I$ celebrate；pass．$\kappa \lambda$ éo $\mu \alpha \iota, I$ am celebrated．In II．$\omega$ ，
 In Callim．Del．40．ék $\kappa \epsilon o \Delta \tilde{\eta} \lambda o s$ must at all events be accented like the above，éx $\lambda$ 白o，in as much as either celebrabaris is poet．for vocabaris，or the poet thought himself at liberty to use the syncope thus，éкa入白єo，

$K \lambda_{i}^{\prime} \nu \omega_{+}^{+}, I$ bend ：fut．$\kappa \lambda \check{\iota \nu} \hat{\omega}$ ；aor．1．$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \kappa \bar{\imath} \nu \alpha$ ；aor．1．midd．
 in Homer，but $\epsilon \in \kappa \lambda_{\imath} \nu \theta \eta \nu$ § exclusively Ep．and Poet．：much less frequent is the aor．2．pass．and perhaps used only in the compounds as катакג乞ॅท̂ขat，Plato and Aristoph．छvүката－
 $\kappa \lambda \check{\mu}$ ќvoc．－Midd．

Kגúv，I hear，a poetical verb，whose imperf．écivov is used as an

[^174]placed here merely on account of $\kappa \lambda$ éo $\mu a t$ ， some have wished to bring back to the text of Eurip．Alc．449．（461．）and Iph． A．1047．（1035．）．See Matthiæ on the former passage．
$\ddagger$ On the formation of the perf．and aor． 1．pass．，see Teív．
§ Examples however of $\kappa \lambda \iota \nu \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$ may be found in Plutarch（see Stephan．The－ saur．）；and in Æsop．Fab．143．Heusing．， but in this latter the reading is uncertain．
aorist，and also in the present sense of to be in the habit of hearing； see above in＂Evvєтov．Imperat．$\kappa \lambda \dot{v} \epsilon$ ，$\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \epsilon \tau \varepsilon$ ，more commonly $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \theta_{t}$ ， $\kappa \lambda \bar{\nu} \tau \epsilon$ ，like $\beta \tilde{\eta} \theta_{l}, \gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \theta_{l}$ ，\＆c．and with Homeric reduplication кé $\kappa \lambda \nu \theta_{l}$ ，
 part．pass．$\kappa \lambda \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu$ os synonymous with the verbal adj．к久vóós，celebrated．

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

КмА－．See Ка́ $\mu \nu \omega$ ．
Kıáw，I scrape，scratch，infin．кขầ，but in the more ac－ curate Att．writers к $\boldsymbol{\nu} \eta^{\eta} \nu$ ，like $\sigma \mu \bar{\eta} \nu$ and $\psi \hat{\eta} \nu^{*}$ ，Pollux，7，196．；
 $\kappa \nu \bar{\eta} \mu t$ ，is found onlya 3．sing．$\kappa \nu \bar{\eta}$ ，and that but once，Il．$\lambda, 639$ ． compare Herodot．7，139．－Midd．кvâбӨat，Att．кıท̂б0at， Plat．Gorg．p．494．c．Xen．Mem．1，2，30．（Schneid．3．）

K $\nu \omega ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, I$ sleep ：fut．к $\nu \omega \prime \sigma \omega$, \＆c．See＇Ap $\mu \dot{\sigma} \tau \tau \omega$ ：but examples of this verb are so rare that we cannot settle its inflexion with any grammatical certainty．In Apollon．3，690．the aor．1．катакrwoara is found in many of the manuscripts，but the old reading кuтaкvíaбovau is likewise in the best manuscripts（see Brunck），so that nothing can be decided in favour of either．
 to rest ：fut．коє $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \omega$, \＆c．Pass．（and in the Epics midd． also）I sleep．［Homer has the pass．кожд́оная with fut．кот－
 former is used by the poets only．－Passow．］
 more frequently кода́боцає（Xen．Anab．2，5，13．）；the apparently Attic forms of the fut：ко入 $\hat{\omega}$ ，midd．ко $\hat{\omega} \mu \mu t \dagger$ ， are used by Aristophanes，（Equ．459．）merely as a play on the word；the participle of the fut．midd．кодш́нероя（not
 we gather from Hesych．in voc．and from the explanation of

[^175][^176]the Scholiast．［This form is the more usual one in prose， instead of the poetical кoдov́w．In the present the Attics sometimes use the middle instead of the active ；see Schneid． and Heind．Xen．Cyrop．1，2，7．Plat．Menex．p．240．d． Stallb．Protag．p．324．c．But in the fut．they never use the active кодá $\sigma \omega$ ，Xen．Anab．2，5，13．Hellen．1，7， 20. Porson post Hemsterh．Plut．p．575．－Passow．］

Ko $\lambda$ ov $\omega$ ，I mutilate：fut．кодov́ $\omega, \& c$ ．The pass．is formed both with and without $\sigma$ ；thus perf．pass．кєко́доvдaє and $\kappa є \kappa о ́ \lambda о v \sigma \mu a \iota ; ~ a o r . ~ l . ~ p a s s . ~ є ̇ к о д о ⿱ 亠 乂 \theta \eta \nu ~ a n d ~ є ̇ к о д о v ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu . ~$

Schneider in Theophr．caus．plant．2，20．（15．）invariably reads ко－入ovo $9 \varepsilon i \sigma a$ ，ko $\begin{gathered}\text { ov } \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \text { on very slight authority ：but the form without the }\end{gathered}$
 in Philippi Epigr．25．is undisputed．


 and genuine form of the verb；whence the perf．pass．кє－ ко́viцat；and hence in the poets the only way of writing
 $\kappa о \nu \iota ̋ \sigma \omega$ ，perf．pass．кєко́vı $\mu$ а ，did not come into use until later＊．

Kóттн，I hew，cut down：fut．ко́ч̆ ；perf．кє́кофа；aor． 2．pass．èкóт $\boldsymbol{\text { r }}$ ．－Midd．

Homer has the perf．2．in the sense of the present，кєкотныs， $11 . \nu, 60$ ． Od．$\sigma, 334$.

Kоре́ขдขци，I satiate：fut．коре́бш；aor．l．є́ко́рєба．The

[^177]Timon．45．），that кeкovéévos and кeko－ $\nu \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s$ are both equally good，cannot，as applied there，be satisfactory：compare $\mu \eta \nu i \omega$ ．Whether，as some critics contend （see Valck．ad Theocr．1．c．），we ough：in Thom．Mag．instead of Kai кeкоขıa $\mu$ évos $\kappa a i ̀ \kappa \epsilon \kappa о \nu \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s ~ t o ~ r e a d ~ K a i ~ к є к о \nu \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́-~$ vos к．к．，and whether there be sufficient grounds for the rejection of coviāv in the sense of to cover with dust，requires per－ haps a closcr investigation．
 Midd.

The Att. fut. must have been кop $\hat{\text {, }}$, for the Epic one is кор $\hat{\epsilon} \omega$, Il. $\theta$, $379, \nu, 831$. The Ionic dialect takes the $\eta$ in the perf., as act. кєко́ $\eta \kappa \alpha$, pass. кєко́p $\mu$ at; and the Epic language has also a perf. part. with



 pass. кєко́рv $\begin{gathered}\mu \alpha \iota, \text { part. кєкори } \theta \mu \dot{\epsilon} v o s . ~\end{gathered}$

Kот $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega}$, and more frequently in midd. кот'́opac, I feel enmity against :
 This verb retains $\epsilon$ in the formation, except in the Ep. perf. part. кeко-
 $\theta \nu \mu \varphi$, Hom. The part. of the aor. 1. act. кот $\varepsilon \sigma a \sigma a$ occurs in Hymn. Cer. 254. The word is entirely poetical.
 Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 337. But instead of this present the perf. кéкра̄ $\gamma$ a (with the force of a pres.) is generally used,

 2. plur. imperat. of the perf. кєкрá $\gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ without syncope in Aristoph. Vesp. 415. is a very rare case; for we find scarcely any instance of the imperative of a perf. unless where that perf. is used as a present like the one before us, and even then in most cases a syncopated form is preferred. Compare $\gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \nu \epsilon$, and $\kappa є \chi \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ under Xáбк $\omega$.
 кр $\eta$ val, Od. ; aor. 1. pass. é é $\rho a ́ v \theta \eta \nu$, Pind. The Epic infin. fut. midd. in a pass. sense is краขє́є $\sigma \theta a \iota$, Il. 九, 622. In Eurip. Hippol. 1255. кé${ }_{\text {кр }}$ a $a \tau \alpha \mathrm{c}$ is 3 . plur. perf.; nor do I find any instance of it as 3 . sing. also. In the Epic language this verb is capable of being produced in all its tenses, as imperf. ékpaiaıvev, aor. 1.infin. кр $\overline{\eta \nu} \downarrow \iota$, perf. pass. кeкрáavтаı*.

[^178]the resolution of a contracted syllable, but a production by repeating the vowel or syllable, as $\phi \omega \bar{s}$ is contracted from $\phi \dot{a} o s$ and again produced to the Ep. фóws: compare also $\theta \bar{\omega} k o s, \theta$ ó $\omega k o s$ and $\theta a u ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ in Buttm. Lexil.

K $\rho \in \mu a ́ \nu \nu \bar{\nu} \mu$, I hang (anything) ; pass. I am hanged; midd. I hang myself: in addition to which comes a particular form for the intransit., крє́ $\mu a \mu a \iota, I$ am hanging. This last is conjugated like סv́va $\mu a \iota$ with conj. кр́́ $\mu \omega \mu a \iota$, opt. крє $\mu a i \mu \eta \nu^{*}$, кре́яаито. In the inflexion $a$ is short, as in the fut. крєна́бт and aor. l. '̇крє́́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\sigma} a$, and the pass. takes $\sigma$. The Att. fut. is $\kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \hat{\omega},-\hat{a} c,-\hat{a}, \& c$. The aor. 1. pass. éкрє $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ is common to the passive (with a passive and middle sense) and to the intransitive; but the fut. крє $\mu \alpha \sigma \theta$ п $\sigma о \mu a t ~ b e l o n g s ~ w h o l l y ~ t o ~$ $\kappa \rho є \mu и ́ v \nu v \mu$, as the intransit. sense has its own future крє$\mu \eta \sigma o \mu a t, I$ shall hang, be in a state of suspension.

This distinction of forms and meanings is, generally speaking, observed by the Attic writers, although it must not be expected that they had analogy so constantly before their eyes, as never to deviate from it. Forms of the middle are found both in Homer and Hesiod, as éxpé $\mu \omega, 2$. sing. aor. 1. for ékpé $\mu a \sigma o$, Il. o, 18. 21. and the aor. 1. infin. «рє $\mu$ и́ $\sigma \alpha-$ $\sigma \theta a 1$ (with an accus.) to hang anything on, Hes. $\epsilon, 627$. The pres. $\kappa \rho \varepsilon \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$ is used by the later writers $\dagger$. In the pure Attic language the only future is $\kappa \rho \varepsilon \mu \hat{\omega},-\hat{\psi} s$, \&c. Epic $\kappa р є \mu \dot{\omega} \omega$.

In Aristoph. Vesp. 298. all the manuscripts have the optat. кр $\varepsilon$ fooc $\theta e$ from крє́яадає, except the Venetian, which has крє́ $\mu \epsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, naturally leading us to кре́ $\mu \alpha \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon$. The other reading however is not to be rejected too hastily : compare $\mu a \rho v o i \mu \eta \nu, \mu \epsilon \mu v o l \mu \eta \nu$ with the accentuation of the optat. and conjunct. under $\Delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu u$. There must however have been a uniformity in Aristophanes, and we find in Nub. 868. Acharn. 944., at least as the text now stands, крє́ $\mu \alpha \iota$, крє́ $\mu u \tau 0$.

An Attic sister-form of this verb in the pres. and imperf. is кр $\kappa \mu \nu \eta \mu \iota$,
 $\eta$ in the radical syllable $\ddagger$. Hence this way of writing it may well appear doubtful, particularly as $\kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \nu$ - and $\kappa \rho \iota \mu \nu$ - are found occasionally in the manuscripts§. On the whole however they are in favour of the $\eta$; and we find кр $\quad \mu \nu \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ (without any known various reading) in Æschyl. Sept. 231. катакр $\not \mu \nu \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon v a \iota, ~ A r i s t o p h . ~ N u b . ~ 377 . ~ к р \eta \mu \nu a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu, ~ P i n d . ~$

[^179]$\mu t$ to крí $\mu \nu \eta \mu s$ : see note under Kєрáv$\nu v \mu$.
§ See Müncker ad Ant. Lib. 13. extr. Var. Lect. ad Eurip. El. 1217. Barnes. et Musgr. ad Eurip. Herc. 520. Piers. ad Mœr. v. 'Екрє $\mu \alpha ́ \nu \nu \nu є \nu$.

Pyth. 4, 43. the imperat. $\kappa \rho j \mu \nu \eta$, Etym. M. in voc. and in fragments of Euripides there quoted (see Piers. ad Moer. v. кiprq). Eustathius also on II. $\theta, 19$. (if any reliance is to be placed on it) expressly mentions the change of $\varepsilon$ to $\eta$. And lastly in the subst. кp $\eta \mu \nu$ ós (an overhanging precipice), which is of the same family, the $\eta$ is undoubted.

 1. pass. еंкрí诸 ( $\mathfrak{\imath}$ ). In Homer is also a poet. part. aor. pass. крıथөíc, Il. $\nu, 129$. Od. $\theta, 48$. This verb has a middle voice, but only in the Epic language (крivar日aı óveipova, to interpret, Il. $\epsilon, 150$.) : it has however two compounds, depon. midd.,

Hence in good writers the passive form $\dot{\alpha} \pi о к \rho \iota \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a t$ is nothing more

 longs to the later writers.

Крои́ $\omega$, I knock, push: perf. pass. кéкроขцає†, and кéкроибцає ; aor. l. pass. є́крои́бө $\eta$.-Midd.
 Pass. aor. 1. $\dot{e} \kappa \rho \dot{v} \phi \theta \eta \nu$; aor. 2. è $\kappa \rho \dot{v} \beta_{\eta \nu}(\breve{v})$.—Midd.

The aor. 2. act. ếepü $\beta o \nu$ and the forms with the simple characteristic $\phi$, as ëкpuфov, are found only in the later writers, Quintus, Nonnus, \&c. See also Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318. The Ep. imperf. крúлтaбкov (see $\dot{\rho}(\pi$ табког) is in Il. 0,272 . The perf. pass. кéкруццая in Od.

Kтáoцає, Ion. кт́́oцaı, Herodot., I get possession of, ob-
 possess, Hes. є, 439. Ion. є́кттпиає, Il. ı, 402. perf. conj.
 \&c. There is also another form of the perf. opt. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \varphi^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \S$

[^180][^181](like $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \varphi_{\mu}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ from $\mu^{\prime} \mu \nu \eta \mu a \iota$ ), of which we find $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau(\tilde{\prime} \mu \in \theta a$, Eurip. Heracl. 283. Compare Il. $\psi, 361$. Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 3.

In a somewhat later period we find the passive $\tau \dot{a} \kappa \tau \eta \theta \dot{\epsilon} \varphi \tau \alpha$. [Indeed ктáopaı as a passive is rare, and generally confined to the very late writers, Schæf. Schol. Par. Apollon. Rhod. 1, 695. Gnom. Græc. p. 145. sqq. Still however the aor. 1. pass. éxrín $\theta \eta$ occurs in a passive sense in Thucyd. 1, 123. the fem. part. aor. $\kappa \tau \eta \theta \in i \bar{\sigma} \alpha$ in Eurip. Hec. 453. and the perf. part. кєкт $\eta \mu$ évos in Thucyd. 7, 70. An active ктá $\omega$ is never found.-Passow.]
 aor. 2. ếктӑขov; perf. 2. ếктода. We have only to observe here that the aor. 1. is more common in prose than the aor. 2., and that the only perf. in use by the older writers is éктоva. The perf. pass. and aor. pass. were not used in the common language, but in their places the verb $\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ in a passive combination, $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \theta \nu \eta \kappa \in \nu$ or á $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \theta \theta a \nu \in \nu \dot{v} \pi^{\prime}$ aúzov̂.

From the opinions of the Grammarians which have come down to us
 we can extract nothing certain on the various forms of the perfect. The aor. 2. occurs in Xenophon more frequently, where however we must not forget the possible exchange of this verb with kaiveıv, kaveì'. See Sturz. in катактєірєוข. The perf. ёктака, а́тє́ктака, always however accompanied with the various reading éктаүка, was likewise in the written language from the time of Menander: see Meineke ad Men. p. 120. Schæf. ad Schol. Apollon. p. 147.*
from that tense, the termination of the opt. pres. oi $\mu \eta \nu$ was affixed to $\kappa \in \kappa \tau \eta$-, which contained the stem of the verb, making $\kappa \in \kappa \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$. This was changed according to Ionic custom (like $\nu \eta$ nós to $\nu \epsilon \omega \dot{s}$ ) to $\kappa \in \kappa \tau \epsilon \psi^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$, and again contracted by the Attics to $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \varphi \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$. The form in $-\dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ appears to have been preferred by the older Attics, that of $-\dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu \nu$ to be peculiar to Euripides and Xenophon.

* Of the two non-Attic forms êcrayка was undoubtedly the more disagreeable to the ear, while the better-sounding ékтака was recommended by the analogy of $\tau$ fтaка. I would therefore, contrary to the opinion of the above-mentioned philologists, acquit the language of Menander at least of having used that form, and in a
fragment of him preserved by Suidas defend the old reading (which is also that of the Ed. Mediol.) $\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa a \sigma t$. The direction in Thom. Mag. 'A $\pi$ éктоva кá入-
 $\mu 0 \nu \pi a ́ \nu \tau \eta$ is nonsense arising from repeated mistakes. In that passage three perfects must have been mentioned, and nothing can be more suited to the point in question than, 'A $\pi$ éктova кá $\lambda \lambda$ ıov $\grave{\eta}$
 $\tau \eta$. That is to say, the strict Atticist preferred the old Attic perfect to all others, even to the well-formed one of the later Attics; but against the form which he saw and heard everywhere around him he cautioned his readers in the strongest language. Mœris, whom we may with the

There existed also a perf．éктóv $\eta \kappa a$ ，formed like $\delta \in \delta o к \eta \mu \dot{e} v o s$ from $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\chi о \mu а \iota$ or $\mu є \mu$ о́ $\eta \tau a \iota$ from $\mu є і р о \mu а є$＊．Wherever this form occurs in the older Attics it is corrupted；as in Plat．Apol．p．38．c．the present reading taken from the best Codd．is $\dot{\text { ámeктóvare，and of Xen．Hier．3，}}$ 7．，the various reading áneкто⿱óras is in Stobæus：but we must allow that it is used by the later writers，for we find it in Plut．Timol．16．p． 137. in Parthen．24．and in all three manuscripts of Aristot．Elench．33， 2.

The Epic language had the aor．1．pass．both with and without the $\nu$ （see $K \lambda i \nu \omega$ and $T \epsilon i \nu \omega$ ），$\dot{\varepsilon}_{\kappa}^{\kappa} \tau \alpha \dot{\theta} \eta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \alpha ́ \nu \theta \eta \nu$ ，of which the latter was used again in the later prose，as ктav $\theta \hat{\eta} v a \iota$ in Dio Cassius（see Lobeck ad Phryn．p．36．），and кта⿱日өís，Brunck Anal．Ænigm．34．＂Eктä̈єv is Æol．3．plur．for éritáध $\begin{aligned} & \text { бav，Il．} \lambda, 691 \text { ．Od．} \delta, 537 .\end{aligned}$

Homer has the syncopated aorist，corresponding with the aor．2．，like
 $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ，\＆c．and 3．plur．ëкта⿱ for－aбav；opt．ктаіŋ $\boldsymbol{\text { ；infin．кта́ } \mu \epsilon \nu , ~ к \tau \alpha ́ - ~}$ $\mu \epsilon \nu a l$ for $\kappa \tau \dot{a}$ val ；part．ктás．The Homeric conj．is $\kappa \tau \in \in \omega$ for $\kappa \tau \bar{\omega}$（like $i \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ for $\check{\iota \quad} \sigma \tau \omega \overline{\text { ；}}$ ；see＂I $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$ ），whence $\kappa \tau \epsilon \in \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，Od．$\chi, 216$ ．To this we must add a corresponding aorist midd．with passive meaning，ékтá $\mu \eta \nu$ †，
 formed as from ктíш．Homer has also an Epic conj．pres．ктеìvout， Od．$\tau, 490$.

The fut．in Hom．is the common one $\kappa \tau \in \nu \hat{\omega}$ ，but always in a resolved form ктєย $\dot{\epsilon} \omega$ ，－$\epsilon \in \epsilon s$ ，$-\epsilon \in \ell$ ，in which the manuscripts agree in almost every instance：only the compound with karí takes，as universally，the change
 sequently they are fut．midd．with a passive sense．To these we must
 ever as regards the sense a doubt still prevails．Both old and modern commentators agree indeed that it is a future，translating it＂and he who wishes to slay is himself slain＂（for the aor．катéкта is here used in the sense of to be accustomed to slay）．But the context immediately
 are slain＂$\ddagger$ ；which leads us to conjecture that from ктагеiv arose $a$ new

[^182][^183]present кта ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \omega$ ，by which the continuation of the action appears to have been expressed，just as it is by è $\boldsymbol{\pi} \iota \tau$ patéovat in $\kappa, 421$ ．
An Attic sister－form of this verb for the pres．and imperf．in prose is ктi $\nu \nu v \mu \mathrm{c}$ ；for so this form is generally written in the text；but the manuscripts fluctuate between $\iota$ and $\epsilon \ell, \nu$ and $\nu \nu^{*}$ ．

Kтi弓 $\omega$, I found，build：fut．iow，\＆c．The part．pass．ктífevos（like
 Kтеì $\omega$ ），and the verb adj．ктетós，which occur in the compounds éërтi－


Kтvォén，I resound：fut．ктипク̆ош，\＆c．is regular：but the Epics have
 true primitive form or stem of the verb，and the subst．ктívos as well as $\kappa т v \pi \epsilon \in \omega$ are derivatives from it．

Kv入ivס $\omega$ and $\kappa v \lambda i \omega$, I roll（anything）．The only forma－ tion which occurs from these two verbs is fut．$\kappa v \lambda \iota \iota \sigma \omega$ ；aor．
 кєки́入ıбцаь．－Midd．To these we must add a lengthened present кu入ıঠס́é $\dagger$ ，which，in its present tense only，is the prevailing form in Attic prose．

The two fuller forms of the present are used in preference to the other， when it is wished to express certain modifications of the sense implying a continuation of motion（see the lexicons）；yet no fixed distinction can be laid down，and all three occur in the simple sense of to roll，push． Homer has exclusively the form $\kappa v \lambda i \nu \delta \omega$（of which he uses only pres． and imperf．）with the aor．$\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa v \lambda i \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ．It is also probable that кv入ívo $\omega$ ， fut．$\kappa v \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ，was the original form of this verb，and that $\kappa v \lambda i \omega$ ，which is found in the later poets，arose merely from the fut．cudiow．

With the midd．kv入ıvঠeïनal，to roll（neut．），correspond three other forms，

$$
\dot{a} \lambda \iota \delta \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota, \kappa a \lambda \iota v \delta \varepsilon i \sigma \theta a u, \varepsilon i \lambda \iota \nu \delta \varepsilon i \sigma \theta c u \text {, }
$$

[^184]either drop one $\nu$ or shorten the $\varepsilon \in$ to $t$ ． The latter is the most current tradition ； but ктєívvرє is found in the best manu－ scripts，as for instance almost invariably in the Cod．Clark．of Plato．Hence I con－ jecture that this is also the opinion of
 is now the reading there，is owing to the common corruption of $t$ for $\epsilon$ ．
$\dagger$ Of this form we find only the present， but it is probable that the formation in $\cdot \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ，which we see just below in the verbs similarly formed，was borrowed from this．
all used in the intransitive sense of to roll, turn, or drive round; and these
 $\delta \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \notin$, Plut. Agis 3., and in a passage quoted by Stephens é $\gamma \kappa \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \lambda \iota \nu-$ $\delta \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta$. The form $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu \delta \epsilon i \sigma \theta a c ~ i s ~ p r e-e m i n e n t l y ~ t h e ~ A t t i c, ~ a n d ~ o f ~ t h i s ~$ alone we find an active voice with the meaning of to make (a horse) roll, lead him out to roll on the exercise-ground,
for these are the only forms which occur (see Piers. ad Mœr. p. 51.), and they are evidently from $\dot{a} \lambda i \nu \delta \omega, \dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \omega$. See all these forms detailed fully in Buttm. Lexil. p. 396., \&c.
 The comp. $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v v e ́ \epsilon, ~ I ~ s a l u t e, ~ w o r s h i p, ~ i s ~ r e g u l a r ~ ; ~ b u t ~ i n ~$ verse it has also the aor. infin. тробки́oat, e. g. in Soph. Phil. 657. Aristoph. Equ. 156. See Kv́w.

Kúat $\boldsymbol{\tau}, I$ bow, bend forward, is regular : fut. кú $\psi \omega$; perf. кє́кӣфа.

The length of the $v$ is not merely in the perfect (see for instance Epig. incert. 125.), but in the stem or root itself, as is plain from words of the same family, like ки́pos; it must therefore remain long in syllables long by position, and consequently be written кӣభat, like $\pi \in ́ \pi \rho \rho \bar{a} \gamma a, \pi \rho a ̄ \xi a \iota$ and the like.

K $\check{p} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, I meet with, an Ionic verb, used by the Attics for $\tau v \gamma \chi^{\alpha} \nu \omega$ in poetry only $\ddagger$, is regular, But the poets made use also of the older barytone form with $v$ long, кíp $\omega$, which however is not very frequent. Thus we find the imperf. éкípouv, and in Soph. EEd. C. 1159. ëкvipov, whence 3. sing. кî̀, ll. $\psi$, 821.§. Fut. кข̆ $\bar{\eta} \sigma \omega$ and кípow; aor.

 кípoas, Il. $\gamma, 23$. The formation from кípo is more usual in all the poets than that from кvрéw. The midd. ки́poнat is used as a deponent in Il. $\omega, 530$.

[^185]which it would be so desirable to ascertain. § The pres, act. кv́pw has been also restored to some passages by criticism on which we may depend: see Herm. ad Soph. Aj. 307. Matth. ad Eurip. Hipp. 741. with which I may reckon the passage in Aj. (314. Br.), where Hermann has left $\kappa v \rho \in i$, but the reading of the Scholiast, $\kappa$ vjpoc, is more agreeable. Nor would I reject his historical information that the Attics used in the optat. кv́pos rather than kvpoin (or кvроï).

Kv́e and кvéćs, I am pregnant. The formation through all the moods and tenses is $\kappa v i n \sigma \omega$, \&c. To these we mar add an inchoative form кvî̃кш , and кvî́бкодаи, I conceive

To fix the usage between кv́ $\omega$ and $\kappa v^{\prime} \omega$ is difficult, because the forms which occur most frequently vary only in the accent, as кúé кveî, кíovaa кvov̀ $\sigma$, \&c. In Plato however (where in all other instances of this kind the accent fluctuates in the manuscripts, and in Thert. p. 151. b. we find both кíovza and кvov̂vтa,) all the manuscripts have in the following
 which seems to me to settle the question as far as regards this writer*. In the authors of a later period the only decisive forms which I have found are in fuvour of ќv$\omega \dagger$; for instance, ćvoritu, Aristot. H. A. 7, 5. тà кvó $\mu \in \nu a$ тaudia, id. Probl. (see Stephens) : tò òè кúєтat, is in the womb, Poll. 5. 12. p. 73. ërve, Æl. V. H. 5, 18.; while the accent in Aristotle and the later writers is pretty decisive in favour of this same form. Now as Homer has кuéovãv, Il. $\psi, 266$. and éкúєє, $\tau, 117$. perhaps we may be safest in attributing кueiv to the older, and кuecı to the later writers. That is to say, the stem or root KY - with the meaning of to have in itself, is indisputably the old foundation of the verb, which in a very early period took the lengthened form of a present, $\kappa v \in \epsilon \omega$, like $\sigma \tau v \gamma^{\prime} \omega$, ктvтє́ $\omega$, \&c. To the simple stem belonged also, as in other,
 êkü̃e रaîar, Æschyl. Fr. Danaid. ap. Athen. 13. p. 600. : and with this
 fering herself to be impregnated", conceiving, which form, on account of its apparent affinity with к'voaı (see Kıvé $\omega$ ), is erroneously written with double $\sigma$. To express the same meaning was afterwards formed a preseṇt кviíroopaı (Aristot.); with which the active кvírkw as inchoative from кvé $\omega$ was synonymous $\ddagger$.

[^186]Lexicon [and Passow follows him,] takes $\kappa v i \sigma \kappa \omega$ to be the causative of кviбко $\mu \boldsymbol{l}$, consequently in the sense of to impregnate; but all the passages in which the word occurs lead to the conclusion that the active voice is synonymous with the passive. See Poll. 4. extr. Schol. Theocr. 2,66. Stephan. Thesaur. Hippocr. De Steril.

## $\Lambda$.


 from $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \omega)$, or $\Lambda \in ́ \lambda o \gamma \chi a^{*}$, which the Atticists rejected: see Lucian Solœc. 7.

The fut. $\lambda \hat{i} \xi \xi^{\circ} \mu \iota \iota$ appears to have been rare : I find it in Plat. Repub.
 with $\alpha$ short according to the Ion. analogy of changing $\eta$ into short $\alpha$.

In this verb the aor. with reduplication, $\lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha^{\alpha} \chi \omega \tau \iota, \lambda \epsilon \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \chi \eta \tau \varepsilon$, Hom., is not the same as the common aor. 2. but has the causative sense to make a person partaker of, as in II. $\eta, 80$.
 and poetic (Eurip.) defective deponent, used only in pres. and imperfect.

## лАК-. See ^á

 perat. $\lambda a ́ \beta e$ and $\lambda \breve{a} \beta_{e ́ ~(s e e ~}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \rho \chi о \mu a \iota$ ), infin. $\lambda \breve{a} \beta \varepsilon \hat{\varepsilon} \imath v$, part. $\lambda a ̆ \beta \dot{\omega} v$; perf. єíl $\lambda \eta \phi$ with $\approx$ prefixed instead of redupli-


The regular augment of the perf. occurs however sometimes in the dramatic writers: in the perf. pass. for instance instead of $\varepsilon \ddot{\iota} \lambda \eta \mu \mu \mu$, we find $\lambda e ́ \lambda \eta \mu \mu a \iota$, Æschyl. Agam. 885. Eurip. Ion. 1113. Aristoph. Eccl. 1090.

The Ionics have in the perf. act. $\lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda^{\prime} \hat{a}^{\beta} \eta \kappa \alpha$, Herodot. 3, 42, 4, 79. 8,122 . and (retaining the $\mu$ of the pres.) a fut. $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \psi \not \psi \mu a t$; perf. pass.
 rodot. and a verbal adj. $\lambda a \mu \pi \tau$ éos $\ddagger$. The Dorics likewise have $\lambda_{e} \lambda^{\prime}$ $\beta \eta \kappa a$, and in pass. $\lambda e ́ \lambda a \mu \mu a \iota, \lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda a \varphi \phi \theta a \iota$ with a long for $\eta$. In the fut. they have also $\lambda a \psi о \hat{v} \mu a \iota$ and $\lambda a \psi \varepsilon \bar{v} \mu a$. The Epics and Ionics have the aor. 2. $\lambda$ áßerкov, Hes. Fr. 61. and Herodot.

[^187]gloss ávalèáq日at in Erotian and Hesychius refers without doubt to it: but although this latter way of writing the perf. corresponds with the Ionicism ( $\lambda$ é$\lambda a \mu \mu \alpha \iota,-\alpha \dot{\phi} \theta a \iota$ with short $a$ for $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \mu \mu \alpha \iota$, as in $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda a \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \lambda \dot{a} \xi_{0} \mu \alpha \iota, 8 c$.), yet the former way agrees too well with the other forms, and (to mention one,) with $\lambda a \mu-$ $\pi \tau$ éos, Herodot. 3, 127. extr., for us to hesitate a moment in retaining it.
 whence in comp. è $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \mu \psi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, Herodot. 1, 80. 8, 74.; perf. $\lambda e ́ \lambda a \mu \pi a$, Eurip. Androm. 1025. Tro. 1295.
$\Lambda a \nu \theta a ́ v a$, less frequently $\lambda \hat{i} \theta \omega^{*}$ (Xenoph.), I lie hid, am concealed: fut. $\lambda \eta$ そ́ $\sigma \omega$; aor. 2. ể $\lambda$ ă $\theta o v$, infin. $\lambda a \theta \in \hat{\epsilon} v$; perf. $\lambda e ́ \lambda \eta \theta a$, synonymous with the present. Midd. $\lambda a v \theta^{\prime} v o \mu a t$, less frequently $\lambda_{i}^{\prime} \theta_{0} \mu a \iota, ~ I ~ f o r g e t ; ~ f u t . ~ \lambda i ́ \sigma о \mu a \imath ; ~ a o r . ~ 2 . ~ e ́ \lambda a-~$ $\theta_{o ́ \mu \eta \nu}$; perf. $\lambda e ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \mu a t$.

^íборає occurs in the sense of to be concealed, in Aristot. Analyt. Prior. 2, 21. Apollon. 3, 737. The passive $\lambda \eta \sigma \dot{u} \mu \in \nu$ vs (obliviscendus) in Soph. El. 1248. is a lyric licence. The aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ is frequently used by the later poets; see Mosch. 3, 63. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 719. Theocritus has the aor. 1. pass. é $\begin{aligned} & \prime \prime \\ & \sigma\end{aligned} \eta \nu$ : he has also made a depon. pass. from the midd. in the infin. aor. $\lambda a \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\lambda \eta \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a$, 2, 46. The Dorics have also $\lambda \bar{a} \sigma \bar{\omega}$ for $\lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \omega$, and in the midd. $\lambda \bar{a} \sigma \epsilon \bar{v}-$ $\mu a \iota$ for $\lambda \dot{\prime} \sigma о \mu a \iota$.

For $\lambda \dot{e} \lambda \eta \sigma \mu a \iota$ the Epics have $\lambda e ́ \lambda a \sigma \mu a \iota$ with short Ionic $a$. Pindar O1. 10,4 . uses the perf. act. $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\alpha} \theta a$ for the perf. pass. with the sense of $I$ have forgotten.

The Epic $\lambda_{\epsilon \lambda a \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota}$ is the same as $\lambda_{a} \theta_{\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota}$ according to the analogy of $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \mu \omega$, \&c. (see Ká $\mu \nu \omega$ ), I1. $\mu, 235$. compared with $\tau, 136 . \dagger$. But the active form $\lambda \epsilon \lambda a \theta e i \nu$ is distinguished in usage from $\lambda a \theta \epsilon i \nu$, in as much as it is the exact causative of $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda a \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a t$, in the sense of to make to forget, Il. o, 60. $\beta, 600$. Hymn. Ven. 40. Theocritus, in order to express this meaning in the present tense, merely changed the accent, and retained the reduplication, using rò̀ éк $\lambda \in \lambda$ á $\theta_{o \nu \tau a}$ as a fixed epithet for Hades $\ddagger$.

This same sense of causing to forget is expressed by the aor. 1. (which does not occur elsewhere) in Od. $v, 85$. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \varepsilon \nu \dot{a} \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ : and undoubtedly that meaning belonged also to the pres. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \lambda i \hat{\theta} \theta$, of which we find in Od. $\delta, 221$. the neut. part. ${ }^{3} \pi \iota \lambda \bar{\eta} \theta o \nu$, if we follow some of

[^188]formed from perfects (such as icioix $\omega$, 15,58 . \&c.), not only because there is no perf. $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{a} \theta a$, but because $\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \theta \alpha$ has not this meaning. We may be sure that Theocr. had merely the Homeric ée入é$\lambda \alpha \theta \mathrm{ov}$ (11. $\beta, 600$.) in his mind, and from it formed this part. pres., forsaking the proper analogy, as was frequently done by the later poets who imitated Homer.
the grammarians in accenting it thus instead of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \lambda \eta \theta_{0} \nu$ as an adjective*. In another passage Homer has for this sense a particular present $\lambda \eta \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$, ék $\kappa \eta \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \varepsilon \iota$, Od. $\eta, 221$. Of rare occurrence is the form ${ }_{\text {ék }} \times \boldsymbol{\lambda} \alpha \sigma$ us in Alcæus ap. Hephæst. Gaisf. p. 16.
^á $\sigma \kappa \omega, I$ sound, speak: fut. $\lambda \bar{a} \kappa i ́ \sigma \omega$; fut. midd. $\lambda \alpha к i ́ f \sigma \mu a t, ~ A r i-~$
 aor. 2. midd. $\mathfrak{e ́ \lambda a \kappa o ́ \mu \eta \nu ; ~ p e r f . ~ a c t . ~} \lambda$ é̀ā́кa synonymous with the present.

That $\Lambda A K$ - is the stem of this verb is evident from the aor. 2.: the $\sigma$ in the present is therefore inserted to strengthen it, as in "i $\sigma \times \omega$ from eiks, $\tau \iota \tau \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega$ from $\tau \in \dot{\chi} \chi \omega$. This however is only the Attic form; the
 which belong to the Attics, can according to analogy be formed only from the aor. 2. édakov, גaкeiv, and have therefore the a short, as ap-


The Epics have the Ionic $\eta$ in the perf. also, $\lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$, but shorten it
 They have likewise the aor. 2. midd. with redupl., $\lambda \in \lambda$ ácovto, Hymn. Merc. 145.
$\Lambda a ́ \omega$. See $\Lambda \hat{\omega}$.
АЕГХ-. See $\Lambda a \gamma \chi^{\alpha} \nu \omega$.
$\Lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$, in the sense of to say, has no perf. act. ${ }_{+}$, and in the pass. the perf. $\lambda^{\prime} \lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \gamma \mu a \iota}$ and aor. l. $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon ́ \in \theta \eta \nu$. But in the compounds, which have the meaning of to collect, to choose, the perf. is ( $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \chi^{a}$ ) ovvei $\lambda_{0} \chi^{a}, e^{\prime} \xi \in i \lambda o \chi^{a}, \& c$.; and this augment remains also most commonly in the passive, $\kappa \alpha-$

[^189]$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, together with the particular form $\lambda \eta \theta a ́ \nu \omega$ (see above), attached themselves to this particular meaning.

+ We may well therefore be surprised at $\delta \iota a \lambda \bar{\alpha} \kappa \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma a \sigma a$ in Nub. 410. of the same writer: unless perhaps we suppose that in this longer word the syllable was lengthened by a licence approaching nearly to the Epic.- [Passow has סla$\lambda \bar{\alpha} \kappa \in \in \omega$ from $\lambda a \kappa \in ́ \in \omega$ Dor. for $\lambda \eta \kappa \in ́ \omega$, and quotes as his authority the above passage.]
$\ddagger$ The perf. act. was in less general use than the other tenses, and where really wanted its place was frequently supplied by the perf. pass., as $\epsilon \bar{v} \lambda$ र́̀ $\epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha i ́ ~ \sigma o \iota ~ f o r ~$ єü $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \chi a s$.
 $\gamma \eta \nu$. The depon. סıa入é $\gamma \boldsymbol{\mu} a \iota, I$ discourse, has also סıé$\lambda_{\text {e }} \mu$ aı; but in the aor. 1. $\delta_{\iota} \in \lambda^{\prime} \chi \chi^{\theta \eta \nu}$, for which Aristotle has $\delta_{\iota} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \eta \nu$, Top. 7, 4, 2. 8, 3, 7 .

In the old poetry the aorists of this family of verbs have another and
 $\mu \eta \nu$, I lay down to sleep (myself); and in a similar sense to this aor. midd. is used also the syncopated aor. $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \mu \eta \nu$, $\begin{gathered}\text { è } \\ \epsilon\end{gathered} \kappa \tau о$, \&c., with the imperat. $\lambda \in \in \notin o$ or $\lambda \in \in \xi \varepsilon$. The pres. and imperf. never occur with this


Beside the above, the syncop. aor. has also some of the meanings belonging to the ideas to reckon, to collect together, sometimes as a middle, in the sense of to choose oneself, offer oneself as a companion to others,
 $\theta \mu$ ór, he counted the number, $\delta, 451$.
$\Lambda \operatorname{ei} \pi \omega$, I leave, fut. $\lambda$ ei $\psi \omega$, has in the active voice in ge-
 $\lambda$ édotia.-Midd.

The aor. 2. midd. '่̇ $\lambda \pi \sigma^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$, with a kind of passive meaning, I was left, I remained behind, is very common in the Epic poets, e. g. Od. $\delta$, 710. $\nu, 286$. and is found also in the later prose of Lucian; see Schæf. ad Greg. p. 463.
In the pure times of the language the aor. 1. è $\lambda \epsilon \iota \psi a$ belonged solely to $\lambda e i \beta \omega$; it is occasionally however found as the aor. of $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \omega$ in the older writers, as in Aristoph. ap. Antiatt. Bekk. p. 106. Pythag. Aur. Carm. 70., but in the later writers it is more common ; see Schæf. Gnom. Græc. p. 148. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 713. For the pluperf. énєєाтo see $\gamma_{\varepsilon} \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ under $\Gamma \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$. In the formation of the aor. 1. pass. the $\epsilon v$ of the present was shortened to $v$, as $\tau \epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \omega \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \dot{u} \chi \forall \eta \nu$, and sometimes in the dialects a change took place of $\varepsilon \iota$ to $\iota$, as ék $\lambda \iota \phi \theta \epsilon v$, Callim. Cer. 94. See Ernesti on this passage, and Brunck on Apollon. Rhod. 1, 1325.
$\Lambda \varepsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \chi^{\omega}$ is regular. For $\lambda_{\epsilon \lambda \epsilon є} \chi \mu$ ótes see $\Lambda \iota \chi \mu \bar{\sigma} \theta \theta u$.
$\Lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega, ~ I ~ s h e l l, ~ p e e l, ~ \& c . ~ T h i s ~ v e r b, ~ l i k e ~ \beta \lambda e ́ \pi \omega, ~ \lambda e ́ ~ \gamma \omega, ~$ $\pi \lambda$ é $\kappa \omega, \phi \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \omega, \psi \in ́ \gamma \omega$, does not change the radical $\epsilon$ in forming the aor. 2. pass., as, $\epsilon^{\prime} \phi \lambda^{\epsilon} \neq \eta \nu, \beta \lambda_{\epsilon \pi \epsilon i c, ~ \& c . ~}^{\text {c }}$

[^190]$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi ı \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$ is very common: yet in Isocr. Paneg. p. 81. b. Bekker has adopted from

$\Lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega^{*}, I$ see．The fut．$\lambda \in \dot{v} \sigma \omega$ and aor．1．É̀ $\lambda \in v \sigma a$ are certainly not old forms，if indeed they are Greek，Reisig Comm．Critt．de Soph．CEd． C．120．We find indeed éncvoas in Eschyl．Pers．707．，but the ac－ knowledged reading is now the imperf．é $\lambda \epsilon v \sigma \sigma \epsilon s$ ．Again in Soph．©ed． C．1197．入єv́бク！s is a very probable emendation for $\lambda \dot{v} \sigma \nLeftarrow s$, but Tyrwhitt＇s reading $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \eta s$ is as good or better．
$\Lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{u}^{\boldsymbol{v}}, I$ stone．The pass．takes $\sigma$ ．

$\Lambda \hat{\jmath} \theta \omega$ ．See $\Lambda \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\prime} a^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ．
$\Lambda \eta \kappa$ éw．See $\Lambda$ á $\sigma \kappa \omega$ ．
МHX－．See $\Lambda a \gamma \chi^{\prime} v \omega$ ．
Lıá̧ $\omega, I$ bend（anything）．Pass．I bend myself，turn aside：see Buttm．

\iү $\xi_{\epsilon} \beta$ ós，the bow twanged，II．$\delta, 125$ ．For this form a pres．$\lambda i \zeta_{1}$ has been supposed，according to the analogy of $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega, \kappa \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega, \sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$ ； but it nowhere occurs $\dagger$ ．
\ı入aíouaı，I desire，long for；formed from $\lambda$＇á $\omega$（see $\Lambda \bar{\omega}$ ）by redupli－ cation．It is used only in pres．and imperfect．But from $\lambda_{\iota} \lambda$ áw or $\lambda_{\iota} \lambda_{\epsilon ́ \omega}^{\omega}$（ $\lambda_{\iota} \lambda \epsilon \imath \imath \cdot \phi \theta$ ovєî，$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Hesych．）comes the perf．$\lambda \in \lambda i ́ \eta \mu \iota \iota, I$ strive，hasten，for $\lambda \in \lambda i \lambda \eta \mu a \iota$ ：see Buttm．Lexil．p． 406.

 the aor．1．the Ep．l．pers．$\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma a \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ and the Ep．imperat．$\lambda i \sigma \sigma \sigma a \iota$ ；and of the aor．2．the infin．$\lambda$ їтє́ $\sigma \theta a \iota$ and optat．$\lambda$ йтоí $\mu \eta$ ．This is one of the few verbs whose pure theme（from which comes the aor．2．）is used
 Thesm． 313.

ムıхиј́oцaı，I protrude the tongue．We mention this verb for the sake of observing that the Hesiodic participle $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \chi \mu$ óтєs bears the same re－ lation to it as $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \mu \nu \kappa \alpha$ does to $\mu v \kappa \bar{c} \sigma \theta a t$ ；for the diphthong of the radical $\lambda \varepsilon i \chi \omega$ entering into the participle seems to be founded on the natural inclination of the perfect for a long vowel．This participial form and two others very similar，
$\pi є \emptyset ฺ \zeta$ そ́́тєs，Hom．，
$\mu є \mu \nu$ לо́тє，Antim．ap．Eust．ad Od．v，401．p．523，46．Basil．，


[^191]in the later authors，and in the sense of to give a superficial wound，graze，scratch， consequently akin to the Homeric $\lambda i$－ $\gamma i \eta v$ ．He forms $\lambda i \gamma \xi \in$ from $\lambda i \gamma \gamma($ ，and comnects it with $\lambda i ́ \gamma a, \lambda ı y$ ús．］
appear to be remains of the earlier periods of the language, when analogies formed subsequently were not yet in existence. In virtue of their characteristic letters ( $\zeta$ and $\chi \mu$ ) they are not analogous to the perf. 1. or perf. 2. (perf. midd.) : and except in these participles the perfects themselves never occur : nor in the sentence does their connection with the context resemble that of a verb, but rather of an adjective descriptive of the situation or continuous motion of an object. I am therefore inclined to consider them as old verbal adjectives formed something like participles perfect, instances of which we find in German and other languages*. For a more particular account of this verb see Buttm. Lexil. p. 546. and note.
 dialect shorten, in the imperf. of the active and in the pres. and imperf. of the passive voice, all the forms which have $\epsilon$ and o in the termination, as in the imperf. é é ${ }^{\prime}$ ov for é édove,

 ad Phryn. p. 189.

Homer has a 3. sing. aor. 2. גóe, Od. $\kappa$, 361.; and in Hymn. Ap. 120. is a 3. plur. 入óov $\dagger$ : from $\lambda o \varepsilon ́ \omega$ he has an imperf. é $\lambda o ́ e v v$, and an infin.

 in addition to which he uses all the common as well as the abridged forms. The most natural way therefore of treating this verb is to suppose that from the simple stem $\lambda o ́ \omega$ càme the lengthened one $\lambda o \epsilon \in \omega$ (compare $K \dot{v} \omega, \kappa v \dot{\varepsilon} \omega)$, and from this by contraction the common $\lambda o u ́ \omega$, $\begin{gathered}\lambda \\ \lambda \\ \text { ovaa. }\end{gathered}$ 'Eגov́eov, Hymn. Cer. 290. is a form of $\lambda$ dov́ again produced or resolved.

With regard to those abridged forms, the accentuation of é $\lambda o \tilde{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu$,
 4,5.4. lead us to suppose that they are contracted from $\lambda$ ów, è $\boldsymbol{e}_{0} o \mu \epsilon r^{\prime}$, \&c., which is confirmed by the infin. doṽ $_{\nu}$ as quoted from Hippocr. in Galeni Gloss. ; although in the works of Hippocr. it is always written Xovect. Accordingly we do not with some of the older grammarians reckon $\lambda o u ̈ \mu a \iota$ among the examples of the syncope like oípat, but sup-

[^192]+ [In Hes. $\epsilon_{.} 751$. Schneider is correct in having accented it $\lambda_{0} \sigma \theta$ at as the infin. aor. midd. : and instead of $\lambda_{\text {óet (Scol. 21, }}$ 4. Br.) the true accentuation is $\lambda_{o \in i}^{i}$. Passow.]
pose the verb in common use to be a mixture of the contractions of the two old forms $\lambda \boldsymbol{o}^{\omega} \omega$ and $\lambda$ oé $\omega$＊．

This statement is fully confirmed by a further piece of information from Bekker＇s labours on Aristophanes．In Nub．838．the old reading is ＂$\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ тє $\theta \nu \epsilon \omega \bar{\omega} о$ каталои́єє $\mu$ ои то̀v 人iov，where the verb is the 2．sing． midd．，＂thou squanderest my property in bathing＂；see the Scholia． Brunck assisted the metre by the reading of a Paris manuscript，$\mu$ оv ка－ та入oúєı，by which truth as well as error was glossed over．We know now that the former reading is in all the other manuscripts，particularly in the two best（Ravennas and Venetus）；and by this Bekker discovered a sure trace of the true reading，ката入óєь．That is to say，in the indic． pass．the shorter form was the only current one in the old Attic dialect； hence in the 2．sing．they did not use dovet，which is the same as the 3. sing．indic．act．，but preferred the shorter form；not however in the in－ harmonious contraction $\lambda o i$ ，but without the contraction $\lambda$ íeı $\dagger$ ．

The 2．and 3 ．sing．of the pres．act．also might certainly have been $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota$ ，$\lambda$ óєı；but these persons were undoubtedly occupied by $\lambda o v ́ \omega$ ，which had already established itself in all the dialects in the 1 ．sing．，as it

[^193]bably because it was strange to the gram－ marians，who rejected it wherever it oc－ curred in the way that it does in the be－ fore－mentioned passage of Aristophanes． On the other hand è $\lambda o v o v$ is expressly objected to；consequently the form re－ commended in its stead，which is the very one we are in search of，whether it be čं $\lambda o v \sigma o$ or $\dot{\lambda} \lambda o \hat{v}$（from $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda o ́ o v$ ），has been omitted by mistake．Now the gloss of Hesychius，$\Lambda o v, \lambda o v ̃ \sigma a \ell$ ，will assist us in discovering it．Here $\lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \hat{v}$ cannot be the imperat．act．，because it is impossible that in a verb whose active and middle voice are so essentially different，it could be explained by the imperat．of the aor． middle．It is therefore the imperative of the pres．midd．（contracted from $\lambda$ óov） which the grammarians did not hesitate to explain by the imperat．aor．，because in the imperative the difference of these tenses is but trifling，and in other in－ stances very conmonly overlooked by the grammarians．This analogy shows us also with certainty the 2 ．sing．imperf． $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda_{o} \hat{v}$ ，which by a very conceivable over－ sight was omitted in Phrynichus before غ่रov̂ro．The abridged form in the pas－ sive voice is therefore，when completed，

 perat．$\lambda_{0}$ v．
did also in the optat. $\lambda \frac{v_{0}}{} \mu \mu$, -оi $\mu \eta \nu$, in the conj. 入ov́w, - $\eta \mathrm{s}$, \&c., in the part. $\lambda$ oú $\omega v$, and probably also in the imperat. act. $\lambda o v e$. See note in the preceding page.
$\Lambda \dot{v} \omega, I$ loose : fut. $\lambda \dot{v} \sigma \omega(\bar{v})$; aor. 1. è $\lambda \bar{v} \sigma a$; perf. $\lambda \in ́ \lambda \nu ้ \kappa a ;$ perf. pass. $\lambda e ́ \lambda \check{\nu} \mu a \iota$; pluperf. é $\lambda \in \lambda v v_{\mu \eta \nu}$; aor. 1. pass. è $\lambda u ́-$ $\theta_{\eta \nu}(\stackrel{v}{v})$.

This verb together with $\delta \dot{v} \omega$ and $\theta \dot{v} \omega$ shortens the $v$ in the perf. act. and in the perf. and aor. pass. : see Chœroboscus p. 1286. Draco pp. 45, 26. 87, 25. Compare also $\Delta \dot{v} \omega$ and $\Theta_{u ́ \omega}$.

In Od. $\sigma, 238$. Homer has the 3. sing. optat. perf. pass. $\lambda \dot{e} \bar{\lambda} \bar{v} \tau o$ for $\lambda \in \lambda$ vocto; where the $v$ is lengthened by its absorbing the $\iota$ of the optative; and the accent on the antepenult., though not according to the directions of the Grammarians, is yet agreeable to analogy, and corresponds with $\delta a i v v \pi o$ in Hom. and $\pi \eta$ 'jvuro in Plato, as they are found accented in the great majority of the manuscripts. Again from an Epic syncop. aor. pass. é $\begin{gathered}\lambda \\ \mu\end{gathered} \eta \nu$ (corresponding with the regular aor. 2. midd.), Homer has a 1. and 3. sing. $\lambda \dot{v} \mu \eta \eta^{2}, \lambda \dot{\tau} \tau 0$, and 3. plur. $\lambda \dot{v} \nu \tau 0$. An imperat. syncop. aor. act. $\lambda \bar{v} \theta_{\iota}$ (for $\lambda \bar{v} \sigma o r$ ) in Pind. ap. Etym. M. v. $\varepsilon_{i} \theta_{v}-$ pa $\mu$ ßos may perhaps have been formed merely on account of the play on etymology there mentioned; for which it was quite sufficient that the form, though not in use, should be strictly analogical.
$\Lambda \hat{\omega}$, I wish, desire, a Doric defective verb, the only remains of an old theme $\Lambda A \Omega$, used only in the three persons of the sing. $\lambda \bar{\omega}, \lambda \hat{\eta} s, \lambda \hat{\eta}, 3$. plur. $\lambda \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$, optat. $\lambda \in \epsilon \epsilon \mu \iota$, Hesych. infin. $\lambda \bar{\eta} \nu$; compare Markl. Eurip. Suppl. 221.

## M.

Maivopat, I am mad, has a fut. midd. and an aor. 2.
 has the meaning of the present. But the aor. 1. act. $\epsilon_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \eta_{\nu \sim}$, Aristoph. Thesm. 561. has the causative meaning to make mad, in which tense, and indeed in the present also, the compound éк $\kappa$ nive is more usual.

The fut. 2. pass. $\mu$ ăvíбoнac is not Attic*; see Mœr. and Thom. Mag. the perf. pass. $\mu \in \mu_{u} \nu \eta \mu a t$ is used in Theocrit. 10, 31. in the same sense as the pres. $\mu$ аігода.

[^194]
## Maiopal. Sec MA $\Omega$.

## MAK-. See Mŋки́гиси.

Manкı $\eta$, is an Attic infin. mentioned by Phrynichus (in Lex. Seg. p. 51.), Photius and Hesych. from $\mu a \lambda_{\kappa} \iota a ́ t, I$ am frost-bitten. Perhaps the suspected form $\mu \alpha \lambda_{\kappa \iota \epsilon i v ~ i n ~}^{\text {El }}$. N. A. 9, 4. should be $\mu a \lambda_{\kappa \iota} \hat{\eta} \nu$. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 82.

 'Акахícш. The aor. pass. is wanting.

The Dor. fut. 2. $\mu \tilde{\theta} \theta \epsilon \bar{v} \mu a \iota$ for $\mu \mu \theta o \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha \iota$, Theocr. 2, 60. (like $\mu a \chi o \bar{v} \mu a \iota$,


Матє́єı . See Míápтть.
Mápvăдat, I contend, fight; used only in pres. and imperf. which
 but the optat. is $\mu a \rho \nu o i \mu \eta \gamma, \mathrm{Od} . \lambda, 512$. imperf. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a \rho \nu a \dot{\mu} \eta \nu$. [But غ́ยарráa日 $\eta \nu$, Il. $\eta, 301$. is an aor.-Passow.]
 Hes. $e, 206$. To these must be added the Ep. aor. 2. with redupl.



Mapтvpéc ( $v$ short), I bear witness (for or against a person or of a thing). Мартv́poнaı (v long) depon. midd. I call as a witness.

In this case the active $\mu \pi \rho \tau \dot{v} \rho \omega$, which is not in use, must be considered as the causative to $\mu \mu \rho \tau v \rho \in ́ \omega, I$ cause witness to be borne; and $\mu$ пртípopat the midd. of it, I cause witness to be borne for myself, call to vitness.
 Aristoph. Equ. 55 ; perf. pass. $\mu е ́ \mu а ј ј а є, ~ i b . ~ 57 . ~ A l s o ~$ aor. 2. pass.

See also in note to Maiopaı, p. 172. another $\mu \dot{i} \sigma \sigma \omega$ which has been erroneously supposed to exist.

Máхоцаı, I fight: fut. $\mu а \chi$ є́боцаь and more generally



The perf. $\mu е \mu$ кх $\eta \mu \mu \boldsymbol{\text { is }}$ in Isocr. Archid. p. 127. b. Another form of the perf. $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\chi} є \sigma \mu \mu$, found in good manuscripts in Xenoph. Cyr. 7, 1,
14. would be recommended by analogy, but the context makes the common reading preferable, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \varepsilon \nu \xi \nu \mu \mu a \chi \epsilon \sigma a \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$. The form $\mu a \chi$ етéov in Plato Sophist. p. 249. c. Rep. 2. p. 380. b. is supported by the authority of good manuscripts.

When in Homer the metre requires a long syllable the reading fluctuates between $\epsilon \sigma \sigma$ and $\eta \sigma$, yet so that the text (at least as it is lhanded down to us) and a great majority of the manuscripts have in the fut.


The Ionics had also in the pres. $\mu$ ахєо $о \iota$ ( $\mu$ ахєото, Il. a, 272. буццаұє́єтає, Herodot. 7, 239.), which form therefore as to time is
 only : see Fisch. 3. p. 131. Schweigh. Lex. Herodot., and compare II. $\beta, 366$. not. Heyn. Homer has, on account of so many short syllables following each other, lengthened each of the vowels in the pres.


MA-. To this stem or root belong three poetical verbs $\dagger$ :

1. $\mu$ '́ $\mu a, I$ strive after, am eager, desire; a perf. with the force of a pres., of which however we find in use only the 3. plur. $\mu є \mu \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{a} \tau$, and the syncopated 1. plur. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu$ ă $\mu \epsilon \nu$, 2. plur. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu$ व̆тє, 2. dual $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \ddot{̈} \tau о \nu$, the 3. sing. imperat. $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$, 3. plur. pluperf. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \kappa \bar{i} \sigma a v$, and the part.
 tos, Il. $\beta, 818$. Theocr. 25, 105. compare $\beta \in \beta a \omega$ 's and $\gamma \in \gamma a\left({ }^{\prime} s\right.$.-The form $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \alpha \epsilon \nu$ in Theocr. 25, 64. is a false reading $\ddagger$. That all these forms are connected immediately with $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \mu 0 \gamma a$, will be shown under Mévш.

[^195]separate them. The identity of the first verb with $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ \nu a, \mu \in ́ \nu o s$, will be shown under Mévw; but then it does not unite so immediately with $\mu \alpha i ́ \sigma \sigma \theta a$, ė $\pi \iota \iota a ́ \sigma \alpha-$ $\sigma \theta a t, \mu a ́ \sigma \tau \iota \xi$, (which evidently come from the physical idea of feeling,) as grammatical and exegetic etymology requirc. We therefore place together, in pursuance of our present object, three verbs only, leaving to the philosophical philologist to extend the inquiry.
$\ddagger$ If $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \alpha \in \nu$ be a true reading, it is one example among many of the later poets having misunderstood the older ones and attributed to then forms which they never used. At all events it cannot be a perf.,
 which is an aor. with reduplication. Brunck has with some probability preferred $\mu$ é $\mu о \nu \epsilon$, but the context requires the imperf. (pluperf.) consequently $\mu \epsilon$ -

2. $\mu \bar{\omega} \mu a \ell$, I desire, seek after: part. $\mu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon$ ध os (Soph. ©Ed. C. 836.) contracted from $\mu$ íо $\mu \iota$; but the $\omega$ generally prevails, as in the infin. $\mu \hat{\omega} \sigma \theta a t$, Theogn. 769. the imperat. $\mu \dot{\omega} \varepsilon о$, Epicharm. ap. Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 20. formed as from $\mu \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \iota$. Compare $\mu \nu \dot{\omega} \epsilon$ f from $\mu \nu$ áo $\mu \iota \iota \mu \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \iota$ under Mı $\mu \nu \dot{\prime} \neq \kappa \omega$, and Záw: see also Toup. ad Suid. v. ©̈xpós.
3. $\mu \mathrm{a}$ iopar, I feel, touch; seek for, desire. To this belong the fut. $\mu$ ácouat, aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$, with $a$ short; but occurring principally in the compounds, as infin. aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota, ~ O d . ~ \lambda, 591$. fut. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \dot{́} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau a \ell$,
 this aor. answer exactly to each other, we may see by such passages as
 vá $\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota *$.-Verb. adj. $\mu a \sigma=o ́ s$.

Me日ve, I am drunken, used only in pres. and imperf., takes its other tenses from the pass., as, é $\mu \in \theta_{v} \sigma 0 \eta \nu, \& c .:$ for the other tenses of the active, as $\dot{e} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \breve{v} \sigma a, \& c$., belong to $\mu \in \theta \dot{v \sigma \kappa \omega}$, I make drunken $\dagger$.

Meipouct, I share, partake, obtain. The older poets have (beside this present, Il. 九, 616. Theogn. 1228.) a 3. sing. ë $\mu \mu \circ \rho \epsilon$. This is plainly
 has a king received such honour." The later Epics use it in the same way, e. g. Apollon, 3, 4. є̈ $\mu \mu о р \epsilon s$. And ${ }_{c}$ we might perhaps consider it as an aor. in all the Epic passages, even when by the context it has evidently the force of a present, " he has obtained, he obtained, i. e. he has." In other cases, however, it will be more natural to take it as a
 $\theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu}{ }^{\text {č }} \xi \in \epsilon ้ \mu \mu о \rho \epsilon \tau \iota \mu \bar{\eta} s$, " now is she a partaker of divine honours." And this is confirmed by the Doric 'E $\mu \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a \nu \tau \iota^{\prime}$ тєтєíXuat, Hesych. $\ddagger$.

This perf. 2. as well as the aor. 2. belong therefore, according to the analogy given in the note below $\S$, to the immediate meaning, with which the midd. $\mu \epsilon i \rho o \mu \alpha \iota$ was used in the present. The act. $\mu \epsilon i \rho \omega$ (properly to divide, whence $\mu$ épos) had therefore the causative sense to give out in

[^196][^197]shares, to allot, whence comes the perf. pass., which occurs only in the third person :

єїцарнає, 3. pers. єінартає* (with the syllable $\epsilon i$ instead of the reduplication like єi $\lambda \eta \phi а$, єí $\eta к а, \& \mathrm{c}$.), it is allotted by fate, it is fated: part. єірарнє́voc: ì єіцарие́vך (scil. $\mu \mathrm{i} \rho \mathrm{o})$ that which is allotted to any one, his fate, destiny.


In Apollonius 1, 646. 973. we find in a similar sense $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\rho} \rho \eta \tau \alpha \iota$, and in 3, 1130. $\mu \epsilon \mu \circ \rho \mu$ évos: the latter with the change of vowel to o retained in the perf. pass. as in iँopro, áwpoo, the former according to the
 (see Kтeiv $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ ).

Mé $\lambda \lambda \omega$, I am about to do a thing, intend to do it: fut. $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. é $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma a, I$ have delayed doing it. The Attics add the temporal augment to the syllabic one of the imperfect making $\eta_{\mu} \mu \lambda \lambda o \nu$, like ${ }^{\prime} \delta \partial_{v \nu a ́ \mu \eta \nu, ~ \eta} \beta_{o v \lambda o ́ \mu \eta \nu: ~ s e e ~}$ Boúdomat.

Mé̀ $\pi \omega$, midd. $\mu \hat{e} \lambda \pi о \mu a \iota, I$ sing, play. It has no perfect.
Mé $\lambda \omega, I$ am an object of care or concern, I vex, go to the heart, is used in the active voice principally in the third person; pres. $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon t, \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda n v \sigma t$; imperf. ${ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$; fut. $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon t$; infin. pres. $\mu \in ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$, fut. $\mu \in \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \nu, \& c$., it is an object of care, \&c. Pass. $\mu$ é $\lambda о \mu a t, I$ am careful of, anxious about, more generally є̀ $\pi є \mu$ е́ $\lambda о \mu a \iota, ~-\eta ́ \sigma о \mu а є, ~ \& c . ~$

The personal use of the active is in its nature rare, according to which it means, for instance, to be the object of care, e. g. "̌a veptépout $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$, Eurip. Andr. 851. Now as this is most commonly said of impersonal objects, the third persons are naturally the most familiar ; and thus arose the impersonal usage. The compound $\mu \epsilon \tau a \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, it repents,

[^198][^199]admits indeed of no other. The passive $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda o \mu a t$ bears exactly the same relation to the imperf. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, as $\bar{i} \hat{e ́ o} \mu a \iota$ does to $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$.

The forms of the compound $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \mu е \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, \&c., are generally placed with $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \mu \varepsilon \lambda \in i \hat{\sigma} \theta a t$, which is an exactly synonymous sister-form of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t-$ $\mu \dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \sigma 0 a t$; but this latter is declared by the Atticists (see Mœer. and Thom. Mag.) to be less pure than the former. Both are, however, of such frequent occurrence in our editions, that no one can decide which was the original reading of any separate passage. Still there is no doubt of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ being the older form, to which the inflexion of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda i j \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ originally belonged.

The perf. $\mu \epsilon \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \kappa \varepsilon \in \mu o t$ has generally the meaning of, I have been considering about a thing, it has been an object of my care and thought, e. g. Xen. Mem. 3, 6, 10. But the Epic language has a perf. 2. $\mu$ é $\mu \eta \lambda \epsilon$, Dor. $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu a \lambda \epsilon$, which has the same meaning as the present, it lies at my heart, is a source of care and anxiety to me: to which we must add the pluperf. $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \mu \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ with the force of an imperf., Il. $\beta, 614$. The same perf. has, however, sometimes the personal meaning of the pass. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda о \mu a 1$; in the first place as a real perfect, ruv̀ra $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta \lambda a s$, these things hast thou thought carefully about, invented, Hymn. Mcrc. 437. and next equally as much like a present, $\mu \epsilon \mu \eta \lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \tau \tau$ vós, thinking carefully, anxiously about anything, intent upon it, Il. $\epsilon, 708 . \nu, 297$.

The pass. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda o \mu a t$ is also used poetically for $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \hat{\lambda} \omega$, as $\mu \epsilon \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \omega \sigma o t$, Od. $\kappa, 505$. ${ }_{\psi}^{\mathcal{~}}{ }^{2} \mu \epsilon \lambda \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, cui curce sumus, Eurip. Hipp. 60. in which sense we find also the perf. as a pres. and consequently the pluperf. as imperf., $\sigma o \ell \quad \mu \epsilon \mu$ é $\lambda \eta \tau 0$, tibi cura erat, Theocr. 17, 46. in which usage it has undergone also an Epic abridgement, as perf. $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \beta \lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota$, pluperf. $\mu e ́ \mu \beta \lambda є т о$, Il. т, 343. $\phi, 516$. Hes. $\theta, 61$.* like $\mu є \sigma \eta \mu \beta р i ́ a ~ f r o m ~ \grave{\eta} \mu$ épa. - [The aor. 1. pass. $\mu \in \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} v a t$ is sometimes used actively, to have taken care of, ráфov, Soph. Aj. 1184. sometimes passively, to be taken care of, Epig. Ad. 112, 3.-Passow.]
 a perfect.
[This verb occurs first in Hes. e, 188. and Theogn. 795. 871.; but more frequently in Pindar and Herodotus: it is found also in the Attics; as Thucyd. 7, 77. Plato and Isocrates.-Passow.] The Ionics and Tragedians use in a similar deponent sense the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi \theta \eta \nu$ also.

[^200]formed. But it is far more correct to compare this with the similar perfects $\mu$ é$\mu \nu \epsilon 0$ for $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \sigma o$, and $\dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\eta} \rho \epsilon \mu \alpha \iota$.

Méve, I remain: Epic fut. $\mu \in r^{\prime} \in ́ \omega$, Attic contracted $\mu \in \nu \hat{\omega}$;
 Plato Rep. 1. p. 328. b.

The Ionic and poet. perfect $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{r}$, I feel a strong desire, I am determined, $I$ intend, (Herodot. 6, 84. Il. $\varepsilon, 482 . \omega, 657$. \&c.) belongs to a stem or family differing in meaning from the above $\mu \epsilon \nu \omega$, as we see from its derivative тò $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} v o s$, from which again is derived another Epic verb,

 time the analogy of $\gamma \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ a $\gamma \in \gamma^{\prime} a \pi \iota \nu$ \&c. leads to one evident remark, that the relation between those two perfects is the same as between $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu о \jmath^{\prime} \alpha$ and $\mu \epsilon \mu a ́ a \sigma \iota 1$ \&c., which latter correspond also in meaning. All this must prevent us from placing $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ \nu a$, which could not be done without violence, among the forms of $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, to remain; although Euripides, who uses $\mu$ é $\mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \varepsilon$ quite in the old sense at Iph. T. 656. di$\delta \nu \mu \alpha \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\phi} \rho i \boldsymbol{i} \nu$, has the same word in another passage (Iph. A. 1495.) for $\mu$ éveє; this latter is however merely an instance of Lyric caprice, without proving anything as to the language.

METI $\Omega$, or $\mu \epsilon \tau i \eta \mu \ell$, Ion. for $\mu \epsilon \theta i \eta \mu t$; of which we find among others the 3. pres. $\mu \epsilon \tau i \epsilon \iota$, Herodot. 6, 37.59. ; the 3. sing. imperf. midd. $\mu \epsilon$ тiєто (or $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \epsilon \tau i \epsilon \tau о)$ for $\mu \epsilon$ Өiєto, Herodot. 1, 12. ; the infin. fut. midd. $\mu \epsilon \tau i j \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \varepsilon$
 vos, Herodot. According to the analogy of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$ the 3. sing. pres. should be accented $\mu \epsilon \tau \iota \epsilon i$, and $\mu \epsilon \tau i \varepsilon \iota$ should be the imperf.; see Heyne on II. $\zeta, 523$. where Wolf now reads in his last edition $\mu \epsilon \theta_{\iota}$ is. Compare the simple "I $\eta \mu$.

M $\eta \kappa$ ќouat, I bleat, cry out : probably a depon. midd. like ника́одаи.

This verb has some simpler Epic forms; e. g. $\mu \varepsilon \mu_{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\kappa \alpha}$ with the force of a pres. whence part. $\mu \epsilon \mu \eta \kappa \omega$ 's, Il. $\kappa, 362$. and fem. with the short Ion. $a, \mu \varepsilon \mu \ddot{\kappa} v \tilde{\mu} a$, I1. $\delta, 435$. And as this perf. had the sense of a present,
 кov, Hes. $a, 76 . \theta, 673$. To this we must add the aor. éf $\mu$ ккоу, of which however only the part. $\mu \alpha \kappa \dot{\omega} v$ remains, Il. $\pi, 469$. compare Od. $\kappa, 163$. Thus this verb is strictly analogous to the Epic forms of $\mu v \kappa \dot{\alpha} о \mu a \iota$.

[^201][^202]Maiva, I stain, defile: fut. миà ; aor. l. épinva, Att. also é éiàva, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 24. ; aor. 1. pass. é $\mu a^{2} \nu-$ $\theta_{\eta \nu}$; perf. pass. $\mu \not \mu_{i}^{\prime} a \sigma \mu a \iota$.

At II. $\delta, 146$. $\mu$ á $\nu \theta \eta \nu$ ait $\mu a \tau \iota ~ \mu \eta \rho o i$, the verb is either the 3. dual or plural. The old grammarians explained it to be for $\mu u \nu \nu_{i} i \tau \eta \nu$, but of such an abbreviation no other instance is to be found; the moderns have considered it to be for $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu(a ́ v \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$, but the $\eta$ is so unusual in the abridged 3 plur., that no example of it can be adduced even in the dia-
 consider therefore $\mu a^{\prime} r \theta \eta \nu$ to be the dual of a syncop. aor. pass. : (3.
 both of which the $\sigma$ is dropped before the $\theta$.

Mijvv $\mu$, or $\mu i \sigma \gamma \omega \dagger, I$ mix: fut. $\mu i \xi \omega, \& c$. Pass. aor. 1.
 Plat. Legg. 12. p. 951. d.

In the old-Attic inscriptions the derivatives of this verb are very often written with $\epsilon \iota$, as $\varepsilon_{v} \mu \mu \epsilon \kappa \tau a$, which shows that the $\iota$ (except in the aor. 2. pass.) is long. We must therefore write $\mu \hat{\xi}$ al.

Mı $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$, I remind, has from MNA $\Omega$ a fut. $\mu \nu \nu_{i} \sigma \omega$ and
 member, also I mention; aor. 1. é $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; fut. $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \sigma \mu u$; verbal adj. $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau o ́ c$. The perf. pass. $\mu$ é $\mu \nu \eta \mu a \iota$ has the force of a present, I remember, whence imper. $\mu$ '́ $\mu \nu \eta \sigma o$, optat. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta_{\prime}^{\prime} \eta \nu$, Il. $\omega, 745$. Att. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \frac{i}{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ and $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \varphi_{\dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu, ~ H e r m . ~}^{\text {. }}$ Soph. CEd. T. 49. (whence $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \bar{\varphi} \tau о$, Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 3. contracted from the Ion. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \epsilon \varphi \varphi_{\mu} \mu \nu, \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \in \notin \tau \tau$, Il. $\left.\psi, 361.\right)$, conj. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \omega \mu a t,-\eta,-\eta \tau a t$, \&c. $\ddagger$. To this perf. belong the pluperf. é $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \mu \eta \nu$ (whence Ion. 3. plur. é $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu$ éaтo for є́ $\mu$ ́́ $\mu \nu \eta \nu \tau о$, Herodot. 2, 104.), and the fut. 3. (paullo-post fut.) $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta$ поодає, Herod. 8, 62.

[^203]$\dagger$ [Mioy $\omega$ is used by Hom. and the Attics, and by Herodot. exclusively, particularly in the pass. voice. The common pres. $\mu i \gamma_{\nu v} \mu i$ is never found in Hom. either act. or pass. : in the fut. he has the midd. $\mu i \xi \% \mu a \ell$, and the pass. $\mu \check{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$, while Hes. has $\mu \epsilon \mu i \xi о \mu a \iota$.-Passow.]
$\ddagger$ See Kтáo $\mu$ ає with notes.

Ionic abbreviations are ( $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \varepsilon \alpha \iota) \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\nu} \eta$ 2. sing. indicat. for $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta-$ $\sigma a \iota$, Hom., and $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \nu \varepsilon$ imperat. for $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \nu \eta \sigma o$, Herodot. 5, 105 : compare $\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \beta \lambda \epsilon \tau a c$ under $M \in \in \lambda \omega$.

The radical form $\mu \nu a \dot{c} \mu a \iota, \mu \nu \bar{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota$ is in the above sense solely Ionic, in which dialect the $a$ is changed into $\epsilon$, consequently we have 3. sing.

 $\mu \epsilon v o s:$ again by the Ionic lengthening of $\omega$ to $\omega 0$ (like $\gamma \in \lambda \dot{\omega} o \nu \tau \epsilon s, \dot{\eta} \beta \dot{\omega} \omega \nu-$ $\tau \epsilon s,{ }_{i} \beta_{0} \boldsymbol{\mu} \tau \tau$ perat. $\mu \nu \dot{\omega} \epsilon \sigma$, Apollon. Rh., and the part. $\mu \nu \omega \omega^{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ os, Od. The fut. of
 the aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ with the sense of to remember, $\tau$ tvos, Hom. - In the meaning of to woo, $\mu \nu \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is used not only in Homer but also in the common langhage.

MY-. We will here place the following verbs by the side of each other, that it may be at once seen in what they correspond and in what they differ :

Mué $\omega$, I initiate into the mysteries, is regular.
Mív, (whence also катаци́ш, каццiv $\omega$ ) I shut, close, e.g. the lips, eyes, \&c., and used both transit. and intransit. This verb is regular. Perf. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \notin \bar{v} \kappa \alpha, I$ am shut, I am silent.

Mú乡由, I emit a sound by compressing the lips and breathing loud through the nose, I moan, grumble; aor. 1. ${ }^{\text {ép }} \mu \sigma a$, Hippocr. (of the rumbling of the intestines; see Foes. and Schneider): but ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu v \xi a, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \in \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \nu \xi \alpha \nu$ are used by Homer as sounds of anger and reproach. This latter formation, wiṭh $\gamma$ as its characteristic, is common to many verbs which express
 oi $\mu \dot{\omega} \zeta \omega$, whence $\mu v \gamma \mu o ́ s, ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon v a \gamma \mu o ́ s, ~ o i \mu \omega \gamma \mu o ́ s, ~ \& c$.

Mú $\zeta \omega$, I suck : fut. $\mu v \zeta \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma$, \&c., from which inflexion first arose, it appears, in a later æra the pres. $\mu v \zeta{ }^{\prime} \omega{ }^{\omega} \omega$ and $\mu \nu \zeta^{\prime} \epsilon \omega^{*}$.

Mú $\sigma \sigma \omega, \mu \dot{v} \tau \tau \omega$, but more generally $\dot{a} \pi о \mu \dot{v} \tau \tau \omega$, emungo: fut. $\mu \dot{v} \xi \omega, \& c$.-Midd.
[The simple verb occurs only in the writings of the Grammarians and

[^204][^205] emungo.-Passow.]

Mūка́оцає, I bellow, roar: Dep. midd.
From the simple stem of this verb the Epics have formed a perf. with the force of a pres. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \bar{v} \kappa \alpha$, part. $\mu \epsilon \mu v \kappa \dot{\omega} s$, and an aor. $\ddot{\epsilon} \mu \check{v} k o v$.


## N.

Nateráw, I dwell. This Epic verb is never contracted, nor, except in one instance, produced, but is almost invariably found in a purely resolved form, as vaıєтá $\omega$, Od. 九 21. vaıєтáєь, Hes. $\theta, 775$. vaıєtáovat,
 the regular production is in the imperf. vaueraaarov, and of an irregular one in the fem. part. vaıetáwoa*.
Naiw, I dwell, forms its tenses with simple $a^{\dagger} \dagger$. In the active, how-
 to cause to inhabit, settle, or cause to be inhabited, colonize, found. The midd. and pass. fut. vávбoual (Apoll. Rh. 2, 747.), the aor. 1. midd.
 intransit. sense of to settle in a place. The post-Homeric poets, however, use the midd. '̇va ad Apollon. 1, 1356. The perf. vévaruat is not found before the later poets. See Schneider's Lexicon.

The syncop. aor. кafévaote, you have settled yourselves, you dwell, (comp. Hesych. vá $\sigma \theta a t-$ oik $\hat{\eta} \sigma a l$ ) in Aristoph. Vesp. 662. in the anapæsts would be remarkable, but both the best manuscripts have katé$\nu a \sigma \theta \in \nu$, and the third person suits the passage very well.
See also Náw, I flow.
Náora, I stop up, I fill in and beat close together (as earth into a hole): fut. vá $\xi \omega$, aor. l. ềva $\xi a$ : but the perf. pass. is $\nu \in \operatorname{veva\sigma \mu at}$, and the verbal adj. vaбтóc $\ddagger$.

[^206]must have been some grounds for it. Compare the imperat. $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega$ under $\Sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta{ }_{\zeta} \omega$.

+ The termination - $\alpha i \omega$, like $-\dot{a} \zeta \omega$ and $-\dot{a} \nu \nu v \mu t$, serves to strengthen the pres. where the $a$ is short in the other tenses.
$\ddagger$ This verb, like áфv́ббw and some others, follows therefore in its act. voice the general analogy of verbs in $-\sigma \sigma \omega$, with a palatic as its characteristic letter; but in the perf. pass, and verbal adj. its characteristic seems to have been a labial:
 'Арио́ттш.

The passive formation with the $\sigma$ ，as above given，is most indispu－ table in the verbal adj．vagtós．The perf．vévaqтat，too，is undoubted in Aristoph．Eccl．840．，on which and some other suspected passages see the note to $\mathrm{N} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ 1．The only trace which I find of the regular form vévantac is in Suidas in voc．，where it is quoted from Josephus．

N ${ }^{\prime} \omega$ ，I flow，an old verb，found only in pres．and imperf．；written also vaíw．See Schol．Od．九，222．On $\nu \omega \bar{\sigma} \tau \nu, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．see Né́ 2.

Necké $\omega$ ，I rebuke，dispute，retains $\epsilon$ in its inflexion，thus fut．vecréo $\omega$ ， \＆c．
［Hom．and Hes．have also，when the metre requires it，an lon．sister－



Nєíqu．See Né́申
N $\epsilon \mu \omega, I$ distribute，allot：fut．$\nu є \mu \omega$ and $\nu \epsilon \mu \eta \sigma \omega$ ；aor． 1 ．
 $\theta \eta \nu^{*}$ ．Verbal adj．עє $\mu \eta \tau \in ́ o c .-$－Midd．

The fut．ve $\mu i \sigma \omega$ is mentioned by Herodian（post Mœr．et Phryn．） and Thom．Mag．；but I find it quoted only from the later writers， Longus p．55．Schæf．Eurip．Epist．5．On the other hand $\nu \in \mu \epsilon \bar{i} \sigma \theta a \ell$ is in Demosth．Mid．p．579．infra．［The later writers have also an aor．1．midd．é $\varepsilon \varepsilon \mu \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，Lobeck ad Phryn．p．742．－Passow．］

Né $\phi \omega$ ：3．sing．$\nu \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \iota$ ，more generally $\sigma v \nu \nu$ é $\phi \epsilon \iota$ ，it is overcast with clouds；or Zє̀̀c，ouvעé $\phi \epsilon \iota$ ，covers the sky with clouds，Aristoph．Av．1489．Perf．ouvdévo ${ }^{\text {eqv．}}$

See Aristoph．ap．Suid．v．乡vve＇́voфєv．The forms of the pres．are also written with the circumflex，as $\sigma v \nu v e \phi \varepsilon \bar{\ell}$, －ov̂ $\sigma a$ ：see Schneid． Lexicon．The pres．$v \in i \nmid \omega \omega$（with the explanation $\beta \bar{\beta} e^{\prime} \chi \omega$ ）which the Grammarians connect with the above verb（see the Etymologica，and Eust．ad Il．a，420．）is only another way of writing vípw，to snow， which the later writers used also of rain ：see Stephens in Nipw $\dagger$ ．
 pass．$\nu \in ́ \nu \eta \mu a \iota$ or $\nu \in ́ \nu \eta \sigma \mu a \iota$ ．Verbal adj．$\nu \eta \tau o ́ c$.
The pres．$\nu \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ is found only in Herodotus，$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu, 6,80$ ．$e^{\pi} \pi \iota \nu \dot{\varepsilon} o v \sigma \iota$, $4,62 . \ddagger$ ．Homer has a lengthened form which fluctuates between $\nu \eta$ $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ éw

[^207]ing article：Né $\delta \omega$ ，fut．$\nu \dot{\psi} \psi \omega$ ，perf．$\nu \in ́-$ $\nu 0 \phi a$ ，same as $\nu i \phi \omega$ ；a rare，nay a su－ spected form．］
$\ddagger$ See，however，the following note．
and $\imath \eta \nu \epsilon \in \omega$. The inflexion follows the former, as the imperf. vifeov, Il.
 107. aor. 1. infin. midd. $\nu \eta \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \sigma \theta a \iota, ~ 11 . ~ \iota, ~ 137$.

The perf. pass. without $\sigma$ see in Lex. Seguer. 1. p. 13, 24. Thucyd. 7, 87. Xen. Anab. 5, 4, 27. The other form $\nu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \eta \sigma \mu a \iota$ seems to me to stand on good grounds in Aristoph. Nub. 1203., where with a $\mu \phi \quad \rho \bar{\eta}, 5$ $\nu \in \nu \eta \sigma \mu$ évot is the various reading $\nu \in v a \sigma \mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu o t$, which being untenable on account of the sense, could have arisen only from the true verb being written with the $\sigma$. Nor is the reading less sure in Aristoph. Eccles.

 $\delta a \pi i \delta \omega \nu \nu \varepsilon \nu a \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu a \iota$. Now the reading of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \nu \epsilon \nu a \sigma \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu a \iota$ is quite as untenable as that of vevarرévac (looking at the sense) is certain; and Brunck's emendation $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau v e r \eta \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} v a t$ is now confirmed by the quotation in
 writing with the $\sigma$ is supported here again by the false reading é $\pi \iota v \varepsilon-$ $\nu a \sigma \mu$ - and by the similarity of this case to that quoted above from the Nubes. Lastly, we must examine the passage of Theocr. 9, 9. where $\nu^{\prime}$ evagrat is used of a heap of skins, which, it is true, the derivation from vá $\sigma \sigma \omega$ appears to suit: but as the dialect of this poet requires vévaктat, it would seem, according to the direction of the scholium oє $\sigma \dot{\omega} \rho \in \varepsilon \tau a$, , that in the passage in question it should be pronounced

2. I spin: fut. $\boldsymbol{v} \sigma \omega, \& c$. ; in addition to which was formed, but at an early period, another pres. $\nu \dot{\prime} \theta \omega$ (like $\pi \lambda \eta_{\eta} \theta \omega$ from $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$, $\Pi \Lambda \mathrm{E} \Omega$ ) ; and this became afterwards the common form.

It is difficult to decide anything on the usage of $\nu \epsilon i \nu$ and $\nu \dot{\gamma} \theta \epsilon \tau \nu$ in good writers, as the verb occurs so seldom in those which have come down to us. We must therefore content ourselves with the observation of the Antiatticist, $N \hat{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$, ov $\mu \dot{o} \nu o v \nu \varepsilon \hat{\imath} r^{\prime}$, and with what we gather from the glosses of the Grammarians, that the simpler form was peculiar to the older Ionics and Attics. And herein we find an irregularity of contraction; for while the regular form is $\nu \epsilon \bar{i} \nu, \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Hes. $\epsilon, 779$. ëv $\nu \epsilon$, Hesych., the other contractions are invariably quoted by all the grammarians in $\omega$ instead of ov; as $\nu \omega \bar{\sigma} \nu$, Pollux $7,32.10,125 . \nu \omega \overline{\nu \tau \pi}$, Hesych. $\nu \dot{\omega} \mu \in \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{v o s}$, Phot.*. The contraction to ov was therefore studi-

[^208][^209]ously avoided, and from $\nu \bar{\omega}, \nu \bar{\omega} \nu$ the $\omega$ was carried on through the tenses.

The passive forms I find quoted always with the $\sigma$; but it is possible that these came first into use with $\nu^{\prime} \theta^{\prime} \theta \omega$, and that the old form for the meaning of to spin was $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \mu a t$, to which we are also led by the verbals $\nu \eta \tau o ́ s, \nu \hat{\eta} \mu a$, \& c.
3. I swim. None of the forms of the pres. are contracted by the Attics in this short verb except those in $\epsilon \iota$ (compare $\Delta^{\prime} \epsilon$, I bind) ; thus vé $\omega, \nu \in ́ \omega \nu, \nu \in ́ o \mu \epsilon \nu, ~ \& c .$, but $\boldsymbol{\nu \epsilon i ̂ , ~}$
 $\mu a t)$; aor. 1. ěvevбa, \&c.

An Epic sister-form is vinx $\omega$, and the later prose writers use $\boldsymbol{v}^{\prime} \chi^{o-}$ $\mu a t$, a depon. midd.
 away, return, is used in present and imperfect only: the pres. indic. has the force of a future, as véo $\mu a \iota$, contr. vє $\bar{v} \mu a \iota$, Epic 2. sing. veĩa like $\mu v \theta \epsilon i a \iota, ~ \nu \varepsilon i ̀ t a \iota ~ l i k e ~ \mu v \theta \epsilon i ̀ \tau u!. ~$

Níh $\omega$, I wash, takes its tenses from $\nu^{\prime} i \pi \tau \omega$, an unusual verb in the older writers: fut. $v^{\prime} \ell \omega$; aor. 1. évi $\downarrow a, \& c$.; perf. pass. $\nu^{\prime} \nu \nu \mu \mu a t$.-Midd.

The pres. $\nu i \zeta \omega$ is found frequently in Homer, also in Herodot. 2, 172. Aristoph. Vesp. 608. Eurip. Iph. T. 1338. Plat. Symp. p. 175. a. All these writers form $\nu i \psi \omega$, \&c. : while the pres. vintw occurs only in the later writers*, except in one single Homeric passage, Od. $\sigma$, 178.; and this is the more remarkable, as in ten others the reading is viלetv. See Damm.

Niбनoцal, I go, return to. Two questions have been started respecting this verb, one as to its orthography and another as to its inflexion. With regard to the first, we find viбouac, I1. $\psi, 76$. vei $\sigma \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$, Eurip. Phœon. 1240. á $\pi о \nu \iota \sigma \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, Apollon. Rh. 3, 899., and in each case the manuscripts fluctuate between $\epsilon \iota s, \epsilon \iota \sigma \sigma, \iota \sigma, \iota \sigma \sigma$. The form $\nu \varepsilon i \sigma \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ is found in the best manuscripts, (whence we infer that the vowel is long independently
same. Nor is this at variance with the $\dot{\in} \pi \iota v \varepsilon_{0} v_{\sigma}$ of Herodot. quoted at the beginning of No. 1.; for the Ionics constantly use this form, like all those from verbs in $\epsilon \omega$, without contraction. On the other hand we are warranted in supposing that the Attics from veiv to heap up, to

[^210]of the $\sigma \sigma$, ）and its authenticity is further supported by the cognate forms véopaı，veio $\mu a \iota$ ，as well as by its being actually found in inscriptions of the purest times，Bœckh Pind．Ol．3，10．On the other land usage was in favour of víббoцaı（see Etym．M．p．606，12．）；and the Gram－ marians seem to have agreed in writing the pres．vióooual，the fut．vioo－ $\mu a \iota$, Eustath．Il．$\psi, 76$ ．Heyne Il．ı，381．There are other passages with the same doubtful orthography，as veiorovtal，Hes．Op．235．vei $\sigma$－ $\sigma o \mu \varepsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$ ，Theog． 71 ．Gaisf．，both with the various reading $\nu \iota \sigma \sigma_{.}$；and $\nu i \sigma-$ боуто，Scut．469．This uncertainty of the reading leaves the second question equally undecided：for in the three passages first mentioned the sense is that of a future；but then in the verbs which signify to go， the present has frequently the force of the future，as in $\epsilon i \mu \iota$ and $\nu \dot{\varepsilon} о \mu a \iota$ ， Il．$\nu .186 . o, 577$. ：thus in Il．$\psi, 76$ ．if we read viбopat we have the future，if vioбoнal we have the present with the meaning of a future： compare also the scholium in the passage of Euripides．On the gloss of Hesychius veioavro，until we know to what it refers，nothing can be said．

Ní申 $\omega$ ，vєi申 $\omega$ ．See Néф $\omega$ ．
Noéw，I think，has in the Ionic writers the same contraction and accentuation as $\beta$ oct $\omega$ ；e．g．perf．vév $\boldsymbol{\rho} \mu \alpha \iota$ ；pluperf．év $\nu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta \nu$ ，whence 3．sing．év́́vんтo for évevónto，Herodot．1，77．and the compound aor．


Nuбтáと $\omega$ ，I nod（as being sleepy），I sleep ：fut．vvaтáa and $\nu v \sigma \tau a ́ \xi \omega^{*}$ ：but all the derivatives are formed with the palatic letter，as vขбтакти́с，\＆c．

## E．

É $\epsilon$ ，I shave，scrape，retains $\epsilon$ in the inflexion，and takes $\sigma$ in the passive ：thus fut．$\xi \in \notin \omega$ ，Epic $\xi^{\prime} \in \sigma \omega$ ．

Evpé $\omega$, I shave，shear，has more commonly in the midd．


The midd．form $\xi_{v \rho \text { éo }}^{\text {onat }}$ is Ionic ；but it occurs in Attic writers，as $\xi_{v \rho o i} \mu \epsilon \nu o v$, Alexis ap．Athen．13．p．565．b．In the later writers the pres．$\xi v \rho a ́ \omega$ was common，but the inflexion in－á $\sigma \omega$ is never found．See Loheck ad Phryn．p．205．Passow has also another later form $\xi v p i \zeta \omega$ ， ६ирі泣а．

[^211]$\Xi ' v \omega, I$ shave smooth, polish: fut. $\xi^{\prime} v \sigma \omega$, \&c. It takes $\sigma$ in the passive: $\xi_{v}{ }^{\prime} a \sigma \theta a t$, aor. 1. midd. to polish for one's self, for one's own use, Xen. Cyr. 6, 2, 11.
$$
0 .
$$
'Ó́v́popat, I lament, bewail; depon. midd. with both trans. and intrans. sense. The act. appears to have never been in use.
'Oivo $\sigma n \mu a \iota, I$ am enraged with, I hate. Neither this pres. nor $\dot{i} \dot{\delta} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\delta} \dot{0} \zeta \omega$, or $\dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \dot{\zeta} \zeta \mu a \iota$ appear to have been ever in use; but we find in Hom. an aor. 1. midd. ( $\dot{\delta} \delta \check{v} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu)$ - ao, -aтo and 3 . plur. without the augm. $\dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \sigma a v \tau o$, part. $\dot{\delta} \delta v \sigma \sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu o s$; also 3 . sing. perf. pass. with the

${ }^{2} \mathrm{O} \% \omega, I$ send forth a (good or bad) smell: fut. iלnjow; aor. 1. "'Ч, $\eta \sigma a$, Aristoph. Vesp. 1059.; perf. with the force of the pres. $\quad 0 \delta \omega \delta a$. Generally with gen. of the thing or part from which the smell proceeds.
 10. De Superfet. 10.) and the later writers.

Oi' $\gamma \omega$, or oi $\gamma \nu v \mu$, $I$ open : fut. oiz $\xi \omega$; aor. 1. $\omega_{\xi} \xi a$, part. oikas: but the Epics generally separate the diphthong in the augmented forms, as in
 the following compound is in use :
àvoíy,$\dot{a} \nu o i \gamma v v \mu$. In the augmented tenses the syllabic augment is added to the temporal as in the imperf. éधvo $\begin{aligned} & \text { о́єь }\end{aligned}$

 perf. 2. àvé $̣ y a$. This last tense had from a very early period (Hippocr., \&c.) an intransitive meaning, $I$ stand open; which however was unknown to the Attics, who in this sense used the perf. pass. ávé $\varphi \gamma \mu a$. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 157. 158.

In the dialects, as in Herodot., Theocr., \&c., we find the aor. 1. with the regular augment $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\omega} \xi a$; and in the later writers the act. $\ddot{\eta} \nu o \xi \xi a$, pass. ${ }^{\eta}$ voirnv, \&c., Fisch. III. pp.'36. 37.

Oidé $\omega$, I swell. For this verl) with the forms oidón, oidáv $\omega$, oidaive, we cannot lay down any fixed usage. We can only observe that the formation in $-\eta \sigma \omega$ is the only one for all four forms; and that the two last are used also in a causative sense. See Stephens' Thesaur.
 $\ddot{\psi} \mu \omega \xi a$.
 $\omega_{\dot{\prime}}^{\prime} \eta \eta \nu$, infin. oin $\theta \bar{\eta} v a \iota$, part. oin $\theta$ cíc. The 1. pers. sing. of both pres. and imperf. was also pronounced in a syncopated form, oì $\mu a \iota, \stackrel{\psi}{\varphi} \mu \eta \nu$. The 2. pers. sing. of the pres. oícı, (like $\beta_{o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota}$ and oै $\psi \epsilon \iota$ ) was not only the Attic form, but almost the only one in use in the common language.

The old grammarians (see Thom. Mag. in voc.) laid it down as a rule, that the form oifac was used only of things fixed and certain, consequently merely a milder expression for "I am convinced, I know well." That is to say, oi $\mu \alpha \iota, \psi_{\psi} \mu \eta \eta \nu$ was a kind of interjectional phrase introduced into a sentence without much stress laid upon it, like our expression "I believe," which in different languages is used in courtesy to soften the harshness of a positive assertion; and which frequently arises from a slight irony incorporated, as it were, into the tone of polished conversation. We can readily imagine that this must have been particularly natural to the Attic language: and the necessary result therefore was, that as soon as it was wished to give the word its proper force, it was generally pronounced at full length. If now we read this oioput, for example, in the two passages of Isæus (pp. 50, 22. 58,14 .) which are adduced in a note on Thom. Mag. as supposed instances of a contrary nature, we shall feel that the tone of the sentence loses by it. And the further we extend our observation the more we shall find the above rule verified. One thing however may fairly be presumed, that in order to follow it up in all cases, we ought to have the reading more certain than it can possibly be made where the difference in the forms is so slight.

The Epics make use also of the active oin, but only in the present; more frequently they separate the diphthong, $\hat{i} t \omega$, and in the middle always, öto $\alpha$ t, in which the $t$ is long: and in this form, which has the midd.

[^212]as well as the pass. aorist, we find only the regular inflexion; e.g. pres.
 part. ö̈̈өєis; aor. 1. midd. ఙ̈̈̈á $\mu \eta \eta$, whence in Hom. 3. sing. without the augment òívato, and part. óizá $\mu$ evos. This Epic form of the verb has the collateral meaning of to conjecture, to foresee; in which sense we find it in the Ionic prose of Arrian, oi $\sigma \theta \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma$ (Ind. 13, 5.), which however may also be written öi $\sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma$. From $\dot{\omega} \hat{\imath} \theta \theta \eta \nu$ the later (not Attic) writers formed again an infin. aor. oia $\theta \bar{\eta} v a \iota$ with the part. oia $\theta$ eis : and Aratus has with the common formation an aor. 1. infin. midd. oiifoa$\sigma \theta a \iota$, used by still later writers in prose: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 719.

Oǐхоцли, I go, I am gone : imperf. (or aor.) $\varphi^{\prime} \chi^{0} \mu \eta \nu$, I went away; fut. oixijø $\mu$ а.

Although the radical meaning of this verb is, as we shall see in the next paragraph, simply to go, yet an established usage has existed in the common language from Homer's time, by which oixouat never means $I$ am going, but always $I$ am gone. We will first prove this by a number of decisive passages. At Il. o, 223. ijon 'Eırooizaıos Oı̌ $\chi$ eтaı


 $\mu \eta$ poòs oíxovtal $\pi$ roai'; how long has thy mother's breath been gone? Eurip. Or. 440. compare also 844. In Xenophon we find many in-
 $7,3,8$. see also $5,4,11.6,1,45$. and Anab. 3, 1, 32. This usage is continued in the imperf. $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{\prime} \chi \dot{\sigma} \mu \eta \nu$, I was gone; as Penelope says to her
 heard that thou wert gone to Pylos, Od. $\pi$, 24. See also Pind. P. 4, 145. and Xen. Cyr. 3, 2, 27. It may also be understood in the same sense when at the end of a spirited narrative a phrase is added with $\varphi$ хєто;
 man was now gone, when the Medes came ....., Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 5. In the majority of passages however this imperfect cannot without force be made to signify more than simply he went away, e. g. Xwóuevos $\delta^{\prime}$
 థ̈хоуто оiккаде, Xen. Cyr. 3, 2, 14. compared with 8, 3, 28.

That the original meaning of oix $\begin{gathered} \\ \theta\end{gathered}$ at was simply to go, without the addition of away, is clear not only from the sister-form oix $\overline{\text { é }} \omega$, but from the compound $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi o i \chi o \mu a t, ~ I ~ g o ~ t o ~ o r ~ t o w a r d s, ~ a s ~ w e l l ~ a s ~ f r o m ~ s o m e ~ p a s-~$ sages of Homer, in which the simple verb, but never in the pres. conj. (quare, is this accidental?), is used in that original sense: e. g. karà



Now that particular use of the present mentioned in the last paragraph may be explained, like many others, from the oral language: for whoever goes, is gone : whence "he is going thither" is much the same as "he is gone hence." But all such original ideas lose by custom their exact meaning; and so oizctac was used of one who had been gone a long time, who had been long arrived at some other place, or who had quite disappeared from the world. But as soon as the thing is no longer actually present, the difference between the person being then just going away, or being supposed to be on the road to his place
 то, as imperf. of the common oi'Xetal, meant, wherever it was necessary and the context showed it, he was gone; yet it generally signified, agreeably to its origin, he went, went away. And the future had the
 єis $\mu a \kappa \kappa ́ p \omega \nu$ dí тıvas єidaıиovías, Plat. Phæd. 115. d.
From what has been said, a perf. of this verb is superfluous for general use ; it does however sometimes occur (e. g. 所 $\eta \eta \mu a \iota$, Ion. oǐ $\eta \mu a t$, Herodot. 4, 136.), but in the common language in the compounds only, in which therefore $\pi a \rho o i \chi o \mu a \iota$ and $\pi \alpha \rho \underset{\epsilon}{\chi} \eta \eta \mu a \iota, \pi \alpha \rho \omega \chi \eta \mu$ évos are synonymous; see Stephan. Thesaur. and Sturz. Lex. Xen.: and so is the other compound in Herodot. 4, 136. ai i i $\mu$ épaı סьoíX $\eta \nu \tau a \ell$, compared with Soph. Aj. 973. Aías סıoí¿etal. In the older language the perf. is found in an active form also ( $\psi \times \eta \leqslant a$ ) which will therefore connect it with oi $\chi^{\nu \epsilon} \omega$ : it is however rare, and in Homer occurs but once, viz. in $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\omega} \chi \eta \kappa \in \nu$, is past, Il. $\kappa, 252$. ; of more frequent occurrence is the form oiøшка*, which has exactly the common meaning of oixo $\mu \boldsymbol{\tau}$; e. g.

 dently pluperfects with the force of an imperfect; but at 1, 189. 4,
 guage, that is to say used as an aorist, probably because the expression, "he was gone," marked the momentary act of going away $\dagger$. [An Ion. 3. plur. pluperf. é $\pi \dot{\varphi}^{\chi} \chi^{\text {aro }}$ also occurs, but seldom. A regular fut. oikoual is found in some manuscripts in Herodot. 2, 29.-The pres. oì $\bar{\epsilon} о \mu a \iota$, contracted by the Ionics to oixє $\hat{v} \mu a \iota$, is met with only in Leon. Tar. : for the act. oix $\omega$ there is no authority.-Passow.]

[^213]sition of the two palatic letters, oix $\chi \omega \kappa \alpha$.
$\dagger$ It is certain that the common meaning of $\ddot{\psi} \chi \in \tau 0$ may be explained in this same way, that is to say as a pluperf., ot$\chi \in \tau a \ell$ having the force of a perf.: but the view which I have taken of it appears to me simpler.

Ö̈ш. Sec Oı́р
'Oкé $\lambda \lambda \omega$, I land, has (beside the pres. and imperf.) only
 stranded, \&c., Herodot. 8, 84.


 Bast. Ep. Cr. p. 248. Isolated instances of its occurrence in the older writers, (as in Plat. Lys. p. 216. c. compared with Cratyl. p. 427. b.), are but little to be depended on: in the later writers, as Lucian, \&c., it is found very frequently*.-An aor. 1. $\dot{\omega} \lambda i \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a$ is also used by the later writers; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 742. Passow has also a perf. $\dot{\omega}$ बі́ $\sigma \theta \eta \kappa u$.
 $\sigma a$; perf. ò $\lambda \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon \kappa a$. Midd. I perish, am undone ; fut. ỏ̀oû$\mu a \iota$; aor. 2. $\grave{\omega} \grave{o}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$; to which belongs the perf. 2. (perf. midd.) ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega \lambda a$.

The intransitive forms $\dot{\omega} \lambda \hat{o}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ and $\begin{gathered} \\ \\ \lambda \\ \lambda \\ \\ \text { a serve at the same time for }\end{gathered}$
 per forms of the pass. are not used; none but writers of a very late period having $\dot{\omega} \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, $\dot{\lambda}_{\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta}{ }^{\prime} \nu a$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 732.

Of the same æra is also the fut. $\dot{\lambda} \bar{\epsilon} \sigma \omega \neq$, e. g. Long. 3, 17. $\dot{a} \pi o \lambda \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\sigma \omega \nu$, Lucian. Asin. 33. The examples quoted from Attic writers in Lobeck p. 746. are not critically examined.
From the perf. act. was formed an Epic sister-form of the present, $\dot{0} \lambda \in \in \kappa \omega \S$, of which (both in the act. and midd.) Homer has only the pres. and imperf. ; the latter without the augment, ö $\lambda \epsilon \kappa о \nu$, öдéкоvто. Com-


In Il. $\tau, 135$. stands the iterative imperf. $亠 \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon v$, which supposes
 the reading $̈ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$, which would be the iterative aorist ; but the itera-

[^214]$\ddagger$ [What can Buttmann mean by stating $\Delta \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \omega$ to be the usage of the later writess only? We find it in Od. $\nu, 399$. Hes. $\epsilon$, 178. and $\delta \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, II. $\mu, 250$.-Ed.]
$\S$ [Beside this Epic pres. we find $\ddot{0} \lambda \lambda \omega$, ò $\lambda \epsilon \in \omega, \delta \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$, which are not Greek, $b \lambda$ $\lambda v \nu \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, which is suspected, and $\delta \lambda \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ in Hesych.—Passow.]
tive imperfect is the only tense to suit the passage, therefore the various reading $\dot{o} \lambda$ é $\kappa \in \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \nu$ ought to have been adopted long ago.

The part. aor. midd. ö $\begin{gathered}\text { ópevos, beside } \\ \text { its proper meaning (e.g. } ̈ s \sigma^{\prime} \\ \sigma^{\prime}\end{gathered}$ ò ópevov atév $\omega$, Eurip. Or. 1384.), is used as an adjective with the active sense of destructive, і̀онévav 'Epıvvír, Phœo. 1036. In the Epic poets, who on account of the metre can have only oí $\dot{o} \mu \epsilon \mathcal{\nu}$ os, the adjectival usage is the only one, and generally in the active sense with $\mu \bar{\eta} \nu(s$, " $A \tau \eta, \& c$. : but it has also the strictly passive meaning wretched,

[At Il. $\theta, 449 . \dot{0} \lambda \lambda \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$ is the regular pres. part. fem. 'Oגé ${ }^{\prime} \sigma a \iota$ is the Ep. aor. infin. in Hom. and Hes.-Passow.]
${ }^{*} \mathrm{O} \mu \nu \bar{\nu} \mu,, I$ swear: fut. ó $\mu о \hat{v} \mu a t,-є i$, , -єiтat, \&c., infin. ó $\mu \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota^{*}$; the other tenses take an o in the inflexion, as
 ó $\mu \omega \mu \sigma \sigma \mu$ évoc; but in the remaining forms and in the aorist the Attics generally drop the $\sigma$, as in 3. sing. perf. pass. ó $\mu \dot{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, and aor. 1. pass. ${ }^{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\rho}^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$. -The middle occurs in the compounds, e. g. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \mu \nu \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$.

From the $\sigma$ having been properly admitted into those forms only in which the three $\mu$ followed each other, we see that it was done for the sake of euphony ; and consequently they never appear without it. But it was afterwards transferred to some of the other forms, perhaps however not in the pure Attic writers. Thus in Demosth. c. Olymp. p.1174, 8. the reading has always been $\dot{v} \pi o \mu o \theta$ évros, and in Demosth. c. Leptin. p. 805. extr. $\dot{\rho} \mu \dot{\omega} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{a}$ h has been restored from the best manuscript $\dagger$.
[Homer generally uses the aor. 1. without the augment, and frequently with double $\sigma$, ддó $\sigma \sigma \alpha$, \&c. In the simple verb he has the imperf. $\ddot{\omega} \mu \nu \bar{v} \epsilon$ as from $\dot{o} \mu \nu \dot{v} \omega$, but in the compound $\dot{a} \pi \omega^{\prime} \mu \nu \bar{v}$, Od. $\beta, 377$. In Herodot. 1, 153. is the Ionic part. pres. $\dot{\dot{\delta}} \mu \boldsymbol{v} \nu \tau e s$ as from $\dot{\partial} \mu \dot{\delta} \omega$.Passow.]

 is inflected according to the analogy of ä $\gamma \nu v \mu$, $\delta є i к v \nu \mu, ~ \& c$. —Midd.

[^215][^216]'Ovivnut, I am of use to, I help: (no imperf. act.*) fut. óv́now ; aor. 1. üv $u \quad \sigma a$. Midd. óvivapat, I derive assistance,
 part. óvípevoc (Od. $\beta, 33 . \omega, 30$.) ; but the other moods of this aorist have the $a$, as optat. óvai $\mu \eta \nu$, infin. oैvaa日at ; and the indicative also borrowed this formation, but not until a later period, ஸ̀vá $\mu \eta \nu$.

On this peculiarity of the aorist see Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 12. 13. Hence $\ddot{\omega} \nu a \sigma \theta \epsilon$ in Eurip. Herc. 1368. and occurring in that passage only, well deserves our consideration. For a further account of this aor. $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ and the similar one from övo $\quad$ at, see the latter verb. The aor. pass. $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\jmath} \theta_{\eta \nu}$ is also found (instead of $\dot{\omega} \nu i(\mu \eta \nu)$ in Xen. Anab. 5, 5, 2. Theocr. 15, 55.

This is one of those verbs formed by the reduplication of the first syllable like $\dot{\alpha} \rho a \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega, \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \chi i \zeta \omega$; only that in this case the vowel of the reduplication is c (as in $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\delta i \delta \omega \mu c$, \& .) , and it is substituted for the vowel of the root, as the temp. augment $\eta$ is in áriwoa, \&c. ; thus

 used by any writer.

The 3. sing. pres. act. ovivnot and the midd. ovirapat are found in Homer, Plato, and others : but those forms in which there was anything displeasing to the ear were not used, and their places were supplied by the synonymous $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda \epsilon i v$. This was the case for instance with the imperf. act. $\dagger$; and for the same reason it might also seem very likely that the infin. act. òv̌vávas would have been avoided. This however cannot be asserted positively; and there is even great probability in Matthiæ's suspicion that ovivat in Plat. Rep. 10. p. 600. d. may be a corruption of this word $\ddagger$.
"Oуонаи, I think lightly of, reject with disdain, 2. sing. örooat, 3. plur:




[^217]cannot prefer that aor. 2. act. (unknown in any other instance, and used here for the common $\delta \nu \bar{\eta} \sigma a t$,) to Matthiæ's correction; particularly as the imperf. is the only tense naturally suited to that passage.
§ T $\omega \bar{\nu} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ кaróvoббo, Arat. 1142. according to the Paris manuscript.
$\dot{\omega} \nu o \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$, whence in Hom. the opt. ©́vooai $\mu \eta$, -ato, -quтo, and infin. with double $\sigma$, óvó $\sigma \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$.

From a comparison of the forms we see that this is exclusively an Ionic and Epic verb, a formation in $\mu \mathrm{l}$ from the root or stem ONOS. We must not therefore consider, as others frequently have done, övouat, örovtat, órouto, \&c. as forms of the common barytone conjugation.

The inflexion of this verb however is certainly nothing more than a lengthening of the simple root ON - by the insertion of the vowel 0 , to which we are led by two Homeric forms: viz.

1. Aor. ©̈varo, Il. $\rho, 25$. This Homeric form is separated from the üvazo of the later language belonging to ovivi $\eta \boldsymbol{\mu}$, not merely by its meaning, but, if accurately examined, by its form also; only that this latter difference happens to be not marked by a difference of letters. 'That is to say, $\dot{v} v i \nu \eta \mu$, ," $\dot{v i v a \mu \alpha c}$ is a formation in $\mu$ t with the radical vowel $a$, ONA-: «̀ $\nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ therefore bears the same relation to it as é $\sigma \tau \alpha{ }^{\prime}-$ $\mu \eta \nu$, if it were in use, would to ívтa $\mu a \iota$, or as $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ actually does to iлтанаи, and it is the aor. 2. midd. Whereas the formation of óvoнаи from ONO- is not to be unnecessarily confounded with the formation from ONA-, but is to be traced back, as in other similar cases, to the simple stem or root ON-*. According "to this $\dot{\varphi} \nu$ á $\mu \eta \nu$ is the aor. 1. midd. of $\mathrm{ON} \Omega$; or (which is the same thing) the aor. 2. $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu$, $\ddot{\omega} \nu \epsilon-$ то, \&c. took the Ionic $a$, making 屯̈vato, like eúpato, \&c.
2. Pres. oiv $\nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, II. $\omega, 241$. Here the o of the radical syllable is lengthened, as in où入ópevos. It stands therefore for $\dot{\partial} \nu \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, and this again for övoo $\theta$, which is singular ; as there was no metrical reason for forming this particular present from the simple stem $f$.

OII-. See 'O ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\prime} \omega$.
'Oтvíw, I marry, cohabit with, loses in the inflexion the $\iota$; thus fut. ómívo, \&c., Aristoph. Acharn. 255.

[^218]such an arrangement, for the pres. ô $\nu \mathrm{v}$ $\sigma \theta \epsilon$ is as strange in connection with the root ONA- as with ONO-. Yet Hesychius has the glosses $0 \dot{v} \lambda \iota \bar{a} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ (corrupted from oũva $\sigma \theta \epsilon$ ), $\mathrm{O} \tilde{\nu} \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ and $\mathrm{O} \tilde{v} \nu 0 \sigma \theta \epsilon$, all three with that false explanation; for all evidently refer to the Homeric passage. From this and from Aristarchus writing $\dot{\delta} \nu \hat{\prime} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon$ we see clearly how unccrtain the reading was from the earliest times; and I have no doubt therefore that the old and genuine one was ourvo$\sigma \theta \varepsilon$; nay, this becomes a certainty by the occurrence of the same phrase in the 2 . sing. $\hat{\eta}$ ôvorat ...; Od. $\rho$, 378. therefore

[According to Piers. ad Mcer. p. 278. and Porson on Od. $\delta$. 798. the old and genuine form was $\dot{\delta} \pi \dot{v} \omega$; compare Schæf. Schol. Par. Apoll. Rh. 1, 45.-Passow.]
'Opáw, I see: imperf. with double augment éépouv (see
 verb eio $\omega$ (which see) were borrowed the aor. 2. $\epsilon \hat{i} \delta o v, ~ i m-~$
 iסeiv, part. iסóvr. Midd. aor. 2. eioó $\mu \eta \nu$, imper. iठoû (as an interjection ioóv, ecce), infin. ićéöat; and from an unusual stem ОП . . . the fut. in the midd. form oै $\psi$ o $\mu_{1}(I$ shall see). The perf. pass. is either éwópaцat (éópaцaı), or ஸैभцut, $\hat{\omega} \psi a t, \hat{\omega} \pi \tau a t, \& c .$, infin. $\hat{\omega} \phi \theta a t$; but in the aor. 1. pass. the Attics use only ${ }^{\omega} \phi \theta \eta \nu$, while the later writers

 midd. ó $\hat{\sigma} \sigma \sigma a t$, $i \delta \in \in \sigma \theta a t$ is in the simple verbs solely poetical.

 хрє́єтац under $\mathrm{M}_{\mu} \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \kappa \omega$. We find also an Epic 2. sing. pres. midd.
 adopt the latter accentuation we must suppose it formed as from a verb in $\mu$; if the former (which is expressly mentioned by Eustath. p.


[^219]quire غ̇ópaca. Now as all the passages where Dawes wrote \#̈paka (except two totally corrupted in Athen. 2. p. 49.) become quite regular by adopting Tyrwhitt's emendation, èópaxa has been considered an undoubted Attic form, and adopted in all the above-mentioned passages: see Porson ad Eurip. Phœen. 1367. Reisig ad Aristoph. p. 73. Meineke ad Menand. p. 119. And in support of this reading the $o$ is actually found in the Cod. Ravenn. of Aristoph. Plut. 1046. Thesm. 32. 33. At the same time it must be remembered that in other passages there is very strong traditionary authority in favour of the old reading éépaka, which must then be pronounced occasionally as a trisyllable.
$\dagger$ This same $\delta \pi$ rós is also formed from ó $\pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega, I$ roast, consequently for $\delta \pi \tau \eta$ rós, as in Lat. assus for assatus.
easily see why the $\eta$ was preferred to the $a$, a change not uncommon in the Epic language, as in $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma a v \delta i f \eta \nu$ and the infinitives in - $\{\mu \in \nu a \iota$ and

 with any propriety be admitted into Homer's text, as long as ópâraı and $\dot{\delta} \rho \hat{a} \sigma \theta a c$ stand in other passages without a similar various, reading. The other grammarians call this not an Ionic but a Doric form; which no doubt Zenodotus knew as well as they, otherwise he would have written $\dot{o} p \bar{i} \nu$, $\dot{\text { ip }} \bar{\eta}$, коцц $\bar{\eta}$ о, \&c. Whatever it is, we may be sure that it was a reading founded on old copies, which Zenodotus was unwilling to erase. To account for it we have no occasion to have recourse to the formation in $\mu$. We should rather say that the infin. in - $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu a c$ being a sister-form of that in -eıv may be supposed to exist in the contracted shape also, and as there is no other Epic sister-form for $-\hat{\alpha} \nu$ and $-\varepsilon i \nu$ than that in $-\hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon$ pat, the natural supposition is that this belongs to the same contraction. There are instances enough in the Epic language of $\eta$ used for $\epsilon \epsilon$, which is still further supported by a remark of Heraclides in Eustath. ad Od. $v$, 287. p. 735, 15. Basil., that " the Dorians, whose dialect is used
 we must remember that a great portion of the Doric dialect is at the same time archaisms, and therefore not surprising in the Epic language.
 in Tim. Locr.-The imperfect generally used by Homer is (always without the augment) the 3 . sing. act. öpā, midd. ópâto, and plur. ор $\omega$ ขгт.
[Homer has used this verb both in a contracted and resolved shape,
 3. sing. opt. '́p̧̂̃o, 3. plur. ípq́áaro, Hom. Epig. 14, 20. again ípów,
 ópáaбӨat, \&c.-Passow.]
From the root OП- comes the Ion. perf. (2.) ö $\bar{\pi} \omega \pi a$, never used by the Attic prose writers ; and thence in the Od. we find the 3. sing. pluperf. ö $\pi \dot{\omega} \pi \epsilon \epsilon$, in Herodot. $\bar{\pi} \boldsymbol{\omega} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon, 1,68.5,92,6.7,208$. but at 3, 37. $\dot{0} \pi \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \epsilon \epsilon$ is a pure perfect : compare éé' $\theta \epsilon \epsilon$ under "E $\theta \omega$.
 The former is the common fut. of $\dot{\varepsilon} \phi \rho \rho \hat{q} \nu$ occurring in Il. $\xi, 145$. Od. $\eta$, 324.; the latter has the particular sense of to select, choose, Il. 九, 167. Od. $\beta, 294$. which é $\oint о \rho \bar{q} \nu$ never has. And it is a singular fact that of both forms we find an aor. 1. midd. (the simple being never used*), as

[^220] w＇భucto，he chose，in an old Attic expression，for which see Picrs．ad Mer．

 Pass．and midd．I desire，with genitive ；e．g．aor．1．infin．midd．ó $\rho$ ध́－


In the poets the midd．occurs also in its proper meaning，$I$ stretch myself out，or with $\pi o \sigma \sigma i v, \chi \in \rho \sigma i, \& c$ ．I stretch out my feet，hands；in
 тає，I1．$\pi, 834$ ．and 3．plur．pluperf．оршре́хато，Il．$\lambda, 26$.
＂Opvv $\dagger \dagger$ ，I raise，excite，put in motion：fut．öpow；aor．1．※̂poa， part．ö $\rho \sigma a s$ ，and frequently in Hom．the Ionic aor．öpoaqкe for $\dot{\omega}$ ．pac．
 $\mu \eta \nu$ ，or more frequently by syncope（ $\left.{ }^{\omega} \rho \mu \eta \nu\right) 3$ ．sing．шंрто，imper．öpro，




I know of no authority for the fut．midd．ö $\rho \sigma \rho \mu a t$ ，instead of which Homer has（from a fut．2．ípoûرat）the 3．sing．іреīтat（Il．v，140．）； but the various reading óp $\rho \tau=1$ as aor．2．conj．may very well be pre－ ferred to the future．

With the above are joined two reduplicated forms：
1．öpwpa，a perf．belonging to the immediate meaning of the middle， $I$ am risen $u p$ ．Of this form Homer has only the 3．sing．ô $\rho \omega \rho$ e，conj．


2．（世̈ророи）屯ैpopev，aor．2．with redupl．according to the analogy of
 has generally a causative meaning and is therefore the same as the aor． 1．wpoa ：but like that perfect it has sometimes the immediate mean－ ing；and this was the foundation of an earlier opinion，according to

[^221][^222]which «${ }^{\circ} \rho o p e$ was supposed to be a perfect with the quantities trans－ posed，which idea seemed also supported by I1．$\nu, 78$ ．Oṽt $\omega \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ каì é $\mu \circ \grave{\imath}$
 тоб汶＂E $\sigma \sigma v \mu a \iota$ ．But as the aoristic meaning of this form is firmly established by analogy and usage，む̈pope must be understood here as well as elsewhere to indicate the moment of his courage being first roused， and indeed in this passage クुरép $\theta \eta$ might have been joined with the pres． and perf．quite as well as ¿̈pope．

Beside the above Homer has from a perf．pass．ó $\rho \omega \dot{\rho} \epsilon \mu a \iota$ the 3．sing．



 smoothed off into their present shape according to the analogy of the formation in $\epsilon \omega$ ：thus the conj．ósúp ${ }^{\prime}$ rat is quite as agreeable to ana－ logy as кéктш

Another Homeric form is ó $\rho$ éovio（Il．$\beta, 398 . \psi, 212$. ），which is not quite according to analogy，particularly if supposed to be the same as ॐ̈povio．But according to form it can be only an imperfect；and if we examine the passages more closely we shall see that it belongs to a pe－ culiar meaning．It is said of the Greeks，that＇Avatávтes ó $\rho$ éovto «є－
 tes must mean they hastened，rushed；and the same of the winds，roì $\delta^{\circ}$
 is never the meaning of $\omega_{\rho \nu v \nu \tau 0, ~ \& c . ~ W e ~ m u s t ~ t h e r e f o r e ~ s u p p o s e ~ a ~}^{\text {a }}$ separate verb $\dot{\rho} \dot{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\mu a L ^ { * }}$ derived from $\mathrm{OP} \Omega$ ：and we find the pres．of such a verb in the epitaph on Hesiod given by Pausanias（9，38．）＇Hocó－
 still less will arise，but rushes in every direction，is spread far and wide．
 ＇́ซ日入oì ôpoviat，the herdsmen ．．．．．．over the herds．Here the old gram－ marians，as the meaning of the verb is not clear，supposed a separate verb óродає with the meaning I take care of；of which ópovто，at Od．$\gamma, 471$ ．（where the same phrase recurs）would be imperfect $\dagger$ ．But at Il．$\psi, 112$ ．we find in the sáme sense of an overlooker or superin－


[^223][^224]reconcile these passages，but to suppose a separate verb öpouaı synony－
 about anything：while in the third passage，where the metre would not admit of the same form，the pluperf．$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \ldots$ ．．．ópúpet was substituted for it with the sense of，he had bestirred himself，had risen up（to accom－ pany them．）．Thus in both passages the preposition $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ gives of itself the idea of guard or protection．
＇Oṕv $\sigma \sigma,-\tau \tau \omega, I$ dig：fut．ôpu $\xi \omega, \& c$ ．；perf．（with Attic reduplication）ó $\rho \dot{\omega} \rho \overline{v^{\prime}} \chi^{a}$ ；pluperf．óp $\omega \rho \rho^{\prime} \chi є \iota$ ；perf．pass． ó р́́ риунає，Xen．Cyr．7，5，7．Midd．e．g．aor．1．infin． ópúそarӨai，Herodot．1， 186.

In the later writers the reduplication of the perfect was dropped and the temporal augment substituted for it，particularly in the pass．$\ddot{\omega}_{\rho} \rho v$－ $\gamma \mu u \ell$ ，of which we may see instances from the time of Polybius in Lobeck ad Phryn．p．33．Whether we ought to suffer ॐ̈рикто，1，186．and
 рикто only a few lines afterwards in the former passage，I will not ven－ ture to decide．
＇Обфраivoцає，I smell（something）：fut．ò $\sigma ф \rho \eta \sigma о \mu a \iota ;$ aor．$\omega \sigma \phi \rho о ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ：see note under Ai $\sigma$ ávo $\mu a t$ ．［It is joined with accus．in Herodot．1，80．；in the later writers as Ælian，Lucian，\＆c．with genitive．－Passow．］

The pres．ó oфраَ̃ध日at was also an Attic form，Antiphanes ap．Athen． p．299．e．ó $\sigma \phi \rho a ̂ t a l, ~ L u c i a n ~ P i s c a t . ~ 48 . ~$

Instead of $\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ we find，but less frequently，$\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ，whence ə̈бфра⿱亠䒑го，Herodot．1，80，26．see єi入á $\mu \eta \nu$ under Aipéш and єivрá $\mu \eta \nu$ from Eipiokw．The aor．1．midd．$\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ came also into use among the later writers（Arat．Dios．223．see Lobeck ad Phryn．p．741．）， as did also from the regular inflexion other forms，e．g．aor．1．pass． $\dot{\delta} \sigma \phi \rho a \nu \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$, verbal adj．ò $\sigma \phi \rho a \nu \tau o ́ s$, \＆c．，and that in Aristotle．
［This verb was used also as a passive with the meaning of to be smelt， but only by the later medical writers，who have likewise the active ö́申paivew revá rive，I give a person something to smell at，Lobeck ad Phryn．p．468．But the presents，which have been erroneously derived
 Greek．－－Passow．］

Oüло́ $\mu \varepsilon v o s . ~ S e e ~ " O \lambda \lambda v \mu$ ．
Ойขє $\sigma$ є．Sce＂Oгоцаи．

Oúpé $\omega$, mingo: imperf. (with syllab. augm.) éov́pouv*; fut. midd. oúpŋ́боцаь ; perf. act. є́óр $\eta к а$. Beside the regular infin. oupeiv, Hes. $\epsilon, 760$. the common language used oủpท̂̀, like पर̂̀ $\dagger$.
 $\theta \eta \nu$. The following Epic forms belong to a syncopated aorist with $\alpha$
 ovivă, infin. ò̀тá $\mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ and ò̀тá $\mu \epsilon \nu$, part. pass. ò̀т $\dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu$ os. Beside the above Homer has the pres. ov̀rá $\zeta \omega$, with its aor. 1. ov̀rä $\sigma a$, and perf. pass. ойтабнає; also the imperf. ойтабкє and òттібабке.
 The aor. 2. ${ }_{\omega}^{\omega} \phi \in \lambda_{o \nu}$ is used only as a wish, as $\ddot{\omega}_{\omega} \phi \in \lambda o \nu \pi o \imath \hat{\eta}-$ бat, oh that I had done it! also with cí $\theta \in$ and $\dot{\omega}$ : : so ${ }_{\omega}^{\omega} \phi \in-$ $\lambda_{\epsilon c} . .$. . ., $\stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda_{\epsilon} . .$. . oh that thou hadst . . . ., that he had...., \&c.

There are some Ionic forms of the present which come immediately
 44. p. 309.

Homer uses $\dot{o} \phi \hat{\ell} \lambda \lambda \omega$ sometimes as a separate verb with the sense of I increaise, enlarge, sometimes as synonymous with $\dot{\phi} \phi \in \lambda \omega \omega_{\ddagger} \ddagger$.

The form ̈̈申є ${ }^{\circ} o v,-\epsilon s,-\epsilon$ (the 1. and 2. pers. plur. were not in use) had no augment either in the Ion. dialect, in the whole range of Greek poetry (except what was strictly Attic), or in the later prose, e. g. õ申c$\lambda_{o v},-\epsilon s,-\epsilon$; and in this form as well as in the other the Epics doubled the $\lambda$ whenever the metre required it, as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu, \omega^{\prime} \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon$, ö $\phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda o v, \& c$.

 lamp. ap. Tzetz. ad Lycophr. 682. And there is no doubt that the imperfect, however it may have been written, was the true old form of

[^225]this wish，＂it was my duty to have been there，I ought to have been there．＂The common $\omega \boldsymbol{\prime} \phi \subset \lambda o \nu$ arose therefore entirely from a quick pro－ nunciation of the above formula，and has the appearance only of an aor． 2.

Of ö $\phi \in \lambda \lambda \omega, I$ increase，there is in Homer an anomalous 3．sing．opt． $\dot{o} \phi \in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, Il．$\pi, 651$ ．Od．$\beta, 334$ ．If we call this word a present，its irregularity will be quite unexampled．But by a closer examination of the verse in the former of the two passages we shall see that the subject of it is not Hector but Jupiter，who was then in the act of making his decision．In this case then the aor．is the proper form，and it is the more natural one in the other passage．But the aor．of $o \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ can be no other than $\omega \bar{\phi} \epsilon \epsilon \lambda a$ ，opt．ó $\phi \in i \lambda \epsilon \iota \epsilon \nu$ ；and it is not at all improbable that the Rhapsodists，who had but an obscure feeling of analogy，being reminded by this form of the meaning of $\dot{\delta} \varphi \in i \lambda \omega$ ，might have altered it to the clearer but less analogous ó申є́ $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \tau \nu^{*}$ ．
＇Oф入ıбкávө，I am guilty（of a crime），incur（as a punish－ ment）：fut．$\dot{o} \phi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ；perf．${ }^{\omega} \phi \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ ；aor．$\dot{\omega} \phi \lambda o \nu$, infin． $\dot{o} \phi \lambda \in \hat{\imath}$, part．$\dot{o} \phi \lambda \hat{\prime} \nu$, Elmsl．Aristoph．Ach．689．and Eurip．Heracl． 985.

A pres．ob $\phi \lambda \omega$ is nowhere found，and wherever $\bar{\omega} \phi \lambda o v$ occurs，it pre－ supposes a juridical decision or something equivalent to have already taken place；while ó $\phi \lambda \iota \sigma \kappa$ ív $\omega \dagger$ ，$\dot{\phi} \downarrow \lambda i \sigma \kappa a v o v$ represents the investigation as still continuing，and in a metaphor borrowed from common life de－ scribes the situation of one who is constantly exposing himself to some－ thing unpleasant，as ó $\phi \lambda \iota \pi \kappa a ́ v e \iota ~ \gamma e ́ \lambda \omega \tau a, ~ h e ~ i n c u r s ~ l a u g h t e r, ~ m a k e s ~ h i m-~$ self ridiculous，and the like．Bekker was therefore quite right in accenting $\dot{\phi} \phi \lambda \epsilon i \nu \nu$ for ô $\phi \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ according to the reading of the best manu－ scripts in Plat．Alcib．I．35．（p．121．b．）：but with regard to ob $\phi \lambda \omega^{\prime} \nu$ for $\partial \phi \lambda \omega \nu$ we must not decide too hastily ：compare חéqø ${ }^{\prime} \omega \nu$ ．The aor． 1 ． $\pi \rho o \sigma o \phi \lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota$（Alciphr．3，26．）belongs therefore to the later forms enu－ merated in Lobeck＇s Parerg．c． 5.

Among the Ionic resolutions in Herodotus，one of the most remark－ able is that of the 3．pers．of the imperf．$\epsilon \epsilon$ for $\epsilon$ in three verbs，$\tilde{\epsilon} \psi \epsilon \epsilon$ ，
 ${ }^{7} \mathrm{E} \theta \omega$ ．

It is clear that $\hat{\omega} \phi \lambda \nu \nu$ is properly the aor．of $\dot{o} \phi \epsilon i \lambda \omega$ according to the

[^226][^227]analogy of ${ }^{n} \gamma \rho \epsilon \epsilon o$ and $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$ ；and that the other forms for this parti－ cular meaning were framed after it．

## $\Pi$.

Пaǐ $\omega$, I sport，joke：fut．$\pi a^{\prime} \xi^{\prime} \mu a \iota$ and $\pi a \iota \xi \circ \hat{\nu} \mu a \iota$ ；whence the later writers formed an aor．1． $\begin{gathered}\text { en } \\ \pi\end{gathered} \iota \xi a$ ，perf．pass．$\pi \epsilon \in-$ $\pi a t y \mu a \iota, \& c$. ；but in the Ionic and pure Attic dialect the aor．1．is always ${ }^{\prime} \pi \pi a \iota \sigma a$ and the perf．pass．$\pi \epsilon \in \pi a \iota \sigma \mu a \iota$＊，not－ withstanding their similarity to the same tenses in $\pi a i \omega$ ．
［This verb does not occur at all in the Iliad；but in the Odyssey we find（beside the pres．and imperf．）the imperat．aor．пaioare，Od．$\theta$ ， 251．On the other hand the later writers，as Plutarch，\＆c．，have the regular Dor．aor．infin．$\pi a i \hat{\xi} a \iota$ ；the aor．1．pass．$\dot{e x a i} \chi \theta \eta \nu$ ；perf．act． $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi a \iota \chi$ a，perf．pass．$\pi \notin \pi a \iota \gamma \mu a \iota$ ，Lobeck ad Phryn．p．240．－Passow．］

Hai $\omega$, I strike，is regular．The pass．takes $\sigma .-M i d d$. as aor．1．èmaíaato，Xen．

The Attics have another fut．$\pi$ anfow，which is more in use than the regular one，Aristoph．Nub．1125．Lys． 459.

Пa入ai $\omega$ ，I wrestle，struggle：fut．$\pi a \lambda a i \sigma \omega$ ；aor．1．èmá－ $\lambda_{\eta \sigma a}$ ，whence 3．sing．opt．$\pi a \lambda_{\eta}{ }_{\eta \epsilon \iota \epsilon, ~ H e r o d o t . ~}^{0}, 21$ ．where however one manuscript has madaiбeıєข．The pass．takes $\sigma$ ． Пá $\lambda \lambda \omega, I$ shake，swing：aor．1．ễ $\neq \eta \lambda a$ ，Soph．El． 710. Pass．aor． 2.

Homer has also the aor．2．act．with the reduplication in the com－ pound part．$\dot{a} \mu \pi \varepsilon \pi \alpha \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu$ ：and the syncop．aor．2．midd．$\pi a^{\prime} \lambda \tau 0$ ，Il．o， 645．In Callimachus 1．64，we find the aor．1．midd．infin．$\pi \dot{\eta} \lambda a \sigma \theta a<$.
 $\sigma a \sigma \forall a \iota$ ；and perf．$\pi \bar{\epsilon} \pi \bar{a} \mu a \iota \dagger, 3$ ．sing．pluperf．$\pi \hat{\epsilon} \pi \bar{a} \tau 0$ ．This verb was used exactly like кта́одає，ке́ктдиа兀．The aorist is found only in the poets ；the perfect and pluperfect in prose also，e．g．in Xenophon．

The aorist of this verb is sufficiently distinguished from the aorist of $\pi a \tau$ éoцut，I eat，（although they are written the same，）by the a of the former being long while that of the latter is short．The perfect of the latter differs by having the $\sigma \ddagger$ ．

[^228]$\ddagger$ Schneider in his Lexicon attempts to unite these two verbs，but he does it by etymological art，which ought to have no influence on grammatical treatment．

Пáббш，Att．$\pi a ́ \tau \tau \omega, I$ strew，sprinkle，besprinkle：fut． $\pi a ́ \sigma \omega(u-)$ ；perf．pass．$\pi ध ́ \pi a \sigma \mu a t$ ．－Midd．See П入á $\sigma \sigma \omega$ and＇Ар $о$ о́ттш．

Some of the forms of this verb are written the same as those of $\pi a \tau^{\prime} о \mu a \ell$ ．
Пá $\chi^{\omega^{*}}$ ，I suffer：fut．$\pi \epsilon$ íбоцає as the fut．midd．of $\pi \in \dot{\theta} \theta \omega$ ；perf．2．$\pi \in ́ \pi o \nu \theta a$（from the stem IEN －as seen in $^{\prime}$


Beside the above，we find the following old sister－forms；in Od．$\rho, 555$. a fem．perf．part．$\pi \epsilon \pi a ̆ \theta v i ̃ a$, which supposes a perf．$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \theta a$ according to the analogy of ápapvia and others under＇Apapiokw：and in Eschyl． Agam．1635．in the Iambics the aor．1．part．$\pi \dot{\eta}$ бas（from an aor． $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \sigma \alpha)$ ．The fut．$\pi \eta_{1} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ is uncertain $\ddagger$ ．

We find also in Homer a syncopated perf．$\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ for $\pi \epsilon \pi \dot{v} \nu \theta a \tau \varepsilon$ ， like é $\gamma \rho \mathrm{i}$ írop $\theta$ e for $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma$ ópate，by an imitation of the passive termi－ nation ：that is to say，as soon as in $\pi \epsilon \pi \dot{o} \nu \theta a r \epsilon$ the $\theta$ preceded the $\tau$ ，it was changed to $\sigma$（as＂$\dot{\delta} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，i$\quad i \tau \epsilon$ ）and the $\nu$ was dropped，making $\pi \dot{\epsilon}$－ $\pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ；a transition was then made to a passive form $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ．

Пaтá⿱㇒日ш，I strike，is regular ：it was used by the Attics in the active voice only．See $\Pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ ．

Пaré $\omega$ ，I tread，is regular．The pres．pass．accidentally coincides with the following verb．
 $\pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ ；perf．$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \sigma \mu a \iota$ ．That these forms belong to each other is proved by identity of usage（e．g．Herodot．1，73．and 2，47．є́ є́á⿱㇒木аито and $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ v i \tau a \iota ~ \tau \omega \hat{\nu} \kappa \rho \epsilon \bar{\omega} \nu:$ ），as well as by the exact analogy of $\delta a \tau \epsilon i \bar{\sigma} \theta a t$ ，


Пav̀v，I cause to cease，stop：fut．$\pi$ av́vo ；aor．1．émavaa， \＆c．：there are no traces of a perfect．Midd．$\pi$ avopat，$I$ cease：fut．$\pi \epsilon \pi a v ́ \sigma o \mu a \iota \S ; ~ p e r f . ~ p a s s . ~ \pi ध ́ \pi a v \mu a t, ~ I ~ h a v e ~ c e a s e d, ~$ i．e．I no longer continue to do so；aór．l．midd．émaváa $\mu \eta$ ； aor．l．pass．$\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \dot{v} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a v \sigma \theta \eta \nu \|$ ；the former，Ionic and

[^229][^230]perhaps old Attic, is found in Hes. 0, 533. Herodot. 1, 130.; while the latter is preferred by Thucydides and the Attics who followed him *.

The imperat. act. $\pi a \hat{v} \epsilon$ is very commonly used in the immediate sense for $\pi$ avov: and there is one instance mentioned of the aor. Ënavoa in
 $\dot{a} \hat{\epsilon} \theta \lambda \omega \nu$, but the excellent Cod. Vindob. 56. has M $\nu \eta \sigma \tau \bar{\eta} \rho u s$, according to which the subject of the verb is the two chief suitors mentioned in the verse before. By this emendation the connection of the whole sentence becomes so much more natural, that it helps to prove the truth of the reading. Compare also the Ambrosian Scholium.

Пeitiv, I persuade: fut. $\pi \in i \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ê $\pi \in i \sigma a \dagger$; ; perf. тє́тєєка. Pass. тєїоцає, I am persuaded, I believe, I obey: fut. midd. $\pi \epsilon i \sigma o \mu a \iota$; perf. pass. $\pi$ é $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \mu a t, I$ have been convinced, therefore Ibelieve firmly; aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \in \dot{i} \theta \theta \eta v$ : to which we may add the perf. 2. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \sigma \circ \theta a$, generally with the intransitive sense, I trust.

In Il. $\beta, 341, \delta, 159$. we find a syncop. 1. plur. pluperf. $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \epsilon \\ \epsilon \\ \epsilon\end{gathered} \theta \mu \epsilon \nu$
 $\mu \epsilon \nu$ from $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \theta a$ under "Е $\rho \chi \circ \mu a \iota$, and several others, everything between the root and the termination is dropped: and as some of these perfects (кє́краүа, тє́тоө $\theta a, \& \mathrm{c}$.) have the force of a pres., they have also an imperative ending in $\theta \iota$, as кєккра $\chi_{\ell}, \pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \iota$, Æschyl. Eum. 602. in which latter the diphthong of the root is retained.

Poetry has also (see the Indexes of Aristoph. and Eurip.) the aor. 2.
 Hov, $\pi \iota \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i \sigma \theta \eta \nu, \& c$. The Epic language never uses the act. aor. without the redupl., $\pi \varepsilon \pi \iota \theta \circ \nu, \pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \imath \theta \varepsilon, \pi \epsilon \pi i \theta \circ \iota \mu$, \&c.; but in the midd. it has the usual $\pi, \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a t$. The reduplicated form of the midd. (at least in the only passage where it occurs) belongs as to meaning to
 $\theta \dot{\omega} \nu$, Pind. Isth. 4, 122. $\ddagger$

From this aor. 2. arose again other active forms, as fut. $\pi \epsilon \pi i \theta \eta(\sigma \omega$, and $\pi \grave{\imath} \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \theta \eta \sigma a$, and part. $\pi i ̈ \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s: ~ b u t ~ w i t h ~ t h i s ~ d i f f e r e n c e, ~$

[^231][^232]that $\pi \epsilon \pi \iota \theta_{i} \sigma \omega$ has the meaning of to persuade, but $\pi \iota \theta_{j} \sigma \omega, \pi \iota \theta_{\eta} \sigma \pi$ the intransitive sense of $\pi \epsilon i \theta \circ \mu a \iota$ and $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \iota \theta a$, to obey or follow; to trust to,

Such is the distinction which must be observed, if we follow our present Homeric text. But here our attention is at once arrested by the circumstance, that according to this rule $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta$ is and $\pi \iota$ 向 $\sigma$ as would be used in many passages indifferently, without distinction of sense or metre. Now it should be observed, that $\pi \epsilon \pi o t \theta$ ós, of which the established meaning has always been, trusting to, relying on, fretus, never occurs in any other sense; as v$\eta v \sigma i, \lambda a o i s, ~ \chi e i \rho \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota, ~ \dot{a} \lambda \kappa i, ~ \pi \sigma \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon i ́ \eta-~$ $\sigma \iota, \pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta \omega \dot{s}$, \&c.: while we cannot but feel, that in opposition to these the following two passages, фןє and $\dot{a} \nu a \iota \delta \varepsilon i \eta \phi \iota \pi \iota \theta i \sigma a s$, Hes. $\varepsilon, 357$. express a very different idea, viz. obeying or yielding to; which sense the future of the same verb has also in the only passage where any part of it occurs beside the participle; e. g. $\pi t \theta_{i j} \sigma \epsilon \in$, thou wilt obey, Od. $\phi, 369$. In the same way when at Il. $\delta, 398$. Tydeus, having slain all the Thebans, (who lay in wait for him,) excepting Mæon, spares him alone, $\theta \varepsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ repáє $\sigma \sigma \iota \pi \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$, it is quite clear that he does it "in obedience to the signs of the gods." When, however, at $\zeta, 183$. Bellerophon attacks and kills the terrible Chimæra,
 mean nothing more than trusting to, confiding in. But we find in the same sense at Il. $\mu, 256$. speaking of the Trojans attacking the Grecian
 sage alone makes it very probable that $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta$ 's was also the original reading in the other, viz. $\zeta, 183$. And this supposition is strengthened by Il. $\nu, 369$. Od. $\phi, 315$. where our text reads $\pi \iota \theta \dot{j} \sigma a s$ in the same sense of trusting to, but the manuscripts actually have the various reading $\pi \epsilon \pi o t \theta$ is. It is therefore very probable that through the affinity of the two readings, and the similarity of the expressions, both verbs were very early confounded together; and that $\pi \epsilon \pi o t \theta$ ís was also the original reading in $11 . \lambda, 235 . \rho, 48 . \chi, 107$. and Hes. $\epsilon, 669$.

Пeíк $\omega, I$ shear, comb : fut. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$, \&c. Compare the Ion. $\delta \hat{\varepsilon} \xi \omega$ from $\delta \varepsilon i \kappa v v \mu$.-Midd. In the Attic language the pres. $\pi \epsilon_{\wedge} \tau \epsilon \in \omega$ was in use*.

[^233]Theocr. 5, 98. Etym. M. vv. тє́бкаs and $\pi$ єiкш (p. 667, 40.) Etym. Gud. v. $\pi$ єík (p. 456.). Aristoplianes has $\pi e \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu$ and
 $\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu$ is doubtful. In Pollux 7. c. 33. 1. we find $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ as a pres. of $\pi \epsilon \in \xi$ ато, but through a misunderstanding the text of our editions has $\pi \in \in \kappa \epsilon \iota$. See Jungermann's note. Thus we see that the simple stem $\pi$ ékw was strengthened by the Attics to $\pi \in \in \kappa \tau \omega$, which again was changed to $\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau \bar{\omega}$, like $\dot{\rho} i \pi \tau \omega$ to $\dot{\rho} เ \pi \tau \bar{\omega}$.

Пєєขá $\omega$, h hunger: fut. $\pi \epsilon \iota \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, \&c. This verb, like $\delta_{i \nsim}^{\prime} \omega, \zeta^{\prime} \omega, \& c$., has both in the Attic and common dialect an $\eta$, as infin. $\pi \epsilon \omega \eta \imath \nu$, $\delta \iota \psi \tilde{\eta} \nu$, \&c. We find also प $\eta \bar{\eta} c, ~ \zeta \tilde{\eta}$,
 and conj. are the same.

Пєє ${ }^{\prime}$ a, I try, is regular, with a long, Ion. $\eta$, in the inflexion. The passive as a deponent, with fut. middle, has the same sense; but it means also to experience.

The Epics use the aor. of the midd. as well as of the pass. in the sense of a deponent. The same poets have a form $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ with a frequentative meaning, to try, to prove, which again became common in the language of the later writers, while the Attics always used $\pi \epsilon \varphi \bar{q} \nu$ only. The passive with the $\sigma$ belongs entirely to this later $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \dot{c}-$


Пє́кк, пєєттє́ш. See Пєікш.
$\Pi є \lambda a ́ \zeta i v, I$ approach, is regular. The Attic fut. $\pi \in \lambda \hat{̣} \nu$ occurs sometimes in the poets.
In the older language this verb has the causative meaning to bring near, carry or place near ; whence the pass. $\pi \epsilon \lambda$ á $\zeta \rho \mu a t, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ takes the immediate sense, which the active has in the common language. Homer has $\pi \epsilon \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$ in the older meaning only, succeeding poets in both.

The sister-form $\pi \epsilon \lambda a ́ \omega^{*}$ occurs as a present in Hymn. Bacch. 44. $\pi \in \lambda$ ćqu. The poetical aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\lambda} a \eta \eta v$ used by the Attics, and the verbal adj. ändātos which comes from it and is found both in the Attics and the Epic poets, are supposed to be formed by syncope: but the $a$ is always long; whence it is clear that this is rather a transposition of sounds together with a contraction, like кéкра̄кк from кєра́ш, $\pi$ ध́$\pi \rho \bar{\kappa} \kappa \alpha$ from $\pi \epsilon \rho \alpha ́ \omega, \& c$. And in the same way we must explain in the Epics, 1. the perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \eta \mu a t, \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon}$ vos Od. $\mu, 108$. and ?. the aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \eta \nu \nu, \pi \lambda \eta$ ทroo $\dagger$; that is to say, as syncopated forms from
 contraction takes place, as it does in the similar case of кéкра̄̄ка (under Kepáv $\nu \nu \mu$ ), Ion. into $\eta$, Att. in $\bar{a} \ddagger$. We find also frequently $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda$ á $\sigma \theta \eta \nu$, but this is indisputably through the common fault of corrupting the $\theta$

[^234]contraction should take place in both dialects in $\eta$; for the $\alpha$ in кéкра̄ка arises from the influence of the $\rho$. l'erhaps, therefore, the Atticism in this verb was only to avoid a similarity with $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, particularly in $\pi \lambda i \theta \omega$ mentioned at the top of the next page.
of the aor. 1. pass. into $\sigma \theta$; for it cannot be supposed that beside $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ a third form not required by any metre could have been also in use. See Brunck on Eurip. Hec. 880.

The Tragedians have also a sister-form $\pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$, by adding $-\theta \omega$ to the vowel of the stem or root, and this they again contract in the present (as in the last paragraph) into $\pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \theta \omega$ with long $\alpha$.

A pres. $\pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ (for $\pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ ) is also supposed, on account of $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\varepsilon}$-, $\pi \lambda a \zeta \varepsilon$, Od. $\lambda, 583$. and the particip. $\pi \rho o \sigma \pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \zeta o \nu$, Il. $\mu, 285$. And the Epic language furnishes sufficient grounds arising from metrical difficulty, to account for the syncope in these forms. But there are other points to be considered : particularly that these two would then be the only Homeric passages among a very large number, in which the active voice would have the later immediate meaning of to approach. Besides in these two passages the water and the waves are the subject, and the case is the same in a third passage, Il. $\phi, 269$. where the wave that is
 commentators understand this last also to be for $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha \zeta_{\epsilon}$, although here the context makes it far less probable. In addition to this we must observe that the common $\pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$, $-\alpha \gamma \xi \omega$ occurs very frequently in Homer, and is used also of waves, in as much as they beat and drive ships from their course. It is therefore pretty certain that $\pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ is the proper expression for the beating of the waves, and was used intransitively as well as transitively, in as much as an object is met and moved by them, consequently moved from its place, or beaten and driven away; whence therefore the common metaphorical sense of $\pi \lambda \alpha_{\zeta} \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, to wander about.

Another Epic sister-form is made by changing -a $\omega$ into - $\nu \dot{c} \omega,-\nu \eta \mu \iota$, and the $\varepsilon$ of the root into $\iota$, as $\pi \epsilon \lambda^{\prime} \omega, \pi \lambda^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime} \eta \mu \iota, \pi \lambda^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime} \alpha \mu a t$ : see кiр $\nu \eta \mu$ from кєра́ш in note under Kєра́ $\nu \nu v \mu$ и.
$\Pi$ é $\omega \omega$ and more frequently $\pi$ é $\lambda o \mu r \iota, I a m$, an old verb which remained in use among the Dorics ( $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon t, \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \eta$, Fragm. Pythagg. Gale, p. 749. 750.) and the poets. It has only pres, and imperf., which latter, when it retains the augment, suffers syncope; e.g. 3. sing. imperf. act.
 And here we find this peculiarity, that the imperfect passive has very commonly the meaning of the present, as Il. a, 418. $\zeta, 434$.
 $\mu \in v o s t$ in what appears to be the original meaning, $I$ am employed about, prevail amongst, versor, and with the same syncope : as in Od.


[^235]vail among men, frequentant, versantur; in which sense Homer clse-
 stance of the termination - $\dot{\epsilon} \omega$ having the change of vowel to $\omega$.
$\Pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \omega, I$ send: fut. $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi \omega$; aor. 1. є̂ $\pi \epsilon \mu \psi a$; perf. $\pi \epsilon ́-$ $\pi о \mu \phi a^{*}$. In the passive Pindar and Herodotus have the aor. 1. part. $\pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \in i c$, and Photius the part. perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu \mu e ́ v o c$. The other tenses are generally supplied by àmoбтé̀ $\lambda \omega$.

חENO-. See $\Pi \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \chi \omega$.
Пévorat, I am poor: in Hom. I labour, and transit. I prepare by labour, סaîta, \&c. It is used only in pres. and imperf.

Метарєì or Пєторєї-and Пє́тршдаи. Sce Пьрєі̀.

## Пє́тобӨє. See Пáб $\chi$.

Пє́тршнли, \&c. Seе Порєіг.
Пє́лть. See Пє́ббш.
Пєрá $\omega$, I go over, pass over or throıgh: fut. $\pi є \rho \dot{a} \sigma \omega$, Ion. $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma a$, Ion. Є́ $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta \sigma a$. This verb is regular, with a long, Ion. $\eta$.

Different from the above is an inflexion with a short, $\pi \epsilon \rho a \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega, \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\rho \ddot{a} \sigma a$, and in the sense of to sell; but found only in the Epic poets, and without any trace of a present with the same meaning having been in use; for $\pi \epsilon \rho \bar{\omega}$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\chi}$, is in this sense a future. Hence comes the verb in common use $\pi \iota \pi \rho a \dot{\sigma} \kappa \omega$ with the subst. $\pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota s$. For further particulars we refer to that verb, only remarking here that the original identity of the two is undoubted. That is to say, the common meaning of $\pi \epsilon \rho \bar{q} v$ is to go over, and it governs as a transitive the accusative of the space to be passed, as $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\psi} \nu \tau \eta \nu \nu \theta \alpha \dot{\partial} \lambda a \sigma a \nu$; but it may also be taken causatively, to carry overt; whence arose the meaning of to sell, i.e. to carry over the sea or into another country for sale. And usage separated the formation, so that $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$ and its derivatives meant only to sell, while $\pi \epsilon \rho \bar{a} \sigma \omega, \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\prime} \sigma \omega$ retained only the sense of to pass over, with the single exception of $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \nu o s$ in Homer, for which see


With these verbs we must compare a third, $\pi \epsilon \rho a i^{\prime} \omega$, from $\pi \epsilon \in \rho a s$ an end, (consequently with the meaning of to complete,) which is regular

[^236]proper sense; for in the Hymn. Merc. 133. (see Hermann) the reading is not sure; and $\pi \epsilon \rho \bar{q} \nu \pi o ́ \delta \alpha$, Eurip. Hec. 53. is like $\beta$ aivetv $\pi o ́ \delta a$, for which see Baivw.

 $\pi \epsilon \pi \varepsilon$ ¢िavтаı, Od. $\mu, 37$. Soph. Trach. 581.*
 fut. $\pi а \rho \delta \delta_{\eta} \sigma о \mu a t ;$ perf. $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi о \rho \delta a$.

In Aristoph. Vesp. 394. ámoтapṑ is accented falsely. It must be $\dot{\mu} \pi о \pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \delta \omega$ as aor. 2. conj.; for this conjunctive, after the particles ou $\mu \dot{\eta}$, has the force of a future, even when it is joined in a sentence with real futures.

 II. $\omega, 729$. and a syncopated aor. (but only in the infin.) $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \theta a a$, which is to be explained by $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \theta \mu \eta v$, infin. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \theta-\theta a t$, and dropping the 0 $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \theta a$, like $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta a c$. The perf. act. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi o \rho \theta u$ is post-Homeric.

Петєì. See Пі́лтш.
П'́ध $\sigma \omega, \pi \epsilon ́ \epsilon \tau \omega, I$ cook: fut. $\pi \in ́ \psi \omega$, \&ic.; perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \mu \mu \alpha \iota$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \in \phi \theta a \iota$. The pres. $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \tau \omega$ which corresponds with this formation, is found in the later writers.

That חEII- is the simple stem or root is clear from some of the derivatives, as $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega \nu$, ápronónos: and the change from $\pi$ to $\sigma \sigma$ or $\tau \tau$ is
 as well as Kœn. ad Greg. Æol. 42., and Buttm. Lexilog. p. 126.

Пєтáv$\nu \nu \mu$, or $\pi \epsilon \tau a \nu \nu v \dot{\omega}$, I spread wide, open: fut. $\pi \epsilon \tau a ́ \sigma \omega$ (ă) ; aor. l. є̇ $\pi \in ́ \tau a ̆ \sigma a, ~ E p . ~ \pi є ́ \tau a \sigma \sigma a, ~ \& c . ~ P e r f . ~ p a s s . ~ b y ~ s y n-~$


The Att. fut. $\pi \epsilon \tau \bar{\omega}, \& c$., was generally preferred to $\pi \epsilon \tau a ́ \sigma \omega$ : see Thom. Mag. p. 61. and Meineke Menand. Incert. 190. The later writers took the liberty of using this form or the simple theme as a

 oracle of Herodot. 1, 62. and in ávaлєпє́табтal, Lucian. Somn. 29. Out of the Attic dialect this verb was very naturally confounded with the following one, which is so nearly akin to it: see, for instance, é $\pi \varepsilon$ ríct $\eta \nu$ under that verb; Parmenides (Fragm. v. 18.) had a part. aor. $\dot{a} \nu a \pi \tau \dot{\mu} \mu \in v o s$ in an active sense, having opened; and Zenodotus read at II. a, 351. $\chi$ єîpas ávatrús.

* [Hermann doults the admissibility of this Epic form in an Attic poet, and prefers reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon i \rho a r a t$.-Passow.]
† In this aor. as in $\bar{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta} \rho a \kappa \circ \nu$ from $\delta \dot{\delta} \rho \kappa \kappa$, the natural length of the middle syllable is removed by transposing the letters.
 the end of the article on Пèá $\zeta \omega$. Schneider in his Lexicon quotes the following authorities for it; viz. mírva for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \nu a$, imperf. of $\pi i \tau \nu a ́ \omega$, I1. $\phi, 7$. $\pi$ itvís, part. pres. of $\pi i \tau \nu \eta \mu$, Od. $\lambda$, 392. $\pi i \tau \nu a \nu$ 3. plur. for
 $v o \nu$ from $\pi i t \nu \omega$ is doubtful, and Gaisford reads $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \lambda o v$. Schneider improperly confounds this ${ }^{\mathrm{I}}$ verb with $\pi \iota \tau \nu \epsilon \in \omega, \pi \iota \tau \nu \epsilon \bar{\imath} \nu$, a sister-form of $\pi i \pi \tau \omega$ : see the latter.

Пéтонаı, I fly, depon. midd. : fut. $\pi \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a \imath$, Hom. and Aristoph. Pac. 77. 1126., but in Attic prose generally


In addition to the above, which according to the Atticists are the only legitimate forms in Attic prose, we find also frequently a pres. ïлтанає with the aor. 1. $\dot{e} \pi \tau \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \tau \dot{\tau} \sigma \theta a \iota$; and in an active form the aor. $\neq \pi \tau \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \tau \eta ิ \nu a t$, part. $\pi \tau$ ác.

See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 325. Lucian. Lexiph. extr. By these and other testimonies the pres. ïтu $\quad$ aut, which is the common one in use among the later writers, becomes very suspicious as a form of the older language, although still found in some passages without any various reading : see Porson. ad Medeam. 1. Lobeck ad Phryn. 1. c. $\dagger$ The aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ in the Ionic writers and old poets is unobjectionable and of frequent occurrence: see Porson on the passages quoted, and Hermann on Soph. Aj. $275 . \ddagger$ : but in the prose of the older time it is very doubtful, as in many passages where it is the common reading, the manuscripts have $\pi \tau \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a l, \pi \tau \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \nu o s, \& c$. The form $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \eta \nu$ is old and genuine in the poets, although not so frequent; but in the later language it is very common.

Beside the above we find $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \mu a \iota$ and $\pi \varepsilon \tau \boldsymbol{c}^{\prime} о \mu a \iota$ used in the later prose; in which they are free from all suspicion, as even the pass. aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ (for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ ), notwithstanding its identity with the aor.

[^237]$\pi$ тато for $\dot{\alpha} \phi i \pi \tau \pi а г о$ in the former of the two passages. But as Lucian will not
 $\kappa \iota \kappa o ́ \nu$, this emendation does not appear to me too bold.
$\ddagger$ Hermann's opinion on Soph. CEd. T. 17., that $\pi \tau$ é $\theta a t$ is an imperf., still wants the necessary proofs: in the passage itself the sense of the imperfect is by no means decisive.
pass. of $\pi \epsilon \tau \dot{c} \nu \nu v \mu$, occurs in it, e. g. Aristot. H. A. 9, 40. (9, 27, 5. Schneid.) and in Lucian. Rhet. Præcept. 6. For the form $\pi$ étaцat there is older authority in the poets; for $\pi$ éraraı is found not only in Pindar, but also in the chorus and the anapæsts of the dramatic poets*; and Anacreon has the infin. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$ and the 2. sing. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \sigma \sigma \sigma a \iota$.

Lastly come the forms with the change of vowel to o or $\omega$ according to the analogy of фє́р $\omega$ and форє́ $\omega$, трє́ $\mu \omega$ and тролє́ $\omega$, or $\sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \phi \omega$ and $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \dot{\prime} \phi a \omega$, זрє́ $\chi \omega$ and $\tau \rho \omega \chi^{\dot{\omega}} \omega$, and others mentioned under $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega$; in which however it must be observed that this is the only verb with the formation in -á $\omega$ which changes the vowel to $o$ : for the principal form,
 the Epics takes the formation in - $\epsilon \omega$, but only in a resolved shape, as $\pi \sigma \tau$ éovial ; and when the metre requires, it has an $\omega$ in the stem or root, as $\pi \omega \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \tau$. Of the further formation of this verb we find the Doric
 1338. Aristophanes has however the perfect $\pi \epsilon \pi \dot{\sigma} \pi \eta \mu a \iota$ not only in the Anapæsts (Nub. 319.) but also in the Iambics (Av. 1445.) ; whence Bekker's opinion is very probable that this was the usual perfect of $\pi \dot{\epsilon}-$ ropat in the Attic dialect: for I know of no authority for the active $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha \ddagger$ beyond grammatical tradition. If this supposition be correct, the Attic prose usage of the above verb will be as follows:


## ПЕТ-. See Пíттш.

## 

$\Pi$ п́ $\phi \nu o \nu$, é $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu o \nu, I$ slew; the reduplicated and at the same time syn-
 The participle is accented contrary to analogy $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \phi \nu \omega \nu$ (Il. $\pi, 827 . \rho$, 539.), and this is expressly mentioned by the grammarians as a peculiarity; see Etym. Mag. vv. ё $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu o v, \beta a \lambda \omega \nu, \dot{\epsilon}^{\omega} \omega \nu \S$. Of the aoristic meaning in all the Homeric forms belonging to ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \epsilon \phi \nu o v$ there can be

* e.g. in Eurip. Ion. 90. and Aristoph. Av. 573. 574. where Brunck, contrary to all the manuscripts, reads as Attic $\pi$ éтєтat.
+ Whatever may be our opinion of the odes of Anacreon, the 9th is clearly of too pure a perind for us to endure such a barbarism as $\pi \epsilon \tau \bar{a} \sigma a \iota$ Compare e"paббaь

$\ddagger$ The perfects $\pi \varepsilon \in \pi \tau \alpha \mu \alpha, \pi \epsilon \in \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$, $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \omega \kappa \alpha, \pi є \pi \tau \eta \dot{s}\left(\sec ^{\prime} \Pi \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu v \mu \iota, \Pi\right.$ е́$\tau о \mu a \iota, \Pi i \pi \tau \omega$ and $\Pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega)$, formed from verbs coming from the root ПET $\Omega$, are to be explained by syncope as for $\pi \epsilon \pi \varepsilon$ -

тajat, \&cc. These perfects, like кéкт $\eta$ $\mu a \iota$ and $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, are exceptions to the general rule of verbs, beginning with two consonants, and forming their perfect with $\epsilon$ instead of the reduplication. See note under Kтáo $\mu$ at.
§ I see clearly however that we cannot build much on this grammatical tradition. It is possible that the aoristic force of this participle, which is not evident at first sight even in the passages where it occurs, was not observed until its accentuation as a present had become firmly cstablished.
no doubt; and the supposition of a pres. $\pi$ t $\phi v \omega$, as shown also by the analogy of $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \epsilon \in \kappa \lambda \epsilon \tau o$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{́} \varphi p u \delta o \nu$, is perfectly untenable*.

With this we must join the perf. pass. $\pi \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \phi \bar{\phi} \mu u$, of which Homer has the 3. sing. $\pi \in \phi a \tau a t, 3$. plur. $\pi$ 白фarтat, infin. $\pi \in \phi$ '́ $\sigma \theta a t$, and the 3. fut.
 This $\pi \epsilon \phi \neq \mu a t$ bears exactly the same relation to the root $\Phi E N-$ as $\tau \hat{\epsilon}-$

 form comes also from the root $Ф$ A- in фaiv ; nnd lycophron has allowed himself to use, in the sense of killed, the perf. part. $\pi \in \phi a \pi \mu \epsilon$ vos, which belongs also to $\phi a i \nu \omega$ and $\phi \eta \mu i$.
$\Pi_{\eta}^{\eta} \gamma \bar{v} \mu \mathrm{and} \pi \eta \gamma^{\nu} \dot{v} \omega$, I fix : and in the later writers $\pi \dot{\eta} \sigma-$
 є́ $\pi \dot{\eta} \chi 0 \eta \nu$; but more generally aor. 2. є́ $\pi a ́ \gamma \eta \eta$ ( $\mathfrak{a}$ ) ; aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \xi^{\prime} \mu \eta \eta$ : the perf. 2. $\pi \in ́ \pi \eta \gamma a$ has the sense of the
 $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ : an aor. 2. midd. $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \eta \gamma^{\circ} \mu \eta \nu$ occurs in Æsop. Fab. 146. Ern.-Midd.

 63 . ; aor. l. pass. є́ $\pi \iota \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, infin. $\pi \iota \epsilon \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \imath$, but in Hippocr. $\pi \iota \epsilon \chi^{\theta} \bar{\eta} v a \iota$; perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon \pi i \epsilon \sigma \mu a \iota$, but in Hippocr. $\pi \epsilon \pi i \epsilon \gamma \mu a \iota$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \pi \iota \epsilon ́ \chi \theta a \iota$. This. verb therefore, like $\dot{a} \rho \pi a ́ \zeta \omega, \pi a i \zeta \omega$ and others, partakes of two formations, the one with a lingual as its characteristic letter, the other with a palatic.

There are some traces of a sister-form $\pi \iota \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \omega$, as we find in Homer $\pi t \epsilon ́ \zeta \epsilon v \nu$ 3. plur. imperf. for é $\pi i \epsilon \zeta_{0 \nu}$, in Herodotus $\pi \iota \epsilon \zeta \epsilon \dot{v} \mu \epsilon v o s$, and in Plut. Thes. 6. $\pi \iota \epsilon$ ¢ồvтos.
$\Pi_{i}^{\prime} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota, I$ fill, infin. $\pi \mu \mu \pi \lambda^{\prime} \nu a t$, follows í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$ in its pres. and imperf., imitating it even in the admission or rejection of the forms in $-a \omega$ : fut. $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $e^{\prime} \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$;

[^238]aor. 1. midd. é $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$; perf. pass. $\pi e ́ \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu a \iota$; aor. 1. pass. $\epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

In the compounds of this and the following verb $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta$ $\mu t$, whenever a $\mu$ precedes the first $\pi$, it is dropped before the second, as $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi i \pi \lambda \eta \theta_{l}$, Il. $\phi, 311$.; but resumed when the augment intervenes, as $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \in \pi i \mu \pi \lambda a \sigma a v$.
The poets observe or disregard the above rule according to the metre ; but the deviations from it which occur in prose, at least in the older writers, may be ascribed to the negligence of transcribers. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 95.

The syncopated pass. aor. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$, imper. $\pi \lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma o$, opt. $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \mu \eta \nu$ (like $\beta \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu), \& c$. , is one of the few aorists of this kind which are found also in Attic prose; e. g. in Aristoph. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \hat{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu o s, \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{f} \mu \eta \nu^{*}$. In this last the diphthong of the optative $\epsilon t$ is remarkable, as the formation $\pi \tau \pi \pi \lambda a ́ \nu a l, \pi i \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \mu a l, \& c$. supposes a stem or root ПАA-. But in the same way $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$, which comes from xpá $\omega$, has in the opt. xpeint. The supposition most agreeable to analogy is, that П $\Lambda \mathrm{A} \Omega$ was changed after the Iono-Doric manner to $\Pi \Lambda \mathrm{E} \Omega$, whence therefore the Lat. pleo. To this we must add the Hesiodic ( $\theta, 880$.) $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda e \bar{v} \sigma u$ for $-\omega \bar{\sigma} a \iota$; for as in the Epic Ionicism, unlike to the later, aov in those verbal forms is changed to $\varepsilon v$, the above participle supposes a present $\pi \mu \pi \pi \lambda$ é $\omega$.

The immediate sense to be full belongs to $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$. This verb, beside the pres. and imperf., has no other tense than the perf. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \theta a$ synonymous with the present, Pherecr. in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 330, 23. Antim. Theb. Fr. 12. Arat. 774. $\ddagger$

[^239] common language the analogy of $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu t$ in cvery part of its formation, even to the dropping or retaining of the $\mu$ before the $\pi$.

Photius in his Lex. v. oérotal quotes as one of the older Atticisms $\pi \varepsilon \pi \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ оs.
 Compare the forms under $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$, which lead to a formation in $-\hat{\epsilon} \omega^{*}$.

In this verb the form $\pi \rho \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ is synonymous with $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu \mu$, but found only in Il. 九, 589. évérp $\theta_{0}$.
 infin. $\pi \iota \epsilon \imath \imath, \& c$. imper. $\pi i \epsilon$ (Od. $\iota, 347$. Eurip. Cycl. 560.) solely poetical, the common term being $\pi \hat{\imath} \theta_{\iota}$ (like $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \theta_{\iota}$, $\beta \hat{\eta} \theta_{l}, \gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \theta_{l}, \& c$. .), Athen. 10. p. 446. B. The other tenses come from the root $\Pi O_{-}$, with variable quantity, as perf.
 adj. жотóc, потéoc, whence the Lat. poto.
The Ion. particip. $\pi \iota \nu e \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ (like $\left.\pi \iota \epsilon \zeta \varepsilon^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu o s\right)$ for $\pi \iota \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o s$, is found in Hippocr. de A. A. L. 22.

A future in the shape of the fut. 2. $\pi \iota o \bar{\mu} \mu \mathrm{a}$ is of frequent occurrence from the time of Aristotle. We find indeed $\pi \tau \varepsilon \bar{i} \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ in Xen. Symp. 4, 7. but probably the old reading $\pi i \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ ought to be restored: see also Schweigh. Athen. 5. p. 497. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 31.-The 1 in $\pi i o-$ $\mu a t$ is long in Aristophanes, e.g. Equ. 1289. 1401. but in the other comedians it is short : see Athen, 10. p. 446. e. 11. 783. e. (p. 221. Schweigh.) p. 471. a. 13. p. 570. d.-A solitary instance of $\pi i \rho \mu a \iota$ (with l long) as a present for $\pi i \nu \omega$ is found in Pind. Ol. 6, 147.

The syncop. infin. $\pi i \nu$ or $\pi \varepsilon i \nu$, accented also $\pi i \nu, \pi \epsilon i \nu$, occurs in Lucill. Epig. 28, 3. Meineke Euphor. Fr. 105. See Mus. Antiqu. Stud. p. 247. sqq. Herodian. Hermanni $\$ 47$.

[^240][^241]Пıтiбкш, I give to drink: fut. $\pi$ iow (Pind. Isthm. 6, 108.


Пıт ${ }^{\prime}$ а́ $\kappa \omega, I$ sell, Ion. $\pi \iota \pi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$, Herodot. It has in the common language neither fut. nor aor. active: the other forms are, perf. $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \rho \bar{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha$; perf. pass. $\pi \in ́ \pi \rho \bar{\jmath} \mu a!$, infin.
 In all these forms the Ionics changed the long $a$ to $\eta$.

In the common language the defective tenses were made up by $\dot{a} \pi o-$ $\delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \rho \mu a t, \dot{a} \pi \varepsilon \delta \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu$. The forms properly belonging to this verb are in the old and Epic language, fut. $\pi \varepsilon \rho a ́ \sigma \omega$ (with $\alpha$ short), Att. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \omega \bar{\omega}$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{q} v, \pi \epsilon \rho a ́ q \nu$; aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho a \sigma \alpha$; of which the pres. $\pi \epsilon \rho a \dot{\alpha} \omega$, as we have seen above, is nowhere found with this meaning, but occurs only in the cognate sense of to go over, in which however it is inflected with $-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, Ion. $-\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$. The above $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \kappa a$ with the other forms came from the formation $\pi \varepsilon \rho$ व̆̃ $\omega$ ( $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \hat{\rho}$ ăka) by the same metathesis, which we
 кра̄ка, Іоп. ке́кр $п к а$.

The Homeric $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \varepsilon \mathcal{v}_{0}$ s, I1. $\phi, 58$., formed from $\pi \epsilon \rho \rho^{\prime} \omega$, $-\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, and referring to $\dot{e x} \pi \dot{\rho} \rho a \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ at $v .40$., would therefore be a particular deviation from the above; according to which it would stand for $\pi \epsilon \pi \varepsilon-$ рăرévos with the a lengthened on account of the metre: but this metrical necessity was much more likely to have suggested, according to the above analogy, and with the Ionic $\eta$, the form $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \eta \mu \epsilon$ 'yos; which without doubt is the true reading of the passage*.

The pres. $\pi \iota \pi \rho$ íckw does not occur in the Epic language, but in its stead is found $\pi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \nu \eta \mu$ ( compare $\delta a \mu \nu a ́ \omega, \delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \eta \mu$ under $\Delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$ ). In the old language, therefore, the following is the established usage;


The Atticists lay it down as a rule that $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho$ á $\sigma o \mu a t$, not $\pi \rho a-$ Ón $_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \alpha u$, is used as the common future: and in reading the Attic writers we shall find that this rule holds good, in as much as the text has $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho$ á $\sigma$ eral where there is not the slightest expression of certainty or quickness. And what is particularly confirmed by the rule is this, that although $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$ is good Attic, yet $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \bar{a} \sigma \theta a s$ is very frequently found, without any of the force of a perfect, instead of the mere aorist, e. g. є́кiŋpu $\xi_{e} \pi \in \pi \rho \bar{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$, "he proclaimed that.... should be sold," Xen.

[^242] in each case the other form is expressly referred to as a various reading.

 Myst. p. 10, 18. These forms therefore bear the same relation to each

 imperat. is accented $\pi i \pi \tau e$ : the formation is from ПET $\Omega$;
 $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{v}$; perf. $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega \kappa a$, Attic part. $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \grave{\omega} \boldsymbol{c}$, ŵroc.

The part. perf. is shortened by the Epic poets to $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \omega$ 's, by the Attic to $\pi e \pi \tau \omega$ 's. The latter carries us back to the regular $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega \kappa \omega$ 's, as the $\beta \varepsilon \beta \rho \hat{\text { outes }}$ of Sophocles comes from $\beta \in \beta \rho \omega \kappa \kappa \dot{s}$; but $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \omega$ 's points to $\pi \in \pi \tau \eta \kappa a$ (compare $\tau \in \theta \nu \in \omega^{\prime} s$ ). And this is without doubt the original form (IEET $\Omega \in \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$, like $\delta \epsilon \mu \omega \delta \in \delta \delta \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$ ), from which by the change of vowel came $\pi$ є́пт $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \alpha$ : see Buttm. Lexil. p. 137.

We find also both aorists regularly formed from the simple stem or root $\Pi$ ET $\Omega$ : viz.

1. द̈тeтov, aor. 2. in Pindar and other Doric writers.

 have been confounded together in daily usage; so in the verb before us the aor. 1. was not found, indeed, in the current language of the day, yet it appears to have remained always in the dialects; hence it occurs among others in the Alexandrine and occasionally in the later ones; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 724. Orph. Arg. 519. Among the older writers Euripides has it twice in the Chorus, $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma a$, Tro. 291. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\boldsymbol{\sigma e l e}$, Alc. 471 . in both which passages these forms have been rejected in the latest editions by a precipitate criticism $\ddagger$.

[^243]of o $\nu$, as $\varepsilon i \delta a$, $\in i \lambda a$, è $\lambda \alpha \beta \alpha \nu$, and acknowledged to be barbarous. But they who classed it thus, did not at the same time consider, that while these latter forms have very little in the pure language harmonizing with them, like $\epsilon i \pi a, \eta \nu \cup \gamma \kappa a$, the form $\varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \sigma a$ on the other hand is the regular aor. 1., and with its future $\pi \epsilon \sigma o \bar{v}-$ $\mu a \iota$ answers to $\varepsilon$ है $\pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \alpha, \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma 0 \bar{v} \mu a \iota$ and many others, in short to half the language. In this case thercfore, where the anomalous ex $\pi \epsilon \sigma \circ \nu$ was in current use, the
 $\sigma \epsilon \iota$ rò ễ $\pi \epsilon \sigma \alpha$, Schol. Aristoph. Av. 840 .) might very well remain as a not-discordant dialect in the Lyric poetry of the Iono-Attics, with quite as much reason as

 pears to be the established formation of this verb by a comparison of some of the passages where it occurs; and thus it comes under the analogy of $\sigma \tau \cup \gamma \in ́ \omega$, धैбтvyov and similar verbs, from the aorist of which arises a pres. in - $\hat{\epsilon} \omega$ : see $\kappa \tau \nu \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega$. The accentuation however of $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ for $\pi \iota \tau \nu \bar{w}$, of $\pi i \tau \nu o \nu \tau \epsilon s, \& c$. not only occurs very frequently in the manuscripts and in the Grammarians, but sense and metre are by no means generally decisive between them. See Hermann on Eurip. Med. 53. (Ed. Elmsl. Lips. p. 340. sqq.) and Reisig on Soph. Cd. Col. 1754. (Enarr. p. ccxi.) The only cases where the aorist appears to me evident, are those where we find $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ \pi \\ \text { r }\end{gathered}$ not contain the simple root, which is much more conspicuous in the Pindaric émerov (see $\pi i \pi \pi \omega$ ); the formation of the aor. émetov, pres. $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ has in its favour the analogy of the aor. é $\delta a \kappa o \nu$, pres. $\delta a ́ \kappa \nu \omega$. I do not therefore by any means reject the supposition that $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ and $\pi \iota \tau \nu \epsilon \in \omega$ might have existed together (like $\beta \nu \nu \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$ and $\beta \dot{v} \nu \omega, \delta v \nu \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ and $\delta v ́ v \omega$ ),
 from $\kappa \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ is used by the same Tragedians as an aorist. And here in particular, where from $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ arose a lengthened present $\pi \iota \tau \nu \bar{\omega}$, it ap-
the similarly analogous and equally unusual $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \in \tau 0 \nu$ remained in the Æolo-Doric dialect. Now it is at least worthy of remark, that this is the only one of all those Alexandrine aorists which tradition attributes to Euripides ; and with regard to the correctness of the readings, if we had nothing else in support of them, we have this consideration, that while it was very conceivable and indeed almost unavoidable for ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \nu, \pi \in ́ \sigma O L$ to have intruded themselves as various readings, it was quite inconceivable that transcribersor correctors of the metre should have interpolated $\hat{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon \sigma a$ and $\pi \in \in \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$. For who has ever seen an instance of Christian transcribers having introduced into the tragedians or any of the Attic writers those other forms ciofa, e̋ $\lambda a \beta a \nu$, which are so common in the LXX.? And this leads me back to the examination of another passage, which grammatical criticism has long lost sight of. In the wellknown passage of Herodotus 6, 21. the text formerly had és ס́x́cpva ễ $\pi \epsilon \sigma a \nu \tau \delta \partial$
 was adopted from some of the manuscripts, the historian was deprived of an intended grammatical figure as well as of his dialect. Longinus $(24,1$.) quotes this
passage as an instance of a collectlve singular used instead of a plural to elevate the diction. And certainly the expression, as It now stands in Herodotus, fully answers that purpose, as does also a passage quoted just before from Demosthenes, $\hat{\eta} \Pi \in \lambda o \pi o ́ \nu$ $\nu \eta \sigma o s \ddot{̈} \pi a \sigma a \delta_{\imath \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \eta ́ \kappa \epsilon \iota \text {. But the pas- }}$ sage of Herodotus is so corrupted in Longinus that it contradicts the reason for its being quoted : the manuscripts have $\tilde{\varepsilon} \pi 6-$ $\sigma a \nu$ or $\varepsilon \in \pi \epsilon \sigma 0 \nu$ oi $\theta \epsilon \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \iota$. It will perhaps be said that the whole sentence has been corrupted, by the attempts made to explain it, from $\tilde{*} \pi \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \tau \dot{\partial} \theta \in ́ \eta \tau \rho \circ \nu$, which is now adopted as the text in Longinus also: this would be possible, if the reading had been only $6 \pi \in \sigma \sigma \nu$; but how came, the commentator or his corrupter by ę $\pi \varepsilon \sigma a \nu$ ? Let us now suppose that the old reading both in Herodotus and Longinus was Eै $\pi \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$ тò $\theta$ é $\eta$ rpo $\nu$, and we then discover the corruption in eacl writer; in the
 If aught were wanting to complete the proof of $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \alpha$ being a genuine form, it would be found, I think, in the comparison with the aorists $\epsilon \not \chi \in \sigma a$ and ${ }^{6} \chi \in \sigma 0 \nu$, the confusion between which was not remarked until very lately.
pears very natural that a distinction should have been made between


ПА-. See Пе́入.

$\Pi \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$, I cause to wander, turn from its course : fut. $\pi \lambda \lambda^{2} \xi \omega$; aor. 1.



These tenses are formed as from a pres. ПлАГХ $\Omega$; or, which comes to the same, $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ has $\gamma \gamma$ for its characteristic letter, like $\kappa \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ and бадл $\lfloor\zeta \omega$.
$\Pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, I$ form ; fut. $\pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \omega, \& c$. This verb, like $\pi a ́ \sigma-$ $\sigma \omega, \pi \tau i \sigma \sigma \omega$, é $\rho \in ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \beta \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\beta \lambda_{i \tau \tau \omega}$, has for its characteristic letter a lingual instead of a palatic, which is generally seen by a $\sigma$ in the inflexion instead of $\xi, \gamma, \kappa$, or $\chi$ : see 'Арио́ттш. From the compounds imvoтдáOос, коротлá$\theta$ oc the characteristic letter would seem to be $\theta$.
$\Pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \kappa \omega, I$ plat, weave: fut. $\pi \lambda \epsilon \in \xi \omega$; aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon \xi{ }_{\xi}{ }^{\prime}-$ $\mu \eta \nu$; perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu a t$. The aor. 2. pass. is generally é $\pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \kappa \eta \nu$, but Bekker has always found in the best manuscripts of Plato $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \lambda^{\prime} \kappa \eta \nu$ : see $\mathrm{B} \lambda \in ́ \epsilon \pi \omega$.

 thus, perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \in \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \mu a \iota$; aor. 1. pass. é $\pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

This verb was still found in the older Attic writers in a resolved
 27. has great weight; and in Thucyd. 4, 28. Bekker has followed the majority of the Codd. in retaining $\pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon$. See note to $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega, I$ want.

There is an Ionic form of this verb $\pi \lambda \omega^{\prime} \omega \dagger$, infin. $\pi \lambda \omega^{\prime} \epsilon \iota$; fut. $\pi \lambda \omega^{\prime}-$ $\sigma \omega$; aor. l. $\begin{gathered} \\ \pi \\ \lambda \\ \omega \\ \end{gathered}$; perf. $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \lambda \omega \kappa a$. Euripides, who introduced this

[^244]Hermann can read only $\pi เ \tau \nu 0 \cup ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$, of which he avails himself also in ( $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \pi i r-$ vovers) Aschyl. Pers. 461. If my view of the subject be adopted, no change is necessary.
$\dagger$ [Homer seems to have used $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda} \dot{\omega} \omega$ with its derivatives more in the sense of to swim, and $\pi \lambda \epsilon \in$ with the meaning of to sail.-Passow.]
perfect on the Attic stage (Hel. 539.), appears to have been ridiculed by Aristophanes (Thesm. 878.) for so doing. To this verb belongs also an Epic aor. 2. ё $\pi \lambda \omega \nu,-\omega s,-\omega,-\omega \mu \varepsilon \nu$, \&c. ; part. $\pi \lambda \omega$ 's, $\pi \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \tau o s$; and its


$\Pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$. See $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$.
$\Pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\pi \lambda \eta \eta_{\tau \tau \omega}, I$ strike: fut. $\pi \lambda \eta \xi \xi \omega$; perf. 2. (sometimes in a pass. sense) $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi \lambda \eta \gamma a$; perf. pass. $\pi \in \in \pi \lambda \eta-$ $\gamma \mu a \iota$; aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \gamma \eta \nu$.

Beside the active and passive of this verb we find in Homer the middle also ( $\mu \eta \rho o ̀ \nu \pi \lambda_{\eta} \xi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu \circ G$ ); so that it is used in all its voices by the Epics and by them only. In the Attic dialect the place of the active was supplied by $\pi a \tau a \dot{\sigma}-$ $\sigma \omega$, which again was not used by the older Attics in the passive.

All this holds good of the simple verb only and of its proper meaning, in which however there is no compound in regular use. On the other hand $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$ and ката$\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$, which mean in the active to strike with fear, in the passive to be struck with fear, are used in both those voices and have in the aor. 2. pass. the $\check{a}$; as, $\epsilon^{\prime} \xi \epsilon \pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$, $\kappa а \tau a \pi \lambda a \gamma \eta{ }^{2} \nu a$.

On the relative usage of $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\pi a r a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ as laid down above, see Valcken. ad Act. Apost. 12, 7. and the passage of Lysias there


The perfect however appears to have been an exception, which, as it could not be formed from $\pi a r a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ so as to please the ear, was taken probably from the old Ionic dialect, and continued in constant use among the Attic writers with an active meaning in the form $\pi \varepsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma a$ : as in Aristoph. Av. 1350. ôs âv $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \hat{\gamma} \eta$ ròv $\pi a \tau \notin \rho \alpha$ veorròs $\tilde{\omega}^{\nu} \nu^{*}$. In the later language the perf. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma$ a was used in a passive sense: see

[^245]much more natural to understand the accusative as the subject of the passive, a construction in which we cannot well use $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \in ์ v a l$ in Xenophon. I conjecture thercfore that under $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \chi^{\epsilon} \nu a t$ is concealed the true reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \bar{\eta} \chi 0 a t$.
 Mag. v. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \dot{\omega}$ 's, p. 703.

On $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\prime} \mid \gamma \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda a \dot{\prime} \gamma \eta \nu$ compare what has been said on " $A \gamma \nu \nu \mu$, éá $\eta \eta \nu$. We have only further to observe that Homer uses on account of the metre катe $\pi \lambda i j \gamma \eta \nu$, Il. $\gamma, 31$.

The Epics have also an aor. 2. act. and midd. but only with the reduplication, as $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma o \nu$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$, and $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\jmath} \gamma \epsilon \tau 0$, in the same sense as $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \xi(1),{ }^{\dot{\epsilon}} \pi \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \xi a \tau 0$.
 $\sigma$ $\theta a t$.

 verb is generally poetical.
 more generally $\pi \nu \in v \sigma o \hat{v} \mu a t$; aor. 1. ễvєvनa, \&c.; aor. 1. pass. è $\pi \nu \epsilon$ '́vo $\eta \nu$.

There is no instance of a perf. pass. formed according to the above formation; the only one in use is the poetical $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \nu \bar{v} \mu a \iota$, with the force of a present and the particular meaning of to be inspired with wisdom, be wise, intelligent : hence perf. infin. $\pi \in \pi \gamma v \hat{v} \theta a$, , and 2 . sing. pluperf. (with the force of an imperf.) $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \nu v \sigma o$, Od. $\psi, 210$. By the same formation come the Epic syncopated aor. 2. $\ddot{\alpha} \mu \pi \nu \bar{v} \tau о$ for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \nu v \tau 0$; the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \nu \dot{v} \nu \theta \eta$ for $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi, \tilde{v} \theta \eta$ (like $i \delta \rho \dot{\delta} \nu \theta \eta \nu$ ); and the imper. aor. 2. act. à $\mu \pi \nu v e$ for á $\nu \dot{a} \pi \nu \nu v$, consequently from an aorist cı̈ $\mu \pi \nu v o \nu$ used by the later Epics, as Quintus, \&c. $\dagger$ On the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \nu \dot{\nu} \nu \theta \eta \nu$ see Teivw.
$\Pi \nu i \gamma \omega, I$ choke: fut. midd. (with transit. meaning) $\pi v^{\prime}-$



[^246]$\sigma \theta \epsilon$, Epicharm. ap. Athen. p. 60. Without attempting to restore the whole of this tetrameter, I shall content myself with amending what the language and sense require, oi $\mu$ v́кає and $\dot{\omega} \pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \kappa o ́ \tau \epsilon s$ (oi $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa \lambda$.) : and 1 therefore understand it as Stephens does, "you will poison (people) like dried mushrooms": which passage is at least an authority for the fut. middle ; the probability of the Doric future $\pi \nu \iota \xi_{0} \bar{v} \mu a \iota$ having been used in the Attic dialect is strengthened by $\phi \in v_{\xi} \boldsymbol{z}_{0} \hat{v}-$ $\mu \alpha \iota, \pi a \iota \xi_{0} \bar{v} \mu \alpha \iota$. Lucian however (Contempl. 23.) has $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \quad \nu i \xi \in \iota s$.
aor. 2. é $\pi \nu i \gamma \eta \nu$. The 1 is long except in the aor. 2. pass., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 107.

по-. See חiva.
Пo $\theta^{\prime} \epsilon$, I long for, regret: Ionic and old Attic fut. $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi}$ $\theta$ écow, more generally $\pi \mathrm{o} \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, Xen. Mem. 3, 11, 3., also $\pi$ оө́́кoнaь not only Ionic in Herodotus, but in Plato, e.g. Heind. Phædo, p. 98. a.; aor. 1. act. é $\pi \delta_{0} \theta \varepsilon \sigma a$, whence 3.
 Isocr. ; both forms of the aor. 1. are found in Herodot. $3,36.9,22$. ; perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi o ́ \theta \eta \kappa a$; perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon \pi o ́ \theta \eta \mu u \iota$; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \mathrm{o} \theta^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

Поvé $\omega$, I labour, suffer, is inflected regularly ; thus, fut. $\pi o v \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \& c$. : but when it signifies physical pain or suffering, it makes $\pi 0 \nu$ é $\sigma \omega$.

Such is the statement of the grammarians; see Chœerob. in Bekk. Anecd. in Ind.; where we find also quoted as an exception, $\pi \in \pi$ óvpio T̀े $\sigma \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{e}} \hat{\lambda} \eta$, Aristoph. Pac. 820. : but the probability is that the perfect is always formed with the $\eta$ (whatever be its meaning) as in $\pi 0 \theta$ éw. The formation of $\pi$ ové $\sigma \omega$, \&c. is found in Hippocr. de Morb. 1, 15. 16. and three times in Lucian. Asin. 9.
[In the oldest language we find only the depon. midd. тоvéopat, -クुбouat in an absolute sense : see Homer passim.-Passow.]

Mopeiv, to give, infin. of $\epsilon \pi \pi o \rho o v$, a defective aorist used by the poets. [The indicative without the augment is found frequently in Homer; ;] the part. $\pi$ ор $\omega$ in in Æschyl. Prom. 954. ; the infin. $\pi$ opeiv in Hesychius.
In Pind. Pyth. 2, 105. is an infin. $\pi \in \pi \sigma \rho \epsilon i v$, but the majority of the manuscripts have $\pi \epsilon \pi a \rho \epsilon i v$. According to the former reading the word is an infinitive of the above verb with reduplication : but there is in Hesychius an old explanation of $\pi \epsilon \pi a \rho \epsilon i v-\epsilon \in \nu \delta \epsilon i \xi \zeta u t, \sigma \eta \mu \bar{\eta} \nu a t$, which appears to me to suit the sense of Pindar better; ostentare. See Bœeckh. In this latter case it is therefore a solitary form of some lost verb*.

By the principle of the metathesis, as shown under $\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$ and $\mathrm{K} n \lambda \epsilon \in \omega$, we find that to the stem or root of $\pi \rho \rho \in i v$ (with the sense of to impart, allot,) belongs the perf. pass. $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \pi \rho \omega \mu \mu \iota$, I am allotted by fate, fated;

[^247] Compare Meipouat.

ПО-. See Пivш.
$\Pi \dot{\pi} \pi о \sigma \theta e$. See $\Pi{ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi \omega$.
ПРА-. See Пıтра́бкш and $\Pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu$.

> Пра́ббш, Ep. and Ion. $\pi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega^{*}$, transit. I do, intransit. I am doing (well or ill), find myself in a certain state or situation: fut. $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \omega$, Ion. $\pi \rho \eta \eta^{\xi}{ }_{\omega} \omega$; perf. $\pi \epsilon ́-$ $\pi \rho \bar{a} \chi a$; perf. 2. $\pi \in \in \pi \rho \bar{a} \gamma a$; perf. pass. $\pi \in ́ \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a t$, \&c. In the older writers $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \gamma^{\prime}$ was the only perfect; afterwards arose the custom of using $\pi$ 白 $\pi \rho a y a$ in an intransitive sense only, $\pi e ́ \pi \rho a \chi^{a}$ in a transitive. The $a$ is naturally long.

The above usage may be gathered from the direction of the Atticists, who merely tell us that $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \gamma a$ is Attic, $\pi \in \pi \rho a \chi^{a}$ common Greek : see Piers. ad Mœr. p. 293. Phryn. App. Soph. p. 60. But the latter is found only in a transitive sense : e. g. in Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 42. Hell. 5, 2, 32. Anab. 5, 7, 29. Menand. Incert. 75. (see Meineke, p. 221.), and as a rejected various reading in Aristoph. Equ. 683. Against this usage, therefore, the assertion of the Atticists is directed : and it is now uncertain in this as in many similat cases, with what writers the objectionable usage began, and when it is to be attributed to transcribers $\dagger$.
$\Pi \rho \eta \theta \omega$. *See $\Pi 1 \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu$.
Прiar0at, to buy, infin. of émpıá $\mu \eta \nu$, a defective aorist (according to the analogy of é $\pi \tau a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ), used by the Attics


[^248]ticists sufficient to warrant our positively esserting that this form was not used by Xenophon.
$\ddagger$ This is the meaning of the direction of Phrynichus, which is quite free from corruptions, though Lobeck (p.137.) has misunderstood it. The grammarian directs that nothing of $\omega \nu \epsilon \bar{i} \sigma \theta a t$ should be used, as a form of $\pi \rho i a \sigma \theta a \ell$ may stand in its place. At the time this was said, no one could misunderstand it, as a pres. $\pi$ тiapat was unheard of in the whole range of Greek literature, and $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi \rho!\alpha^{-}$ $\mu \eta \nu$ was equally unknown as an imperfect. The only thing intended was to guard against some forms of $\omega \nu \epsilon i \sigma \theta a t$. The grammarian excludes therefore from
(Aristoph. Ach. 870.), or $\pi \rho^{\prime} i \omega$ (id. Nub. 614.) ; opt. $\pi \rho t a i-$ $\mu \eta \nu$; conj. $\pi \rho i \omega \mu a t$; infin. $\pi \rho i a \sigma \theta a t$; part. $\pi p t a ́ \mu є \nu o c . ~ S e e ~$ Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 137. 360.
$\Pi i_{i}, I$ saw, gnash (the teeth) ; imperat. $\pi \rho \hat{i ́ \epsilon}$, Aristoph. Ran. 927. The passive takes $\sigma$; as, aor. 1. é $\pi \rho^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \eta$; perf. $\pi \in ́ \pi \rho t \sigma \mu a t$.

The $t$ is undoubtedly long throughout all the inflexions of $\pi \rho i \omega$; and with this the $\sigma$ in the passive agrees, according to the rule mentioned under $\dot{\alpha} \rho o \omega^{*}$; so that it is not necessary on that account to have recourse to a present $\pi \rho i \zeta \omega$, which, it appears, became very common at a Jater period $\dagger$. See also Buttm. Lexil. p. 485.

## Прої́бонац. See Kататр.


$\Pi \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma u$, an infin. aor. of rare occurrence and of a rather uncertain character, supposed to be a contraction from $\pi \rho \rho \mathbf{\omega} \sigma a t$, and explained as an expression of the palestra in Lucian. Asin. 10. where (ib. 9.) we find also the imperat. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \pi \rho \omega \sigma o \nu$ as an emendation of $\tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma a s$, and again of Straton. Epigr. 48., where the text has the part. по'w as. Both Schneider and Passow derive it from $\pi \rho \circ \omega \theta \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$; fut. $\pi \rho o \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ or
 \&c.
Urail, I stumble: fut. $\pi r a i \sigma \omega$, \&c. It takes $\sigma$ in the passive, as perf. ërtatopat, \&c. See 'Apów and Прíw.

$\Pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega, I$ duck or drop the head from fear: fut. $\pi \tau \dot{\eta} \xi \omega$, \&c., is regular : perf. ế $\pi \tau \eta \chi^{a}$.

In Æschyl. Eum. 247. all the manuscripts have катaтraкผंv, which some have changed to катєптакшंs, on account of the Hesychian gloss émтакє́val, кєкрифย́vaı. But the verse requires a short $a$; and an aor. 2. ëттăkov is quite analogous, as the majority of the cognate words, irákes, $\pi \tau \bar{\omega} \kappa \kappa s$, \&c., show $\kappa$ to be the characteristic letter of $\pi \tau \eta \sigma \sigma \omega$. If, therefore, the gloss of Hesychius be genuine, this is the Dorio perf. 2. with

[^249] $\pi a \lambda a i \omega, \pi \tau a i \omega, \pi \rho i \omega, \chi \rho i ́ \omega, \beta \dot{v} \omega, \xi_{\dot{z}} \dot{\omega} \omega$, " $\omega$.
$\dagger$ See Pollux 7. c. 26. The instance in Plat. Theag. p. 124. a. is of sufficient antiquity, notwithstanding the spuriousness of the dialogue.



We find in the poets other forms from a more simple stem or root
 ๕̈ $\gamma \nu \omega \nu$ under $\Gamma\left(\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega\right.$ ），and a part．perf．$\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \omega^{\prime} s$（see Baiv $\omega$ ），which is not to be confounded with $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \omega$＇s under $\Pi i \pi \tau \omega$ ．All the above，and in particular this reduplication（ $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau-$ ）comes from the root חET－，as we have observed in a note at the end of Пétoца．

Птioow，I stamp（grain）：fut．$\pi \tau i \sigma \omega$ ；perf．pass．${ }^{\epsilon \ell \pi} \pi \tau-$ $\sigma \mu a$ ．See ААро́ттш and П入а́ббш．

## ПTO－．See Пíтт．

חтi$\rho \omega$, I make fearful：fut．$\pi \tau \nu \rho \hat{\omega} . ~ P a s s . ~ \pi \tau \cup ́ \rho o \mu a t, ~$ with aor．2．غं $\pi \tau \dot{v} \rho \eta \nu, I$ become fearful，said particularly of horses；infin．$\pi \tau v \rho \eta ̂ \nu a \iota ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \theta a ́ v a \tau o \nu . ~$
$\Pi \tau \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega, I$ fold up：fut．$\pi \tau \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$ ，\＆c．，is regular．－Midd． ［I fold or wrap（anything）round me，with accus．Ari－ stoph．Nub．267．－Passow．］
$\Pi \tau \dot{v} \omega, I$ spit：fut．$\pi \tau \dot{\boldsymbol{v} \sigma \omega}$ ．The pass．takes $\sigma$ ，as perf．

［It is written also $\psi \dot{v} \omega$ ，whence the Latin spuo．The $v$ is long in pres．and imperf．，but short in fut．，\＆c．：see Graefe Mel．124，7．，yet in Theocr．24，19．and Apollon．Rhod．2，570．4，925．the $v$ is short in the imperf．，when the syllable following is short also；this is fre－ quently the case in Nonnus．－Passow．］
$\Pi \dot{\prime} \theta \omega$, I cause to rot ：fut．$\pi \dot{v} \sigma \omega$ ；aor．1．ënvoa，\＆c．Pass．I rot．The $v$ is long throughout；yet Callimachus（Fr．313．）has allowed himself


Пиข日ávoцaı，I inquire，learn by inquiry，depon．midd．， forms its tenses from $\pi \in \dot{v} \theta 0 \mu a \iota^{*}$ ，which is still used by the Epic and Tragic poets；thus，fut．$\pi \epsilon \hat{v}^{\prime} \sigma o \mu a \iota \dagger$ ；aor．$\dot{\epsilon} \pi v-$ $0_{o}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ ，［imper．$\pi v \theta_{0} \hat{v}$ ，but Ion．with change of accent $\pi \dot{v} \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon$ ，Herodot．3，63．，Epic opt．$\pi \epsilon \pi \dot{v} \theta_{o \iota \tau}$ ，infin．$\pi \check{v} \theta_{\varepsilon-}$


[^250]b., Epic. $\pi$ é $\pi v \sigma \sigma a \iota, ~ O d . ~ \lambda, 494 . ;$ pluperf. è $\pi є \pi \dot{v} \sigma \mu \eta \nu$. Verbal adj. тєvбто́с, тєvбтє́oc.
 \&c., although it is derived from $\pi v \rho \epsilon \tau o ̛ s . ~ C o m p a r e ~ e ́ \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \omega . ~$

## P.

'Paive, Ibesprinkle, forms the following tenses regularly:


In the Epic language we observe two irregular forms ; 1.) the aor. 1.
 Od. $v, 354$. pluperf. $\begin{gathered}\text { ép } \\ \rho\end{gathered} \dot{\alpha}^{\delta} a \tau 0$, Il. $\mu, 431$. That is to say, from the simple stem or root PA- were formed one derivative with its full complement of tenses- ${ }^{\text {paiv }} \boldsymbol{\nu}$, and another very defective - PAZ $\Omega \dagger$.


[Nonnus has an irregular aor. é ${ }^{\rho} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{a} \phi \epsilon$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318.Passow.]
 same as $\bar{\epsilon} \rho \delta \omega$, from which it is formed by transposing the two first
 Of the passive we find only $\dot{\rho} \in \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, as $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon}^{\rho} \chi \theta \eta \nu$ and $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \mu a \iota$ are formed


In order to form a correct judgment on the connection of these forms, we must first keep in view the mutual change, founded on general rules, of the middle $\ddagger$ consonants $\gamma$ and $\delta$, with which is connected that of $\gamma$ to $\zeta$ occurring in other verbs, e. g. крá弓由, крауєiv. The next thing to be observed is, that the forms ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \delta \delta \omega$, $e_{\rho} \rho \xi a$, with the subst. ${ }_{\rho} \rho \gamma o v$, have the digamma in the old language, and that the aspirate which is joined with the $\rho$ was frequently in the dialects changed into the digamma, for instance in the Æolic $\beta$ póóov, i.e. wrodon for pódov, a rose. We must


[^251]+ According to Apollon. de Adv. p. 600,28 . the fut. $\dot{\rho} \alpha \nu \bar{\omega}$ was used by the Attics with $\alpha$ long: on which see $\Phi$ aivw.
$\ddagger$ [Consonants are divided into aspirated, as $\theta, \phi, \chi ;$ smooth, a $; \pi, \tau$; and middle, as $\beta, \gamma, \delta$.]
in order to distinguish in them the same appearance as we find in

'PE-. See Einciv.
'Péw, I flow: fut. $\dot{\rho} \in \dot{v} \sigma о \mu a \iota$, Theogn. 448.; aor. 1. ép $^{\rho}$ $\dot{\rho}$ evoa; but these two forms are seldom found in the Attics (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 739 .), who generally use the fut. $\dot{\rho} v \eta \sigma o \mu a t$, the aor. 2. pass. (with an active sense) $\epsilon_{\rho} \rho \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \eta \nu$, and
 aorist $\dagger$.

We may easily conceive that a neuter idea like that of to flow may be understood in an active as well as passive sense, and it is therefore unnecessary to have recourse to a theme PYHMI in order to form $\dot{e} \rho \dot{\rho} \rho \dot{p} \eta \nu$.
 dropping with sweat, is merely a lengthening of the o in $\dot{\rho} \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon$ vos, like
 duced into the passage without the slightest authority, is thercfore to be rejected.

 All the above have a transitive meaning, in which, however, there occurs no perfect; but we find in an intransitive sense a perf. 2. ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \rho \rho \omega \gamma a, I$ am broken, with the change


 and in Arat. Dios. 85. an Ion. 3. plur. pass. $\dot{\eta} \gamma v v_{a} a$. There is a
 ever, is particularly used as an expression of the palæstra, to throw to the ground, Jac, Ach. Tat. p. 821.-Passow.]


 poetical.-Passow.]

[^252][^253]'Pıyów, I freeze: fut. $\dot{\rho} \iota \gamma \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$, \&c. This word, like iסpón, is contracted into $\omega$ and $\psi$ instead of the regular ov and ot; e. g. infin. $\dot{\rho}<\gamma \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$, Aristoph. Vesp. 446. Av. 935. (yet we find $\dot{\rho} \iota \gamma o u ̂ \nu, ~ N u b . ~ 442.) ; ~ d a t . ~ p a r t . ~ \dot{\rho} \iota \gamma \omega \nu \tau \iota, ~ A c h . ~ 1145 . ; ~$ part. fem. $\dot{\rho} \iota \gamma \omega \sigma a$, Simonid. De Mul. 29.; opt. $\dot{\rho} \iota \not \subset \dot{\varphi} \eta \nu$, Brunck. Aristoph. Ach. 1146. Av. 935. Lucian De Luct. 11. Plut. Apophth. Lac. p. 233. a. Hippocr. De Sal. Diæt. 1.; conj. $\dot{\rho} \not \subset \hat{\varphi}$, Plat. Gorg. p. 507. d. (p. 527. Heind.) with Buttm. notes. See also Piers. ad Mœr. pp. 336, 339. All these are Attic forms.
 There are also two sister-forms $\dot{\rho} \iota \pi \tau \epsilon \epsilon^{*}, \dot{\rho} \iota \pi \tau \hat{\omega}$, from the former of which comes the imperf. éépointєov, Herod. 8,53.; but the formation follows $\dot{\rho} i \pi \tau \omega$. The $\iota$ is long by nature (whence $\dot{\rho} \stackrel{\imath}{\imath} \tau \epsilon, \dot{\rho} \hat{\imath} \psi a t)$, except in $\bar{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{\imath} \phi \eta \nu$.
 the only two instances in Homer of $a$ instead of $\varepsilon$, except perhaps the doubtful $\dot{a} \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma a \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, Od. $\psi, 95$. To these we must add $\dot{\alpha} v a \sigma \sigma e i a \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, Hymn. Apoll. 403. and $\rho 0 / \zeta \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$, Hes. 0,835 . [A reduplicated infin. perf. pass. $\dot{\rho} \rho \bar{i} \phi \theta a t$ is found in Pind. Fr. 281.-Passow.]
'Pot $\zeta a \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$, Epic imperf., with the force of an aorist, from pot ${ }^{\prime}$ 'ew; see the preceding paragraph,

'Púo

${ }^{\text {'P }} \mathbf{\varphi} \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu$ or $\dot{\rho} \omega \nu \nu \dot{v} \omega, I$ strengthen: fut. $\dot{\rho} \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$, \&c. (compare "A ${ }^{\text {人 }}$ the force of a pres.), I am strong, in health, [whence the
 Thucyd. 2, 8.] ; imperat. é é $\dot{\rho} \omega \sigma o$, like vale, farewell : part.

[^254]rodot. 4, 94. 188. \&c., afterwards in Xen. and other Attic writers. Elmsley excludes it from the Tragedians, but without grounds; while Buttmann confines the distinction between $\rho \iota \pi \tau \varepsilon \in \omega$ and jimro to the Attic writers.-Passow.]
é $\rho \dot{\rho} \omega_{\mu}$ évoc. The aor. 1. pass. is the only tense which takes the $\sigma$, as $\notin \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{\varphi} \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \nu$.
'P'̂ouau, [an old Epic depon. midd.] I move with rapidity, rush, wave,

 however, connect it with $\dot{\rho} \dot{\omega} \nu v \mu, \dot{\rho} \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$, $\dot{\rho} v o \mu a t, ~ \dot{\rho} u \eta \eta$ and the Lat. ruo. -Passow.]

## $\Sigma$.

इaipe, I brush, sweep away: fut. $\sigma a \rho \hat{\omega}$; aor. 1. éaŋpa, part. ońpac, Soph. Ant. 409. No other tenses are in use.

Another form $\sigma u \rho o ́ \omega$, - $\omega \sigma \omega$ was used in the active and passive, but not by the Attics: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 83. Whether perhaps the passive of it was used by the Attics to supply the defectiveness of $\sigma a l \rho \omega$, I know not. Lycophron (389.) has $\sigma a p o v i \mu e v o s$.

From the same stem or root, but with a different radical meaning, comes a perfect, with the force of a present, $\sigma^{\text {é }}-$ onpa, I grin; part. $\sigma \in \sigma \eta \rho \dot{\omega}$ с, -vîa, -óc, Theocr. 7, 19. Epic fem. бєбăpvía, Hes. Sc. 268.
$\sum a \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega, I$ blow the trumpet: fut. $\sigma a \lambda \pi i \gamma \xi \omega ;$ aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma a ́ \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \xi a$, Il. $\phi, 388$., but the later writers use $\sigma a \lambda \pi i \sigma \omega$, є́ $\sigma a ́ \lambda \pi \iota \sigma a$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 191. So also the old subst. was $\sigma a \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \kappa \tau \dot{\eta} c$, the later one $\sigma a \lambda \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta ́ c$. Compare П $\lambda_{a ́ \zeta}^{\iota}$ and $\Sigma_{v p i}{ }^{2} \omega$.

Уaów. See $\Sigma \mathbf{\Sigma}^{\omega} \zeta \omega$.
Уá $\omega$, an old form for $\sigma \hat{\eta} \theta \omega, I$ sift, whence 3. plur. $\sigma \hat{\omega} \sigma t$, Herodot. 1. 200.
$\Sigma \beta_{\epsilon} \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu$, or $\sigma \beta \epsilon \nu v \dot{v} \omega$ (Pind.), I extinguish: fut. $\sigma \beta \in ́ \sigma \omega$, less frequently $\sigma \beta \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma о \mu a \iota$, Plat. Legg. 7. p. 805. c. ; aor. 1. ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \beta \epsilon \sigma a *$; the perf. ${ }^{\ell} \sigma \beta \eta \kappa a$, and the syncopated aor. 2. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \eta \nu$, 1. plur. ${ }_{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \beta_{\eta \mu \epsilon \nu}$, opt. $\sigma \beta \epsilon i \eta \nu$, infin. $\sigma \beta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ have the intrans. sense of the passive $\dagger$. Pass. $\sigma \beta$ évvvaat, I am extin-

[^255]guished, Idie away, dry up ; perf. é $\sigma \beta \in \sigma \mu a t$; aor. 1. є́ $\sigma \beta \in \notin \theta \eta \nu$. The passive therefore takes $\sigma$. On the formation of ${ }_{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \beta_{\eta \nu}$ see éyvov under $\Gamma_{\imath \gamma \nu} \dot{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$ : and on the intrans. sense of ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \beta \eta \nu$ and ${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \beta_{\eta \kappa \alpha}$ see note under T$\epsilon \dot{\prime} \chi \chi$.

Strictly speaking, $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ have only the passive sense, to be extinguished; but as in verbs of this kind the immediate sense comes so near to the passive, not only does $\sigma \hat{\beta} \hat{\epsilon} \nu v y \mu a t$ serve for a
 this latter, or rather its compound $a \pi \epsilon \sigma \beta \eta \eta^{\prime}$, is by far the more common of the two.

$\sum_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \beta \omega$ or $\sigma \in \beta_{o \mu a t, ~ I ~ r e v e r e, ~ i s ~ f o u n d ~ o n l y ~ i n ~ t h e ~ p r e s e n t, ~}^{\text {, }}$ and in the aor. l. pass. 'éé $\phi \theta \eta \nu, I$ was filled with reverence, Soph. ap. Hesych. whence part. fem. $\sigma \epsilon \phi \theta \in i \sigma a$, Plat. Phædr. p. 254. b.
[The act. $\sigma^{\varepsilon} \beta \omega$, fut. $\sigma \hat{\varepsilon} \psi \omega$, is post-Homeric.-Passow.]

 under 'Pímiш.
$\Sigma \in \dot{v} \omega$, I drive : pass. and midd. I hasten. This verb, like those beginning with $\rho$, doubles the first consonant in the augmented tenses, and retains it even in the perfect instead of the reduplication; e.g.
 $\sigma^{\sigma} \mu a \iota *$; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \dot{\theta} \theta_{\eta}$, Soph. Aj. 294. And having the $\sigma$ thus doubled, it has none in the termination of the aor. 1. act. or midd., as
 forms with one $\sigma$ are of less frequent occurrence ; $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \dot{v} \theta \eta \nu$, Eurip. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon$ $\sigma^{\prime} \dot{\theta} \eta$, Hom. In this as in other cases, the Epic dialect rejects the augment entirely ; as $\sigma \in \hat{v} a, \sigma \in \hat{v} \varepsilon$, , $\sigma$ éato.
The perf. pass. '̇бסvuat, I am put in motion, has the meaning of, $I$ am restless, eager for, as in II. $\nu, 79$. Od. $\kappa$, 484. in which sense the
 tion of a present, é $\sigma \sigma \dot{u} \mu \epsilon v o s ~ \pi o \lambda \grave{\epsilon} \mu o v$, Il. $\omega .404$. According to this the pluperf. é $\sigma \sigma \dot{v} \mu \eta \nu$ would have the force of the imperfect; but it coincides in form with the syncop. aor. (see é $\kappa \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \dot{\nu}$ in note under $\mathrm{K} \tau \epsilon \nu \omega)$ as in
 and the sense is therefore always that of an aorist.. In the second

[^256] syllable is rejected for the same euphonic reason as in ếoceva.

We find also syncopated forms of the present; as 3. sing. oevirat, Soph. Trach. 645. but most commonly with a change of vowel, бov̀ $\alpha$ a, ooṽrat, Æschyl. Ch. 636. бoûqrat, Pers. 25., whence the imperatives used in common life, oov̂, run, quick, Aristoph. Vesp. 209. or бov̂̃o, $\sigma o v \sigma \theta \omega, \sigma o v ̄ \theta \epsilon$, and infin. $\sigma o v ̄ \sigma \theta a \iota$ *. [These forms are used only by the Attic poets.-Passow.]

And lastly to this place belongs the well-known Laconian ámé $\sigma \sigma o v a$, he is gone, from Xen. Hellen. 1, 1, 23. explained to be an aor. 2. pass. for á $\boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma u ́ \eta \text { . }}$
$\sum_{\eta}^{\prime} \pi \omega$, I make rotten or putrid. Pass. ón $\pi о \mu a \iota, ~ I ~ r o t, ~ p u-~$
 meaning of the pass.) $\sigma \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \eta \pi a$.
 used only in pres. and imperfect. The rare perf. $\sigma \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \mu a \iota$ is found in an inscription in a passive sense.
[We find, however, in Herodot. 8, 31. the aor. 1. midd. éeivayto. The act. $\sigma i \nu \omega$ never occurs; and, except in the above-mentioned perfect and in Orph.Arg. 212., oivoual has never a passive sense.-Passow.]
$\Sigma_{\kappa}{ }^{\prime} \pi \tau \omega, I d i g$ : fut. $\sigma \kappa a ́ \psi \omega$; perf. pass. єौбканца兀; aor. 2. pass. '̇ $\sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \phi \eta \nu$. The characteristic letter is therefore $\phi$.
$\Sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta a ́ v \nu v \mu$, or $-\nu \nu v ́ \omega, I$ disperse, scatter: fut. $\sigma \kappa \in ́ \delta a \sigma \omega$, Att. $\sigma \kappa \kappa \delta \hat{\omega},-\hat{a} \varsigma,-\hat{a}$, Aristoph. Vesp. 229. but found also in Herodot. 8, 68. The passive takes $\sigma$, as perf. è $\sigma \kappa$ édaб $\mu a \iota$; aor. 1. є่ $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \check{a} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

Sister-forms of the above are $\sigma \kappa i \delta \nu \eta \mu \iota$ (compare кір $\eta \eta \mu_{c}$ from кєра́ $\nu$ $\nu v \mu$ ), $\sigma x i \delta \partial \nu a \mu a \iota$; and in the Epic poets, dropping the $\sigma$, кє $\delta \dot{a} \nu \nu v \mu t$, $\kappa i_{-}$ $\delta v \eta \mu \iota$, like $\sigma \mu$ ккро́s, $\mu \iota \kappa \rho o ́ s$, \&c. Apollonius and others have also кє $\delta a i \omega$ : see $\delta$ aí $\omega$. [Such a form as $\sigma x \varepsilon \delta \dot{d} \zeta \omega$ appears to have never occurred.Passow.]

[^257][^258]$\Sigma_{\kappa e ́ \lambda} \lambda \lambda \omega$, or $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \lambda$ é $\dot{\omega}, I d r y$ anything. But more frequently
 $\sigma_{\kappa} \lambda_{\eta}{ }_{\eta} \sigma \boldsymbol{\mu} a \iota$; to which we must add (with the same intransitive sense of the passive) the active forms, aor. 2. ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \nu$, opt. $\sigma \kappa \lambda a i \eta \nu$, infin. $\sigma \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu a t$; and perf. ế $\sigma \lambda \eta \kappa a$. See note under T $\epsilon^{\prime} \chi \chi$.

The active of this verb scarcely ever occurs in a causative sense; nor do we find in the common language the aorist, which, according to analogy, would be $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \epsilon \varepsilon \iota \lambda a . ~ B u t ~ i n ~ t h e ~ E p i c ~ w r i t e r s ~ w e ~ f i n d ~ f o r m s ~ o f ~\end{gathered}$
 Th. 694. These lead us to a theme $\sigma \kappa \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \omega$, which also exists, but which in the common language is a completely different verb from the above, signifying to scratch, scrape. So common, however, is the mutual change of the vowels $a$ and $\epsilon$, that we may with full confidence suppose a theme $\sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ to have existed in the old Ionic dialect with the former meaning, as we find the $a$ in the optative $\sigma \kappa \lambda \alpha i \eta \nu$ (although known to us only from $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \kappa \lambda a i \eta$ in Hesychius), and we have therefore here the metathesis $\Sigma K A \Lambda$-, $\Sigma K \Lambda A-$, according to the analogy of $\beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha, \kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega \kappa \varepsilon \in \kappa \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ and many others.
$\Sigma_{\kappa \in ́ \pi \tau о \mu a t, ~ I ~ l o o k ~ a r o u n d ~ m e, ~ c o n s i d e r, ~(a ~ d e p o n . ~ m i d d .) ~}^{\text {. }}$ is inflected regularly. The Attics scarcely ever used the pres. and imperf., but generally $\sigma \kappa о \pi \hat{\omega}$ or $\sigma \kappa о \pi о \hat{\nu} \mu a \iota$; on the contrary in the future always $\sigma \kappa$ é $\psi о \mu a t$, never $\sigma \kappa о \pi \eta \sigma \omega$ or $\sigma к о \pi \eta \sigma о \mu a \iota$, as also in the aor. є́бкєч'á $\eta \nu$, and in the
 In this last-quoted passage it has its usual active signification, but in Demosth. Mid. p. 576, 27., and Erot. p. 1403, 21. it is used passively, although even in this writer its regular usage is active. Verbal adj. $\sigma \kappa \in \pi \tau \in \frac{1}{\circ}$.

The pres. and imperf. belong principally to the Epic language; e.g.
 тó $\mu$ evos, Apoll. Rhod. In the older Attics I have found $\sigma$ кeாтóre $\theta a$ in Plat. Lach. p. 185. and $\pi \rho o v \sigma \kappa$ éntero in Thucyd. 8, 66. (see however the note below.) In the later writers these tenses are found more frequently, as in Lucian, \&c.*

[^259][^260]An aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \in \in \eta \nu$ is found in the LXX, as in Numb. 1, 19.

$\Sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon \in \omega$, or $\sigma \kappa о \pi о \hat{\mu} \mu$, idem. It is used only in the pres. and imperf.: all the other tenses are supplied by окє́тто$\mu a t$; which see.
$\Sigma \kappa \dot{\omega} \pi \tau \omega$, I joke, make a joke of : fut. midd. ок $\omega$ чо $\mu \alpha \iota$, Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 278. 844. [aor. 1. є́ $\sigma \kappa \omega \neq$; and in Aristoph. Nub. 296. Reisig has restored to the text the act. fut. $\sigma \kappa \dot{\kappa} \omega \psi \omega$. Compare Comm. Crit. de Soph. CEd. C. 398. -Passow.]
$\Sigma \mu a ́ \omega$, , Ion. $\sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \omega$, I smear, anoint: fut. $\sigma \mu \eta \prime \sigma \omega$, Dor. $\sigma \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. midd. $\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu$; aor. 1. pass. $\overparen{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\eta} \chi \chi_{\eta \nu}$; verbal adj. $\sigma \mu \eta \kappa \tau o ́ c$. These two last are formed from a sister-form $\sigma \mu \dot{\eta} \chi \omega$, (fut. $\sigma \mu \dot{\eta} \xi \omega$, aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \eta \xi, \alpha, \& c$.,) used by the Epics and in the later language: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 253. The present is contracted to $\sigma \mu \hat{\omega}$ and inflected in $\eta$, as $\sigma \mu \hat{q} c, \sigma \mu \hat{\eta}, \& \mathrm{c}$., infin. $\sigma \mu \eta ̂ \nu$; (see пєєvá $\omega$ ) nor do $\sigma \mu \bar{a} c$, , $\mu \tilde{c} \nu$, \& $\& \mathbf{c} .$, ever occur before the time of Lu cian ; Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 61.

## 

 $\pi а ̆ \kappa a ; ~ p e r f . ~ p a s s . ~ є ̂ \sigma \pi a \sigma \mu a \imath ; ~ a o r . ~ 1 . ~ m i d d . ~ Є ̇ \sigma \pi a \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu ; ~ a o r . ~$ 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi a ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.] The $a$ is short in all the tenses.

## $\Sigma_{\pi \varepsilon i v, ~ \& c . ~ S e e ~ " E \pi \omega . ~}^{\text {. }}$

$\Sigma_{\pi \epsilon i \rho \omega, I ~ s o w: ~[f u t . ~}^{\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \text {; aor. 1. }{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon ı \rho a ; \text { perf. } 2 . ~}$ є̌ $\sigma \pi \circ \rho a ;$ perf. pass. $\neq \sigma \pi \alpha \rho \mu a \iota$; ] aor. 2. pass. є́ $\sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\rho} \eta \nu$ with a short.-Mind.
 $\sigma \kappa о \pi \bar{\omega}, \sigma \kappa о \pi о \bar{u} \mu a \iota$ (compounds as well as simple), coupled with the decided defectiveness of the forms of $\sigma x 0 \pi \epsilon i \nu$ in $-\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \omega$, and - $\hat{\eta} \sigma a l$, of which I nowhere find any mention. Instances where $\sigma \kappa$ éттоцаı formerly stood in the text may be seen in Sturz. Lex. Xenopl. in voc.; these require the particular examination of the critic. In the passage of Thucydides, all the manuscripts have т̀̀ $\dot{\rho} \eta \theta \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon v a$

[^261]

［Homer has the Ionic imperf．$\sigma \pi \epsilon \nu \delta \partial \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon$ and the aor．$\sigma \pi \varepsilon i \sigma a \sigma \kappa e$ ，as also the Ep．2، sing．conj．pres，$\sigma \pi$ 白 $\nu$ ò $\sigma \theta a$, Od．$\delta, 591$ ．－Passow．］
$\Sigma \tau a ́ \zeta \omega, I d r o p:$ fut．$\sigma \tau a ́ \xi \omega, \& c$ ．Compare Ba $\boldsymbol{B} \tau a ́ \zeta \omega, \Delta_{t-}$ бтáל̆ $\omega$ ．
 $\beta_{o \nu} ;$ ］aor．2．pass．$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \beta \eta \nu$ ，Soph．Aj． 883.
 $\chi^{o v}$ ．［The word is solely Poet．and Ion．］
$\Sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, I$ send：［fut．$\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$, Ep．$\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega$ ；aor．1．ế $\tau \epsilon \epsilon$ $\lambda \alpha$ ；aor．1．midd．є́бтєє $\lambda a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ；perf．ếтта入кa；perf．pass． é $\sigma \tau a \lambda_{\mu a \iota}$ ；pluperf．$\in \sigma \tau a ́ \lambda \mu \eta \nu$ ；］aor．2．pass．é $\sigma \tau a ́ \lambda \eta \nu$ ；and in the poets aor．1．é $\sigma \tau a ́ \lambda \theta_{\eta \nu}$ ．

In Herodot．7，89．we find a 3．plur．pluperf．é $\sigma \tau a \lambda a ́ \delta a \tau o$, which however is perhaps nothing more than an old error for éeráduco，occur－ ring in Hes．Scut． 288.
$\Sigma \tau \epsilon \nu a ́ \zeta \omega, I$ groan ：fut．$\sigma \tau \in \nu a ́ \xi \omega, \& c$ ．Compare $\Sigma \tau a ́ \zeta \omega$,

$\Sigma_{\tau \in ́ \nu} \boldsymbol{\omega}, I$ sigh，is used only in pres．and imperf．＊．
The poets（历schyl．and Eurip．）usse also a pass．orévouat，Epic $\sigma \tau \epsilon i-$ vopat，in the sense of $I$ am narrow，full．
$\Sigma_{\tau \epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega, I$ love，am contented．with：fut．$\sigma \tau$ ép $\xi \omega, \& c$ ．； perf．2．é $\sigma \tau o \rho y a$, Herodot．7， 104.
$\Sigma_{\tau \epsilon \rho} \epsilon \in \omega$, I deprive，bereave ：fut．$\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ，but also $\sigma \tau \epsilon-$ $\rho$ é $\sigma \omega$ ，Schæf．Schol．Par．Apollon．Rh．1，850．Jacob． Anthol．Poet．pp．680．711．whence the infin．aor．$\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho$ é－ $\sigma a \iota, \mathrm{Od} . \nu, 262$ ．This verb is complete and regular in all its tenses in its compound ámuatepée $\omega$ ，which，beside the more general idea of to deprive，has oftener the more im－ mediate sense of to take away；e．g．fut．à $\pi \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \omega$ ；


[^262]$\sigma \tau \in ́ \rho \eta \theta \eta \nu$; with the fut. midd. àтобтєрŋ́бодat. In the simple verb the pres. in general use is $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega, \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta \sigma \omega$, 白 $\sigma \tau \dot{\prime}-$ $\rho \eta \sigma a, \& c$. ; and in the passive $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о \hat{\mu} \mu \iota$ or $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho i \sigma \kappa о \mu a t$,
 é $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta^{\prime} \theta_{\eta \nu}$.

A particular form is $\sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho \circ \mu a \iota$ with the meaning of $I$ am in the stute of a person deprived of anything, I am without $i t$. [In prose this form is used only in pres. and imperf. -Passow.]

We must not confound, as is too commonly done, this $\sigma \tau$ épo $\mu$ a with

 considered as an aorist of the principal verb, if the indic. pres. did not occur in the same full meaning in Xen. Symp. 4, 31. $\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\delta} \dot{\eta} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$
 $\mu a t$ : see also Anab. 3, 2, 2.

The poets have also from $\sigma \tau \in \rho о \mu a<$ the part. aor. 2. pass. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon i s$, synonymous with $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ and $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \epsilon i$ is.

Whether the simple verb $\sigma \tau e \rho \bar{\omega}, ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \hat{v} \mu a \iota ~ o c c u r s ~ a s ~ a ~ p r e s . ~ i n ~ t h e ~ o l d ~$ Attic writers I cannot venture to assert positively in the present imperfect state of our catalogues of Greek verbs. In Lucian and others it is, at least in the passive, not uncommon. But in Xen. Anab. 1, 9,



Homer seems to have inflected $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \in \omega$ with the $\epsilon$, for he has the aor.
 $\sigma \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$, which occurs in the old Atticism, (Andocid. Myster. extr.) is to be explained by the same inflection.
$\Sigma_{\tau \epsilon \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \iota}, 3$. sing. pres. and $\sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \tau 0,3$. sing. imperf., Epic defective deponent. The above forms occur frequently in Homer in the sense of he gives to understand, promises, threatens : and we find the 3. plur. бтєûyтau once in Æschyl. Pers. 49. in the same sense. At Od. $\lambda, 584$. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \hat{z} \tau 0$ dè $\delta \iota \not \subset \alpha, \omega \nu$, in a description of Tantalus, Passow derives it from it $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$, and translates it in its literal sense, he stood, but Voss renders it, he strove, endeavoured.
$\Sigma_{\tau \eta \rho i L} \omega, I$ fix: fut. $\sigma \tau \eta \rho i \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota \xi \alpha$; aor. 1. midd. é $\sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota \xi a ́ \mu \eta \nu$; perf. pass. è $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{n} \rho \iota y \mu a \iota$; pluperf. є̇ $\sigma \tau \eta-$ рі́ $\not \mu \eta \nu$. Compare Baбтáל $\omega, \Delta \iota \sigma \tau \dot{C} \zeta \omega$.
$\Sigma_{\tau} i \zeta \omega, I$ prick：fut．$\sigma \tau i \xi \omega$ ；aor．1．${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \sigma \tau \iota \xi a$ ；perf．pass． е̌бт兀үдаı．See the preceding．
$\Sigma_{\tau о \rho \in ́ v \nu v \mu \iota, ~ I ~ s p r e a d, ~ s t r e w, ~ a b b r e v . ~ \sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu v \mu, ~ a n d ~ b y ~}^{\text {，}}$ metathesis $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \nu \nu v \mu$ ；so also in the formation＊，fut．$\sigma \tau 0-$ $\rho \in ́ \sigma \omega$ or $\sigma \tau \rho \omega ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$（Att．$\pi a \rho a \sigma \tau о \rho \omega \hat{\omega}$ ，Aristoph．Equ．484．）；
 forms are perf．pass．ě $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu a \imath$ ；aor．1．pass． $\begin{gathered} \\ \sigma \tau \rho \\ \rho \\ \theta\end{gathered} \eta \nu$ ；verbal adj．$\sigma \tau \rho \omega \tau о ́ с$.
Hippocrates uses катабторєө日ī̀at；see Foes．OEc．Hippocr．：and Hesychius explains é $\sigma \tau 0 \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \eta$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau o \rho \dot{1} \theta \eta$ by $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \rho \omega \dot{\theta} \eta \eta$ ．
 $\phi a$ ，Theognet．Conv．Athen．3．p．104．c．Lobeck ad Phryn． p．578．perf．pass．é $\sigma \tau \rho a \mu \mu a \iota$（like $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho a \mu \mu a \iota$ and $\tau \in ́ \theta \rho a \mu \mu a \iota$ ， with $a$ instead of $\epsilon \ddagger$ ）；aor．1．pass．ė $\sigma \tau \rho \in ́ \notin \theta \eta \nu$（compare


The aor．1．pass．$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \rho \dot{ } \dot{\phi} \theta \eta \nu$ occurs in the Doric dialect of Theocr．7， 132．I know of no authority for a pres．$\sigma \tau \rho i ́ \phi \omega$ ；compare т $\tau a ́ \pi \omega$ ，т $\rho \alpha ́-$ $\phi \omega$ ．In Il．$\sigma, 546$ ．$\sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \psi a \sigma \kappa o \nu$ is 3．plur．aor．for é $\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \psi a \nu$ ．

इテvyé $\omega$, I fear，hate，is regular．The perf．à $\pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\gamma} \eta \eta \kappa \alpha$ has the force of a present，Herodot．2． 47.
From an obsolete stem $\Sigma T Y \Gamma \Omega$ or $\Sigma T Y Z \Omega$ Homer has the aor． 2.
 causative meaning of to make terrible；which latter form is how－ ever again used by the later poets，e．g．by Apoll．Rh．4，512．，in its original sense．
$\Sigma_{v \rho i}{ }^{\prime}, \omega$, Att．$\sigma v \rho i \tau \tau \omega$, I pipe：fut．$\sigma v \rho i \xi \omega$ ，more fre－ quently and purer Attic $\sigma v \rho i \xi \neq \mu a \iota$ ，Non－Attic $\sigma v \rho i \sigma \omega$ ，Dor． ovpiodo ；see Hemsterh．Aristoph．Plut．p．229．The aor． 1．infin．ovpioat is found in Lucian．Harmon．2．Com－

 $\rho \eta \nu$ ．

[^263]$\Sigma \phi{ }^{\prime} \measuredangle \omega$, Att. $\sigma \phi^{\prime} \tau \tau \omega$, [I cut the throat, slaughter, offer $u p$ in sacrifice: fut. $\sigma \phi{ }^{\prime} \xi \omega$; aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon} \sigma \phi a \xi a$; perf. pass*
 Pind.] but in the Attic writers generally aor. 2. é $\sigma \phi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \eta \eta$,

$\Sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, I$ deceive: [fut. $\sigma \phi a ̆ \lambda \omega \hat{\omega}$; aor. 1. $\notin \sigma \phi \eta \lambda a$, infin. $\sigma \phi \bar{\eta} \lambda a \iota$; aor. 2. $\epsilon \sigma \phi a \lambda o \nu$, Pind.; perf. pass. ${ }^{\text {é }} \sigma \phi a \lambda \mu a \iota$; ] aor. 2. pass. $\epsilon \in \phi a ́ \lambda \eta \nu$.
$\Sigma \phi \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega, I$ tie together, fasten together: fut. $\sigma \phi^{\prime} \gamma \xi \omega$;
 $\xi a \iota, \& c$.
$\Sigma \phi \dot{\prime} \check{\iota} \omega, I$ beat (as the pulse does), palpito: fut. $\sigma \phi^{\prime} \xi^{\prime} \omega$, \&c.: Compare $\Sigma \tau a ́ \zeta \omega, \Sigma \tau i \zeta \omega, \& c$.
$\Sigma \chi \alpha ́ \zeta \omega, I d r o p$, open: fut. $\sigma \chi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$, \&c. This verb has in the older language a pres. in -á $\omega$, as $\sigma \chi a ́ \omega$, infin. $\sigma \chi \hat{q} \nu$ : imperf. $\bar{\epsilon} \sigma \chi \not \omega \nu$; sec Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 219.; but in the formation the $a$ is always short.
[Both the act. and midd. voices of this verb have a transit. and intransit. meaning; in the former it seems connected with ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi(\omega, \sigma \chi \in \hat{\epsilon} \theta \omega$, 'iox $\omega$. An'Alexandrian form é exá̧ooav for ếoxa̧ov is found in Lycophr. 21.-Passow.]


 Att. $\sigma \hat{́} \sigma \omega \mu a t$, otherwise generally $\sigma \hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \sigma \mu a l$; aor. 1. pass. $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \sigma\end{gathered} \dot{\theta} \eta \nu$. . Mido.

The radical form is $\sigma a \dot{o} \omega$, , $\alpha \omega^{\prime} \sigma \omega$, coming regularly from $\sigma$ áos, salvus; and as from $\sigma \dot{o} o s$ came $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$, so by contraction from $\sigma a o ́ \omega$ was formed $\sigma \omega^{\prime} \omega$, $\sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega, \sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega \mu a t$, $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega^{\prime} \eta \eta \nu$. The pres. $\sigma \dot{\omega} \omega \omega^{*} \sigma \omega^{\prime} \epsilon \iota, \& c$. remained in the usage of the Epic poets; but $\sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \omega$, which sprung from it, was introduced into the common language, and gave rise afterwards to $\sigma \hat{\ell} \sigma \omega$ $\sigma \mu \alpha$. The rarity of the older form $\sigma \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega \mu \mu$ (on which see Suid. v. $\sigma \hat{\varepsilon}-$ $\sigma \omega \sigma \pi a l$ ) arose from transcribers using the one then in common use $\dagger$.
There is perhaps no instance whatever in the Epic writers of the pres. $\sigma \omega \dot{\zeta} \zeta \ddagger$. In the other tenses they use the resolved form only, as fut.

[^264]$\ddagger$ The single occurrence of $\sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \omega \nu$ in Od. $\epsilon, 490$. is most likely a false reading for $\sigma \dot{\omega} \omega \nu$, as we find at $\iota, 430$. $\sigma \dot{\omega}=\nu \tau \in s$ : and in Hes. $\epsilon, 374$. $\sigma$ ẃとol is a rejected reading. Among the Alexandrine Epics Apollon. Rhod. has invariably oúw, \&.c.
 and in the present beside $\sigma \omega{ }^{\prime} \omega$ ，\＆c．，a shortened form of it ；as，conj． oóns，oóm，odं $\omega \sigma \iota \nu$ ，Il．८，393．424．681．But the resolved form is sel－ dom found in the present in the Epic writers；ouoi，Theogn． 868. Bekk．and Callim．Del．22．$\sigma$ aov̂̃ı＊，Tyrt．2，13．The imperative，would therefore be $\sigma$ áov，and the imperf．（＇̇́ $\sigma a ́ o v \nu$ ）3．sing．白 $\sigma a ́ o v, ~ \sigma a ́ o v, ~ a n d ~ s o ~$ the imperative is written in the manuscripts and in the text of the com－ mon editions in the following passages；Hom．Hymn．12．（13．）Callim． Epigr．35．Theodorid．Epigr．4．Epigr．Adesp．179．But Homer has $\in \in \sigma$ á $\omega, \sigma$ á $\omega$, Il．$\phi, 238 . \pi, 363$ ．as the 3 ．sing．imperf．，and $\sigma$ á $\omega$ ， Od．$\nu, 230 . \rho, 595$ ．as the imperat．；and so has Callimachus in his hymns：whence also the text of the first－quoted passages has been sometimes altered to $\sigma$ ác．Besides it has been already mentioned under $\nu$ vaerá $\omega$ ，that this form is lengthened in the same anomalous manner as
 traction，instead of being resolved into－ow according to general analogy， was changed to $-a \omega$ ．

In an Attic inscription in Corp．Inscr．Gr．T．1．p．107．no， 71. stands legibly $\mathbf{\Sigma O O}$ ，while the context requires the fut．$\sigma \omega \boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega$ ：that form must therefore be read $\sigma \omega \dot{\omega}$ ，which is the same old future as the Epic épúoval，tavvioval，and which had therefore left its traces in the
 ticle on＇Epúw．

## T．

TA－．We must suppose this stem or root on account of the old im－ perative $\tau \hat{\eta}$ ，take！here！（in French tiens ！）to which belonged also a plural $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$（Sophron．ap．Schol．Aristoph．Ach．204．），formed accord－ ing to the analogy of $\zeta \stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \nu, \& c$ ．

Akin to the above is another stem or root TAF－，$\dagger$ from which Homer has a redupl．part．aor．2．teєay ${ }^{\prime} \nu$ ，seizing．

That the supposition of a stem or root TA－for the formation of $\tau \varepsilon-$ taкa，\＆c．from тeiv $\omega$ is grammatically unnecessary，although there may be etymological grounds for it，is shown under Teive．See also an ac－ count of all above－mentioned forms in Buttm．Lexil．Art．Terayáv， p．503．et sqq．

TAГ－．See TA－（TA $\Omega$ ）．
Ta入áw．See T入áw．

[^265]
 $\phi$, 174. In Il. $\rho, 393$. we find a 3. sing. pres. távviat, as formed from távvpat. The $v$ is short in all the tenses, so that Homer, in order to lengthen it, doubles the $\sigma$.

Ta $\rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\tau a \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega, I$ disturb : fut. $\tau a \rho a ́ \xi \omega \dagger, \& c$. Its inflexion is regular.
This verb has a sister-form of less frequent occurrence, 1.) in the Attics $\theta$ pátrt with long $a$, whence the neut. part. тò $\theta$ oártov: the pres. was used in prose, the aor. 1. $\epsilon \theta \rho a \xi \alpha$, infin. $\theta \rho a \hat{\xi} \alpha c$ by the poets. 2.) in the Epic writers the perf., with an intransit. sense, rétp $\eta \chi \alpha$, I am agitated, stormy.

This $\theta \rho a ́ t \tau \omega$ was formed from rapátre by transposing the first a with the $\rho$, and then contracting the two alphas into one long syllable: consequently the + before the $\rho$ became aspirated, like $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\theta} \theta \rho \pi \pi \pi \nu, \theta o \mu \dot{\alpha}-$ $\tau \iota o v, ~ ¢ \rho o v \hat{\delta} o s, \& c$. In $\tau \in \tau \rho \eta \chi^{a}$ the $r$ was necessarily restored, and the $\eta$ for $\bar{a}$ is a common Ionicism. From this perfect the later writers formed a pres. т $\quad$ í $\chi \omega$. See the Art. on $\begin{gathered}\text { ér } \tau \eta \eta \chi^{a} \text { in Buttm. Lexil. p. } 506 . ~\end{gathered}$

Tá $\sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\tau a ́ \tau \tau \omega, I$ set in order, arrange : fut. $\tau a ́ \xi \omega$; perf. pass. тé $\tau a \gamma \mu a t$; aor. 1. pass. $\epsilon \in a ́ \chi \theta \eta \nu$; aor. 2. (less


Taфєiv and гафŋ̂val. See Өánтш and ӨАФ-.
Teive, I stretch out, extend (anything) : fut. $\tau \in \nu \hat{\omega}$; aor. 1. êтєıva; perf. тéтăка ; perf. pass. тéтацає; aor. l. pass. є́тád $\theta \nu$. See TA-, and Tavúw.

This verb with $\kappa \lambda i \nu \omega$, крi $i \nu \omega$, $\kappa \tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$, and $\pi \lambda \dot{v} \nu \omega$ drop the $\nu$ in the perf. act., perf. pass., and aor. 1. pass., and take the short vowel of the future; the two verbs in - eivw changing also the $\epsilon$ to $a$. When we observe that $\tilde{\epsilon} \phi \theta_{\iota} \mu a \iota$ and $\delta v \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ belong, both in form and meaning, to $\phi \theta i \omega$ and $\delta \dot{\delta} \omega$ (not $\phi \theta i \nu \omega, \delta i v \omega)$, that $i \delta \rho \dot{v} \nu \theta \eta \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi r^{\dot{v} \nu} \theta \eta \nu$ must come from $i \delta \rho \dot{v} \omega, \pi \nu{ }^{\hat{\epsilon}} \omega$, there being no trace of a pres. in $-\nu \omega$ for either, and that $\beta a i \nu \omega$ comes from BA $\Omega, \phi \theta a ́ \nu \omega$ from $\Phi \ominus A \Omega$, \&c. \&c., we may conclude that the above five verbs also ( $\tau \epsilon i v \omega$, \&c.) came originally from roots which according to the more general analogy would be pure, and that another present was afterwards formed by the very common insertion of the $\nu$. But as in these five verbs the $\nu$ is carried on to the future,

[^266]which is not the case with the other anomalous verbs in $-\nu \omega$ ，and there exists also a plain analogy between these and other verbs which have for their characteristic letter $\lambda, \mu, \nu$ ，or $\rho$ ，particularly in the change of the vowel $\epsilon$ to $\alpha$ ；it seems to me a more grammatical and more practi－ cal arrangement to join them thus with each other and with the verbs in $-\nu \omega$ ，than to refer certain tenses to such themes as KPI $\Omega, T A \Omega, \& c$ ．，by which the number of verbal anomalies would be unnecessarily increased．

Tei $\rho \omega$, I rub out（attero），wear out，torment，is used only in pres．and imperf．Topeì and Tépropą must be considered as distinct stems or roots，which，although akin to each other，have been separated by usage．See both in their places．

TEK－．See Tíktu．
Tє $\lambda$ é $\omega$ ，I finish，complete，fulfil：fut．$\tau \epsilon \lambda \in ́ \sigma \omega^{*}, \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega$（Il． 0，415．），and Att．$\tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$ ，Plat．Protag．p．311．b．；in the passive also $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \nu a$（Herodot．3，134．）is a future．See $\Delta \epsilon ́ \mu \omega$ and Ka入́́ $\omega$ ．Pass．тє $\lambda \in ́ o \mu a \imath$ ；fut．тє $\lambda \in ́ \sigma o \mu a \iota$ ；perf． $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ；aor．1．pass．＇̇тє $\lambda \in ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ．
 dotus uses the infin．re入é $\sigma \alpha$ ．We find also in Homer the Epic pres． $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \omega$ both in the act．and pass．voice．－Passow．］

Té $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ，an old verb $\dagger$ ，occurring only in its compounds， which may be found in the Lexicons；e．g．àvaテé $\lambda \lambda \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\tau \in ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \& c$ ．It is inflected regularly according to the ana－ logy of verbs having as their characteristic letter $\lambda, \mu, \nu$ ，or $\rho$ ；and in the passive has only the aor．l．－Midd．
［Passow gives the following inflection：гé $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ；fut．тє $\lambda \hat{\omega}$ ，Æol．тє́ $\lambda$－


 perf．$\tau \in ́ \tau \mu \eta \kappa a \ddagger$ ；perf．pass．тé $\tau \mu \eta \mu a \iota$ ；aor．1．pass．ė $\tau \mu \eta \eta_{-}$ $\theta \eta \nu$ ；3．fut．$\tau \epsilon \tau \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma о \mu a \iota$ ，whence $\epsilon \in \tau \epsilon \tau \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta_{0 \nu}$ ，Plat．De Rep．8．p．564．c．－Midd．

In Il．$\nu, 707$. ré $\mu \epsilon \iota$ is a solitary instance of a pres．т $\varepsilon$ $\mu \omega$ ；and so it is

[^267][^268]considered by Heyne : but Wolf and Passow read $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ as a future. The common form however in both Epic and Ionic writers is тápriw: yet the aor. $\begin{gathered}\text { z } \\ \text { a } \\ \mu \nu \nu \\ \nu\end{gathered}$ is found in the Attics, and was probably one of the older Atticisms, e. g. Thucyd. 1, 81. Eurip. Hel. 1240.

An Epic sister-form is $\tau \mu i \prime \gamma \omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\text {è }} \tau \mu \eta \xi \alpha$; aor. 2. ${ }^{\text {é }} \tau \mu a \gamma o \nu$; aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \mu a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$. See also T $\epsilon \tau \mu o \nu$.

Tє́ $\rho \pi \omega$, I delight: fut. $\tau \in ́ \rho \psi \omega$; aor. 1. ê $\tau \in \rho \psi a, \& c$. This verb is regular.

The pass. тє́ $\rho \pi о \mu \iota, I$ am delighted, satiated, has in the Epic language


 тєтарт $\dot{\mu} \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, тєтарто́ $\mu \epsilon$ vos. But the aor. 1. pass. is found likewise in many passages of Homer with a change of vowel, e. g. тíp $\varphi \theta \eta$, Od. $\tau$, 213. $\tau$ áp $\phi \theta \in v, \zeta, 99$. : for this however there are not sufficient analogical grounds; and as there is still less foundation for imagining that these two forms were used indifferently for each other in the same poem, it is possible that the one with the change of vowel might have been an impure dialect foisted into Homer's text at some very early period*.

Three times (Il. $\gamma, 441 . \xi, 314$. Od. $\theta, 292$.) Homer has $\tau \rho a \pi \epsilon i o \mu \epsilon \nu$, which is aor. 2. conj. pass. for $\tau \rho a \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\tau \rho a \pi \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$, and formed according to the analogy of verbs in $\mu$, that is like $\theta$ eio $\mu u$ for $\theta$ é $\omega \mu$ a from $\tau i \theta \eta \mu$, or $\sigma \tau \varepsilon i o \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \in \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ from $\tilde{i} \sigma \tau \eta \mu$. But in the above passages the verb comes from $\tau \hat{\epsilon} \rho \pi \omega$, not from $\tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$, by the same metathesis as in $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \neq \nu$ : see $\Pi$ Ié $\rho \theta \omega \dagger$.
 $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \tilde{\eta} \nu \iota, \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta \dot{\mu} \downarrow \nu \iota$, Il. $\pi, 519$. Od. $\zeta, 98$. The active voice does not occur in any ancient writer, but in its stead we find, in a causative sense, Tepoainw, I make dry, dry up, (regularly inflected) whence aor. 1. étéропй Il. $\pi$, 529.

At Il. $\pi$, 519. we find тepoìvat to become dry, and at v. 529. téponve

[^269]from rןє́ $\pi \omega$, grounded on grammatical construction, is correct. To which we may add that Homer in such a sense (to turn oneself toward) never uses $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \bar{\eta} \nu a i$ but $\tau \rho a \pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$; while on the other hand we meet with the same expression $\tau \varepsilon \in \rho \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ фө入ótクtı at $\mathrm{Od} . \varepsilon, 227$. In the passage of Od. $\theta$, 292. we must join єủvท $\theta$ ć $\nu \tau \epsilon$ $\lambda$ ék $\rho \rho о \nu \delta \in$, like és Opóvò ǐ̧e and the like.
he made dry; hence the two forms, thus standing in evident relation to each other, have been generally considered as infinitive and indicative of the same verb, with no other difference than that of sense. Now as tépoqve can be nothing but an aor. 1. act., тepoŋ̀vat would then be the infinitive of the same tense, with an immediate or neuter meaning. But тeporímevat (Od. $\zeta, 98$.), which exactly corresponds with it, is clearly an aor. passive*.

Nicander (Ther. 96. 693. 709.) has some forms of an aor. èt $\tau \in \rho \sigma a$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \notin \rho \sigma \eta \nu a$; and again in Theocr. 22, 63. I would, rather on account of the context, consider $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \sigma \varepsilon \iota$ to be a future than a present. If this be so, and these forms of Nicander, like others of the same poet, were not made by hinself, they come probably from $\tau \in \in \rho \rho \rho, I d r y u p$ (see the


Tєєăy(̆̀v. See TA-.
Tetev $\chi \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$, to be armed, Od. $\chi, 104$. a perfect derived from the subst. тєíरea. Compare 'E $\sigma \theta \eta \mu$ évos.

## Terípuat. See TIE-.

 we find no other tense than the conj. $\tau \varepsilon \tau \mu \eta s, \eta$, Od. 0,15 . The analogy of ë $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu 0 \nu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda о ́ \mu \eta \nu$ appears to lead us to a theme TEM $\Omega$, which however being totally different in meaning from TEM $\Omega$ the stem or root of $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \nu \omega$, must be kept distinct from it, at least by the Grammarian.
[Of this latter root we find étét $\mu \epsilon \tau \circ$ in Orph. Arg. 366. which, as well as éreт $\mu o v$, Passow forms from an obsolete pres. тét $\mu \omega$.]

## Teтраiv. See Tıтрáш.

## Tcúx $\boldsymbol{c}$. The two following cognate verbs must be kept distinct from each other.

1. Teí $\chi$, I prepare: a poetical word, regularly inflected, as fut.

[^270]$\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \in \sigma \theta$ al with $\tau \in i \rho \varepsilon \iota \nu$ by means of a future and an aorist of this verb according to the analogy of кєípo ëképoa (compare ' $A \lambda \bar{\lambda}(\xi)$ ), must be pronounced incorrect, because the $\sigma$ in $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a z$ is in the root through the Ionicism of $\rho \sigma$ for $\dot{\rho} \dot{\rho}$, as shown by the derivative subst. тa $\rho \dot{\rho}$ ós and rapoós, and the Lat. torreo. Nor is there so immediate an agreement between the meanings of ( $\tau \in ́ \rho \rho \omega) \tau \epsilon \in \rho \sigma \omega, I d r y u p$, and $\tau \in i \rho \omega, I$ rub off; which latter may indeed have been pronounced in the Aolic dialect r $\epsilon$ épo $\rho$ also (see Greg. Cor. in Eol. ii.), as to justify the grammarian in joining both verbs under the same inflexion.


2. Tvy $\chi^{a ́ v \omega, ~ I ~ h a p p e n, ~ c h a n c e ~ t o ~ b e, ~ h i t ~ u p o n: ~ f u t . ~ \tau \epsilon u ́-~}$
 of these tenses from rév $\chi \omega$ see notes under $\Pi \nu \nu 0 a ́ v o \mu a \iota ~ a n d ~$
 $\chi^{\circ \nu}$ (without having recourse to a new theme $\tau \nu \chi$ é $\omega$ ) see 'Акахіцн and note.
The meaning of $\tau v \gamma \chi^{\dot{a}} \nu \omega$, érv$\chi^{o \nu}$ is that of the passive of $\tau \in \chi^{\prime} \chi^{\omega}$ with an intransitive immediate force. That is to say retíx $\theta$ at very frequently means in the Epic poets to be fated, destined, brought on by circumstances, whence teruктai is much the same as $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau i$, for which was
 ( $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta o \mu \varepsilon \nu$, oiov érú $\chi^{\theta \eta}$ ) had precisely the same meaning as érvұev in prose. Thus êtuxé $\mu$ ot roûto, this happened to me, was much the

 étó $\chi \eta \eta$, was prepared for them, was their lot : and sometimes in this as in other cases the relation is reversed, éruxov tov́rov, I obtained that as my lot, whence comes the meaning of to obtain, light upon, find. In a similar way it is easy to distinguish in the two aorists of the same theme, ${ }^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \varepsilon \xi a$ and $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau u \chi \epsilon \nu$, the causative and the immediate meaning becoming active and passive, ("I caused, prepared," and "it was prepared, was my lot") a distinction which we see plainly in üpeı $\psi a$ and


With this aor. 2. is connected also, according to the analogy given in the last note, the perf. act. from the same simple form, rétev $\chi$ a. This was the true Ionic perfect of $\tau v \gamma \chi^{\dot{d} \nu \omega}$, e. g. in Herodot. 3, 14. extr., which in a later period became frequent in the non-Attic writers, as in Aristot. Eth. 3, 14. Polyb. 1, 81 : see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 395. Nay, the part. of this perfect occurs in Homer in a completely passive sense

[^271]$\pi$ т́фvка, I am produced, I grow.
The same may be observed of čotทv and $\bar{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$, of $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu$ and $\delta \in \dot{\delta} \delta v \kappa \alpha$, of $\bar{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \eta \nu$ and $\epsilon \not \sigma \beta \eta \kappa \alpha$, of $\bar{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \nu$ and $\epsilon \not \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ (in $\sigma x \in ́ \lambda \lambda(v)$, of $\eta \rho \iota \pi \frac{\nu}{}$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\eta} \rho \iota \pi \alpha$. Again by usage тє́тєv $\chi$ a belongs not to rєú $\chi \omega$, but to $\tau v \gamma \chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$; and the Epics join $\tau \in \mathfrak{c}-$

 similar instances may be seen in a note under 'Aл $\uparrow \sigma \kappa о \mu a$. For the perf. of $\tau$ ev $\chi \omega$ in an active sense, there is no genuine undisputed authority*.

From ërvyov, rvđeì were formed (according to the analogy of îkaұov,
 perfect, precisely synonymous with those above-mentioned, viz. érú $\chi \eta \sigma a$ and тeтíŋ $\eta \kappa a$, of which the aor. 1. remained in Epic usage, while the perfect became the Attic and common form.

In the Ionic 3. plur. of tétvypaı Homer has restored, on account of the metre, the diphthong of the present, making tetévaiat, тereíXato; but we find also, at least in the later prose, тeréypat (see
 has not answered the expectation, Lucian. Alex. $28 \dagger$. And lastly in Homer, the fut. 3. is not formed with $v$, but written $\tau \in \tau \in \dot{v} \xi o \mu a \ell$; which future is used at I1. $\mu, 345 . \phi, 585$. in the neuter sense only of тéтvүнац, and therefore cannot be mistaken at $\phi, 322$.

The same uncertainty which is found in the vowel of тикто́s, тevкт ós, appears to have existed also in the aor. 1. pass.; at least in Anacr. 10. $\tau \grave{o} \tau \epsilon v \chi^{\theta} \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ is the better accredited reading. Perhaps it was wished to
 which has in all other instances a neuter meaning.

The Epic language has another aorist, always found in a reduplicated shape, the aor. 2. тetuкeiv, Midd. тeтvкéa $\theta$ a, and corresponding in meaning with $\tau \in \dot{\exists} \xi a \iota$, reú $\dot{\xi} a \sigma \theta a l$, to prepare: see Od. o, 94. Il. a, 467. The $\kappa$ comes from the Ionic dialect (see $\Delta$ е́конаи), and is retained in this old form, which may be compared with кeкaঠeì under Xá̧ $\zeta$.

- In II. $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, 346. the reading of most of the manuscripts, and, until very lately, of the text also, was $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon v \chi a \tau o \nu$ in the sense of to prepare. But as the perfect cannot possibly stand in that passage, the other reading $\tau \in \tau \epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \in \tau 0 \nu$, which the Scholiast also follows, has been adopted. This, however, is equally inadmissible. For whether it be considered as a present, (which is contrary to Homer's practice in the narrative,) or as an imperfect with the termination of $-\boldsymbol{\tau} \nu$ for $-\tau \eta \nu$, such a form as terev́z $\omega$ for $\tau \in \dot{\chi} \chi \omega$ or $\tau \varepsilon ́-$ revxov for érevxov is quite unheard of, and (which is decisive,) not required by the metre. There is no doubt, therefore, that the reading of the Schol. Ven., extracted from some old copies (è ećvéxov for $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \in u \chi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \eta \nu$ ), is the only true one. That is to say, as the termination in - Tov of this imperfect, though not without pa-
rallel cases (II. $\kappa$, 364. $\sigma, 583$.) in the old Epic poetry, was yet contrary to the common rules of grammar established at a later period, the word was first altered to a supposed present $\tau \in \tau \epsilon \bar{\chi} \in \tau \sigma v$, and then to a perfect, which, as far as regarded formation, was a correct one. The present Scholium of this verse is most corrupt; that at I1. $\kappa, 364$. attributed to the Alexandrines, and containing the Scholiast's opinion of this dual in all three passages, reads indeed in the one before us тєтє́́रєтоע, but it can only be rendered consistent with itself by our reading there
 ย̇ $\tau \varepsilon v \chi \circ \nu$.
$\dagger$ See also Stephan. Thesaur. in $\dot{d} \pi \sigma^{-}$ тvyхávw, and Lex. Seguer. (Antiatt.) p. 79., where the still more astonishing form $\boldsymbol{a} \pi \pi=\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\chi} \chi \eta \tau a t$ is explained by $\dot{a} \pi 0_{0}$ те́тєvкта.

With this refucé $\theta a \mathrm{at}$ is joined in the same Epic language a new pre－
 342．this form has plainly and without force the meaning of $\tau \in \dot{u} \chi \in \omega \nu$, to prepare（fire）；and so it was understood by the ancients，as the usage of Apollonius proves，who uses it（4，248．）in the sense of＂to prepare the sacrifice．＂The active voice is found in the Alexandrine poets，as in Arat．418．Antim．Fr．26．Lycophr．1403．Opp．Hal．2，99．Com－ pare Ruhnk．Epist．Crit．p．38．At the same time this form belongs
 $\nu, 159$ ．）to aim at any one，bears the same relation to ruxeiv ruvos，to hit any one，as á àociof $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \varepsilon \epsilon$ ，he runs away（spoken of one who may still be caught），does to $\dot{\pi} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\rho} \rho a$ ，he escaped，or as captare does to capere， and the like＊．

Tóvoaı for $\tau v \chi$ モiv，see in its alphabetical place．
T $\boldsymbol{\eta} \kappa \omega$, I melt，soften，（trans．）：fut．$\tau \dot{\eta} \xi \omega, \& c$ ．Pass．$\tau \dot{\eta}-$ кода兀，with aor．2．є́тáкпン（ă），and perf．тéт $\quad$ кка，I melt， （intrans．）：see ${ }^{\epsilon} a \gamma a, \& c$ ．，under＂A ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu v \mu$ ，and note under Tév́ $\chi$ ．

TIE－，whence $\tau \in \tau i n \mu a, I$ am vexed，of which we find only the 2. dual．тєтiŋ $\sigma \theta o \nu$, Il．$\theta, 447$ ．and the part．тeтın $\mu$ évos，Il．$\lambda, 555$ ．In the same sense Homer uses also the active form тeтınw＇s，－ótos，Il．九， $30 . \lambda$ ， 554．Compare кєкафךш＇s，кєкиךш＇s，$\beta \in \beta a \rho \eta \omega \dot{s}$ ，\＆c．：see also $\beta \in \beta \alpha \omega^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ under Buivw．

Tiктш，I bring forth，pario $\dagger$ ：fut．тé $\xi \omega \neq$ ，more generally
 －óc，Hes．є， 593.


#### Abstract

＊Modern critics have attempted to con－ nect this verb with teraiv，by deducing the idea of taking aim from that of draw－ ing tight the string of the bow，and be－ cause at II．$\theta, 41 . v \pi^{\prime}$ ö $\chi \in \sigma \phi \iota$ тเтv́бкєто is used of attaching the horses to the cha－ riot，i．e．straining or drawing tight the traces．But independently of the two verbs（rıтaiv and rıтv́aк $\omega$ ，being si－ milar only in appearance，the similarity vanishes entirely between reiv $\omega$ and $\tau t-$ т plained by means of this deduction with－ out very unusual force；and as for the idea of the horses straining or stretching the traces，it does not correspond with any Greek or Latin expression whatever，


for Homer uses tıтaivetv äpرa in the sense of the horses drawing along the chariot．Tirv́reco日at in the above pas－ sage is＇therefore only a slight deviation from $\tau \epsilon v \in \chi \in \iota \nu$ ，with the sense of to set in order，make ready，and hence the Greek commentators unanimously explain it by ย̇тоьนа́そєเข．
＋［Sometimes also，I beget，Eurip． Suppl．1092．in which sense Homer very frequently uses the middle voice，II．$\beta$ ， 742．－Ed．］
$\ddagger$ Decisive authorities for this active form in the Iambic trimeter of the Attics will be found in Aristoph．Thesm． 509. Eurip．Tro．742．Eschyl．Prom． 868.

The perf. pass. тéteyuat and aor. 1. pass. $\begin{gathered}\tau \\ \tau\end{gathered} \in \theta \eta \nu$ are found only in non-Attic writers, e. g. in Hippocr. De Superfet. 8. and Pausan. 3, 7. The same perfect, with change of vowel, tétoy Epist. 141. The middle voice, with the same meaning as the active, is poetical only; тiктeтal, Eschyl. ap. Athen. p. 600. b. aor. 2. éteќó $\eta \eta$, тéкєто, тєкé $\sigma \theta a \iota$, Hom. [The aor. 1. тé $\xi_{a \sigma \theta a t ~ i s ~ f o u n d ~ i n ~ s o m e ~ e d i t i o n s ~}^{\text {a }}$ of Hes. $\theta, 889$., but perhaps the better reading is $\tau \in \dot{\xi} \xi \sigma \theta a \iota$. The aor. 1. act. ěre ${ }^{\xi} \alpha$ is very rare, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 743.-Passow.]

A fut. infin. текєïөtal (as from текоѝ $\mu a \iota$ ) is found in Hymn. Ven. 127., but I think $\tau \in \kappa$ é $\theta$ Oac would suit the syntax of the passage quite as well, in which case teкeīə $\theta$ al might be an old correction. The form $\tau \in \xi \varepsilon i \epsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, Arat. 124., which must be explained by supposing a fut. $\tau \in \xi=v ิ \mu a \iota, \tau \in \xi \varepsilon \xi_{i o \mu \alpha \iota}$, is very suspicious*.

Tì $\lambda \lambda \omega, I$ pluck, tear up; fut. $\tau \grave{\lambda} \lambda \hat{\omega}$; aor. l. êтī̀áa perf. pass. тé $\tau \boldsymbol{\lambda} \mu a \iota$.-Midd. This verb is inflected like крivш.

## 

 have also a sister-form Tєт $\mathrm{T} \alpha i \nu \omega$, fut. $\tau \in \tau \rho a \nu \hat{\omega}$, aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \in ́ \tau-$ $\rho \eta \nu a$, Aristoph. Thesm. 18., but in Theophr. é $\tau$ é $\tau \rho \bar{\nu} v a \dagger$. This latter verb, which is properly nothing more than a strengthened form of the other, became the general one in Attic usage. The perfects are however always taken from the radical form, thus perf. act. $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho \eta \kappa a$, perf. pass. $\tau \in e^{-}$ $\tau \rho \eta \mu a \imath$, Herodot. 4, 158.-Midd.

The aor. érétpqua, formed contrary to the general rule of verbs in $-\alpha i \nu \omega$ (see Kep $\alpha i \nu \omega$ ), is an Ionicism which remained in the Attic language. Authorities from Theophrastus for érétpava may be seen in Stephan. Thesaur. The form $\operatorname{\tau urpaiv} \omega$, wherever found, is a corruption.

Tıг $\dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$, I wound: fut. $\tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega, \& c$. Perf. part. pass. $\tau \in \tau \rho \omega \mu$ ย́vaı vє́єє, injured, Herodot. 8, 18.

The stem or root of $\tau \iota \tau \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma x \omega$ is in the verb topeiv, (as OOP- is the root of $\theta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$, BOP- of $\beta \iota \beta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$, ) by the well-known metathesis detailed more at length under Bá $\lambda \lambda \omega, ~ \Theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$, and Ka入é $\omega$. But as the

[^272][^273]sense of the derivative verb has become more precise and limited than that of its original theme, they must be treated as two separate verbs. Homer has the present in a more simple shape, $\tau \rho \dot{\tilde{\prime} \omega} \omega, \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \in s$; but only once, and then in the general sense of to hurt or injure, Od.. $\phi, 293$.
Tıтúбкш. See Teúx.
Ti $\omega$. As usage has separated the two following verbs, it will be better to do the same.

Ti $\omega, I$ honour, is solely poetical, and quite regular ; e.g. fut. тi $\sigma \omega$;


Tiva, I pay or suffer (the penalty of an offence), forms, like the preceding, a fut. điow; aor. 1. ếtioa, \&c.; perf. т́́тька; but the Attics make the $\imath$ short in all the tenses, and the pass. takes $\sigma$, as perf. $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \iota \sigma \mu a \iota$; aor. 1. $\in \tau i \sigma \theta \eta \nu$. Midd. тivouaı, I punish (a person), avenge (a thing) : fut. ті́бодаı; aor. 1. е̇тьба́ $\mu \eta \nu$.

According to the general analogy of verbs in -ivo, the Epics have the clong in rive and all its tenses. The Attics, on the contrary, generally use it short: see, as instances of tiv , Æschyl. Prom, 112. Soph. EEd. Col. 1203. Eurip. Or. 7.; and of tioal, Aristoph. Eccl. 45. Vesp. 1424. The $\iota$ of the present is also short in the Doric dialect of Pindar (Pyth. 2, 44.) ; in the early time of Solon (5, 31.), as well as in that of the later Epigrammatists, Jac. Anthol. Poet. p. 823. On the other hand, the fut. and its derivative tenses have the $\iota$ long in Pind. Ol. 2, 106., in the Anapæsts of Aristoph. Eccl. 656. 663., in the Iambic Trimeter of Soph. Trach. 1113. Phil. 1041. and in a lyric passage of Aj. 182.; see Reisig. Comm. Crit. de Soph. ©Ed. Col. p. 220.

We find an Ionic sister-form of the pres. тivш in тivpv $\mu \iota$, тivขvpar, written in the Attic poetry tivvpat with $\iota$ short, Eurip. Or. 313*. $_{\text {* }}$

Tג $\hat{\eta} v a t$, to bear or suffer, bear up manfully, venture, dare. Of this verb there is neither present nor imperfect: fut. $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \circ \mu a \iota$; perf. $\tau \in ́ \tau \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$; aor. 2. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \lambda_{\eta \nu}$, imper. $\tau \grave{\lambda} \hat{\eta} \theta \iota$, opt. $\tau \lambda a i \not \eta \nu, \dagger$ infin. $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} v a \iota$, part. $\tau \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}, \tau \lambda \hat{a} \sigma a, \tau \lambda a ́ v$. Compare є้ $\gamma \nu \omega \nu$, \&c., under Г $\uparrow \boldsymbol{\nu} \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$.

These forms are used both in poetry and prose, while the defective tenses are supplied from the verbs of similar meaning $\dot{\boldsymbol{i} \pi о} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \omega$ and

[^274]¿ंvé $\chi o \mu u$. Tét $\lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ is a regular perfect, and used as such in Aristoph. Plut. 280., but the poets have formed from it (with the force of a present,) the following syncopated forms; perf. plur. тє́ $\tau \lambda \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$, тє́ $\tau \lambda a \tau \epsilon$, $\tau \in \tau \lambda \bar{a} \sigma \iota$, dual $\tau \epsilon ́ \tau \lambda a \tau о \nu$; imper. тє́ $\tau \lambda a \theta \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \lambda a ́ \tau \omega, \& c$; opt. $\tau \epsilon \tau \lambda a \imath_{\eta} \nu^{*}$;


 $\rho, 166 .$, whence conj. $\tau \alpha \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega,-\eta s,-\eta$, Il. $\nu, 829 . o, 164$. , and in a later period we find a fut. ràá $\sigma \sigma \omega$, Lycophr. 746.

## TM-. See Tє́ $\mu \nu \omega$ and Tє́т $\mu \omega$.

Т $\mu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$. See Tє́ $\mu \nu \omega$.
Topeì (Hesych.), to pierce, stab; aor. 2. êtooov, a defective aorist, II. $\lambda, 236 .$, and (of less frequent occurrence,) aor. 1. є́тóp $\sigma \sigma \alpha$, part. торíŋous, Hymn. Merc. 119. A pres. торéw is nowhere found. [There are also traces in Hesych. of a reduplicated aor. тє́ropov explained by $\tau \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma a \iota$.-Passow.]

The same idea of piercing lies in $\tau \epsilon \tau \circ \rho \eta \eta^{\sigma} \omega$, a future with the meaning of to pierce (the ears), utter with a loud or shrill voice in Aristophanes (Pac. 381.), who has also in the same sense a present ropev́w (Thesm. 986.) $\ddagger$.

Tóv $\sigma \alpha$, Dor. róo $\sigma \alpha \iota s$, an aor. part. synonymous with $\tau v \chi \varepsilon i v$, Pind. Pyth. 3, 48., compare Bœckh. var. lect. p. 456. Beside the above we
 10, 52.

Tратєíw. See Té $\boldsymbol{\rho} \pi \omega$.
Тра́тн. See Tрє́тн.
T $\rho \in ́ \mu \omega$, I tremble, is used only in the pres. and imperf.
T $\rho \in ́ \pi \pi \omega$, I turn: fut. $\tau \rho \in ́ \notin \omega$; aor. 1. єै $\tau \rho \in \notin a$; aor. 1. midd.



[^275]it has the aor. 1. $\varepsilon$ er $\tau i \lambda a$, the original sense is most evident in èmıré入入 $\epsilon \iota \nu$.
$\ddagger$ As $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \mu$ оро $\quad$ comes from $\mu \epsilon i \rho \omega$, so is Étopov indisputably the aorist of a stem or root TEP-, which may be compared etymologically with $\tau$ ei $\rho \omega$, although this latter cannot in its precise meaning be joined grammatically with ropeiv. Hesychius has preserved forms of the reduplicated aorist тє́тopò ( $\tau \in ́ \tau o \rho є \nu, \tau \epsilon \tau o ́ \rho \eta$ ), but which are explained by $\tau \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma a l$. See Tıт $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$.
§ See note under K $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \omega$. This $\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ roopa is found in Aristoph. Nub. 85S. in
and $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho a \phi a$; perf. pass. $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho a \mu \mu a \imath$ *.-Midd. Verbal adj. $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \tau o ́ r$, and with the sense of the middle voice $\tau \rho a-$ $\pi \eta \tau \in \dot{\varepsilon} \circ$, With regard to the aorist, $\tau \rho \in \dot{\epsilon} \pi \omega$ is the only verb which prefers the aor. 2 . to the aor. 1. in all three voices : still, however, the latter is used in each voice to express certain deviations of meaning; but this is a subject for the Lexicons.

A very singular instance of the aor. 2 . midd. in a passive sense is


In this verb, as in $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\rho} \phi \omega$ and $\tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \phi \omega$, the $a$ of the perf. pass. is not carried on to the aor. 1. excepting in the Ionic and Doric dialects $\dagger$ : thus the Attics use $\dot{e ́}^{\tau} \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \phi \theta \eta \nu$, т $\rho \epsilon \phi \theta \bar{\eta} \nu u$, , $\tau \rho \varnothing \phi \theta \epsilon$ ís, Xen. Ven. 12, 5., but Herodotus $\left(4,12.9,56\right.$.) has é $\tau \rho \alpha^{\prime} \phi \theta \eta \nu, ~ \tau \rho a \phi \theta$ cis. At the same time it is difficult to form a decided judgement on this point, as Herodotus has not only a pres. трáт $\omega$, but also $(3,155$.) єтetpá $\psi о \nu \tau u$, and ( 4 ,
 Compare $\sigma \tau \rho \bar{\rho} \phi \omega$.

We find in a multiplicity of verbs, as in $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau a \dot{\partial} \omega$, yi $\gamma \nu o \mu \alpha \ell$, $\dot{\alpha} \rho-$
 and note under 'Aкa $\chi^{i},(\omega)$ : but in the verb before us, as well as in ктeive, we have instances of a present so formed, e.g. è étrpaméova, Il. $\kappa, 421$. We must here bear in mind that tpané $\omega$, I tread (the grapes), is a very different verb. See $\tau \rho a \pi \varepsilon i o \mu \epsilon \nu$ under Tép $\pi \omega$. [We find also in Homer an imperat. perf. pass. тєтpó $\phi \theta \omega$, Il. $\mu, 273$., an Epic 3. sing. of the pluperf. pass. rétpanto, and the Epic and Ionic 3. plur. of the perf. and pluperf. pass. тєтра́фатаt, тєтра́фато.-Passow.]

[^276]fects passive of т $\rho \in ́ \pi \omega$, т $\rho \in ́ \phi \omega$ and $\sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \phi \omega$ : in $\kappa \lambda \in \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \omega$ also usage fluctuates between $\kappa \varepsilon ́ \kappa \lambda є \mu \mu \alpha_{\iota}$ and кс́кла $\mu \mu \alpha$. See Etym. M. voc. є́тıтєтрáфatal, and Not. Crit. ad Aristoph. Vesp. 57. et ad Athen. 9. p. 409. c.
$\dagger$ [Passow adds the Epic language of Homer, and quotes ér $\rho a ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$ from Od. 0,80 . but the reading seems to be un-certain.-Ed.]
$\ddagger$ However singular it may appear that in the Ionic dialect the verb should be inflected $\tau \rho a \dot{\pi} \pi \omega$, т $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \psi \omega$, yet this is by far the most common mode of inflexion in our copies of Herodotus: see Schweigh. in é $\pi \iota \tau \rho$.: nay, in the two passages quoted above we find é $\pi \iota \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \psi o \nu \tau a \iota$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ ย́$\tau \rho \epsilon \psi \epsilon$ in very excellent manuscripts.

T $\rho \varepsilon ́ \phi \omega, I$ nourish: fut. $\theta \rho \varepsilon ́ \notin \omega^{*}$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\prime} \theta \rho \rho \in \psi a$; perf. 2.
 $\tau \in ́ \theta \rho a \mu \mu a \iota$ (see $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho a \mu \mu a \iota$ and note under T $\rho \in ́ \pi \pi \omega$ ), infin. $\tau \epsilon$ $\theta \rho a ́ \phi \theta a \iota \dagger ;$ aor. 2. pass. éт $\rho a ́ \phi \eta \nu:$ verbal adj. $\theta \rho \in \pi \tau o ́ c$.

The stem or root of this verb had both the immediate sensc to become fat, large, strong, and the causative one to make fat, \&c. From this latter comes the common meaning; the former occurs in the Epic language, but only in the aor. 2. є̈тpaфov and the perf. тétpoфa, according to the rule laid down in the note under Teíx $\omega$ : and undoubtedly these two forms had in that Epic language this intransitive meaning only, but in a later period the perfect took the causative sense also, as we see it in Soph. EEd. Col. 186. Alcæ. Messen. Epigr. 18. (Anal. 1. p. 490.), and Polyb. 5, 74., while the aor. 2. (ěтрафє, Il. $\dot{\phi}, 279$. $\dot{\text { érpa- }}$ $\phi$ ф́т $\eta \nu, \epsilon, 555$. трафе́ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ for $-\epsilon i ̀, \eta, \eta$, 199.) became obsolete $\ddagger$. That is to say, when in this as in other similar verbs, that neuter meaning to become large, grow up, began to be expressed in the present by the passive voice (see Il. 九, 143.), it soon spread to the aor. and perf. passive : and thus we find, even as early as Homer, the forms $\dot{\text { ét }} \boldsymbol{1} \dot{\prime} \phi \eta$,



#### Abstract

* Among the laws which regulate the Greek aspirates, we may observe the following; that where two successive syllables begin each with an aspirate, one of the aspirates, generally the first, is changed to the tenuis of the same organ : and when by any formation the second disappears, the first is restored. Thus, the root of this verb is $Ө Р Е \Phi-$, whence r $\rho \dot{\varepsilon} \phi \omega$, and again $\theta \rho$ é $\psi \omega$.


$\dagger$ Not rér $\rho \alpha \phi \theta \alpha \iota$, which belongs to тоє́т $\omega$, and which, though found in all the manuscripts in Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 24. (17.), must nevertheless be a corruption. Té $\theta \rho a \phi \theta$ in Plat. Legg. init. is the correct reading. Compare $\tau \in \theta a ́ \phi \theta a \iota$ under Өá $\pi \tau$.
$\ddagger$ [Yet in Callim. Jov. 55. we find

§ Of the passages in which these passive forms are now found, we must first reject II. $\beta$, 661. where the old reading
 pots èüா $\eta$ и́ctots was first changed by Barnes to $\tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, to the injury of the rhythm, and at the same time in opposition to almost all the manuscripts; for not one has $\tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ in regular order, nor is there the least trace of such a read-
ing in any of the Grammarians. There was evidently, therefore, in the text of Homer, as handed down to us, a discrepancy between this passage and two others ( $\gamma, 201$. "Os т $\rho \alpha \dot{\phi} \eta \eta$ є́v $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu \varphi$, and $\lambda$, 122. "Os т $\rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta$ ย่ $\nu$ Ө $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \kappa \eta)$, which those grammarians did not attempt to reconcile, and in which we ouglat to have followed their example. Nay, this discrepancy should have rather led us to conjecture that the passive forms had crept into Homer's text from the usage of a later period; that the 3. plur. $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \epsilon \nu$, for instance, lıad taken the place of $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha}-$ $\phi 0 \nu$, and that the original reading of the two passages quoted above was "Os r $\rho \dot{\alpha}$ -
 This conjecture is much strengthened by the circumstance, that the remaining passage, of which the emendation is not so easy, ('A $A \lambda$ ' $\dot{\delta} \mu \circ \bar{v}$, $\dot{\omega}$ є́ $\tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ غ́v $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \rho о \iota \sigma \iota$ סó $\mu \circ \iota \sigma \iota \nu, 11 . \psi, 84$.), abounds in variety of readings. One, in particular, of great weight in criticising Homer's text as being a full quotation of the whole passage in Aschines (c. Timarch. p. 21.), has this striking difference, ' $\Omega_{s} \dot{\delta} \mu 0 \hat{v}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \in \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \quad \pi \in \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{v} . \delta$. Surprising as this latter form is, we see at once

The present with the radical vowel $a$, тpá $\phi \omega$, is exclusively Doric, as in Pind. Pyth. 2, 82. 4, 205. Isthm. 8, 88, (7, 40. Bœeckh.)*

T $\rho$ é $\chi \omega$, I run, forms its future like $\tau \rho \in ́ \phi \omega$ (see note under
 the more common future comes from a very different stem or root, fut. $\delta \rho a \mu \circ \hat{\jmath} \mu a t \dagger$; aor. 2. $\varepsilon$ є́ $\delta \rho a \mu \nu \nu$; perf. $\delta є \delta \rho a ́ \mu \eta \kappa a$.

The forms ${ }^{*} \theta \rho \in \xi \alpha, \theta \rho \in \in \xi \circ \mu a \iota$ were almost obsolete: Homer has the aorist (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 719.); and the future is still found as an old Atticism in Aristophanes, $\mu \epsilon \tau \nexists \rho \epsilon \in \notin о \mu a \iota$ (see Fischer ad Well. 3. p. 182. Herm. ad Nub. 1005.) and $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \theta \rho \in \dot{\xi} \alpha \iota$, Thesm. 657., at which passage the Scholiast thinks it necessary (so little was the word in use,) to explain it.

The present of this verb is found in the Doric writers with the $a$, $\tau \rho \alpha^{\prime} \chi \omega$ : see Boeckh on Pind. Pyth. 8, 34.

The perf. $\delta \varepsilon \delta \rho \alpha \mu \eta \kappa \alpha \ddagger$ is formed from the aor. 2. $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \rho a \mu o \nu \\ \text { according }\end{gathered}$

that, with the mere additional insertion of $\delta$ ' after ' $\Omega$ s required to connect it with the context, this was the old and genuine reading of the verse: instead of which some grammatical Diaskeuastes removed the $\dot{\omega}$ from its natural place, where it answered to the corresponding " $\Omega \mathrm{s} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \alpha i \delta_{\sigma \tau \epsilon} \alpha$, and sacrificed the $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ which served to exalt the comparison, merely to introduce into the verse the regular $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$, grating as this $\check{c} \rho \ldots$...must have been to an Ionic ear by the harshness which it gave the metre. Now as far as regards this é $\tau \rho \dot{a}-$ $\phi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, Bœekh (on Pind. Pyth. 4, 115.) is of opinion that the ancients saw in all these Homeric forms ( $\tau \rho \alpha \dot{\phi \epsilon, ~ т ~} \rho \alpha \phi \in ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$, \&c.) nothing more than a shortening of the $\eta$. I agree with him in this opinion: but a correct idea of the true relation of this verb in Homer's language can only be formed by our recollecting the mutual coincidence of meaning in ërpaфe and rє́rрофє, and the great leading analogy mentioned in a note under Meípo $\mu \alpha$, and again more fully illustrated in a note under T T $\varepsilon$ ט $\chi \omega$. The form ér $\rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \nu$ is not Homeric, but ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ Tpaфov had the intransitive sense expressed afterwards by ér $\rho a ́-$ $\phi \eta \nu$ only. Now, where the difference of form was so slight, it was very natural that any one, who did not carry in his mind the whole of Homer's usage, should suppose the forms $\tau \rho a ́ \phi \epsilon, ~ r \rho a \phi ́ \in-\tau \eta \nu$, $\$ c \mathrm{c}$., to be merely a metrical shortening
of the vowel, as in the conjunctives $i \mu \epsilon i$ $\rho \in \tau \alpha \iota, \nu \alpha v \tau i \lambda \lambda \in \tau \alpha \iota, 8 \mathrm{cc}$ : and thus ét $\rho a ́-$ $\phi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ was introduced where the old Rhapsodist had used é $\tau \rho$ á $\phi$ o $\mu \in \nu$, as also from the 3. plur. Ëт $\rho a \phi \circ \nu$ was made Ërpaфєข. I have no doubt, therefore, that the old reading of the above verse was, ' $\Omega s \delta^{\prime}$
 $\mu \circ \iota \sigma \iota \nu$.

* In all three passages the forms in question are by some accented as aorists, $\tau \rho a \phi \in i ̂ \nu, \tau \rho \alpha \phi \omega ́ \nu:$ but we dare not so easily suppose ễ épaфov to be used for $\tilde{e} \theta \rho \in \psi a$. In all three passages the present is correct, in the last it is indispensable.
+ This future in an active form is found in the comic writer Philetærus ap. Athen. 10. p. $416 . \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \delta \rho a \mu \bar{\omega}$ : for such is the syntax of that whole passage that the Attic language does not allow it to be transferred altogether to the conjunctive ( $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega, \delta \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \omega$ ) by a change of accent.
$\ddagger$ Sufficient authority for this perfect is collected in Fischer vol. 3. p. 183. to which may be added $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \delta \epsilon \delta \rho a ́ \mu \eta \tau \alpha \iota$, Xen. EEc. 15, 1. That the old Grammarians cite their proofs of $\delta \in \delta \rho \alpha ́ \mu \eta \kappa a$ from Menander or Philemon (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 619.), arose from the circumstance that this perfect active, like that of so many other verbs, is of very rare occurrence.
$\delta_{\rho} \propto \mu \nu \hat{\nu} \mu a \iota$ cannot be formed from it in the same way, for then it would
 therefore, from the theme itself, which, on account of the old perf. ¿éèpo $\mu$ (Od. є, 412. $\zeta, 45$.), is supposed to be $\triangle \mathrm{PEM}$; from which, it is true, that future cannot be formed in the usual Attic manner of verbs having $\lambda, \mu, \nu$, or $\rho$ as their characteristic letter ; but a fixed analogy in the change of the vowel is not to be expected in these primitive verbs, the present of which was probably never in actual existence. Compare what has been said on Bád $\lambda \omega$ and $\Lambda a \gamma \chi^{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \omega \omega$.

The 3. sing. of a fut. a ${ }^{v}$ voípá $\mu e \tau a \iota$ is found in Philipp. Thess. Epigr. 24, 4. for which it is probable the writer had some old Epic authority.

T $\rho^{\prime} \epsilon$, I I tremble, retains $\epsilon$ in the inflexion: thus infin. $\tau \rho \in i \nu$ : fut. $\tau \rho \in \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. ět $\tau \in \sigma a$. This verb keeps all its forms resolved, except where they can be contracted in $\epsilon t$ : see $\Delta_{\epsilon} \epsilon, ~ I$ bind.
[The Epic poets double the $\sigma$, making (with the omission of the
 Passow.]

T $\rho \dot{\prime} \beta \omega$, I rub: fut. $\tau \rho i \notin \omega$; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho i \phi \theta \eta \nu$, Thuc. 2,77 . but more frequently is used the aor. 2. é $\tau \boldsymbol{\rho} \beta_{\eta \eta \nu}$, (on which see $\Gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega)$; perf. pass. $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho(\mu \mu a \imath$.
[Homer has the aor. 1. act. of this verb in its compound $\delta$ datpi $\psi a s$, Il. $\lambda, 846$. The fut. midd. трíqouat is used in a passive sense in Thucyd. 6, 18.-Passow.]

T ${ }^{\prime} i \zeta \omega$, I twitter, chirp : fut. $\tau$ рi $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega$ and (Hemsterh. Aristoph. Plut. 1.100.) $\tau \rho i \xi \omega$; perf. with force of a pres. $\tau \epsilon$ -
 racteristic letter of this verb is $\gamma$.

The Epics allowed themselves the liberty of pronouncing long the accented $o$ in the oblique cases of the part. perf., as reтрıүตттas for


тРүФ-. See Өрі́ттш.
T $\rho^{\prime} \chi^{\omega}$, I rub in pieces, wear out, consume, forms from $\tau \rho v \chi$ ó (a present of rare occurrence) an aor. 1. є́т $\rho^{\prime} \chi \omega \sigma a$; aor. 1. pass. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \tau \rho v \chi \chi^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$; part. perf. pass. $\tau \in \tau \rho v \chi \omega \mu \in ́ v o c$, \&c. The pres. pass, $\tau \rho v \chi$ ойтаt is found in Mimnerm. Fr. 2.



The $a$ in this aorist would seem to lead us to a theme TPHГ , a sister-form of $\tau \rho \omega \dot{\gamma} \omega$, like $\pi \tau \eta \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\pi \tau \omega^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega$. An aor. 1. in the compound кaтaт $\rho \omega^{\prime} \xi a v \tau e s$ is found in Timon Phlias. Fr. 7.

Tv $\chi \chi^{\alpha} \nu \omega$. See Teú $\chi \omega$.
Tv́ $\pi \tau \omega, I$ beat: fut. $\tau \hat{\imath} \psi \omega, \& c$. ; aor. 2. pass. є̀ є $\dot{\tau} \pi \eta \nu$.-Midd.-Instead of the regular inflexions the Attics used a fut. $\tau v \pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, a perf. pass. $\tau \in \tau \dot{v} \pi \tau \eta \mu a \iota$, and a verbal adj. $\tau ข \pi \tau \eta \tau \in \in \circ$.

On the above deviation from the regular inflexion, see Thom. Mag. in voc. and Stephan. 'Thesaur. The fut. midd. тvлтйооцає in Aristoph. Nub. 1382. with a passive sense, may possibly be a mistake for $\tau \cup \pi \dot{\eta} \dot{\sigma} \mu a \iota$; as the old reading $\dot{\omega} \theta \dot{\eta} \mid \sigma \varepsilon \iota$ in Eurip. Med. 336. is now proved by the Codd. to have been a corruption from $\dot{\omega} \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$. The
 Homer's time : the aor. 2. érvoov is seldom found, but it does occur in Eurip. Ion. 766.

Tú $\phi \omega, I$ smoke, burn : fut. $\theta \dot{v} \psi \omega^{*}$; aor. 1. ${ }^{*} \theta v \psi a$; perf. pass. $\tau \hat{e} \theta \nu \mu \mu a!$ or $\tau \in ́ \theta \bar{v} \mu a t$; aor. 2. pass. є́ $\tau u ́ \phi \eta \nu$.

## $\Upsilon$.


 $\nu a$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 26. perf. $v ф а у к а . ~$

A very suspicious reduplicated perf. pass. iфńфafرaє is quoted by Suidas in voc. Phrynich. Seguer. p. 20, 3. Herodian $\pi$. $\mu 0 \nu . \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \xi .44$, 25. The Grammarian in Suidas is puzzled how to account for the $\eta$ in the second syllable, whence I conjecture it to be a corruption of $\dot{v} \phi \dot{v} \phi$ a $\sigma \tau a$, which is quoted in the Etym. M. in voc. as an old and rare form from Zenodotus. In all our Attic writers we find invariably ṽ $\phi \alpha \sigma-$ $\mu a \iota$. Homer has from the radical form $\dot{u} \phi \dot{a} \omega$ a sister-form $\dot{\imath} \phi \dot{\prime} \omega$, whence the 3. plur. v́申ó $\omega \sigma \iota$, Od. $\eta, 105$.


[^277]I am rained upon, made wet with rain; fut. midd. (in the same sense) चैбоцаи, Herodot. 2, 14. aor. 1. pass. ṽ̈ $\sigma \eta \nu$, Herodot. 3, 10.

$$
\Phi .
$$

$\Phi A-$. See $\Phi \eta \mu i ́$ : also Фaivw and $\Pi$ é $\phi v o v$.
ФАГ-. See 'Ебөíw.
Фaiva, I bring to light, show: intrans. I shine. Pass. I am brought to light, I appear. Act. фaive; fut. фằ $\hat{\omega}$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\circ} \phi \eta \nu a$, infin. $\phi \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ;$ perf. $\pi \epsilon ́ \phi а \gamma_{\kappa}{ }^{*}$; perf. 2. $\pi \epsilon ́-$
 aor. 2. $\epsilon \notin a ́ v \eta \nu, ~ i n f i n . ~ \phi a \nu \eta ̂ v a \iota ; ~ p e r f . ~ \pi ́ ́ \phi a \sigma \mu a t . ~ M i d d . ~$ фаігодаı; fut. фavoûдaı; aor. 1. infin. ф'́varөat, Soph. The active voice has in the transitive sense the aor. 1.; in the intransitive the pres. the imperf. and the perf. 2. The passive has (beside the meaning attributed to it above) the strict passive sense of $\phi$ aiv $\omega$ as a transitive verb, and in this sense it employs the aor. 1.; e. g. тà фav $\theta^{\prime} \nu \tau a$, the things announced or declared, Demosth. c. Theocr. p. 1325.,
 $\phi^{\prime} \nu 0 \eta$, Lys. De Aristoph. Bon. p. 155, 28.; but in the sense of to appear the aor. 2. pass. is used. In this last sense we find a double future, viz. the fut. midd. which is the more common, and the fut. pass. which is of rarer occurrence: the latter is found more frequently in verse, but it is met with in prose also, e. g. фavíбouvo, Isæ. De Philoct. p. 58, 33. ávaфavíбovtaı, Xen. Hell. 3, 5, 11. The perf. 2. of the active serves as a perf. to фaivo$\mu a t$ in this intransitive sense ; while the perf. pass. (beside its proper passive meaning, I have been announced) has also the neuter sense of, I have appeared. And lastly we find a form of the middle voice (the aor. 1. infin. ф ${ }^{\prime} \nu a \sigma \theta a t$, Soph. Phil. 944.) in the transitive sense of the active, which is particularly common in the compound $\dot{a} \pi о ф a i \nu \omega$.

[^278]This verb is contracted from the old $\phi$ aeiv (Hom.), as aip $\omega$ is from $\dot{\alpha} \varepsilon i \rho \omega$. Hence in the Epic writers the radical syllable admits of being
 aor. 1 . is used by Homer in the same sense as é $\not \subset \alpha, \eta \eta \nu$.

By deriving the verb from this same radical form the Attics pronounced the future $\phi a \nu \bar{\omega}$ with the $a$ long, that is to say, they contracted it from $\phi$ aevw. Apollonius (De Adv. p. 600, 28.) expressly mentions this quantity, and Bekker notices the same in Aristoph. Equ. 300. where the words кai $\sigma \varepsilon \phi a \nu \omega \bar{\omega}(-u--)$ have been arranged differently in opposition to all the Codd. The coincidence of this verb with the same appearance in aipo makes the thing certain : still however in both verbs the usual quantity is not altered in the Attic. writers: e.g. $\phi a ̆ \nu \bar{\omega}$, Soph. Aj. 1362. and фăvov̂ $\mu a \iota$ wherever it occurst.
An aor. 2. act. and midd. of this verb is also quoted, but there is no certain authority for either. At Il. $\pi, 299$. the old editions certainly did read the 3. plur. é $\phi$ avo $\ddagger$; but as many of the most undoubted forms of $\phi a \nu \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$ occur in Homer, it has been correctly altered to eै $\varphi \mathrm{a}$ $\nu \in v$, which is found in the best manuscripts. It is true that quáerkev (Il. $\lambda, 64$.) appears to point to such an act. aorist ; but this iterative
 そ̈ $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$, \&c. The forms $\pi \rho o u ̈ \phi a \nu \epsilon s$ (Soph. Phil. 1191.) and фár ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ s (P̣hilem. Fr. inc. 52.b.) are more than suspicious from their transitive meaning : see Buttmann's notes on Soph. Phil. And lastly in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 34. instead of $\phi$ avoi $\mu \eta \nu$ the various reading фacvoí $\eta \nu$ ought to have been long ago adopted. In Soph. Aj. 313. фavoipv is the Attic. optat. fut. of the active voice.

At Od. $\xi, 502$. we find the stem of this verb in its most simple form, the 3 . sing. $\varphi$ á in the sense of the aorist, "the morning broke," which may be considered as the aor. 2. (eै $\phi \alpha o v, \phi a \in i v$ ) from which came the pres. $\phi \pi \epsilon i \nu \omega$. But Aratus has taken the liberty of using this simple form as a present, $\lambda_{\epsilon \pi \tau \grave{\alpha}}$ фíovgal, v. 607. where the sense of the aorist does not suit. And if we form from the same simple stem an analogous perf. act. and pass. we come to the Homeric fut. 3. $\pi \in ф \dot{\eta} \sigma \rho \mu \alpha$, II. $\rho, 155$. (will have appeared, will have burst over,) written precisely the same as the fut. of $\Phi E N \Omega$.

[^279]ailpw : or is $\dot{\rho} \alpha \nu \bar{\omega}$ correct, and did the $\rho$ produce the same effect here as in $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \dot{\rho} \rho \bar{a}-$ ros?
$\ddagger$ [Passow unhesitatingly condemns this aorist as entirely obsolete; see Pors. Eurip. Or. 1266. Buttm. Soph. Phil. 1191. Meineke Menand. p. 416.-Ed.]

Фá $\sigma \kappa \omega$. See $\Phi_{\eta \mu i ́ . ~}^{\text {. }}$
$\Phi$ ávok $\omega$ or $\Phi \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$ (compare $\tau \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma a \iota, \tau \rho a \hat{v} \mu u), I$ appear or break forth as the morning does; a verb occurring only in its compounds with dea, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$, and $\dot{v} \pi \dot{o}$ (see the examples in Schneider's Lexicon *), of which the inflexion (fut. $\phi$ av́vo, aor. $\varepsilon \varphi \phi a v \sigma \alpha$ ) is known only from the Septuagint and New Testament, e. g. Sam. ii. 2, 32. Ephes. 5, 14., but it is supported by the subst. $\dot{\pi} \pi$ ó $_{\dot{\phi}}$ avats, Herodot. 7, 36.

The Epic verb $\pi \iota \phi$ а́vбк $\omega$, $\pi \iota \phi$ ávко $\mu \iota, I$ show, give to understand, of which we find only the pres. and imperf., is distinct from $\phi$ av́rkw.

Фєíסoнаı, I spare, Depon. midd. ; fut. фєiбoнaı; aor. 1. є́фєєбá $\mu \eta$, infin. фєía

The Epic poets have the aor. 2. with reduplication, e. g. infin. $\pi \in \phi$ i$\delta \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$, opt. $\pi \epsilon \phi \iota \delta o i \mu \eta \nu$, whence a fut. $\pi \epsilon \phi \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$ : compare $\pi \epsilon \pi \iota \theta$ 亿и$\sigma \omega$ from $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \theta \epsilon i ̄ v$ under Пєi $\theta \omega$, and áках ${ }^{i} \jmath \omega \omega$ with note under 'Aкaх ${ }^{i-}$ $\zeta \omega$. In Euseb. 10. p. 130. Valckenaër (ad Herodot. 8, 10.) has cor-
 $\phi \epsilon i \delta o \mu a \iota$, like ó $\phi \epsilon \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \mu \epsilon \frac{\nu}{\prime}$ in Euseb. and aipєú $\mu \epsilon \nu o s$ in Hesiod.

## ФEN-. See Пéфvov.

$\Phi$ е́ $\beta \omega, I$ feed, nourish : perf. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \rho \rho \beta a$; pluperf. є́ $\pi \epsilon \phi \dot{\rho} \beta \notin \iota \nu$, Hymn. Merc. 105. Pass. I am nourished, tivós, Hom. Hymn. 30, 4. The fut. and aor. are defective both in the act. and pass.
$\Phi \in ́ \rho \omega, I$ bring or carry, forms its tenses from very different stems or roots; thus, fut. oil $\sigma \omega$, to which we must add from the common language an imperative (used also by the Epic and Attic writers) with the force of a pres. or aor.
 Bat. 482. Ach. 1099. 1101. 1122. Antim. Fr. 10.: see édíveto, p. 73. From the stem EГK $\Omega$ or ENEГK $\Omega$ come

 and -oıuc, -oו) the usage is very fluctuating, as the Grammarians have observed $\ddagger$. Of the remaining forms we find

[^280]an aorist in Od. $\gamma$, 429. Il. $\gamma, 120$, but as a fut. in Il. $\sigma$, 191.), and oï $\sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$, which has the force of a present in Pind. Pyth. 4, 181.
$\ddagger$ See Greg. Cor. in Att. 78. with the quotations there made by Koen.; and Phryn. Appar. p. 35, 24.
a preference given（the Attic usage is sometimes exclusive），

 2．；while the others together with the whole of the middle
 $\kappa a ́ \tau \omega,-к а ́ \sigma \theta a \iota,-\kappa а ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о с, \& c$ ．：imperat．midd．є้̌ขєүкаı．Perf．

 pass．èvє $\chi^{\theta}{ }^{\prime} \sigma о \mu a \iota$ and oi （poet．$\phi \epsilon \rho \tau o ́ c) .-M i d d$.
In the aorist the Ionics have ク̈veıка，conj．éveikw，infin．éveiкal，\＆c．，
 ple theme which can be adopted for these forms is E「K $\Omega$ ，whence by redupl．$\ddot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa o \nu$ ，like $\eta^{\prime \prime} \gamma a \gamma o \nu, \dot{d} \lambda a \lambda \kappa \epsilon i v$, \＆c．＊The relation of the aor．
 under eỉa．Let us now suppose EГK $\Omega$ lengthened to ENEK $\Omega$

 Ionic グvecia appears to have been produced from $\eta_{\nu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \alpha a$ by a mere change of pronunciation，and the same formation was then extended by a false usage to other forms，e．g．to $\dot{\eta} \nu \varepsilon i \chi \theta \eta \nu$ ，évívei $\gamma \mu a t$ ，and to the pres．бvveveiketat in Hes．Scut． 440 ．；still however we find the perf． évíveqктat in old Attic inscriptions：see Corp．Inscr．Græc．to． 1. Inscr．Att．no．71．p． 116.

The old Aorist，of which the imper．oi $\sigma \varepsilon$ and infin．oi $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$ are the only remaining tenses，was mentioned at the beginning of this article and in the note there subjoined．If this oi $\sigma \epsilon$ and the other imperatives quoted below be considered as isolated instances of an imperative fu－ ture，such a supposition is at variance with all usage，for strictly speak－ ing either all imperatives are futures，or none are so．Hence it is more agreeable to analogy to suppose a new theme arising out of the future from which these aorists may be formed；compare áeíधєo，$\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in o, \partial_{\rho} \rho-$ $\sigma \epsilon 0, \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$ ，and $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \sigma \epsilon \tau 0, \delta \dot{\delta} \sigma \epsilon 0$, p． 73 ．This aorist occurs also with the common termination of the aor．1．；of which the surest instance is found in Herodotus，but with an unusual lengthening of the radical syllable，in the compound $\dot{\alpha} \nu \bar{\omega} \sigma a t(1,157$.$) ；and this lengthening is$ again found in another form，in which it is quite as extraordinary，$\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega^{\prime}$－

[^281]iatos ( $6,66$. ), both words having the same sense of sending (referre) to consult an oracle*. Suspicious examples of the aorist oiral from succeeding writers, and genuine ones of a very late period may be seen in Lobeck Parerg. p. 733. We find in Lucian Parasit. 2. a solitary instance of the perf. pass. $\pi$ pooiorcut, in which for the sake of perspicuity the $o$ is left unchanged, and the augment therefore can only be recognised by means of the accent.

The few forms coming immediately from $\phi$ ¢́ $\rho \omega$, which are in general
 the syncopated Epic imper. фépre for $\phi$ 'िєтє, II. 九, 171. ; the 3 . sing. $\phi \dot{\varphi} \rho \eta \sigma t$ as from $\phi \dot{\varphi} \varphi \eta \mu$, Od. $\tau, 111$.; the Ion. 3. sing. imperf. $\phi$ '́ $\rho \sigma \sigma \varepsilon$, and 3. plur. $\phi$ ' $\rho \in \sigma к о \nu$, Od. $\iota, 429 . \kappa, 108$.; and the poetical verbal adj.
 from $\delta \dot{\delta} \mu \omega$; see last note, p. 61.: but this latter has the more precise sense of being in the habit of carrying, of wearing generally. Of this verb we find an Epic infin. pres. форй

$\Phi \epsilon \check{v} \gamma \omega, I$ fly : fut. $\phi \in u ́ \xi о \mu a \iota$ and $\phi \in v \xi \circ \hat{\nu} \mu a \iota \ddagger$; perf. $\pi \varepsilon ́-$ $\phi \epsilon u \gamma a ;$ aor. 2. $\notin \phi u \gamma o v$. There is no passive voice. Verbal adj. фєикто́с, фєиктє́oc.

The perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \phi v \gamma \mu a t$ is a passive in form only, as the Epics use the part. $\pi \epsilon \phi v \gamma \mu \dot{\epsilon} v o s$ in the active sense of having escaped, Od. $a, 18 \S$. On the $v$ of this perf. see note under Xé $\boldsymbol{\omega}$.

The Epic language uses the verbal adj. фиктós: whence ă $\phi$ иктоs came into the common dialect.


* Reiz, Schneider in his Lexicon voc. áváïбтos, and Lobeck, Parerg. p.733. consider both as corruptions and read $\dot{\alpha} \nu o \bar{o}-$ orl, äyoovtos; and certainly in Herodot. 7, 149. we find the fut. $\dot{\alpha} \nu o i \sigma \varepsilon \iota \nu$ in a similar sense (referre ad populum) without any various reading. Hermann on the contrary conjectures it to be an old Ionicism, and he has this in his favour; that Aretæus, who afiects the Ionic dia-
 $\rho \omega$, consequently an imitation of Herodotus. But errors are frequently found even in works of great antiquity; and as we meet with this incorrect form in this compound only, the mistake was perhaps caused by the similar sound of the other $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ wï̈ros, unexpected, which is correctly formed from $\dot{a}$ and (oïopat) ö̈̈rós, like $\dot{a} \nu \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \mu \mathrm{os}, \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha} \circ \mathrm{s}$, \&c. And why
should not the gloss of Suidas, $\alpha \nu o i=\sigma a i$, although explained only by the general expression кодíal, refer to the above passage of Herodotus? Still however greater certainty is requisite before we alter the text of Herodotus.
$\dagger$ Of this verb we find an instance ( $\phi 0-$ $\rho \in ́ \sigma a l)$ as early as Isæus; in the later authors it is more frequent.
$\ddagger$ [Фєvకov̂ $\mu a t$ is properly Doric, but is found in Aristoph. Ach. 203. and elsewhere in that writer. Very late authors have a fut. 2. $\phi v \gamma \hat{\omega}$.-Passow.]
§ We may compare this participle with $\bar{\delta} \delta \delta a \kappa \rho v \mu \dot{v} \nu 0 \mathrm{~s}$; in both verbs the perf. pass. expresses the completion of an action belonging rather to the middle voice, having shed a flood of tears, having conveyed himself to a place of safety. See also $\alpha^{\lambda} \lambda \tau \tau \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu o s$.
 conj. фผ̄ (3. sing. фท่̣, Hom.), infin. фávat, part. фác, ; imperf. $\varepsilon \neq \eta \nu$; fut. $\phi \eta \bar{\eta} \omega$; aor. 1. $\notin \phi \eta \sigma a$. Of the midd. were used the following forms, viz. the infin. and part. pres. фá⿱日at, фá $\mu \in v o c ;$; both used by Homer, the latter by the Attics also ; and the imperf. 'ं $\phi^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$. Of the passive we find some perfect forms, as the part. $\pi є \phi a \sigma \mu \epsilon \in \nu c$, Il. $\xi$, 127. and the imperat. $\pi \epsilon ф \phi^{\prime} \sigma \theta \omega$. Verbal adj. фатóc, фаréoc, and the Hesiodic фатєוóc.

This verb is the only genuine instance of a dissyllable in $-\mu$ (beginning with a consonant) without the reduplication. The radical form is $\Phi A \Omega$. The indicative present, with the exception of the 2 sing., is enclitic, i. e. throws back the accent on the word preceding. In the formation of this 2 . sing. $\phi$ gis there is no ground for the 1 subscriptum, and the acute accent instead of the circumflex is unusual, but both are supported by very strong tradition $\dagger$.

This verb has a twofold meaning, viz. l. the general idea of $I$ say, and 2. the more precise one of I assert, maintain, assent, allow; with its converse oü $\phi \eta \mu \mathrm{l}, I$ dissent, deny. The present $\phi \eta \mu i$ has both senses ; but the first is limited by the general usage of the pure Attic writers to the pres. and imperf. active through all their moods, the remaining tenses being supplied from the anomalous $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i v$. On the other hand the fut. and the aor. 1. are generally found in the second sense; in which also the imperfect with the infin. and part. present, in order to avoid ambiguity, are generally expressed by $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ (which does not




In the 2 . sing. of the imperfect we generally find in the Attic writers ধै $\varnothing \eta \sigma \theta a$; see Thom. Mag. p. 397. : the simple ë $\phi \eta$ s becomes more frequent in the later authors; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 236. This $\bar{\epsilon} \phi \eta \nu$ is commonly used as a complete aorist, synonymous with eirov; and

[^282]out the $\iota$ subscriptum, like $\quad 1 \sigma \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$, but the conjunctive with it. Passow however in his Lexicon says expressly $\phi \eta{ }^{\prime} s$ (not $\phi \dot{\eta} s$ or $\phi \hat{\eta} s$ ) : the latter he restricts to the 2. sing. imperf. Ion. for $\kappa \phi \eta s$, Hom. See the Eitym. M. voc. $\phi$ g's and Chœerobosc. MS. ap. Bekk. p. 345. v.-Ed.]
to this imperfect we may add the infin. фúrat, which is confined so entirely to express past time only (фávą ròv Пєрєк入éa, that Pericles has said) that as soon as an infin. pres. is wanted, $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ or $\phi^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \in \iota \nu$ is used*. The same holds good of the imperf. with the infin. and part. pres. of the middle voice. With regard to the statement of the Grammarians that there was also a particular aor. 2. $\epsilon \phi \eta \nu$, which retained the $\eta$ in the plural, and had $\phi \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota$ or $\phi \hat{a} v a \iota$ in the infinitive, it is entirely unfounded. If we find фávaı occasionally in the text of some authors, it is either an error of transcription, or if correct (as it is in Eubul. ap. Athen. p. 8.c.) it is a poetical licence like $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \hat{\alpha} \nu a \iota$.

By aphæresis the following forms have arisen from $\phi \eta \mu i$ in the language of common conversation ; $\eta \mu i$, say $I$ (inquam), in a quick repetition in Aristoph. Nub. 1145. Ran. 37.; and again in the imperf. $\eta^{\circ} \nu \delta^{\circ}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega^{\prime}$, said $I, \eta \geqslant \delta^{\prime}$ ós, said he, (for $\epsilon \not \phi \eta \nu, \notin \phi \eta$, ) in the conversational narrative of Aristoph. Equ. 640. and Plato ; to which belongs also the Epic ${ }_{\eta}$, he spake, Il. a, 219.
[In the Homeric usage we find the 1. plur. opt. pres. $\phi a \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\phi$ ai$\eta \mu \epsilon \nu$; the 3. conj. $\phi \eta \eta_{\eta}$ for $\phi \tilde{\eta}$; the imperf. $\phi \tilde{\eta} \nu, \phi \bar{\eta} s, \phi \hat{\eta}$ for ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \eta \nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \eta s$,
 $\phi$ áo for $\phi \dot{a} \sigma o$, Od. $\pi, 168$. $\sigma, 170$. -Passow.]
 eै $\phi \theta \eta \nu$, opt. $\phi \theta a i \eta \nu$, conj. $\phi \theta \hat{\omega}$, infin. $\phi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a t$, part. $\phi \theta^{\prime} c$; perf. é $\phi \theta$ äкa. The aor. 2. is preferred by the Atticists to the aor. 1. $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { Q } \\ \text { ă } \sigma a \\ \text {; but this latter is used by the best Attic }\end{gathered}$ writers, e. g. by Thucyd. 3, 49. and from the time of Xenophon is the more usual form of the two.

The fut. $\phi \theta a ́ \sigma \omega$ is found only in the later writers, e. g. in Dio Chrys. 12. p. 195.; and an aor. 1. pass. é $\phi \theta$ á $\sigma \eta \eta \nu$ occurs in Joseph. Ant. 8, 6. A part. aor. midd. $\phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mathcal{\nu} o s$ is used by the Epic poets synonymous with $\phi \theta$ ás, like $\phi a ́ s, \phi$ á $\mu \epsilon v o s$ from $\phi \eta \mu i$. We find also a Doric fut. $\phi \theta \dot{a} \xi \omega$, aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon} \phi \theta a \xi \alpha$. Парa $\phi \theta a i \eta \sigma \iota$ in Il. $\kappa, 346$. is a lengthened aor. opt. not conj.; as the ac would be an unheard of diphthong in the conjunctive of $\epsilon \not \epsilon \theta \eta \nu$, and the $-\sigma \iota$ is admissible in lengthening the optative, though less usual than in the conjunctive.



[^283]$\Phi \theta$ eip $\omega, I$ corrupt, is regular: thus, fut. $\phi \theta \in \rho \hat{\omega}$ (Epic $\phi \theta \in ́ \rho \sigma \omega$, Il. $\nu, 625$.) ; perf. ${ }^{\text {é } \phi \theta а р к а ~ ; ~ p e r f . ~ 2 . ~}{ }^{\text {é } \phi} \phi$ ора ; perf. pass. $\begin{gathered} \\ \ell\end{gathered} \theta a \rho \mu u t$; aor. 1. pass. $\grave{\epsilon} \phi \theta a ́ \rho \eta \nu$; verbal adj. $\phi \theta a \rho \tau o ́ c$. The perf. 2. é $\phi \theta$ opa, sié $\phi \theta$ opa had originally the intransitive sense, I am become corrupt, am destroyed, undone ; this is its meaning at Il. o, 128., and it was so used by the Ionics and by all the later writers from Theophrastus. The pure Attics on the contrary gave it a transitive sense, and used intransitively the pass. é $\phi \theta a \rho \mu a t, ~ \notin \phi \theta a ́ \rho \eta v$. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 160. Still however we find the perf. 1. é $\phi \theta а \rho к а$ in the early Attic writers : see the old instances collected in Piers. ad Mœr. p. 127.
The fut. of the neuter meaning is generally $\phi \theta a \rho \eta \sigma_{\sigma} \mu a \iota$, for which the Ionics have the fut. 2 . midd. (with the change of vowel to $a$,) $\delta(a-$ $\phi \theta a \rho \dot{є} \neq \mu a \ell$, Herodot. 8, 108. 9, $42^{*}$.
$\Phi \theta^{i} \nu \omega$ and $\varphi \theta^{\prime} \omega$, I pass away, come to an end, perish. This verb is generally poetical, and the pres. $\phi \theta i \omega$ with its imperf. é $\phi \theta \iota o \nu$ are exclusively Epic. The intransitive meaning (I pass away) is by much the prevailing one in the present tense, indeed there occurs no instance of $\phi \theta i \omega$ with the causative sense of $I$ bring to an end, consume: for the imperfect in Il. $\sigma$, 446. $\phi \rho \epsilon \in \nu a s$ é $\phi \theta \iota \epsilon \nu$ is to be understood intransitively, as is also $\phi \theta i \omega$ at $\mathrm{Od} . \beta, 368$. wis $\kappa \varepsilon$ dód $\omega \phi$ ings. The transitive meaning of $\phi \theta i{ }^{2} \omega$ is found in Soph. El. 1414. and Theocr. 25, 122. In general this form has the neuter sense, in which it is used in prose also, still however only in certain expressions which do not proceed from the present. The remaining forms, which the poets use in an intransitive sense, are taken from the midd. of $\phi \theta i \omega$, as the fut. $\phi \theta i \sigma o \mu a t$, the perf. eै $\phi \theta \iota \mu a \iota$, and the pluperf. $e^{\prime} \phi \theta i \mu \eta \nu$, which last form is at the same time (see $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ in note under $\mathrm{K} \tau \boldsymbol{e} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ) a syncopated aorist, e.g. in Eurip. Hipp. 839. Soph. Ed. 'T. 962. 970., and in this respect it has its own moods, as opt. $\phi \theta i \mu \eta r,(\phi \theta i o), \phi \theta i ̄ \tau 0$, Od. $\kappa, 51 . \lambda, 330 \dagger$; conj. $\phi \theta i \omega-$


On the other hand the transitive meaning is established in the fut. act. and aor. 1. $\phi \theta i \sigma \omega, \check{\epsilon} \phi \theta \iota \sigma a$ : see note under Mei $\rho \rho \mu a t$, and compare


[^284]the pluperfect $\delta \iota \epsilon \phi \theta \dot{a} \rho a \tau 0$.
$t$ In the latter passage the reading of the text was until lately $\phi \theta \in i ̂ \tau o$, arising from a false conception of the unusual form $\phi \theta$ īto.

The quantity of the 6 (both in the present in $-3 \omega$ and in the tenses formed from $\phi \theta i \omega)$ is the same as that of riv $\omega$, long in the Epic poets, but short in the Attic writers : e. g. compare $\phi \theta i \nu \omega$, Od. $\lambda, 182 . \xi$, 161. with Soph. Ant. 695. Eurip. Alc. 201. ; and $\phi \theta i \sigma \omega$, \&c. Il. $\pi$, 461. $\chi$, 61. with Soph. Trach. 709. Aj. 1027. On the contrary the perf. pass., and consequently the syncop. aor. also, together with the derivatives $\phi$ ifors, $\phi \theta$ crós, have always the $/$ short. Compare the $v$ short in $\lambda \dot{\lambda} \dot{\lambda} \tilde{v}_{\mu} \mu$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{\lambda} \theta \eta \nu$ while it is long in $\lambda \dot{v} \omega, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \omega$.

The neuter $\phi \theta i \nu \omega$ came into more general use in the later writers, who formed for themselves a new inflexion in -i, $\sigma \omega$ : thus $\phi \theta$ tivígaites


In a verse thrice repeated (Od. $\epsilon, 110.133 . \eta, 251$. ) "E $\nu \theta^{\prime}$ ä $\lambda \lambda o \iota \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$
 in $-\theta \omega$ (compare $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{v} \nu a \theta o v$, p. 22.) has always maintained its ground in the text against $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \phi \theta_{\ell} \theta \in \nu$ : and yet it is decidedly incorrect. The latter is found in the best sources; and in the Etym. M. p. 532, 43. it is quoted as the established and only reading. If the former is supposed to be an imperfect, that tense does not suit persons suddenly perishing by shipwreck; if an aorist be required, nothing is more natural than ${ }_{\epsilon} \phi \theta \iota \theta \epsilon \nu$. The perf. ${ }_{\epsilon} \phi \theta \iota \mu a \iota$ (without $\sigma$, and with ı short) is quite sufficient ground for an aorist $\varepsilon$ ' $\phi \theta / \theta \eta \nu$ !

## $\Phi \iota \lambda e ́ \omega, I$ love, is regular.

The Epic language has from the stem of this verb an aorist in the
 $\tau i \lambda \lambda \omega$, $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \\ i \lambda a \\ \text { enables us to form a correct opinion of this old form. In }\end{gathered}$ Hes. 0,97 . and Hom. Hymn. 25. (see Hermann on that passage) we find the conj. of this aorist $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu \tau a l$ corrupted in the text to $\phi \iota \lambda \in \tilde{v} \nu \tau a l$; while in Hymn. Cer. 117. Wolf has restored it from $\phi$ ( $\lambda$ ovrau, and v . 487. from $\phi_{i} \lambda \omega \nu \tau \alpha u$.
$\Phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega, I$ burn, transit. : fut. $\phi \lambda \epsilon \in \xi \omega$. The aor. 2. pass. is $\bar{\epsilon} \phi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \eta \nu$ : see note under $\mathrm{B} \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \pi \omega$.
$\Phi \lambda e ́ \omega, ~ I ~ a m ~ f u l l ~ t o ~ o v e r f l o w i n g: ~ u s e d ~ o n l y ~ i n ~ p r e s, ~ a n d ~ i m p e r f . ~ T h i s ~$ verb is connected by Onomatopeeia with $\phi \lambda \dot{\nu} \omega$, I overflow; chatter : áv̀̀
 also $\phi \lambda \dot{\lambda} \zeta \omega, \phi \lambda \dot{v} \xi \alpha \iota^{*}$. But $\phi \lambda \hat{v} \omega, I$ singe, burn, is quite distinct from the above; of which we find $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \phi \lambda \dot{v} \epsilon \iota$ in Aristoph. Nub. 395. with $v$

[^285]long，instead of which Herodotus $(5,77$ ．）has the diphthong $\pi f \rho(\pi \epsilon-$

 aor．1．midd．imperat．фó $\beta_{\eta \sigma a \iota . ~ P a s s . ~ ф о ~}^{\text {®éo } \mu a \imath, ~ I ~ a m ~ t e r-~}$
 without any difference of meaning，Xen．Cyr．1，4，19．3， $3,30.6,7,15$ ．；aor．1．pass．є́ $\phi \circ \beta_{\eta} 0 \eta \nu$ ；perf．pass．$\pi \epsilon \phi_{o ́-}^{-}$ $\beta \eta \mu a t$ ．－Passow．］
［The perf．pass．has particularly the sense of to be put to fight，to $f l y, \mathrm{Il}$ ．and Herodot．9，70．The aor．1．midd．＇ं $\phi 0 \beta \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ belongs to the latest and worst period of the language；e．g．Anacr．3，11．－ Passow．］

Форє́ш．See Фе́рш．
 perf．$\pi \in ́ \phi \rho a \kappa a . ~ P a s s . ~(i n ~ H e r o d o t u s) ~ I ~ p e r c e i v e, ~ o b s e r v e ~: ~$ imperf．é $\phi \rho a \zeta \nprec \mu \eta \nu, ~ H e r o d o t . ~ 3, ~ 154 . ; ~ a o r . ~ 1 . ~ e ́ ф \rho a ́ \sigma 0 \eta \nu, ~$ part．фрaб日cic，ib．1，84．5，92．7，46．9，19．；perf．$\pi$ é－ $\phi \rho a \delta \mu a \iota$ or $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \phi \rho a \sigma \mu a \iota$ ．Midd．（in the Epic poets）I per－ ceive，observe ；also I consider，reflect，consult，plan：fut． фра́бонає；aor．l．midd．є́фраба́циข．

 under Ké入одає），Il．к，127．，particularly used in the 3．sing．тé申paঠ̀e；
 $\eta, 49$ ．т，477．；optat．$\pi \epsilon \phi p$ ádor．The part．perf．pass．with a $\delta$ ，and in a passive sense，occurs in Hes．$\epsilon, 653$ ．In a fragment in Athen． 11. p．465．f．фpaí $\eta$ is a false reading，instead of which there is a various reading $\phi p a ́ \sigma \nexists \eta$ ．
［The active of this verb is frequent in Xenophon；otherwise it is not often found in prose：the middle occurs only in the Epic poets and in an oracle in Herodotus 3，57．－Passow．］

Фрá⿱宀бн，Att．фрáт $\tau \omega$ ，（in the later writers фрá ${ }^{\prime} \nu v \mu$ also），I fill，stop up，place close together，fortify：fut． $\phi \rho a ́ \xi \omega$ ；aor．1．$\check{\epsilon} \phi \rho a \xi a$ ；aor．1．pass．є́ $\phi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \chi^{\theta \eta \nu}$ ；aor． 1. midd．є́ $\phi \rho a \xi \xi^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ ；perf．pass．$\pi \in ́ \phi \rho a \gamma \mu a \iota$ ；aor．2．pass． （in the compound）$\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \phi \rho a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$, Lucian．Dial．Mort．28， 2.

Фре́є，I suffer to pass：fut．фр $\eta \sigma \omega$ ．This verb is used
 out, in, through: in addition to which we find a decompound è $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \phi \rho \in ́ \omega$ in Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1267. and Seidl. Eurip. El. 1028*. Midd. I suffer to pass to myself, take to myself, admit; e.g. єiซєфрои́ $\mu \eta \nu$, Eurip. Tro. 647. to which belongs the fut. єioфр $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \theta a t$, Demosth. Cherson. p. 93, 18. : for the fut. act. ( $\epsilon \kappa ф \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, єi $\sigma \phi \rho \dot{\prime} \sigma \omega, \delta \iota a \phi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, Aristoph. Vesp. 156. 892. Av. 193.) is in common use. The aor. 1. pass. єє $\kappa \phi \rho \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ occurs in Elian. ap. Suid. in voc.
The Grammarians mention also an imperat. eioøфןєs, êriфpes, which
 $\kappa \lambda \dot{v} \omega$, é $\chi \omega$; but we know not any passage where it really occurs $\dagger$. 'E $\xi_{\epsilon 申 \rho \in i o p e v}$ in Aristoph. Vesp. 125. is a very singular form $\ddagger$. Whether the unusual present $\pi \iota \phi \rho a ́ v a \iota$ belongs to $\phi \rho \epsilon \in \omega$, by a change of the radical vowel (compare $\delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \epsilon \in \omega$ and $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ ), is uncertain : see Schneider in ' ${ }^{\mathrm{E}} \mu \pi i \phi \rho \eta \mu \iota \S$, and on Aristot. H. A. 5, 5. Schæf. on Gregor. p. 521. not. $|\mid$
$\Phi \rho i \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\phi \rho i ́ \tau \tau \omega, I$ shudder: fut. фрi $\omega$; aor. 1. ${ }^{\varepsilon} \phi \rho \iota \xi a$; perf. (its pure characteristic letter is $\kappa$, as in the subst. фрї́и,) те́фрїка.

The Doric part. жeфpíovias (Pind. Pyth. 4, 326.) is either a perfect formed according to the analogy of the present, like кeкגijyovтes under
 фрікк. Compare also ávearúkovaa, Archim. and see Greg. Cor. in ※tol. 56. Maitt. p. 239.

[^286][^287] pass．éфpí $\chi \theta \eta v$ ，infin．$\phi \rho v \chi^{0 \hat{\eta} v a t, ~ H o m . ~ E p i g r . ~ 14, ~ 4 . ~ a o r . ~}$


## ФYZ－．See Феи́үш．

Фu入á⿱宀丁, Att．$\phi \nu \lambda a ́ \tau \tau \omega$, Iwatch：fut．$\phi u \lambda a ́ \xi \omega, \& c .-M i d n$. I stand on my guard，guard mysolf against，take heed of．

The imperative N $\eta \grave{\nu} \nu$ đè $\pi \rho \circ \phi \dot{\prime} \lambda a \chi \theta \in$（Hymn．Apoll．538．）in whatever way we explain it，is a very anomalous form．If we suppose it to be
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$, seems greatly in favour of that supposition，particularly as the imperat．perf．was also in use，e．g．in Hes．$\epsilon, 795$ ．$\pi є ф \dot{u} \lambda a \xi 0$ ：but this form，as well as the whole of the middle voice，has always the definite sense of to be on one＇s guard，and with the accus．to be on one＇s guard against，watch aguinst；whereas the simple meaning of watching over is expressed by the active only，фv入́á $\sigma \omega, \pi \rho \circ \phi \nu \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ ：there is no reason，therefore，why we should adopt in this case the great anomaly of dropping the reduplication．Nor can it be the syncopated aorist， because，as we have just said，the passage requires the common meaning of the active voice，and a tense which shall strictly express duration． As we are reduced，then，to the necessity of supposing it to be some anomalous form，it appears most reasonable to preserve a regularity in the meaning．I consider therefore $\pi \rho \circ \emptyset \dot{\partial} \lambda a \chi \theta \varepsilon$ to be a syncopated form of the pres．act．like фе́pтє，consequently for $\pi \rho \emptyset \phi u \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, formed from the stem or root $\Phi \curlyvee \Lambda A K-$ ，yet instead of the termination－ктє taking that of $-\chi \theta \epsilon$ ，like ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \omega \chi \theta \varepsilon^{*}$ ．
$\Phi v \rho \omega$, I mix，particularly by adding moisture；whence， I knead；and in Homer，I wet，moisten，stain：it has in the older language a fut．$\phi \dot{\prime} \rho \sigma \omega$ ；aor．1．é $\phi v \rho \sigma a, ~ \& c$. ：but in prose it changes to the inflexion of－á $\omega$ ，as fut．фvpáo $\omega$ ， and in Hippocr．Diæt．2，8，10．фvónow；aor．1．$\grave{\epsilon} \phi \dot{v} \rho a \sigma a ;$

 p．147．c．）；sce Lobeck ad Phryn．p．205．In the perf． pass．both $\pi є ф \dot{\rho} \rho a \mu a i$ and $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi v \rho \mu a \iota \dagger$ were in use；the latter

[^288][^289]in Homer and Xenophon; compare Od. 七, 397. and Xen. Ages. 2, 14.
 28.) : ou the other hand the present $\phi \nu \rho \hat{\omega}, \phi \nu \rho \bar{q} \nu$ appears not to have been in use, except perhaps among some of the later writers. The formation of $\phi \dot{v} \rho \sigma \omega$ always remained in the language of poetry; and Pindar (Nem. 1, 104.) has also the fut. 3. (paullo-post) $\pi \varepsilon \phi \dot{1} \rho \sigma o-$ $\mu a t$; which rather confirms than opposes the observation made in my Grammar, "that verbs with $\lambda, \mu, \nu$ or $\rho$ as their characteristic letter, seldom have a third future, if they are inflected regularly:" for ф'́ $\rho \omega$, by its inflexion in $-\sigma \omega$, no longer preserves its analogy with those verbs.
$\Phi \dot{v} \omega, I$ beget ${ }^{*}$, is inflected regularly. But the perf. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon}-$
 note p. 53. and note p. 238.) have the immediate meaning of to spring up, be produced or begotten $\dagger$, to which belong

 and the statement there made of this verb.
 фúw (probably with $\nu$ long) is found in Xenoph. Hier. 7, 3. ois $\delta^{\circ}$ â $\nu$ $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\phi} \dot{\eta} \not \ldots . . . . \ddot{e}^{\varphi} \rho \omega \mathrm{s}$. The 3. sing. opt. $\phi \dot{\eta} \eta$ occurs in Theocr. 15, 94. If this optative had followed strictly the analogy of verbs in $-\mu$, the optatives in - $\epsilon i \eta \nu$, -ai $\eta$, -oi $\eta \nu$ would have required the corresponding termination to be - vin $\nu$ : but as this diphthong is never found before a consonant, the passive optative could not be -vi $\mu \eta \nu$, - $\nu i \bar{\tau} o$, but became $-\dot{\nu} \mu \eta \nu,-\nu \tau o$, and therefore to preserve conformity the active was written
 Lexil. p. 425 . with note $\ddagger$.

Beside ëфur, an aor. 2. pass. was formed with the same sense, viz.
 time of Hippocrates, and among the later writers became the common form. To this belongs also a fut. фийбoнal, of which we find the infin.

conjecture that there were older precedents for this latter. See Valck. ad Schol. Eurip. Phœen. 1201.

- [This verb is not confined to the above sense; it has the general meaning of to produce, bring forth, and is used of plants, trees, the hair, the teeth, \&ic.; and
in Porson. Eurip. Phœn. 34. of a mother. -Passow.]
$\dagger$ In the later writers $\phi u ́ s$, oi $\phi \dot{v} \nu \tau \in s$ is used in the causative sense; see Bekker on Phot. Bibl. p. 17. a. (Appian.)
$\ddagger$ [Passow is however of opinion that фúnv still remains very doubtful.]

Instead of $\pi \epsilon \phi$ úxa㲺 we find in Homer the Epic $\pi \epsilon \phi$ и́nat，and instead
 the omission of the $\kappa$ ，see $\beta \epsilon \beta a \dot{\omega} s \mathrm{p}$ ．37．and on the length of the ob－
 pluperf．Homer always uses the mere reduplication without the aug－ ment；while Hesiod（ $\varepsilon, 151 . a, 76.0,152.673$ ．）has in a particular instance restored the augment，and formed a 3．plur．éré $\phi \bar{u}$ кov（for

［Parmenides has ventured to use $\phi \bar{\nu} \nu$ for $\phi \bar{v}{ }^{\prime}$ at ；but the 3 ．plur．aor．



## X．

Xáॅоцає，áva $\chi^{\prime} \zeta о \mu а є$ \＃，I retire，retreat：depon．midd．
The prose usage of this verb is known only from Xenophon，who has
 he has also in the same sense an instance of the unusual active voice of this same verb，ávaұ̧́́oveєs，Anab．4，1，12．（16．）We find also ä $\gamma \chi$ а弓є quoted from Soph．in Lex．Seguer．6．p．340．In the older language the active voice of this verb had also the causative sense of I cause to retire，drive back ：see Pind．Nem．10，129．where the reading ${ }_{\epsilon}$ Xa $a \sigma a \nu$ is given，it must be confessed，by only one Codex，and yet both metre and sense leave no doubt of its being the true one．

Homer has an aor．2．кéккioov，and in the midd．a．3．plur．кєкádovтo， with a fut．act．кeкadín formed from it．These forms came by an old Ionicism（compare тєтvкєiv）from éxuiov，which usage has retained in this unchanged shape under the cognate verb $\chi^{a \nu \delta a ́ v \omega}$ ．Hence кexí－ סovto（Il．$\delta, 497$ ．）is precisely the same as éx＇́⿱㇒⿻二亅⿱八乂， forms（Il．$\lambda, 334$ ．Od．$\phi, 153$ ．）with the genitive have the sense of
 a person yield or retire from anything，expressed more simply in Latin


Xaìw．See Xáorw．
Xaip, I rejoice：fut．रaヶpijow；aor．2．（from the passive voice）é $\chi$ á $\rho \eta \nu$ ；and from this aorist was formed again a perf．кє $\chi^{\prime} \rho \eta \kappa а$ or $\kappa є \chi \dot{́} \rho \eta \mu a \iota$ ，with the force of the present increased，I am rejoiced：compare＂Avơáv $\omega$ ẽa $\delta a$ ，Өá $\lambda \lambda \omega$


[^290]
## 263

mation of the perfect from the aorist see $\dot{a} \kappa a \not \chi^{\eta} \sigma \omega$ and note p. 12.

The perfect кєХ́́p ${ }^{\prime} \kappa \alpha$ is found in Aristoph. Vesp. 764.; the part. $\kappa \in \chi a \rho \eta \kappa \omega$ 's, rejoiced, is of frequent occurrence in Herodotus, and with-
 occurs likewise in Aristoph. Vesp. 389. and its part. кєұapquévos in Hom. Hymn. 6, 10. Both the futures formed with reduplication from these perfects are found also in Homer, e.g. $\kappa є \chi \alpha \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon \in \epsilon \nu$, Il. o, 98., кєұарі́бєтає, Оd. $\psi, 266$.

Of the regular inflexion, we find in the poets (from an Epic aor. 1. midd. é $\chi \eta \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ ) the 3 . sing. $\chi$ ŋ́paro, Il. $\xi, 270$. : compare Jacob. Anthol. Poet. p. 262. and (from a reduplicated aor. 2. midd. кехкоó $\mu \eta$ י) the 3. plur. кехápovio with the optatives кєхápoito, кєұкроiato, Il. and Od. The part. perf. кєХ ${ }^{\text {ap }} \mu \dot{\text { évos }}$, rejoiced, occurs in Eurip. Or. 1122. El. 1077. and other tragedies of the same writer. The verbal adj. is $\chi^{\text {aprós. }}$

The aor. 1. éxaipqoa is found in the later writers, e. g. in Plut. Lucull. 25.*. The fut. xapض́бонaє which occurs in the LXX., although
 p. 12.), is decidedly a form to be rejected : see Thom. Mag. [The pres. midd. $\chi^{\text {aí } \rho \mu \mu \iota}$ was a notorious barbarism, Aristoph. Fr. 291.: nor were $\chi^{\alpha u \rho} \rho^{\prime} \omega, \chi^{\alpha \rho} \rho^{\prime} \omega$ or $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \omega$ ever in use.-Passow.]

Xadá $\omega, I$ loosen, relax : fut. $\chi^{a \lambda a ́ \sigma \omega, ~ D o r . ~} \chi^{a \lambda a ́ \xi \omega, ~ \& c . ~}$ This verb has $a$ short in the inflexion; and takes $\sigma$ in the passive ; e.g. perf. pass. кє $\chi^{a} \lambda a \sigma \mu a \iota$.
 (synonymous with the present) ké $\chi^{\alpha \nu \delta} \delta$. This future is generally placed by mistake with a theme XEIS, although it is evident that
 Oov. It comes therefore from the root XAN $\triangle$-, with a change of the radical vowel. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 181.

Xáбкш, I open (intrans.), open my mouth, gape: imperf. є́ $\chi a \sigma \kappa о \nu$. This verb borrows from $\chi^{a i \nu \omega}$ (which is not used

[^291]have given a somewhat different meaning. Hence I cannot but think it a question worth considering, whether the earlier writers would not have used the same expression in this case, and whether Plutarch had not some precedent for his use of it.
by any of the older writers) a fut. $\chi^{\text {avoûmat*, }}$, an aor. є́ $\chi a \nu o \nu$, and a perf. (synonymous with the pres.) кє́ $\chi \eta \nu a \dagger$, I am open, have my mouth open.

Lucian (Dial. Mort. 6, 3.) is the earliest writer in which we find any instance of the pres. $\chi u i \nu \omega \ddagger$.
 $\nu a t e$, Herodian found $\boldsymbol{k \epsilon}$ रíp $\varepsilon \tau \epsilon$ written, (see Chœorobosc. in Bekk. Aneed. III, p. 1287. where "Opvo兀 is a corruption,) which he considers to be an inflexion of the indicative for -are. For that some of the older authors preferred writing the perf. act. of the verb with $e$, is clear from Apollon. Synt, 1, 10. (p. 37, 9. Be.) : see also 'Avinootu and note p. 25. In the Attic language, indeed, this inflexion is inadmissible, but for that very reason the reading of Herodian is most probably the true one, misunderstood by the Grammarians above mentioned. Kєұípere is the imperative, which mood is most suitable to the context of that passage; and the rarity of its occurrence misled the commentators: see «екра́үете under Кра́ць.
 є̌ $\chi є \sigma о \nu ; ~ p e r f . ~ p a s s . ~ к є ́ \chi є \sigma \mu a \iota ~(p a r t . ~ к є \chi є \sigma \mu e ́ \nu ๐ \nu, ~ A r i s t o p h . ~$ Ach. 1185.).

I have some doubt whether the aor. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi$ eror be a genuine form; and I may say the same of the infin. x $\in \sigma \sigma \bar{\iota}$, which is found in Aristoph. Thesm. 570. As the word is only a vulgar term, individual forms do not occur often enough to enable us to speak of the two aorists with any degree of certainty. In the Attic language they appear to be confounded, as they are in $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon i \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \gamma \varepsilon \epsilon i \nu$; compare $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \nu$ and $\check{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma a$,

 proves as little in favour of the aor. l.ans it dues of the middle voice of this verb, for it is used in that passage in a play on the word.

Xeiooцаı. See Xuviávш.



[^292][^293]

 only supposed to have existed from the derivative $\chi \in \hat{v} \mu \boldsymbol{a}$ and the shortness of the $v$ in cé $\chi v k a$, \&c. That $\chi$ é $\omega$ is fut. as well as pres. was first remarked by Elmsley, and proved by the following examples: кápa тє

 Com. ap. Athen. p. 665. c. To which we may add $\chi$ є́́ $\mu \in \gamma_{0}$ (said of pouring out the libation,) kai évaytov̀vza, Isæus 6. p. 61.: which passages had been previously explained sometimes as harshness of syntax, at others as harshness of contraction. And thus $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ in Jerem. VI, 11. and Act. Apost. II, 17., which has been hitherto cited as a barbarous form of the biblical writers, differs only in accent from the pure Attic $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \gamma \chi^{\epsilon} \omega \ddagger$.

 which may be the conj. aor. supplying in Homer's usage the place of the future, quite as well as the Epic fut. $\chi^{\text {ev }} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ answering to the Attic fut. $\chi \in \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ (compare $\delta \dot{\eta} \omega$, , $\kappa \in \epsilon \omega \nu, \kappa \in \in \omega \nu, \sigma \dot{\omega} \omega$ ); both which views are in syntax fundamentally the same. Again סárpuat $\chi \chi^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \omega$, Eurip. El. 181. (where I proposed on a former occasion to read the false form $\chi$ ev́row, is, as far as regards the verb, quite correct. Xeviv in that passage is not the present, (it never occurs as a present even in the Epic language, the metre being satisfied by $\chi$ cic: see $\mathrm{Od} . \iota, 10$. Hes. $\theta, 83$.) but it is the Epic future of Homer which suits the lyric stanza, and may be joined with кpoívo in the preceding verse, without offending against $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ in the following one.

The Epic language has also the syncop. aor. pass. é $\chi \dot{i} \mu \eta \eta$, ế $\chi$ vio, $\chi^{i} \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 s$ (to be poured out, ) formed after the perfect.

[^294][^295]On the aor．1．pass．é $\chi \in ⿱ ㇒ 日 勺 \theta \eta \nu, \chi^{\epsilon} \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a u$ ，which was very common in the later writers，see the preceding note，and Lobeck ad Phryn．p． 731.
$\mathrm{X} \wedge \wedge \Delta-$ ，whence an Ionic perf．кé $\chi \lambda \bar{a} \delta a^{*}$ ，of which Pindar（Ol．9， 3. Pyth．4，319．）has the part．$\kappa \epsilon \chi \lambda \bar{\alpha} \delta \bar{\omega}$ s，gen．$\kappa \in \chi^{\lambda \text { cúovios，swelling：}}$ compare $\pi \in ф \rho i к o \nu \tau a s$ under Фрiббw．［We find also in Pind．Fr．48．a perf．infin．$\kappa \epsilon \chi^{\lambda} \dot{a}^{\delta} \epsilon \iota \nu$ for $\kappa \epsilon \chi \lambda a \delta \epsilon \in \nu \alpha \iota$ ．－Passow．］

Xów，I heap up（generally，a mound of earth）：fut．$\chi^{\dot{\omega} \sigma \omega}$ ， \＆c．；infin．pres．$\chi^{0 \hat{\nu} \nu}$ ，part．$\chi^{\bar{\omega} \nu}$ ．The passive takes $\sigma$ ，e．g． perf．кé $\chi \omega \sigma \mu a \iota$ ；aor．1．é $\chi \dot{\omega} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, infin．$\chi \omega \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a t$.

The above formation is frequent in Herodotus，while the pres．$\chi{ }^{\dot{\omega}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$－ $\nu \nu \mu \iota$ belongs to the later writers．X $\omega$ о $\mu$ a may be found in its alpha－ betical place．
 again came a fut．$\chi \rho a \iota \sigma \mu \eta \sigma \omega$ and aor．1．é $\chi \rho a i \sigma \mu \eta \sigma a$ ：compare $\dot{\text { án } \alpha \chi} \chi^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ and note p．12．See also Buttm．Lexil．pp．541－8．

Xpáw．To this stem belong many verbs with particular meanings；all those，however，which are used in prose may be easily traced to the same idea，commodare，to give， $l e n d \dagger$ ．All have the inflexion with the $\eta$ ，e．g．xpnow， \＆c．，and that even in the Doric dialect．The contracted forms take also $\eta$ as the vowel of contraction，as in $\zeta^{\prime} \omega \omega$ ， $\kappa \nu{ }^{\prime} \omega, \sigma \mu a ́ \omega, \& c$ ．，while this peculiarity is also to be re－ marked，that the Ionic dialect here takes $\bar{\alpha}$ as the vowel of contraction，as in кขą $\nu, \sigma \mu a ̂ \tau a t, \& c ., ~ H e r o d o t . ~ 9, ~ 110 . ~ W e ~$ will now describe five forms which are used in prose．

1．X $\rho a ́ \omega, I$ give an oracle，foretel：fut．х $\rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \omega$ ；aor． 1.


[^296] bursting forth of water from a spring or any confined place，or the bubbling of boil－ ing water．］

+ Some other old deviations of meaning In this verb come from the idea of to lay hold on：see $\chi \rho a ́ \omega$, є́ $\pi \iota \chi \rho a ́ \omega, \chi \rho a v ́ \omega$, and xpaiv $\omega$ ，in Schneider＇s Lexicon；where， however，there are no striking peculiari－ ties of deviation．It appears to me evi－ dent that all these and the meaning of to give，\＆c．，come etymologically from $\chi \in i \rho, \chi \in \rho o ́ s$.
 takes $\sigma$ ．See also xpíとい．

In the Attic tragedians we find the present and imperfect contracted in $\eta$ ；thus $\chi \rho \eta \bar{\eta}$ is 3．sing．pres．for $\chi \rho \bar{q}$, Herm．Soph．El．35． $\begin{gathered} \\ \xi\end{gathered} \in \notin \chi \rho \eta$ is 3．sing．imperf．，Soph．CEd．C．87．On the other hand Herodotus has frequently the 2 ．sing．$\chi \rho \bar{q} s, 3$ ．sing．$\chi \rho \bar{q}$ ，and in the infin．$\chi \rho \bar{q} \nu$ ；and he is followed by the later writers，as Lucian，\＆c．In the Ionic dialect $\chi{ }^{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \omega$ is sometimes changed to $\chi^{\dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon} \omega$ ，whence the part．pres．$\chi$ pøova， Herodot．7，111．；and in the Epic poetry it becomes $\chi$ pel $\omega$ ，whence the part．Xoeiuv，Od．ө， 79.

In many passages of Herodotus all the manuscripts have the perfect passive with the $\sigma$ ：in others the $\sigma$ is wanting：see Schweigh．Lex． Herodot．It is easily seen that uniformity must be preserved by adopting it in all cases；$\kappa_{\ell} \chi \chi \rho \eta \mu a \iota$ belongs to $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ only．

In the middle voice the meaning of this verb approaches very nearly to that of the common $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，as in the expression $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \imath \mu \varepsilon \nu \tau \epsilon i(\omega)$ ， which appears to be exactly the same as $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota \mu a \nu \tau \iota \hat{\eta}$ in Xenophon；
 that $\chi p \hat{\eta} \nu$ ，to foretell，answers correctly to $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$, to consult an oracle． See Od．0，79．81．к， 492.

2．Xрáoцat，I use，depon．midd．：fut．хрŋ́бонаь；aor． 1. є́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ；perf．（without $\sigma$ ）кє́ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \iota$ ．The present and imperf．are contracted in $\eta$ instead of the regular $a$ ，thus $\chi \rho \hat{\omega} \mu a t, \chi \rho \hat{\eta}, \chi \rho \bar{\eta} \tau a t$, infin．$\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma 0 a t, \& c$ ．，Lobeck ad Phryn． p．61．Kéx $\quad$ пйa is sometimes used in the strict sense of a perfect，e．g．in Xen．Cyr．3，1，30．（24．）ó mo入入áкıç aủ $\frac{1 \text { ģ }}{}$ $\kappa \in \chi \rho \eta \mu \in ́ v o c:$ but it has generally the sense of the present， as in Xen．Equ．4，5．кє $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a t ~ r a i ̂, ~ o ́ \pi \lambda a i ̂ c, ~ a n d ~ i n ~ m o s t ~$ instances the force is increased，I am always using and therefore I have＊．Verbal adj．хрŋбтóc，хрךотє́ov，Plat． Gorg． 136.

In the Epic language $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ has the meaning of to be in need of $\dagger$ ； hence in Homer and Hesiod кexp $\eta \mu^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{v}$ os is used as an adjective in the
 id．16，73．Compare גpí and the note under X Xíņw．

[^297][^298]In the unusual case of a passive tense being furined from this middle verb (compare $\beta \iota a ́ \zeta о \mu \alpha \iota$ ), the aorist has the $\sigma$ (as in $\chi$ рáv, I foretell), ui
 to death (from катахрїлөai riva), Herodot. 9, 120. with which the verbal adjective agrees.

In this verb the forms of the Ionic dialect are difficult to be ascertained with any degree of certainty : for sometimes the passages and
 \&c.; at other times the $a$ is changed to $\varepsilon$ in the same forms, as $\chi \rho \varepsilon \in \epsilon \tau{ }_{l}$,
 the imperative Herodotus ( 1,115 .) has, according to all the manuscripts,
 like $\dot{e x} \times \lambda$ 白v, which see under K $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega$.
 infin. pres. кiхраvaı. Midd. кiхранає, I borrow.

It has been correctly remarked, that $\chi^{\rho i \hat{j} \sigma a}$ in Herodotus means simply to give, grant (see Herodot. 7, 38. and Schweigh. in Lex.). But a present $\chi \rho a \dot{\omega}$ never occurs in this sense; we place, therefore, the present $\kappa i \chi \rho \eta \mu$ instead of it, although in the instances where it occurs in Demosthenes and others, it has the proper meaning of to lend. The aor. 1. midd. é $\chi \rho \eta \sigma a \dot{\mu} \mu \nu$ was avoided by the Attic writers in this sense : see Antiatt. Bekk. p. 116.
4. X $\rho$ í, (oportet) it is necessary; an impersonal verb: opt. $\chi \rho \epsilon i \eta, ~ c o n j . ~ \chi \rho \hat{q}, ~ i n f i n . ~ \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu a l, ~ p a r t . ~(\tau o ̀) ~ \chi \rho \epsilon ' \omega v . ~$


The indicative of this verb may be considered as the 3. sing of $\chi \rho a ́ \omega$ - $\chi \rho \bar{\eta}$, with the tone or accent shortened. The participle also comes exactly, according to analogy, from $\chi$ pâov, like väós, Ion. vpós, Att. $\nu \epsilon \omega$ 's (compare the subst. X $\rho \in \epsilon \omega s$ and the neut. part. $\tau \in \forall \nu \epsilon \omega ' s$ ): but it has the anomalous accent of $i \omega^{\prime} \prime$ and the Ionic $\epsilon^{\prime} \omega^{\prime} r:$ It is indeclinable; that is to say, it occurred so seldom in any construction requiring other

[^299]text. Whoever examines the passages and their various readings with the help of Schweighæuser's Lexicon Herodot., will find it most probable that Herodotus always contracted in $a$ the forms which were grounded on $a \in$, while those in ao were changed to $\epsilon \omega$. To decide between $\epsilon \omega$ and $\epsilon 0$ is much more difficult. There can bc, however, no hesitation in rejecting from the text of Herodotus such forms as $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \chi \rho \bar{\jmath} \tau!$.
than the nominative or accusative case, that the other cases became obsolete. It is found sometimes as a genitive, e.g. in Eurip. Hippol. 1256. Herc. Fur. 21. Joseph. Ant. 8, 284. but there is perhaps no


In the other three moods (opt., conj., and infin.) this verb follows the formation of verbs in $\mu$, retaining, however, the $\eta$ in the infinitive, and $\epsilon \iota$ instead of $a \iota$ in the optative, as in a similar case under $\Pi i ́ \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$.

We find twice in Euripides (Hecub. 258. Herc. Fur. 828.) тò $\chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$, which Thom. Mag. in voc. affirms to be a poetical infinitive; therefore contracted for $\chi$ piju. At the same time it is not to be denied that the participle $\chi \rho \epsilon \omega^{\nu} \nu$, which is preferred by some critics, and which may be pronounced as a monosyllable, would suit both passages better.

The imperfect, whether it followed the conjugation of contracted verbs or of those in $\mu$, would be $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi \chi \rho \eta}$ : therefore $\dot{\varepsilon}_{\chi} \chi \rho \bar{\eta} \nu$ or $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \nu$ (the only forms ever used) are to be compared with the 3 . sing. $\hat{\eta} \nu$, Ion. $\begin{gathered}\eta \\ \eta\end{gathered}$ from ci $\mu \dot{i}$. But the accent of the augmented form is so strikingly anomalous that we should be forced to consider it incorrect, did not the vain attempts of the Grammarians to explain it show (see Eustath. ad Od. $\kappa, 60$.), that it was founded firmly on tradition*.

In the older language this verb had also the meaning of opus est, one has need, I have need; and in this sense it was afterwards used or

 Aristoph. Acharn. 778. compare $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$. From this verb Herodotus (3, 117.) has a middle voice with a similar meaning in the form хрпitкоиar. Compare кє́ $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \iota$ above, and note on X $\rho \dot{\prime} \zeta \omega$ below.
5. 'А $\pi$ ó $\rho \eta$, is sufficient. This verb has the anomaly of the preceding one in this 3 . sing. pres. indic. only, inasmuch as it is shortened from ámo $\chi \rho \hat{\eta}$; in all its other forms it follows regularly $\chi \rho a ́ \omega$, \&c. : thus 3. plur. á $\pi 0 \chi \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \omega \nu$;
 1. àтє́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, \&c. Midd. ámo ${ }^{\rho} \rho \bar{\omega} \mu a \iota, I$ have enough; infin. $\dot{a} \pi о \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$. In this voice it is inflected like $\chi \rho a ́ o \mu a \iota, 2$.

The Ionics have also the regular 3. sing. pres. indic. ámoxpq̆. In the same or a similar sense Herodotus has other compounds, karaxp $\bar{q}$,


This verb is not an impersonal, although, like other personal verbs, it

[^300]is sometimes used impersonally; on the contrary, in many instances its subject stands plainly before it, and hence it has the plural ámoxpễ : but as things or objects in the third person are its most natural subject, the other persons became obsolete; yet not entirely; see Epicharmus in Heindorf's Note on Plat. Gorg. 131. cis é $\gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ ámox $\rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, 1 alone am sufficient. See a similar appearance in Mé̀ $\omega$, where however the 1 . and 2. person have remained in use somewhat more than in this verb. A solitary irregularity occurs in the middle voice in àтєхре́єто (Herodot.

$X \rho \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\prime} \boldsymbol{\iota}, I$ desire, wish $\dagger$. The Attics use it in present and imperfect only.

In the Ionic dialect it is $\chi \rho \eta t \zeta \omega$ : whence the more precise Grammarians write the common form $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \dot{\zeta} \omega$, like $\ddot{q} \tau \tau \omega$ : see Greg. Cor. in Ion. 42. The Ionics have also other tenses, as $\chi \rho \eta$ írou, é $\chi \rho$ íï $\sigma \alpha$ (Herodot. 7, 38. 5. 20. 65.), because in this form no confusion can possibly be made with the tenses of $\chi$ pá $\omega$. But in the printed text all these are constantly written with $\eta$ in Herodotus also. X $\rho \dot{\eta} \zeta \omega$ in the sense of $\chi \rho \bar{q} \nu$, to foretell, see in Schneid. Lex. $\ddagger$.

Xpí, I besmear, anoint: fut. $\chi$ píc,$\& c$. ; perf. pass.
 found in Com. ap. Athen. 13. p. 557. f.-Midd.

This verb has also the meaning of to sting, as spoken of insects and the like; on which Plrynichus (Appar. p. 46.) gives the following rule, that in this latter sense the perfect passive is written eexpir$\theta a \iota$, in the former $\kappa є \chi \rho \epsilon i ̈ \sigma \theta a t$. In this last incorrect form (although in that writer the diphthong $\epsilon t$ is expressly named,) we must look for nothing more than the correct form кєұ $\bar{\imath} \sigma \theta a t$; and the direction given by Phryni-




[^301](anything) forward, offer; hinreichen, to reaeh or extend to any certain point, and also to be sufficient.
$\dagger$ This meaning arises from those forms of $\chi \rho a \dot{\omega} \omega$ which have the meaning of $I$ need, in which sense, however, the verb $\chi \rho$ ŋŋら $\omega$ itself occurs in the later writers only: see Stephan. Thesaur.
$\ddagger$ [Schneider quotes $\chi \rho \dot{\jmath} \zeta \omega$ in this sense from Eschyl. Choeph. 338. Soph. Ed. C. 1426. Eurip. Hel. 523.]
 but in both passages with the meaning of to touch, and the collateral idea of a polluting touch. Perhaps in the old Attic language this was the only meaning of $\chi \rho \omega^{\prime \prime} \kappa$, and кє́ $\chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu a \iota$ belonged to this present only : for according to the analogy of $\zeta \omega^{\prime} \nu \nu v \mu \iota$ and $\sigma \omega^{\prime} \zeta \omega$, we might expect the perfect passive of $\chi \rho \omega \dot{\nu} \nu v \mu \iota$ in the old Attic to be кеє $\chi \omega \mu \mu \iota$, which appears merely as the various reading of $\kappa$ é $\chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu \alpha t, \mathrm{e}$. g. in Aristot. De Color. 3. But in Eth. Nicom. 2, 3. all the manuscripts have $\epsilon^{\gamma} \kappa \in \chi \rho \omega-$ бرévos.

X $\omega \dot{\nu} \nu \nu \mu$. See Xó ${ }^{2}$.

$\mathrm{X} \omega \rho \epsilon \in \omega$, I yield, go: fut. midd. $\chi \omega \rho \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, but sometimes also $\chi \omega \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta \sigma \omega$ : see Poppo Obs. Crit. in Thucyd. p. 149. and Buttmann's Notes in the Auctarium ad Plat. Thert. 117. Ed. 2.

## $\Psi$.

$\Psi a v \omega, I$ touch: fut. $\psi a v \sigma \omega$, \&c. ; perf. pass. $ॄ \notin q a v \sigma a t$; aor. 1. pass. $\grave{\epsilon} \psi a ́ v \sigma \theta \eta v$.
[It is generally joined with the genitive, sometimes with the dative, whether with an accusative depends on Soph. Ant. 858. 962.Passow.]
$\Psi \alpha^{\prime} \omega$, I rub : fut. $\psi \dot{\prime} \sigma \omega, \& c$., like $\kappa \nu \alpha^{\prime} \omega, \sigma \mu a ́ \omega$; see also Пєєvá $\omega$. The passive fluctuates between the formation with
 $\theta \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \not\langle\eta \quad \sigma \theta \eta \nu$.

See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 254. The sister-furm $\psi^{\prime} \boldsymbol{n}^{\boldsymbol{x}}$ (compare $\sigma \mu{ }^{\prime} \omega, \sigma \mu \eta^{\prime} \chi \omega$ ) has the more precise sense of to rub down (a horse); to rub in pieces; to the latter of which belongs кагє́ $\psi \eta \kappa \tau a \varepsilon$ in Soph. Trach. 698.
$\Psi \epsilon ́ \gamma(\omega, I$ blame, reproach : fut. $\psi \in ́ \xi \omega, \& \mathrm{c}$. ; perf. é $\psi \mathrm{o} \gamma \mathrm{a}$;

$\Psi \epsilon v ́ \delta \omega, I$ deceive, cheat: fut. $\psi \in \dot{v} \sigma \omega$, \&c. ; perf. pass.
 $\grave{\epsilon} \psi \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma a \nu \tau о$ тàc àmєı入ác, they did not make their threats false, made them good, Herodot. 6, 32.
$\Psi \eta^{\chi} \chi$. See $\Psi a ́ \omega$.
$\Psi \dot{v} \chi \omega, I$ cool : fut. $\psi \dot{v} \xi \omega$; anr. 1. pass. $\in \notin \not \psi^{v} \chi \theta \eta v$; aor. 2. pass. é $\nless \dot{v} y \eta \nu$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \notin \dot{u} \chi \eta \nu$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318.

## $\Omega$.

' $\Omega \theta \dot{\epsilon} \omega, I$ push: fut. $\dot{\omega} \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ and $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \omega$. All the other tenses are formed from $\Omega \Theta \Omega$, and with the syllabic augment, e.g. imperf. é $\omega$ 白ovv; aor. 1.
 Pors. Eurip. Med. 336. Plat. Tim. p. 79. e.-Midd.
' $\Omega v \in ́ о \mu a \imath, ~ I ~ b u y, ~ d e p o n . ~ m i d d . ~: ~ f u t . ~ \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a \imath, ~ \& c . ~ T h i s ~$ verb has also the syllabic augment, e. g. imperf. $\epsilon \omega \nu o v ́ \mu \eta \nu$;
 aorist the pure Attic writers used é $\pi \rho \iota a ́ \mu \eta \nu, \pi \rho i a \sigma \theta a \iota$.
[This verb was seldom or never used as a passive in the sense of to be sold, yet we find in Plat. Phæd. p. 69.b. the part. © woúpera, where Heindarf's reading $\dot{\omega} \nu o v j \epsilon \theta a$ appears to be unnecessary. The pluperf. $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\omega} \nu \eta \tau o$ occurs in Aristoph. Fr. 1175. On the aor. 1. pass. infin. $\dot{\varepsilon} \omega v \eta-$
 19. A part. perf. act. É $\omega v \eta \kappa \omega$ 's is quoted by the Grammarians from Lysias.-Passow.]

[^302]
## I N D EX．

N．B．－The following Index is intended to assist the Student，where the alphabetical arrangement of the work may fail him：consequently those forms only will be found here，which do not begin with the same letter or syllable as the verbs to which they respectively belong．Nor has it been thought necessary to mention all the persons，moods，par－ ticiples，\＆c．which occur in the work；in most cases the 1．pers．sing． of the indicative（if that form be in use，）will be found a sufficient guide to all the other moods and persons of any particular tense．The re－ ferences are to pages．
＇Aує́о ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\text {A．}} 7$.
á $\gamma \dot{\eta} \lambda a \iota, 1$.
ä $\gamma \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ ，ત九 $\gamma \eta \mu$ и， 121.


$\dot{\alpha} \gamma^{\nu} \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \alpha \sigma \kappa є, \dot{a} \gamma^{\nu} \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \epsilon-$ бкє，4， 223.
á $\gamma о \rho a ́ \sigma \omega, 152$ note．
à үорє́єєє， 89.

ád́́夭Өcu， 24.
äíov，á $\delta \dot{j} \mid \sigma \omega, 24$.
ä $\epsilon \sigma \iota, 36$.
đ̈йкєs， 11.
aipєú $\mu$ суos， 10.
аір $\rho, 10,250$.
ảкá $\eta \mu \mu \iota, 9,12$.
áкс́ $\chi \omega \nu, 6$ note．
а́кєіорая， 13.
дки́юко， 13.
а̇кі́хє $\mu$ а， 12.
à $\lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \mu a \iota, 9$.

$\ddot{a}_{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota, 18$.
$\dot{\text { à }}$ cís， 83.
à入éкผ， 15.
ă $\lambda \epsilon \nu,{ }^{\wedge} \lambda$ é $\nu, 83$ ．
à $\lambda$ є́ $\sigma a \iota, 18$.
ä $\lambda \epsilon т \alpha \iota, 18$ ．
${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda_{i} \theta \omega, 15$.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{\jmath} \lambda \epsilon \kappa \alpha, 15$.
व’ $\lambda \not{\eta} \lambda \iota ф \boldsymbol{\alpha}, 14$ ．
 ӓ入ทтає， 18.
à $\lambda \iota \nu \grave{\iota} \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota, 159$
$\dot{a} \lambda i ́ \nu \delta \omega, \dot{a} \lambda i ́ \sigma \omega, 160$.
$\dot{a} \lambda o i \eta \nu, \dot{a} \lambda \bar{\omega}, 16$.
ä入отто， 18.

ӓ $\mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{\jmath} \boldsymbol{\alpha}, 36$.
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \epsilon \pi \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu, 198$.
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi i \sigma \chi \omega, 113$.
$\ddot{\alpha} \mu \pi \nu v \epsilon, \dot{a} \mu \pi \nu v \nu \theta \eta, 216$.
$\dot{\text { á } \mu}{ }^{\prime} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu, 177$ note．
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \bar{\epsilon} \xi \omega, 113$.
à $\mu ф \iota \in \imath \nu \nu \nu \mu \iota, 96$.
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \in \in ́ \sigma \omega, \dot{a} \mu \phi \hat{\omega}, 96$.

á $\nu \alpha \beta \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota, 38$.
àvaßı́шбконає， 42.
ả $\nu a \beta$ рáт $\tau \omega, 45$ note．
à $\nu а \beta \rho o ́ \xi є є є \nu, 46$.
ảvaßроұє́v， 46.
àvaүıүขஸ́шкш， 54.
ảvaס́á $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota, 247$.
$\dot{a} \nu a \delta \bar{\omega} \nu, 64$.

äva入tos， 14.
à $\nu a \pi \epsilon \pi$ ย́табтац， 205.
ávaтєт $\bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha, 205$.
a่vаббєíaткє， 223.

ả»até入入 $\omega, 235$.
«̀vатérрафи，ả»атє́трофа， 244 note．

àvaфuí $\sigma \in \sigma \theta a t, 261$.
ảvaХá̧o䒑at，ảva才áלov－
тєs， 262.
$\dot{a} \nu \in \beta i \boldsymbol{i} \omega \nu, 42,43$.
à $\nu \in ́ \gamma \nu \omega \sigma a, 54$ ．
$\dot{a} \nu \epsilon \bar{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu, \dot{\text { à }} \nu \epsilon і ̈ \tau \epsilon, 115$.
àvє乡itๆтоs， 86 note．
à $\nu$ ヒ̈ดขтає， 115.
à $\nu \in ́ \pi \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \nu, 209$ note．
à $\nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \alpha \mu \iota, 117$.
ảขย์ซยє，ằ $ย \sigma \alpha \nu, ~ 25$ ， 117.

ảעєбта́коขба， 259.
à $\nu є \tau \rho a ́ \pi \epsilon \tau о, 244$.

à $\nu$ モ́ $\chi \omega$ ，\＆c．， 113.
àvéఱ $\gamma$ a， 5 note， 183.

à $\nu \in ́ \omega \nu \tau \alpha, 115$.
àvé $\omega \xi \alpha$, à $\nu \in ́ \varphi \chi^{\alpha}, 183$.
à $\nu \eta \hat{\alpha} \nu, 120$.
áv $\eta \kappa \varepsilon \nu, 117$.

áขウ́vo日a， 7 note， 25.
à $\nu р є \iota \psi a ́ \mu \eta \nu, 100$.
$\dot{\alpha} \nu i \jmath \sigma \epsilon, 117$.
àvıєî，áríєı， 116 note．
àiév， 116.
àvoi $\gamma \nu \nu \mu$ ，àvoi $\gamma \omega, 183$ ．
àvoíctr， 253 note．
àveīтor， 89.
дข่єє́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon, 269$.
àvt $\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \omega, 89$ ．
àvtıर९й， 270 note．
äv $\nu$ 人a， 7 note．
а่ขи́̈̈тоя， 252.


${ }^{a}{ }^{2}{ }^{2} \omega \chi \theta_{l}, 26$.
à $\ddagger a \iota, 7$.
g＇$\xi a, 11$.
ӑझаขто，5， 7.
ă $\xi a s, \stackrel{a}{ } \xi^{\prime} \alpha \sigma \theta \varepsilon, 7$ ．

á $\xi \omega, 4,6$.

$\mu \epsilon \nu, 2$.
ג̇тауорєи́ш， 89.

а̇ланß入іткш， 21.
ä $\pi a ́ \phi \omega \nu, 6$ note．

58.

ітєдб́ $\boldsymbol{\eta \nu ,} 211$.
वітёї́pa， 240.


алтєєєєіे， 88.
аілєїтоу， 89.
ділєерүа⿱宀таи， 99.
ӓтєєрує，$\dot{\pi} \pi є і ̈ \rho \gamma є, \quad 80$,
91．
 157.

іте́̀а， 93.
$\dot{\pi} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \omega \nu, 215$.
д̈лєрой $\mu a, 88$.
i $\pi \epsilon \in \sigma \beta \eta \nu^{\prime}, 225$.

$\dot{\mathbf{a} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau е ́ р \eta \sigma а, ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \sigma т є р і ́-~}$
$\theta \eta \nu, 229$.

длєєйкабь， 109.
điтєфáv $\theta$ ŋ， 249.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\phi} \theta_{t} \theta_{0},{ }^{\prime} 257$.
àтєфа́ $\boldsymbol{q}_{\eta}, 258$.


атє $х \rho є є є о, 270$.
$\pi \pi \epsilon \chi \rho \eta, \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \chi \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu, 269$ і̀лє $\omega \sigma \theta$ évtos， 6.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu, \quad \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \epsilon-$
$\lambda \epsilon \nu, 2$.
$\dot{a} \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta, 3$.
$\dot{a} \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \lambda o \nu, 2,3$.
аліциґротоу， 20.
ब̇ $\pi \bar{\eta} \xi a s, 7$.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \dot{\nu} \rho \omega \nu, 34$.
аं $\pi \eta \chi$ Әо́ $\mu \eta, 110$.
алікатає， 132.
aimגakeiv， 21 note．
äтлатоs， 202.
джоßєßávaı， 38. á $\pi \dot{\beta} \beta \rho \iota \xi a s, 46$.
ämodid́pával， 68. iтподіঠра́әкєє， 240.
ã兀́̃óouто， 69.
дітоঠрра̄̀ии， 68.

àmod́р́́申ои， 71.
дытод $\dot{\sigma о \mu а и, ~} 211$.
атлєєтєі̀， 88.
«สоє́рүєє， 92.
аँло́єрбє， 103.
वто弓єбөєis， 117.
वं $\pi 兀 \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega, 127$.
а̇тоӨоро́vтеs， 128.
dं $\pi 0 \theta \rho \dot{\rho} \omega \sigma \kappa \omega \nu, 128$.

à $\pi о \kappa \lambda a ́ s, ~ 150$.
сітокріродаи， 156.

атоци́ттн， 177.
а́тоขєббнєӨа， 181.
длтопарі̄̄， 205.
дтотє́ $а у к а, 249$ note．
वंтотл $\bar{\eta} \sigma a t, 210$ note．
$\dot{\pi} \pi о \pi \nu i \xi \varepsilon$ es， 216 note．
aंтooßéซas， 224 note．
а́то́өта， 134.
$\dot{\text { à } \pi и \sigma \tau є р є i ̂ ̀ ~} \theta \epsilon, 230$.
व்тибтєеє́ш， 229.

сітотеті́Хワтсt， 239 note．
גпоі́pas， 34.
 नovaı， 34 note．
ג̇пофаішш， 249.
גंтохрq̆， 270 note．
व்тох白 $\omega, 270$.
атоххๆ， 269.
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\omega} \mu \nu \nu, 188$.

dа ápp̨，6，note．
ӑрарог， 30.

ג́рéaөaı， 10.
а́рєєби， 31.

גцйрєє， 30.
дрйрека， 31.
а́рірєєцає， 30.
сориродаи， 32.
ă $\rho \theta \in \nu, 30$ ．

арой $\mu є \nu, 10$.

dं $\rho \bar{\omega}$, ă $\rho \omega \mu \alpha, 10$.

ä $\sigma a, ~ a ̈ \sigma a \sigma \theta a l, 1$.
їба， 36.
я̈бодає，7， 8.
ä $\sigma \sigma \omega, 6$ ．
वै $\sigma \sigma \omega, ~ a ̈ \sigma \sigma \omega, 11$.
$\ddot{\psi} \sigma \omega, \dot{\alpha} \sigma \bar{\omega}, 8$ ．
ḋ̛áu，àté $\omega, 1$.
йттш，ӑттш， 11.
атт $\omega \mu \mu t, 1$.
à̀áta， 1.
à $\phi \epsilon i \theta \eta \eta$, à $\phi \in \theta \in i ́ s, 115$.
áфєîка， 6 nole．
á $\phi \in i ̂ \lambda a t ; ~ 9$ note．
д́фєìva， 115.
àeîral， 6 note．
dфєїəav， 115.
áфєīтo， 116.
á $\phi$＇í $\omega, 116$.
áфé入al， 9 note．
í $\varphi \in \lambda o \hat{\mu} \mu a \iota, 9$.
íqé $\mu \in \nu o s, 116$.
«̈феs， 115.
đ̀ф́́өтадка， 178 note．
ä申єбти́दєє， 186.
йфєтоя， 116.
àф $\dot{v} \omega, 109$. $\dot{\text { ádé }} \boldsymbol{\omega}, 116$.
 note， 115 note． і́ $\phi \hat{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}, 132$.
 note．
 dфі́ote， 116. dфiovy， 115. diфiर才aı， 132. áфov̂， 116. d $\phi \bar{\omega}, 115,116$. $\dot{a}_{\chi} \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu, 12$.
 $A \Omega, 1$ ．
ăшрго， 6 note．

## B．

Bā $\mu \in s, 38$.
ßàv， 87.
$\beta а \sigma \varepsilon \bar{\mu} \mu \iota$, s7．
ßӑте，$\beta$ а́тŋท， 38.
ßє́ $\beta a a, \beta$ в́ßaктаи， 37.
вєваниає， 39.
вє弓а́р $\eta \mu а \iota, 40$.
ßєßарпш́s， 37.
$\beta \in \beta i \eta \kappa \varepsilon \nu, 40$.
Вє́ßланиає， 43.
вєßо́л пиаи， 39.
$\beta \in \beta \rho \epsilon \gamma \mu \notin \nu=5,45$.
$\beta$ є́ $\beta \rho \ell \theta a, 46$.
$\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \rho о \chi a, \beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \rho v \chi^{a}, 46$.
$\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \rho \boldsymbol{\omega \kappa} \boldsymbol{\alpha}, 41$.
$\beta є \beta \rho \omega \mu$ е́vos， 44.
$\beta \in \beta \rho \dot{\prime}, 37,38$.
Beiw，38， 40.
$\beta \in ́ \omega, \beta$ й $\eta, 38$.

$\beta$ ко́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \epsilon \theta a , ~ 4 0 , ~} 42$.
ßеш̂̀at， 42.
$\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta$ єтая， 43.
$\beta \lambda \varepsilon i \mu \eta \nu, 39$.
$\beta \lambda$ íctat，$\beta \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a t, 39$.
$\beta \lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \eta \nu, \quad \beta \lambda \bar{\eta} 0, \quad 39$ note．
$\beta \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \boldsymbol{\iota}, 39$.
ß入є́̈ккш， 39 note．
Врஸ́бонає， 41.
｜$\beta \omega \theta \epsilon \overline{\mathrm{L}}, 44$. ßผ́бato， 44 note． $\beta \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon, 43$.阝ผंбодаи， 44.

## r．

「éraa，50， 51. $\gamma^{\text {¢́ryova，}} 5$ note， 49. $\gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu a, 48$.
үєүшขібкш， 48.
үєivato， 50.
$\gamma \in \lambda$ oíwr， 48.
үєขа向 $\mu є \nu, 50$.

үє́थто，50， 51.
үєч́ $\mu \epsilon \theta a, 51$.
үрпуоре́ш， 75.
$\Delta$.
Dáŋтą， 55.
баір $\omega, 62$.
баї $\theta$ हís， 56.
даци́q， 62.
$\delta a \mu a ́ \zeta \omega, 62$.
ба $\mu \varepsilon i s, 62$.
$\delta a \mu \nu$ व́ $\omega$, д́á $\mu \nu \eta \mu, 62$.
дарйбонаи， 62.
$\delta a \rho \theta \varepsilon i s, \delta a \rho \tau o ́ s, 62$.
ठа́соцаи， 55.
¿av́ra， 56.
ס́́áal， 58.
ঠ́́ $\gamma \mu a t, 63$.
ס́éóaa， 56.
סe8aíarat， 55.
$\delta_{\epsilon \delta u} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu \hat{v} v o s, 56$.
ঠєঠ̌aкрv $\mu$ évos， 253 note．
ঠе́дарка， 62.

$\delta_{\varepsilon} \grave{a} a \mu$ и́vos， 56.
ঠéde $\gamma \mu a,{ }^{6} 6$.



д̀́ $\delta \eta \gamma \mu a, 57$,
ঠєठі́гораи，64， 208.
$\delta \dot{\delta} \delta \eta \chi a, 57$.
ठ́éca， 59.

б́є́ $\tilde{\mu \eta к а, ~ 61, ~} 62$.
đécouka，59， 60.
ঠєठо́кทиає， 70.
бєїокпиє́vов， 64.
бе́cioца， 61.

¿éco opa， 62.
ס̇éropка，62， 81 note．

бєборака，6і， 71.
бе́ঠ́рацає， 71.
дєঠга́ $\mu \eta к а, 246$.
д̀́̇́paそą， 70.
дє́ச́раб $\mu \iota, 71$.
б́́ঠ́рода， 247.

бєíठєү $\mu \iota, 59,63$.
¿єíía，59， 60.
бєєібкодаи， 59 поtе．
ঠеíoouка， 60.

غєі́ионєи， 61.
סєir，тó， 65.
деіораи， 61.
غєíp $\omega, 62$.
ঠе́конаи， 63.
$\delta^{\delta \epsilon} \xi_{\omega}, 58$.
¿є́єяаи， 61.
ठéor， 64.
¿єن́oua， 66.
ঠє́хатац， 68.
б万乡одаи， 57.
ठїрац， 62.
$\delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \epsilon, 64$.
$\delta \dot{\eta} \omega, \delta \bar{\eta} \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon s, 56$.
¿थぃ $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \varepsilon, 39$ note．

סаа $\delta о$ й $\mu a t, 64$.

ঠ̀́а́кєєци， 143.
$\delta_{\iota} a \lambda a \kappa \epsilon ́ \omega, 164$.

дсатрíथas， 247.
ס＾a申avaxoúaŋ， 251 note．
дıафӨаре́одаи， 256.

діii $\eta \mu, 64$.
дфбрі́бкш， 67.
סíe， 61.

 165.

र८єтєфผ́бкк， 251 note：
ס̌épтas，92．
סíбӘवи， 61.
¿ıєфӨ́́рато，ঠьефӨаре́кито， 256 note．
סєє́фӨора， 256.
$\dot{\delta} \not \eta \gamma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta, 3$.
Sé́rүбє入ov， 2.
$\delta i \eta \mu, 61$.
סथŋңа， 121.
Séŋpéar， 100.
Sıoíरŋขтає， 186.
סíw，סíov，סíopaц， 61.

8íшرaı， 61.
$\delta \mu \eta \theta$ cis， 62.
¿oáббато， 58.
סoкєîv，тó， 65.
Sóøког， 69.

$\delta \rho a ̂ \theta \iota, ~ \delta \rho a i \eta \nu, 67$.
ঠрацой $\mu \alpha, 246$.
¿ра̂̀at， 67.
ঠрати́v， 71.
¿рáбонаи，ঠрás， 67.
סрaтós， 62.
ठрйбоцац， 67.
$\delta \rho \hat{\omega}, 67$.
¿рчิци，бршंоєци， 71.
ס＇ı̀avta，ס̀̀vavtos， 74.
Śvaдто，ס́v́єто， 73 note．
ঠ̇́vєєo， 73.
бубо́литоs， 74.
סі́бкєу， 73.
$\delta \omega \dot{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu, \delta \dot{\varsigma} \sigma \iota, 69$.
$\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega, 68$.
$\delta \omega ' \omega, \delta \omega \dot{\eta} s, 69$.

## E．

＂E $\alpha$ imperf．， 85.


є́á $\lambda \eta \nu$, є̇á $\lambda \eta \nu, 83$ ．

 ëas imperf．， 85.
 є̃aта兀，ẽaто， 118.
є̌aтє imperf．， 85.
éáф $\theta \eta, 29$.
є̌ $\beta \eta \nu, \delta 7$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \beta$ 亿́лбєто，7，8， 38.
є́ßíßабкє，39．
$\dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda с ́ \beta \eta \quad, 43$.
$\ddot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \eta \nu, 39$.

غ゙ß $\beta \sigma \alpha, \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \dot{\omega} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 44$.

є́ $\gamma \gamma$ иíлато， 74.
єं $\gamma \delta$ ои́тп $\eta \sigma \alpha, 70$.
єิ $\gamma \eta \mu a, 47$.
є́ $\gamma к а ө є і є а т о, ~ 131 . ~$
є́ $\gamma \kappa є \kappa \alpha \lambda \iota \nu \delta \eta \mu$ ย́v $\eta, 160$.
є́ $\gamma к є \chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu$ е́vоs， 271.
є้ урєто， 75.
є́ $\gamma$ рі́ $\quad$ ора， 5 note， 75.
é $\gamma \rho$ í $\gamma$ ор $\theta a, ~ 75,76$ note．
$\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \chi^{\epsilon} \omega,{ }_{\epsilon} \gamma \chi \epsilon \bar{\omega}, 265$.
$\epsilon \dot{\delta} \dot{d} \mu \eta \nu, 62$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta}$ аó $\mu \eta \nu, 55$.
є́óáp $\nu, 62$.
є́ $\delta a \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu, 5 \overline{5}$.
єौE்єєбா． 59.

є̇ $\delta \in ́ \delta \iota \mu \epsilon \nu, 59$.
é $\delta$ é $\theta \eta \nu, 64$.
є̈ $\delta \varepsilon \mu a, 61$.
ё $̇ є \iota \rho a, 62$.
ย̌ธ̇ $\xi a, 58$.

є́ $\delta ́ \epsilon \not \sigma \omega, 108$.
є́ঠ̇є́єєто， 66.
ééєún $\sigma a$ ， 64.
é $\dot{1} \dot{\prime} \delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu a \iota, 108$.

є̇ $\begin{array}{r}\eta ́ \delta o \mu a \ell, ~ \\ 7 \\ \text { note，} 108 .\end{array}$
є̌ $\grave{\eta} \eta \sigma a, 64$.


є̌ $\delta \iota<о \nu$, êdı $\xi a, 69$.

$\dot{\epsilon} \delta \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu, 62$.
є้ $\delta \mu \eta т о, 62$ note．
є́ $\delta \rho a \theta o v, 57$.
єєєракои， 62.

єँ $\delta \rho \alpha \mu о \nu, 246$.
є̈ $\delta \rho \alpha \nu, 67$.
ё $\delta \rho$ риба， 68.
є้ $\delta \rho \eta \nu, 67$.


ย $\delta \omega \nu, 68$ ．
є́єı ¿ópevos， 80 ．
єєєєтоข， 88.
є́єє $\sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu, 80,8 \pi$ ．
ध́é̀ĩoual，9．4．
éє $\lambda \mu \Omega \iota$, éє $\lambda \mu$ ćvors，83．
є́є́ $\lambda \pi о \mu \alpha \iota, 80$ nole， 94.
є́é入ба兀， 83.
є゙єлто， 84.
 92， 221.
éép $\boldsymbol{\omega}, 80$ nole， 92.
є้єр $\mu \alpha \iota$ ，є́єр $\mu$ є́vоs，є̌єрто， єєєрхато， 92.
ééซбато， 118.
є́є́ббато，є̈єбто， 96.
モ゙弓 $\eta \nu, ~ Є ̈ \zeta \omega \nu, 119$.
є́ $\eta \kappa а, 115$.
є $\eta \nu, 85$.
én $\quad$ davov， 24.
є̈ $\eta \sigma \theta a$, S5．
é $\theta$ á $\phi \theta \eta \nu, 122$.
є́ $\theta$ є́ $\rho \eta \nu, 124$.

๕̈ $\theta \eta \eta, 115$.
$\dot{\text { é向бато，} 123 .}$
є̈Өироу， 128.
є̈Өра ${ }^{\prime}$ а， 234.
є̈Өрє ${ }^{\circ} \alpha, 246$.

éӨvұа， 248.
ё $0 \omega \kappa \alpha, 77$.
є゙aбa， 74.
єíataи，єïato， 117.
єíato，єïato， 84.
єіато， 95.
ëi $і \mu$ и，81， 82 note．
є゙̌ 87.
єïr， 115.
є $\because \theta \eta \nu, 115$.
єì $\theta \imath \sigma \mu a \iota, 76$.
єiка， 81 note．
єiкка，єїкєєン， 115.

є九ккөо⿱， 80.
 82 note．
єiкс＇s，єiкós， 81.
єì $\alpha$, єì $\kappa \dot{\mu} \eta \nu, 9$.
єì $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu \mathrm{c} \iota, 89$ note．
$\epsilon \ddot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon, 84$.
єi入ŋ́入ov $\theta a, 106$.
єi入í入ov $\theta \mu \varepsilon \nu, 200$.
єї入ŋфа， 89 note， 162.
єї $\lambda \eta \chi$ Х, 89 note， 162.
عї入ı $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \mu \iota \iota, 94$.

єï $\lambda \kappa v \sigma \sigma, ~ \epsilon i \lambda \kappa \dot{v} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, \epsilon i \lambda-$ кv́б $\mu a \iota, 94$.
．$โ \lambda \xi a, 94$.

cìioxa， 89 note， 164.
єï $\lambda \omega, 9$ ．
ยíhaı，єīбui，єitaı， 95.

єifal from í $\epsilon \mu a \iota, 115$.
ёіцартаи， 89 note．
єí$\mu \epsilon \nu$ ，єíرєs， 85.
$\epsilon \hat{i} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，є $\grave{\tau} \epsilon$, є $\hat{i} \sigma \alpha \nu, 115$.
єï $\mu \boldsymbol{r}, 116$.
eival， 115.
．єivv $\mu$ e， 96.
єíदабt， 82.
єiouvià， 81.
єīima，єîmov， 9 ．
єiँmov， 97.
єija， 92.
єіруабнає， 99.
єї $\gamma \gamma \nu v \mu, 92$.
єірє $\bar{\sigma} \sigma \boldsymbol{*}, \mathrm{S} 9$.

єірїбонає，88， 102.
єїронаи，101， 102.
єіри́ $\mu є \nu а$ ， 105.
єіридтац，єiриито， 104.
еїрито， 105.
єіры， 88.
eis， 115.
є $\mathrm{\epsilon}^{\sigma} \alpha, 117$.
єіба́ $\mu \eta \nu$ ，єїбато， 87.
єíá $\mu \eta \nu, 131$.
єḯas，єíááцєংos， 117.
єїбєтсь， 118.

єі $\sigma є ф \rho о$ и́ $\mu \nu, 259$.
єīə $\theta a, 86$ note．
eiotrทrós， 86 note．
єโंбо， 116.
є＇єориая，78， 87.
єібтíkєเข， 134.
єíбфрéш，є’íбфрєs，єí фрท̋бєбӨat， 259.
єітє，єїтทン， 85.
عî́to， 116.
є $ا \chi$ єє， 112.

$\epsilon i \omega$ for＇$\omega \omega, 87$.
cil $\omega$ Oa， 6 note， 76.
$\epsilon^{\prime}(\omega \nu, 74$.
є́кん $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \sigma \theta \eta \nu, ~ \\ 131 .\end{gathered}$
є́кк日ウ́ $\mu \eta \nu, 118$.
ếкаvov， 139.
éкко⿱亠乂， 139.
غ́ка́р $\quad \nu, 142$.
 note．
éкßра́бтоцаи， 45 note．

éкүєүáovтац， 51.
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \bar{v} \mu \epsilon \nu, 73$.
є́кєка́ $\sigma \mu \eta \nu, 138$.
є́кєк入о́ $\mu \nu, 144,207$.
є́кє́кра $\gamma \mu \epsilon \nu, 200$.
éкє́คа $\sigma \alpha$ ，éкє $\rho \alpha \sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ ，
144.

ёкє $\rho \sigma \alpha$, éкє́ $\rho \theta \eta \nu, 143$.
ёк $\quad$ а， 139.

éкıXov， 147.
є́ккє́àтєs， 140.
ёк $\lambda \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma}{ }^{2} \nu, 149$.
ёкえаєข， 150.
モ̇є $\lambda \lambda \xi \xi \alpha, 149$.
ө́к入 $\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \pi \eta \nu, 151$.



ёк久ทŋ $\sigma \alpha, 150$.

е́кцаі́гш， 169.
е́ктєлєєтабтая， 205.
ékт入í！

ě̃кра
éкра́日 $\eta \nu, 144$.
є́крє́ $\mu \omega, 155$.

є́кт $\alpha^{\theta} \eta \nu, 158$.
ёктака， 53 note， 157.
є́кта́ $\mu \eta \nu, 158$ note．

$\dot{\text { е́ктєт } \mu i ́ / \sigma є \sigma \theta о \nu, ~} 235$.
є่ктє́т $\mu \eta \sigma \theta \circ \nu, 39$.
ёктога， 157.
є́кто́vŋка， 158.
ёкиӨоข， 146.
$\dot{\text { éкфреí } \omega, 259 \text { note．}}$
ёккрєs， 259.
 ф $\varnothing \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota, 259$.
éरх的q， 270 note．
غ́кхрі́｜テє， 269.
è $\lambda \underset{\sim}{c}$, è̉ $\lambda a, 93$.
è $\lambda \alpha ́ q \nu, 93$.
é $\lambda a \neq 0 \nu, 163$.
ë入 $\lambda \iota, 9$.
є́ $\lambda \alpha \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha, 164$.
є̇入 $\alpha \dot{\prime} \mu \theta \eta \nu, 162$.
é $\lambda \hat{\alpha} \nu$, ，$̂ \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha, ~ \in ̇ \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \omega, ~ 93 . ~$
é̀ $\lambda a \chi \circ \nu, 162$.
ć $\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \omega, 93$.

ẻ $\lambda \epsilon i ̄ v, 9$.
é̉ $\lambda є 1 \pi \tau о, 51,165$.
є̈ $\lambda \epsilon \iota \psi a, 165$.
с่ $\lambda$ є́ликто， 94.
є́ $\lambda \epsilon \xi \alpha$, è $\lambda \epsilon \xi a ́ \mu \eta \eta, 165$.

é $\lambda \dot{\prime} \lambda \alpha \mu r \iota$, é $\lambda \dot{\prime} \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 93$.
é入 $\eta \lambda$ с́ато， 93.
 94.

с่ $\lambda \eta$ д́́ $\delta а т о, 93$.
ć $\lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \mu \epsilon \nu, ~ \in ́ \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \tau \epsilon, 106$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu, \dot{c}^{\wedge} \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 163$.
є̈ $\lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \nu, 3,165$.
é $\lambda \iota \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$, é $\lambda \iota \tau o ́ \mu \eta \nu, 166$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda a ́ \mu \psi \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, 1$ ı̀3．
è $\lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta$ ）， 166.
é入óєvv， 167.
$\ddot{\epsilon} \lambda \sigma \alpha \nu$, è $\lambda \sigma \alpha t$, ë $\lambda \sigma \alpha s, S 3$.
白 $\lambda \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu, 169$.

$\dot{\text { є́ } \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}, 9 . ~}$
$\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\omega},{ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \lambda \omega \nu, 93$.
є̈цакау， 175.

$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \epsilon \beta \bar{\omega} \sigma t, 38$.
$\bar{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \iota \nu a, 175$.
є́ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \eta к о \nu, 175$.
$\check{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha c, 85$.
$\tilde{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu, \tilde{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon, \epsilon \tilde{\epsilon} \sigma a \nu, 115$.
${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \eta \nu, 116$.
є́ $\mu \eta \nu a, 169$.
е́ніпга， 175.
$\check{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \nu,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\mu} \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \iota, 85$.
$\stackrel{\text { с }}{\mu} \mu о р є, 172$.
є́ $\mu \nu \eta \dot{\jmath} \mu \nu к а, 122$.
є $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \alpha, 176$.

$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi i \pi \lambda \eta \theta$ с， 209.
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi 1 \pi \rho \epsilon i s, 210$ note．
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi i ф р \eta \mu, 259$.
é $\mu \pi \lambda \epsilon i ̈ \theta$＇， 209 note．
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda i ́ \mu \varepsilon v o s$, 209.

ё $\mu$ кког， 178.
е́ $\mu ф р а ́ т т \omega, 259$ note．
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi \dot{\eta} \eta, \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \tau а, 261$.
éva入ónva 14.
غ́vapw， 95.

$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta i \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu, 61$.
ย่ $\nu$ ঠขขє่оขб兀， 74.
évє $\gamma \gamma \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma a, 74$ note．
ย่vєүкєiv， 6 note， 252.
є́vєiк 252.
є̈ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} є \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}, 179$.
є́vєєрие́vos， 93.
є́vєі́Хєє，77， 114.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \mu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \eta, 179$.
évévitov，évévıाтtov， 6 note， 95.

غ̇ $\nu \in \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta \nu, 182$.
éveoup $\begin{array}{r}\text { ко́таs，} 196 \text { note．}\end{array}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \pi i \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu, 209$.
モ゙vєтор， 90.

$\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ ย́ $\pi \omega, 89$ ．
ধ̈ข $ข \in \nu \sigma a, 181$.

є̇ขє $\chi^{\theta i \jmath \sigma о \mu а с . ~} 252$.
 252.

غ́ví ota， 7 note．
évívoxa， 7 note， 252.
є́v $\eta \rho \dot{́} \mu \eta \nu, 95$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \epsilon i v, 106$.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \nu i \pi \tau \omega, 90,95$.

ย่ขย $\sigma \pi \eta ́ \sigma \omega, 89$.
êvtãov，89，90， 95.
є́vía $\sigma \omega, 95$.
évi $\psi \omega, 89$.
ย゙ข $\nu \epsilon \pi \sigma \nu, 90$.
ย̇ $\nu \nu$ ย́ $\pi \omega$ ，89．
évข＇ผ́as， 182.
є́vтi， 84.
éそa入īซaı， 160.
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi a \lambda \iota \phi \hat{\eta}, 14$.
є́ $\xi \alpha \mu \beta \lambda o v ̄ \mu \epsilon \nu, 20$.
є́ $\xi a \pi a ́ \phi \eta \sigma \in \nu, 28$.
с́ $\xi_{\epsilon \alpha \gamma є i ̄ \sigma \alpha, ~} 6$.
$\dot{\dot{\epsilon} \xi є \beta \lambda а ́ \sigma \pi \eta \sigma \epsilon, ~ 4.5 . ~}$
$\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \epsilon \beta$ рá $\sigma \sigma о \nu \tau 0,45$ note．
є́ $є \in ́ \delta р а \mu є \nu, 68$.

é $\xi \varepsilon i ́ p a s, 92$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \eta \nu, 215$.
є́цєєра̄ба兀， 98.
є́єєфрєіо $\quad \epsilon \nu, 259$.
є́乡é $\chi \rho \eta, 267$.

є́乡єєйєเร， 6.

白系 $\mu \beta \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha, 21$.
є́ $ఢ \mathfrak{\eta} \rho а \mu \mu а \iota, 12$ note．


ёoc $\gamma \mu \varepsilon \nu, 81,82$ note．
є̌o兀
ع̌०кка，80，81， 82 note．
є̈ $ц \mu, 84$.
є́ó入єє，є́ó入 $\eta$ то， 83.
є̈олтa， 5 note， 80 note， 94.

єัo $\begin{gathered}\text { imperf．，} 85 .\end{gathered}$
๕ัоขт， 84.
モ̇óvt $\omega \nu$ ，ėóvt $\omega$ ，imperat．， 85.

є̇о́ркка，є̇о́ркцає， 191.
Ěop $\begin{aligned} & \text { a，} \\ & 80 \\ & \text { note，} 221 .\end{aligned}$
є́ $\pi \dot{\prime} \check{\prime} \gamma \eta \nu, 208$.
$\dot{\text { Érán }, 199 \text { note．} . ~}$
ধ̈ $\pi a \theta o \nu, 199$.
غ́ $\pi a \iota \nu$ éw， 8 note．
ध́ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \mu \epsilon \nu о s$, ė̃ầто， 18.
є̈ $\pi a \rho \delta о \nu, 205$.
є́ $\pi а \rho є і ̈, 10$.
є́ $\pi \alpha \sigma c ́ \mu \eta \nu, 199$.
éтаи́рабӨaı， 9.
émav̂pov， 34.
غ́ $\pi a \not \subset a v a ́ v \theta \eta \nu, 85$.
ย̇ $\pi$ ย́ $\gamma є \nu \tau о, 50$.

é $\pi \epsilon \subset \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu$ ย́vovs， 165 notc．
є́тєігvбӨat， 96.
ө́тєєрєо́ $\mu є \nu о$ о， 102.
єंтєєрйорає， 102.
є́ $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \not \rho$ е́ $\omega, 259$.
є่ $\pi \epsilon \lambda \lambda \sigma \epsilon \nu, 163$.
є́ $\pi є ́ \mu \nu \xi a r^{\prime}, 177$.
єє $\pi \epsilon ข ท \nu \circ \theta є, 95$.
є̇ $\pi \epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon\llcorner, 208$.
є́ $\pi є ́ \pi \iota \theta \mu \epsilon \nu, 200$.
ध́ $\pi \in ́ \pi \lambda \omega \nu, 215$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \pi \dot{v} \sigma \mu \eta \nu$ ，221．

érєрє́б $\theta$ at， 102.
モ̈ $\pi \epsilon \sigma \alpha, 212$.
غ่тєбкย́ $\pi \eta \sigma a \nu, 228$.
є̈ $\pi \varepsilon \sigma \circ \nu, 7,212$.
éné $\sigma \pi o \nu, 97$.
є́тє́ $\sigma \pi о \nu \tau о, 97$ note．
є̇ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \tau а ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu , ~ 2 0 5 , ~} 206$.
є̌สєтоン， 212.
ย̇ $\pi$ є́тоблє， 243.
є̇ $є$ ध́траџєє， 244.
є́ $\pi є ́ т \rho є \psi є, 244$ note．
є̈ $\pi \epsilon \dot{\varphi} \nu \circ \nu, 207$.
є̇тєф̣́ $\beta є \iota \nu, 251$.

غ́л ́́фvкov， 262.
є́ $\pi \in ́ \chi \omega, 112$.
є̇ $\pi \eta \gamma$ о́ $\mu \eta \nu, 208$.
є́лілїテа， 12.
є̈ $\pi \eta \lambda \alpha, 198$.

є́ $\pi \eta \dot{v} \rho \circ$ ， 34.


є́ $\pi ィ \beta a \sigma \kappa є ́ \mu є \nu, 38$.
غ่ $\pi ィ \beta \mathfrak{\jmath} \boldsymbol{\jmath} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} เ \nu, 37$.
є́ $\pi \iota \beta \grave{\eta}$ тоv， 38.
є́ $\pi \iota \delta є \delta \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \tau \alpha \iota, 246$ note．

ச́ $\pi \iota \in ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota, 96$.

ย̇ $\pi 心 a \lambda$ е́ $\sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota, 141$ note．
є́лі́кєццая， 142.
є́тькікоь， 148.
ย̇лıкрŋ̄бац， 145.

é $\pi$ เ $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v o s, 165$ note．
в́ті入й $\theta \omega, 163$.
é $\pi \iota \mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma о \mu a l, \quad$ é $\pi \iota \mu a ́ \sigma \alpha-$ $\sigma \theta a l, 172$.
غ́тィце́ло $\mu \mathrm{a}$ ，173， 174.

$\nu a \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \nu \in \nu a ́ \sigma \mu \epsilon v a \iota$, 180.

ย̇สเขย์๐ขสィ， 179.
ë $\pi เ \circ \nu, 210$.
モ̇ாıóчоцає， 192.
غ̇лเ $\pi \lambda$ о́ $\mu \in v o s, 203$.
ச̇ $\pi \iota \pi \lambda \omega \dot{\prime}, 215$.


ë̉ $\boldsymbol{\iota} / \sigma a, 210$.
ย̇ $\pi \iota \sigma \pi \epsilon i \nu, ~ \in ̇ \pi i \sigma \pi o v, ~ 97 . ~$
є́ $\pi i \sigma \tau q, 96$.
émıбтéw $\mu a \iota, 96$ note．
є́ $\pi i \sigma \tau \eta, 96$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \tau \in ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, 235$.
éntтєтрáфатає，244 note．
є́ $\pi$ тто́ббаเs， 243.
غ́ $\pi \iota \tau \rho a \pi$ є́ovat，159， 244.
є́тıтра́чогтаи，244．
é $\pi เ \tau \rho$ é $\psi$ оутац， 244 note．
ย̇ $\pi \iota \phi \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \iota ้$ ， 251 note．
غ́ $\pi$＇$\chi$ €iss， 265.

є̈ $\pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \xi a, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \gamma \chi^{\theta} \eta \nu$, 214.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \nu, 202$.
غ́ $\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\kappa} \kappa \nu, 214$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 202$.
$\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon, 203$.

є̈п $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \downarrow, 214$.
 є̈ $\pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma a, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ， 214.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \lambda_{\mu}^{\prime} \mu \nu, 202,209$.
є̈ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma a, 208,209$.
ё $\pi \lambda \omega \nu, 215$.
$\check{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha, 214$.
غ่ $\pi \nu$ र́v $\theta \eta \nu, 216$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu, 210$.

єєтороу， 217.
є́тота́ $\theta \eta \nu, 207$.
モ̇ло́чато， 193.
ènóчоцаı， 192.
є́ $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\theta} \eta \eta \nu, 211$.
є̈ $\pi \rho \alpha \theta$ ov， 205.
$\epsilon ̈ \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \epsilon, 210$.
ध́ $\pi \rho \hat{\eta} \theta \eta \nu, 211$.
є̈ $\pi \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon, 210$.
є́ $\pi \rho \iota \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu, 218$.
є́ $\pi \rho o ́ \omega \sigma a$, ë $\pi \rho \omega \sigma a, 219$.
ёлтакоข，є́ $\pi \tau а к є ́ v a l, 219 . ~$
é $\pi \tau \alpha ́ \mu \eta$ ’， 206.
є̈ $\pi \tau \eta \chi \alpha, 220$.
є̈ $\pi \tau \eta \nu, 206$.
є̇пто́ $\mu \eta \nu, 97,206$.
є́ $\pi \omega \mu о \sigma \alpha \dot{\mu} \nu \nu, 188$.
є́тн́хато， 112.
є́тч́ $\chi$ ато， 186.
є́ра́a $\sigma \theta \epsilon, 98$.

ёратац， 98.
єॅр $\boldsymbol{\omega}, 91,221$.
еै $\rho \delta \omega, 221$.
épéє
е́рєі́о $\mu є \nu, 103$.
êp $\epsilon$ दa， 221.
е́ре́рьтто， 100.
є̂p $\in \sigma \sigma a, 100$.
є́рєú $\mu \in \nu 0 v, 10$.

épé $\omega, 88,89,103$.
ép $\eta$ рédaral， 99.
ép рре́ঠато， 93.
є́ри́рєєька，є́ри́рєєбдаь， є́рярєьгтає， 99.
є́рйрıуцаı，е́рйрь $\mu \mu а \iota, 99$.
є́рйрıта，99，100．

є́рทбव́ $\mu \in \nu о$ ， 102.
є́p $\quad$ тгц， 98.


єрітє $\frac{1}{}$
є́puє̀vos， 92.
є́p $\xi_{a}, \epsilon_{\rho} \xi_{\alpha}, 91,92,221$.
є́ $\rho \xi_{\omega}, 221$.
épóć ${ }^{\prime} \eta \eta, 222$.
 221.


є́p’pєvбa， 222.
с́p’ṕń $\theta \eta \nu, 88$.
ép’pítrєov， 74 note．

ép’́pváá $\mu \nu, 104$.
ё́ṕpито， 105.
${ }^{\prime} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \omega \gamma \mathrm{a}, 5$ note，6， 222.

є́ $\rho \dot{\rho} \omega \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu, \quad$ є́ $\rho \rho \rho ْ \omega \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu$ ， 224.

є $\rho \sigma \alpha, 92$.
ย́púe $\theta a c, 105$.
є́puкакєєєข，95， 103.
є̆рито，105， 106.
є́ $\rho \chi$ атая，ё $\rho$ Хато， 92.
${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\rho} \chi^{\theta}{ }^{\theta} \eta \nu, 221$.
épúw pres．and fut．103， 105 note．
$\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega, 88$.
ếs， 115.
є́ба $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ ípato， 3.
éซą，95， 117.
غ́ $\sigma \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon v o s, 117,118$.
є̈ซav， 85.
$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \dot{a} o v \nu, 239$.
є́ $\sigma a ́ \pi \eta \nu, 226$.
ẽous， 117.
 283.

ёбßar， 225.
$\epsilon \sigma \beta \in \sigma a, 224$.
$\dot{\epsilon \sigma \beta \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu, ~} \quad$ モै $\sigma є \sigma \mu \varkappa \iota$, 225.

єँ $\sigma \beta \eta \kappa a, ~ \stackrel{\pi}{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \eta \nu$ ，22．4．

с́ $\sigma \epsilon \mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \tau о, 17 \underset{\sim}{2}$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta \eta \nu, 225$.
є́ $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \lambda$ ato， 18 note．
є̌ $\sigma \eta \rho \alpha, 224$.
ย゙ $\sigma \theta a \iota, 116$.
е゙ $\sigma \theta \eta, 131$.
$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta \omega, 131$ note．
é $\sigma i ́ v a \nu \tau o, 226$.
єै $\sigma \kappa \mu \mu \alpha \iota, ~ \epsilon ́ \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \phi \eta \nu, 226$.
єं $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \grave{c} a ́ \sigma Ө \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \in ́ \delta \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, 226.

єैбкє $\mu \mu \boldsymbol{\iota}, 277$.
є́ $\sigma \kappa є \pi \eta \nu, 278$.
є̇бкє $\alpha^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu, 277$.
デァкท入 227.
єै $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ ，є̈ $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \nu, 227$.
єँ $\sigma к о \nu, 85$.
є゙ $\sigma \kappa \omega \psi a$ ， 228.
$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \eta \xi \alpha^{\prime}, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \eta \sigma a ́ \mu i \eta \nu, \quad \dot{\epsilon}-$ $\sigma \mu \eta \chi^{\theta \eta \nu, 228 .}$
є゙ $\sigma о \mu \alpha$ ，95， 11 \％．
є́ $\sigma о \bar{\mu} \mu \alpha, 85$.
є̈ $\sigma \pi \alpha \kappa \alpha, 228$.
є́ $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ \rho \eta \nu$ ，єै $\sigma \pi \alpha \rho \mu \alpha \iota, 228$.
є̈ $\sigma \pi a \sigma \alpha, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi a ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, є้－ $\sigma \pi a \sigma \mu \pi$, 228．
є゙ $\sigma \pi є ル \alpha, 229$.
є゙бтєєคа，2～8．
є้ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha$ ，єै $\sigma \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 229$.
є゙ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \tau є, 89$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi о ́ \mu \eta \nu, 97$.
єैбтоข， 97.
є̋ $\sigma \pi о \beta а, ~ 228 . ~$
€ँ $\sigma \sigma \alpha, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu, .95$.
テ̈ $\sigma \sigma \alpha \iota, 117$.
є́ $\sigma \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ īтаı， 85.
غ̀ $\sigma$ є́о $\mu$ 人， 122.
 बєvov，$\in \sigma \sigma \epsilon v o ́ \mu \eta \nu, 225$.
єैँбо， 84.
є̈ $\sigma \sigma о, 96$.
єัп $\sigma о \mu \alpha, ~ 85$.
غ̇ббov̂ $\mu$ а८， 122.
є́ $\sigma \sigma \dot{v} \theta \eta \nu, ~ \not ้ \sigma \sigma v \mu \alpha \iota, 225$.
є่ $\sigma \dot{\jmath} \mu \eta \nu, 158$ note，2＠5．
є $\sigma \sigma \omega, 95$.
غ̇ $\sigma \omega \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu .122$.

 бт $\alpha \lambda \theta \eta \nu, \epsilon \in \sigma \tau \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \eta \nu, 229$.
є̋ $\sigma т а \mu є \nu, ~ \grave{є} \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \nu a \ell, 136$.
є̈ $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$, єै $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu, 137$.
є́ $\sigma \tau \epsilon i ́ \lambda \alpha, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \lambda \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \nu$ ， 229.

є̄ $\sigma \tau є ६, 229$.
є́ $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \eta \sigma \alpha$ ，є́ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\jmath} \theta \eta \nu$ ，＇̇－ бтє́рךцає， 230.
є́бтŋка， 134.
غ் $\sigma \tau \eta(\omega, 135$ note
 136.
 230.

єั $\sigma т \eta \sigma a, 134$.

є̌бтı $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \iota, 231$.
є́ $\sigma \tau \iota \chi \circ$ ， 229.
єัбто， 96.
๕̃бторүа， 229.
є́ то́рєба，є́бторє́ $\sigma \eta$ ， є́бтори́习习，231．
ё $\sigma т \rho \mu \mu \alpha \iota, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \rho \alpha ́ ф \eta \nu$, с́ $\sigma \tau \rho a ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \rho \in ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$, єै $\sigma т \rho о ф а, 231$.
є้ $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \sigma \alpha$, є́ $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \nu$, е゙－ $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha, 281$.

є̈ $\sigma \tau \omega s, 136$.
є́бúせワv， 225.
є́ $\dot{́} \rho \eta \nu, 231$.

є̈ $\sigma \phi \alpha о \nu$ ，$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \nu$ ，$\quad$ ё－ $\sigma ф а \lambda \mu a \iota, 232$.
єै $\sigma \phi \alpha \xi \alpha$, є́ $\sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \chi \theta \eta \nu, 232$.
єै $\sigma ф \eta \lambda, 232$.
eै $\sigma ф \gamma \mu \alpha \iota, 232$.
є́ $\chi^{\alpha} \zeta$ бобаข，232
є̈б $\chi^{\epsilon} \theta \circ v, 22,11 \%$.

є $\sigma \chi \omega \nu, 232$.
๕゙ $\sigma \omega, 95$.
є̈ $\sigma \omega \sigma \alpha, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \nu, 232$.
є́та́ $\eta \eta \nu, 234$.
є́т $\dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu, 234$.
є̇та́кךข， 240.



стганоу， 235.
є́тavúซӨๆv， 234.
є̇т $\alpha \xi_{\alpha}^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu, 234$.
 236.

є́т $\dot{\phi} \varphi \nu, 122$.
є́тá $\chi$ Ө $\eta \nu, 234$.
є́тєı入 $\alpha$ ，є́тєє入á $\mu \eta v$ ， 235.
є̈тєเขа， 234.
є́тєко́ $\quad \eta \nu, 241$.
є̈тєкоข， 240.
є́тє́ $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \alpha$ ，є́тє́ $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$ ，є̇т $\epsilon-$ $\lambda \in ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 235$.
є̂t є $\lambda \sigma a, 235$.
є̌тєرоン， 235.

є̈тєрг $\alpha$, 237．

єैт $\epsilon \rho \psi a$ ，е́т $є \rho \phi \theta \eta \nu, 236$.
є̇тєта́ $\lambda \eta \nu, 235$.
éтє́т $\lambda u \mu \epsilon \nu, 243$.
є̂тєт $\mu \circ \nu$ ，є́тє́т $\mu є \tau о, 237$.
є́тє́тןŋขа， 241.
є̈тєчそа， 238.
є́тє́́Хєтоу， 239 note．
є̇тєí ${ }^{\theta \eta \gamma, 239 .}$
éтé $\chi \forall \eta \nu, 241$.
є̈т $\mu a \gamma о \nu$, є́т $\mu a ́ \gamma \eta \nu, 2 S 6$.
є́т $\mu$ í，$\theta \eta \nu, 235$.
єैт $\mu \eta \xi \alpha, 236$.
є́то́р $\quad \sigma \alpha$ ，є̌тороข， 243.
êтрауоv，є̇т
є̌трафоv，غ̇тра́ф $\quad \nu, 245$.
є́трє́ $\phi \geqslant \nu, 244$.
є̌т $\rho \eta \sigma \alpha, 241$.
є́трißŋv，є́трíфөךv，247．
є́три́фŋข， 128.
є̇тúӨ $\eta \nu, 128$.
є́т $\mathfrak{\prime} \chi \eta \sigma \alpha, 329$.

єűaरov， 24.
єûкто， 109.
 109.

є́фccáv $\theta \eta \nu, 250$.
є̈фаүоу， 108.
є́ $q a ́ \mu \eta \nu, 254$.
є̈ф
є́фєіิто， 116.

ёфєоог， 2 јз．
$\dot{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon \sigma \pi \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu, 97$.

є́申є́ $\sigma \sigma є \sigma \theta a \iota, 117$ note．
е́фє́ $\sigma \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, 117$.
є́фєбта́кєє， 137 note．
$\dot{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega \sigma \iota \nu, 136$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \phi \bar{\eta} \pi \tau \alpha \iota, 29$.


${ }^{\xi} \phi \theta \alpha \sigma \alpha, \dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 255$.
eै $\phi \theta \eta \nu, 255$.
$\dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta i \mu \eta \nu, 159$ note．
єौ $\phi$ өov， 256.
${ }^{\prime} \phi \theta$ Opa， 5 note， 256.
é $\phi \theta$ ós， 114 ．

є́фíтта $\mu \alpha, 96$.
є́фора̃»， 192.


モ̇ $\chi$ а́ $\rho \nu \nu, 263$.


є́хє́ $\theta \eta$ и， 266.
ย̌モєเซЯa， 111 note．
є́ $\chi \in \sigma a$, єौ $\chi \in \sigma о \nu, 212,264$.
є́хŋра́ $\mu \eta \nu, 263$.


є́ $\chi \omega \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu, 271$.

єै $\psi \in є, 77,114$.
є̌ч̣єv 271.

$\theta \eta \nu, \dot{\varepsilon} \psi \dot{\jmath} \sigma \forall \eta \nu, 271$.
équya， 271.
 $\theta \eta \nu, 272$.
E゙ $\omega, 84$.
$\epsilon \not \epsilon \omega \theta$, é $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \epsilon, 77$.
白 $\hat{\omega}$ Oovv，27\％．
єैШки， 272.
ยี $\omega \kappa 兀, 6$ note， 115 note．
 note．
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{\omega} \lambda \pi \epsilon є \nu, 94$.
$\check{\epsilon} \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \tau, 36$.

ё $\omega \nu, 74$.
éứv， 84.
$\dot{\epsilon} \omega v^{\prime} \eta \theta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha, 272$.
é $\omega \nu \eta \kappa \omega \dot{s}, 272$.
є́ $\omega \stackrel{\eta}{ } \boldsymbol{\sigma} u \mu \in ́ v \eta \nu, 6,272$.
 éต́vŋто， 272.

є́ $\omega$＇́ $\gamma є \iota \nu, 221$.
é $\omega$ ́́ртацоข， 96.
є́ $\omega \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu, ~ \check{\epsilon} \omega \sigma \mu a \iota, 272$.

## H．

${ }^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{H}, 116$.

${ }_{\eta}^{\eta}$ for $\stackrel{\tilde{\eta} \nu}{ } \nu, 85$.
$\eta{ }^{\eta} \alpha, 85$.
ที่ル，86， 106.
引ү $\boldsymbol{a}^{\prime} \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon, 2$.
${ }_{i}{ }_{i} \gamma \alpha \gamma 0 \nu, 6$.
$\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, \quad \quad \dot{\eta} \gamma \alpha \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ， गुүর́ббато， 2.
$\eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon i \lambda \alpha, 2$.

ท่ $\gamma \gamma^{\prime} \omega \boldsymbol{v}$ ，グ $\gamma \gamma \dot{\eta} \eta \sigma a, 74$.
${ }_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \alpha, 74$.
グүєípovто， 3.

 тає， $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma є \rho є \dot{\epsilon}$ Өогто， $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma є-$

$\eta \gamma \eta \lambda \alpha, 1$.
$\dot{\eta}_{\eta} \gamma \mu \alpha, 7$.

ที้ $\delta \epsilon เ \nu, 77,78,82$ note．
خंटєoć $\mu \eta \nu, 8$.
ท゙ठєбаи， 79.
$\eta \chi^{\circ} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \forall \eta \nu, \eta \eta^{\eta} \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha, 8$.
$\grave{\eta} \delta \dot{́} \sigma \theta \eta v, 108$.
$\eta$ ī， 87.
ग̄єє亢є，गुєiòє七ग，78， 79.
引ौєín， 77.
$\eta{ }_{\eta} \epsilon \iota \nu, 86$.
$\tilde{\eta} \in \nu, 85$.
ŋєєрє́Өovтаи， 10.
i゙ท $\eta, 85$.
グィ $\gamma \mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu, 82$ note．
ӭккто， 81 note， S 2 note．
グィои， 87.

グィสぃข，79， 87.
ทֹка， 7.
${ }_{\eta}{ }^{2} \times a, 121$.
$\dot{\hat{\eta}}^{*} \kappa \alpha, 115$.
${ }_{i} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu, 116$.
$\eta \geqslant \kappa \pi \sigma \alpha, \eta \eta^{\eta} \kappa \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 80$.

ท̈кахоv， 6 note， 12.
іккіккоєьข， 13.
ク̆коика，ท̉ноvб $\mu$ аі，मुкои́－ $\sigma \theta \eta \nu, 13$.
$\dot{\eta} \kappa р о \hat{\sigma} \sigma о, ~ \dot{\eta} \kappa \rho о \omega \hat{,}, 13$.
$\ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega, 121,132$.
$\dot{\eta} \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu, 93$.
${ }_{i}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \lambda \kappa o v, 15$.
ij $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu, 18$.
$\grave{\eta} \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 93$.
$引 \lambda \delta \alpha \jmath^{\prime} \epsilon, 14$.
$\eta{ }^{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \psi \alpha, \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon i \phi \theta \eta \nu, 14$.
$\dot{\eta} \lambda \in \xi \alpha \mu \eta \nu, 14$.
ウ̀лє́vato， 15.
ทㄱ́뷔v， 13.

クु入८бко́ $\mu \eta \nu, 16$.
引クл८тоу， 17.
ที $\lambda \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha, 94$.
$\dot{\eta} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\gamma} \eta \nu, \eta_{1} \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\theta} \eta \eta, 18$.
${ }_{i}{ }_{1} \lambda о \iota \phi$ ， 14 ．
$i \lambda \wedge o ́ \mu \eta \nu, 18$.
ï入ouv， 15.
$\ddot{\eta} \lambda \nu{ }_{\square}^{\tau} \alpha, 19$.
${ }^{\dagger} \lambda \phi о \nu, 20$.
ї $\lambda \omega \kappa$ а，16， 17.
引̀ $\lambda \dot{\omega} \mu \mu \nu, 13$.
ทi $\lambda \omega \nu, 16,17$.
${ }^{\eta} \mu \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha,{ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \beta \lambda \omega \sigma a, 20$.
ї $\mu$ роотоข， 20.
$\dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \iota, \eta \eta \mu \nu, 118$.
$\eta \not \mu \eta \nu, 84$ ．
$\jmath^{\prime} \mu i, 255$.
$\dot{\eta} \mu \pi \epsilon і ́ \chi є т о, \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \pi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \chi є \tau о$, 113.
$\eta \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi o v, \quad \eta \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi \chi^{\delta} \mu \eta \nu$, 113.
$\eta ँ \mu \pi \lambda а к о \nu, 21$.
$\dot{\eta} \mu \phi і \epsilon \sigma \alpha, \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\psi} \iota \sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu \nu$ ， $\dot{\eta} \mu ф і є \sigma \mu 兀 и, 22,96$.
$\ddot{\eta} \mu \omega v, 20$.
$\eta_{\eta \nu}$ for $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \varphi \eta \nu, 255 .\end{gathered}$

ท้а́入 $\omega \kappa \alpha$ ，ท้ขá $\lambda \omega \sigma a, 23$. ทัvapov， 95.
ザvסavor， 24.
ทีขє
ทีขє
$\eta \nu \in \in \emptyset \nu, 8$ ．

グขєєхо́ $\mu \eta \nu, 113$.
$\eta \eta^{\eta} \nu \in \kappa \alpha, \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu \in \sigma \alpha, 8$ ．
$\dot{\eta} \nu \in \sigma \chi$ ó $\mu \eta \nu, 113$.
そ̉ขย́ $\chi$ Өทข，252．

ว่ขทvа́ $\mu \eta \nu, 23$.

ทे $\operatorname{Vov}^{2} 106$.
ทขiสaтє， 95.
グvoıほの，グvoí $\eta$ ข， 183.

ท้ขтєоข， 25.
ท้ข $\omega \gamma 0 \nu$, ท゙ข $\omega \xi \alpha, 26,27$.
ग่ $\xi \alpha, 11$ ．
${ }_{\eta}^{\top} \xi{ }^{\top} a_{3} 121$.
${ }^{\top} \xi \alpha, \eta{ }^{\top} \xi \epsilon, 4,7$ ．
$\eta \dot{\eta} \xi \alpha \mu \eta \nu, \eta{ }_{\eta} \xi \alpha \prime, 7$ ．
ทั้ $\mu є \nu, 87$.
ทㄲ $\pi \alpha$ ov， 6 note， 28.
ク̋рароข， 6 note， 30.
ク̆ $\rho \alpha \sigma \mu \iota$ ，ग่ $\rho \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ ，ว้ $\rho \alpha-$
$\sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，ијри́ббато， 98.
ทัрато， 10.
ท่ $\rho \in ́ \theta \eta \nu, 9$.
ทрєі́бато， 99.
ク้рєоv， 89 note．
ท่ $\rho \in \sigma \alpha$ ，クै $є є \sigma \alpha, 100$ ．
ทौр $\in \sigma \alpha, \eta ้ \rho \in \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，ทั $\rho \in \sigma$ ． $\mu \alpha \iota, ~ ท ’ \rho є ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 31$.
йрєто， 102.

クрйрєєข， 30.
йри́рєєєто， 99.
ทีр $\eta \sigma \alpha, 9$.
$\eta \rho \theta \eta \nu, 30$.
ทีрккоу， 99.
ท̆рьтои，99， 100.
ท̀рі́ттанєข， 32.



ท̆คข уuv， 103.
｜$\theta \rho$ с́屯̧ $\omega, 245$.
Өи́ $\mu є v o s, 128$.
$\theta \dot{u} \psi \omega, 248$.

## I．

＂Ia ${ }^{2}, 86$.
iуرนаı， 132.
i̊є́ш，77， 78.

82 note．
ícov，77， 191.
i̊vīa， 78.
í $\varepsilon, 87$ ．
ǐєرає， 115.
í $\epsilon \mu a l, 87$.
＇iє $\epsilon \alpha$ t，í́ $\mu \eta \nu, 86$.
iєv， 87.
̌єбо（゙єбо）， 86.
iちょ， 80.
iӨúv $\omega, 132$.
ixáv 132.
iкто，їкиєvos，132．
$i \mu \epsilon \nu, \quad i \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota, 87$.
ióvт $\omega \nu, 86$.
ïттанає， 206.
i̋
íajot，7S，82 note．
ぞ $\sigma \theta \iota, 77,78$.
i $\sigma \iota, 87$.
＇i $\sigma \mu \in \nu, 78,82$ note．
ïттабке， 134.
iбтéov，78， 79.
їтоу， 78.
${ }^{\prime} \iota \sigma \chi \omega, 111$.
iт $\eta \nu, 87$.
iтŋтós， 86.
ітоу，＇ітшу， 86.
i＇wv， 86.

## K．

Käєčov̂ $\mu$ ！， 1 §0， 131.
$\kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon i ̄ \epsilon \nu, 115$.
$\kappa a \theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i, 9$.
$\kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \eta \dot{\sigma} \mu a \iota, 181$.
$\kappa \alpha ́ \theta \eta \mu \alpha, 118$.
$\kappa \alpha \lambda \iota \nu \delta \epsilon і \sigma \theta a \iota, 159$.
ката́ßa， 37.
ката $\beta$ аívєє， 38.
катаßро́ңаба！，41．

катаßро́そєєє，41， 46.
 катаүєís， 6. ката⿱㇒́á $\theta \in \epsilon \iota, 57$. катаӨрஸ́бкшу， 128. катакаเє́ $є \nu, ~ к а т а к є є є ́-~$ $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ，кагакךє́ $\mu \epsilon \nu, 140$. ката́кєєає， 142 note． $\star а г а ́ к є є \mu а, ~ 142$. катакทє́ $\mu є \nu, 140$.
 катак入ı $\omega$ ， 151. катакขஸ́баба，катакขஸ́б－ बovad， 152.
катакр $\eta \mu \nu \alpha ́ \mu \in \nu \alpha,, 155$. катактаขє́ovสเข， 158. каталоขєє， 168. кแта́そаขтєs， 7. кататла $\begin{array}{r}\eta \\ \nu\end{array} \iota, 215 .{ }^{\text {．}}$ кататлйтт $\quad 215$. кататтакш́v， 219. кататтท＇т $\eta \nu$ ， 220. ката́ббш， 6.
катабторєбӨŋ̀val， 231. катабхо́ $є \varepsilon \nu о s, 112$. катат $\omega^{\prime} \xi \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, 248$. катафӨıขท＇баs， 257. катаХє́баутı， 264. катах $¢$ q．， 269. катахю $\sigma \theta \dot{\alpha}$ ，катахрך－ $\sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota, 268$.
катєауєія，катєаүท̂， 6. катєа́乡аутєs， 6. $\kappa а т є a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, 6$. катє́aтая， 118. кат $ย ß \rho \omega \xi а, 41$ note． катєүทра， 52. $\kappa \alpha т є \delta \dot{\rho} \rho \theta \eta, 57$. катє $\delta \eta \eta_{i}^{\prime} \eta \sigma \sigma, 67$. катєі́入є $\gamma \mu \alpha$, ， 165. катєі́руєи， 92. катєкаข́Ө $\eta$ ， 139. кате́кта， 158. катย́vабөє， 178. катєขท́vo日є， 95. $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \pi \eta \dot{\gamma} \eta \nu, 216$. катєттакш́s， 219. катєра̂бає， 98. катєрйрєєтто， 100.

катє́ $\sigma \chi \epsilon \tau о, 112$. катєфӨıンךко́тєs， 257. катє́ $\downarrow$ пктац， 271. ка́т $\eta \mu$ ィя， 118.
катŋขд́入 $\omega \sigma a, 24$. $\kappa а т \bar{\eta} \xi a, \bar{b}$.
кат $\theta a v \in i v, 127$.
«av́́そacs， 5.
каข่ $\sigma, 139$.
кє́àтєร， 140.
кéatą， 143 note．

кє́єтаו，кє́єбӨal， 143.
кєíal，кєєવ́ $\mu \in \nu o s, 140$.
кеі́àтєs， 140 note．
$\kappa \varepsilon \epsilon \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，кєí $\omega \nu, 148$. кєíwvтa， 142 note．
кєкабךбо́ $є$ Єa，146， 162. кє́ка $\boldsymbol{\delta} \mu \boldsymbol{\iota}, 138$. ке́каฮ̇ov， 262. кєкќд $\mu, 141$. ке́кар $\mu$ а， 143. ヶе́каб $\mu$ я， 138. кєкаф $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ s，37， 142. кєкє́ $а \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \alpha, 144$. $\kappa є \kappa є ́ \rho \delta а к а, ~ к є \kappa є є ́ \rho \delta \eta \kappa а, ~ к є-$ кє́рঠаука， 145. ＾є́кท亡̇a， 5 note， 146. кє́кпфє， 142. кє́к $\lambda$ а $\gamma \gamma а, 149$. ке́к $\lambda$ а $\mu \mu \alpha \iota, 151,244$ note． кє́к $\lambda а \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 150$. кєкле́aтаи， 151. кє́клєє $\mu \alpha$ ，кє́клєєб $\mu \alpha \iota$ ， 150.

кє́к $\lambda є \mu \mu \alpha \iota, 151,244$ note． кє́к $\lambda \eta \gamma а, 149$. $\kappa є \kappa \lambda \eta$ ท̈̈цає， 151. кє́к $\lambda \boldsymbol{\kappa \kappa \alpha , 1 4 1 .}$ ге́є $\lambda \eta \mu \alpha \iota, 150$. кє́кл»цає， 115. кєєло́ $\mu є \nu о s, 144$. кє́клофа， 151. кє́к $\lambda \nu$ ө， 152. кє́кцךка， 141. $\kappa є \kappa \mu \eta \omega$＇s，37， 141. кєкорђш＇s， 154. ке́кофи， 153. кєкра́аขтає， 154.

кє́краүа， 154.
ќќкрака，202， 211.
кєкра́ $\xi_{о \mu \alpha,} 154$.
ヶе́крах ${ }^{\theta}, 200$.
кє́крŋка， 211.
ке́кргіная， 145.
ке́крька，ке́кргция， 156.
кєки́ $\theta \omega, 146$.
кévóą， 144.
кє́oута！， 143.
кє́ $\rho,{ }^{2} 4$.
кє́раıе，ке́раєрє， 145.
$\kappa \varepsilon \rho a ́ \sigma \omega, 144$.
кє́ $\rho \sigma \omega, 14$ ．
$\kappa є \rho \overline{,}, 144$.

кє́шкєто， 143.
кє́ $\chi a \nu \delta a, 263$.
кєұа́рทка，кєхવ́р $\mu \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ ， 263.
$\kappa є \chi а \rho \eta \sigma \varepsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu, \kappa є \chi a \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma$－ тає， 263.
кєХарך ${ }^{\prime}$ s，37， 262.
$\kappa є \chi a \rho \mu$ ย́vоs，кєХаро́ $\mu \eta \nu$ ， 263.
＊є́ $\chi \in \sigma \mu \alpha, 264$.
кє́ $\chi \eta$ ขа， 264.
кé $\chi \lambda a \delta a, 266$.
ке́ $\begin{gathered}\text { оба，} 264 .\end{gathered}$
кє́ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu a \iota, ~ к є ́ \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, 267.
«є́ $\chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu a \iota, 271$.
кє́Хขка，кє́Хข $\mu a \iota, 265$.
$\kappa є \chi \omega \sigma \mu a \iota, 266$.
кท̃a८，кท̄ov， 140.
кฑิтає， 143.
кıү $\chi^{\text {aveì }, ~} 147$.
кíd $\downarrow \eta \mu, 226$.
кі́р $\eta \eta \mu, 144$.
$\kappa \iota \chi \epsilon i \eta \nu, \kappa є \chi \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota, 147$.
кіхрәиц，\％68．
$\kappa^{\prime}(\chi), 147$.
$\kappa \lambda \alpha \xi \bar{\omega}, 151$.
$\kappa \lambda a v ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \ell, 149$.

$\kappa \lambda \eta \Uparrow \zeta \omega, 150$.
$\kappa \lambda \eta t \omega, 150$.
$\kappa \lambda \eta_{i}^{\prime} \omega, 150$.
$\kappa \lambda \iota \omega \overline{,} 151$.

ко入 $\hat{\omega}, \kappa о \lambda \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota, 152$. краıаív $\omega, 154$.
коаує́єб0ає， 154.
крє $\mu$ о́ш，крє $\mu$ ஸ̂， 155.
крทŋิขає， 154.
коך $\theta$ єís， 145.
ко $\boldsymbol{\prime} \mu \nu \eta \mu \iota, 155$.
кคๆ̄レоข， 154.
кри́ттабкоу，223．
ктаі́ $\eta \nu$ кта́ $\mu \epsilon \nu, 158$.
ктávaı， 53 note， 158.
ктаขє́оขта，ктаขӨŋ̄ขає， кт $\tilde{\sigma} \theta$ Өи， 158.
$\kappa т є ́ \omega, \kappa \tau \in ́ \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, 158$.
ктívขvノє， 159.
«ข่ $\theta є, 146$.
$\Lambda$.
\aөєєิv， 163.
$\lambda а к \eta ́ \sigma \omega, 164$.

$\lambda_{\text {র́ }} \boldsymbol{\jmath}_{о \mu \alpha \iota, ~ 162 .}$
$\lambda a \sigma \epsilon \bar{\mu} \mu \alpha, 163$.
入абөŋँ $\mu \epsilon \nu, 163$.
$\lambda$ лıб $\bar{\omega}, 163$.
入ачой $\mu \propto \iota, ~ \lambda a \psi є \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota$, 162.
$\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon, 3$.

入é入aӨov， 6 note， 163.
入є́入акк，$\lambda є \lambda$ а́коขто， 164.
$\lambda$ е́ $а \mu \mu$ ає，$\lambda є \lambda и ́ \phi \theta а \iota, ~$ 162.
$\lambda$ е́ $\lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha, 168$.
$\lambda$ є́ $\alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 163$.
$\lambda \epsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \chi \omega \sigma \iota, 162$.
入е́入є $\gamma$ нає， 164.
$\lambda є \lambda є \iota \chi$ ио́тєs， 166.
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \theta a, 163$.
入є́入ŋка， 164.
$\lambda$ є́ $\lambda \eta \mu \mu a \iota, 1$ טiz．
入є́ $\lambda \eta \tau \mu \alpha \iota, 163$.
$\lambda є \lambda і п \mu а є, ~ 166$.
入є́入о $\chi^{\prime \prime}$ ，162．
入є́ $\lambda о \iota \pi$ ， 165.
入єли́боцає，169， 208.
入є́ $\lambda$ vто， 169.


$\lambda \eta \theta$ áv $\boldsymbol{\omega}, 164$.
$\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega, \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \theta_{o \mu} \mu \iota, 163$.
$\lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \xi о \mu \iota, 162$.
$\lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \omega, \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu a \iota, 163$.
入оє́ $т \sigma о \mu a \ell, ~ \lambda$ е́є，入óov， 167.
$\lambda u ́ \mu \eta \nu, \lambda$ v́то，$\lambda \tilde{v} \theta \iota, 169$.

## M．

Maөńбо $\mu$ ає， 170. $\mu \alpha \kappa$ м́v， 175.
$\mu \alpha \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \alpha, 169$.
$\mu а \pi є ́ \epsilon \iota \nu, 170$.
на́бонає，172．
$\mu є \theta є і$ иає，115， 175.
$\mu є \theta$ і́єто，116， 175.
$\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota, 174$.
$\mu є ́ \mu \alpha a, 171,175$.
$\mu$ е́ $\alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \iota, 170$.
$\mu є \mu а к \nu i ̂ \alpha, ~ 38 . ~$
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu a \lambda \epsilon, 174$.
$\mu є ́ \mu а \mu є \nu, 171$.
$\mu \epsilon \mu \alpha ́ \imath ' \eta \mu \alpha \iota, 169$.
$\mu є ́ \mu \alpha \rho \pi о \nu, 170$.
$\mu є ́ \mu a \chi a, 170$.
нєرан́s， 171.
$\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \lambda є \tau \alpha \iota, 174$.
$\mu є ́ \mu \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha, 39$ note，44．
$\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \kappa є, 174$.
$\mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \kappa \alpha, 175$.
$\mu є \mu є т \iota \epsilon є ข о$ ， $116,175$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta к а, 175$.
$\mu \varepsilon ́ \mu \eta \lambda \epsilon, 174$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta \nu a, 5$ note， 169.
$\mu є \mu i \alpha \sigma \mu a t$ ，1』 note．
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \nu \eta \mu а \iota, 176$.
$\mu є \mu o ́ \lambda \nu \sigma \mu a \iota, 12$ note．
$\mu$ ќ коขа， 175.
$\mu є \mu \dot{\rho} \eta т а є, 173$.
$\mu є \mu о \rho \mu$ є́ros， 173.
$\mu є \mu \nu$ Цо́тє， 166.
$\mu є ́ \mu v к а, 178$.
$\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \alpha i ́ v \omega$ ，$\mu є \nu \epsilon ́ \eta \nu \alpha, 175$. $\mu є т а \theta \rho є ́ \xi о \mu \alpha \iota, 246$.
$\mu є т а \mu є ิ \lambda є \iota, 173$.
$\mu є \tau \alpha \sigma \pi \omega ้ \nu, 97$.
$\mu є \tau є i \omega, 84$.
нєтєкia月оу； 149.
$\mu \epsilon \tau \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, 175$.
$\mu є$ ієє，$\mu \in$ тієто，116， 175.

$\mu \nu a ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota, 177$.
$\mu \nu є ́ є т \alpha \iota, \mu \nu \in \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s, 177$.
$\mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma, 176$.
$\mu \nu \omega$ оуто， 177.
$\mu о \lambda о \bar{\nu} \mu \alpha, 39$ note， 44.
$\mu \omega \bar{\omega} \alpha \iota, 172$.

## N．

Ná $\sigma \sigma о \mu \iota, 178$.
veîaı，vєitrai， 181.
$\nu \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon, 181$.
ขย́vактає， 179.
$\nu$ ข́vaбرаı， 178.
ขє́v $\eta \mu \alpha \iota$ ，vє́v $\eta \sigma \mu \alpha$ ， 179 ， 180.

ขév七ннає， 181.
ขє́voфа， 179 note．
vє́vшرия， 182.
$\nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha, 181$.
vєv́бoبає， 181.
ขท́єov， 180.
$\nu \eta^{\prime} \theta \omega, \nu \dot{\prime} \sigma \omega, 180$.
$\nu \eta^{\prime} \chi \omega, \nu \eta \dot{\chi} \chi \mu \boldsymbol{\iota}, 181$.
ขíббоขто， 182.
$\nu \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о s, \nu \omega ิ \nu \tau \alpha, \nu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$, 180.

## 妞。

忥ขүкатак入ıvєis， 151.
そv $v \chi$ モ́ $\omega, 265$.
$\xi v \lambda \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon \in \nu o s, 165$ note．
$\xi v \mu \beta \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota, 39$.
$\xi \nu \mu \beta \lambda \eta \dot{\tau} \eta \nu, 39$.
そи $\mu \mu є ⿺ 𠃊 т а, 176$.
そúvtє，そ̌vเov， 116.

## O．

＂O $\omega \omega \delta$ ， 183.

oेढ́́ $\sigma \omega, 183$.
oîid，78，82 note．
oińбuन年at， 185.
oika， 77 note， 81,82 note．
oifuı， 184.
viбӨทंбо $\alpha$ ，25！．
oíб 251.
о＂$\chi$ जк人， 11 ．

ふ̉ไย́кєбкєข， 188.
ö̀ $\lambda \omega \lambda c, 5$ note， 187. ó $\mu$ о̂̀ $\nu \tau \epsilon$ s， 188. эз $\boldsymbol{\omega} \mu о к а, 188$. ถ้ข $\nu \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，${ }^{\circ} \nu \nu \sigma \theta \epsilon, 190$. ö $\nu \tau \omega \nu$ ，imperat．， 85. о́т $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \sigma \boldsymbol{\omega}, 190$.
ö $\pi \omega \pi \alpha, 192$.
оты́тєє，77， 192.
о́рєїтає，193， 194.
о́ре́одто， 194.
öр $\quad$ тає， 18 note， 193. ö $\rho \theta$ al，ò $\rho \mu$ é $\nu$ os， 193. ӧроутає， 194.
ӧрбабкє， 193.
оррбєо，7， 193.
ӧрбєv， 193.
орршра， 6 note， 193.

о́рє́рє $\mu$ ая， 194.
оро́риурає， 195.
ӧ́фрагто，9， 195.
ovi，imperat．， 116.
оข่ไó $\mu \in \nu$ оs， 188.
oṽข $ข \sigma \theta \epsilon, 190$.
ó $\phi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma, \dot{o} \phi \lambda \epsilon i \nu, 197$. ôxa， 112.
óххкк，112， 186 note． ő $\psi о \mu \alpha$ ८， 191.

## II．

Па̂лто， 198.
тараßє́ßадає， 37. тарака入ойขтаs， 141 note．
$\pi \alpha \rho a ́ \sigma \tau \alpha, 134$.
$\pi a ́ \rho a \sigma \chi \epsilon, 112$. тара́ $\chi \bar{\chi}, 111$.
тарафөөiŋँб८， 255. $\pi \alpha \rho a \chi$ є́ $\omega \nu, 265$. $\pi а р ঠ \dot{\eta \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, ~} 205$. $\pi а р є к а Ө є ́ \zeta є т о, ~ 130 . ~$ $\pi \alpha \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \omega \nu, 215$. $\pi \alpha \rho \eta ่ \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon, 2,3$. $\pi \alpha \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \nu, 116$ note．

$\pi а \rho \omega ́ \chi \eta \mu \alpha \iota, 186$.
$\pi a ́ \sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota, 199$.
$\pi \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, 215$.
$\pi \epsilon i ̂, \pi \epsilon i \nu, 210$.
$\pi є і ́ \sigma о \mu а \iota, 199$.
$\pi \epsilon \lambda c ́ \theta \omega, 203$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \xi \omega, 201$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi a \theta v i ̂ a, 199$.
$\pi$ є́тацца兀， 198 note．
$\pi є \pi \alpha \rho є i ้, 217$.
$\pi$ є́табна兀， 199.
$\pi$ т́тєєка， 200.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon і р а \nu \tau а \iota, 202,205$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon i \rho a \tau a \ell, 205$ note．
$\pi є ́ \pi \varepsilon \iota \sigma \theta \iota, \pi$ ย́ $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \mu \iota, 200$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \mu \mu \alpha \iota, 205$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu \mu$ е́vos， 204.
$\pi \epsilon \pi є ́ \rho a \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 205$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \in ́ v o s, 204,211$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \phi \theta a l, 205$.
$\pi \epsilon \in \pi \eta \gamma a, 5$ note， 208.
$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \theta a, 199$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi i \epsilon \gamma \mu a \iota, \quad \pi \epsilon \pi i ́ \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, $\pi \epsilon \pi i \epsilon \chi^{\theta \alpha \iota} 208$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \iota \theta o \nu, 200,251$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \alpha, 214$.
$\pi$ є́ $\pi \lambda \epsilon v \mathrm{~s} a, \pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \mu a \iota$ ， 214.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha, \quad \pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$, 215.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \gamma o v, 6$ note， 216.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s$ ， 202.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 209$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \omega k \alpha, 214$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \tau v \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \in ́ \pi \tau v \sigma o, 216$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi o \iota \theta a, 5$ note，200， 201.
$\pi$ є́тоцає， 210.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi о \mu ф а, 151,204$.
$\pi$ є́ $\pi о \nu \theta a, 199$.
$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi о р \delta а, 205$.
$\pi є \pi о р є i ̂ \nu, 217$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi о \rho \theta a, 205$.
$\pi$ є́тогӨє， 76 note． 199.
$\pi \epsilon \pi о ́ т \alpha \mu \alpha, \pi \epsilon \pi о ́ т \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, 207.
$\pi \dot{\pi} \pi \rho a \gamma a, 218$.
тє́трака，202， 211.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \rho \alpha \mu a \iota, \quad \pi \epsilon \pi \rho \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta \iota \iota$,
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \rho a \chi a, 218$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \eta \mu \epsilon ́ v o s, 210$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \rho \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 219$.
$\pi є ́ \pi \rho \omega \mu$ ц， 217.
$\pi$ т́ттацац，205， 207
note．
$\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \omega ' s, 212$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha, 20 \tau$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \omega$＇s，37， 207 note， 220.
$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \omega, 205$.
$\pi є ́ \pi \tau \omega \kappa \alpha, 6$ note， 207
note， 212.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega \dot{s}, 212$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \dot{\theta}$ Ooıто，$\pi є ́ \pi v \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ ， 220.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \omega \kappa \alpha, 210$.
$\pi \epsilon \rho a ́ \omega, \pi \epsilon \rho a ́ \pi \omega, \pi \epsilon \rho \underset{\imath}{2} \nu$, $\pi \epsilon \rho a ́ q \nu, 211$.
$\pi \epsilon p ı \delta \delta \varepsilon i ́ \sigma \alpha s, 59$.
$\pi \epsilon р \iota є і \pi \epsilon \nu, 97$.
$\pi є \rho \iota \epsilon \lambda \omega, 9$.
$\pi є \rho เ є ́ \rho そ а \nu \tau \epsilon s, 91$ note．
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota є ́ \sigma \pi \epsilon, 97$.
$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \phi \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota, \quad \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon \phi \theta \dot{\eta}_{-}$ $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \in ́ \psi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, 97.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \imath \eta \gamma \varepsilon \in \omega, 121$.
$\pi є \rho ı \eta \dot{\rho} \chi є \tau о, 107$.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \theta \rho \dot{́} \xi \alpha \iota, 246$.
$\pi є \rho \iota \nu є ́ \epsilon \iota \nu, 179$.
$\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi \epsilon \phi \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \mu$ évóvs， 258.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \lambda$ о́ $\mu є \nu о$ ， 203.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \pi \epsilon i ้, 97$.
$\pi є \rho \iota ф \lambda v ́ є \iota, 257$.
$\pi$ ќр $\eta \mu$ ， 211.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \omega, 211$.
$\pi \epsilon \in \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon, \pi \epsilon \sigma o \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha \iota, 212$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ т \alpha \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \sigma \theta a \ell, 206$, 207.
$\pi \epsilon \mathrm{râ} \sigma a, 207$ note．
$\pi \epsilon \tau \omega \hat{,} 205$.
$\pi \epsilon \dot{v} \theta о \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon v ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, 220$.
$\pi$ т́фајка， 249.
тє́фанає， 208.
$\pi$ є́фаб $\mu \alpha, 12,249$.
$\pi \epsilon \phi а \sigma \mu$ и́vos，208，249， 254.
$\pi \epsilon \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \theta \omega, 254$.
$\pi \epsilon \phi \eta \nu a, 5$ note， 249.
$\pi \epsilon ф \dot{\jmath} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, 208,250$.
$\pi є ф \in \delta \dot{\eta} \tau о \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon ф \iota \delta о i ́ \rho \eta \nu$ ，
тефıঠéन $\theta a t, 251$.
$\pi$ п́фор $\beta a, 251$.
$\pi$ є́фра $\gamma \mu \alpha, 258$.
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi р а \delta \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \varepsilon ́ ф \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, 258.
$\pi$ е́фрабоv， 258.
тє́фрека，тєфрі́когтаs， 259.
$\pi \epsilon ф$ v́a $\frac{262 .}{}$.
лєфиらо́тєs， 166.
$\pi є ф \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}, 261$.
$\pi \epsilon ф v \omega \dot{s}, 262$.
тグ入абӨa८， 198.
$\pi \eta \eta^{\prime} \xi \omega, 208$.
$\pi \dot{\eta} \sigma a s, 199$.
$\pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega, 208$.
$\pi \iota \epsilon i \sigma \theta \epsilon, 210$.
$\pi \iota \epsilon ́ \zeta \epsilon v \nu, \quad \pi \iota \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu \cup s$,
11， 74 note．
$\pi є ६ \zeta о \hat{\nu \tau о s, ~} 208$.
$\pi \iota € \chi \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota, 208$.
$\pi i \theta \iota, 210$.
$\pi i \theta \eta \sigma \omega, 200,201$.
$\pi і \lambda \nu \eta \mu, 203$.
$\pi i v, \pi i v, 210$.
$\pi \iota \nu \epsilon \dot{u} \mu \epsilon \mathrm{vos}, 11$.
$\pi i o \mu a \iota, \pi \iota o \hat{\mu} \mu \iota, 210$.
$\pi \iota \pi \rho a ́ \sigma \kappa \omega, 204$.
$\pi i \sigma \omega, 211$.
$\pi i ́ \tau \nu a, \pi i \tau \nu a \nu, \pi i \tau \nu \alpha ́ s$, 206.
$\pi \iota \tau \nu \alpha ́ \omega, \pi i \tau \nu \omega, \pi i \tau \nu \eta \mu t$, 206.
$\pi \iota \tau \nu \epsilon ่ \omega$ for $\pi i ́ \pi \tau \omega, 213$.
$\pi$ тфаи́бк $\omega$ ， 251.
тєфрávą， 259.
$\pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \xi \omega, 203,214$.
$\pi \lambda \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega, \pi \lambda \alpha^{\theta} \theta \hat{\omega}, 203$.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu, 209$.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon i ̀ v$, тó， 66.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma o \mu a \iota, \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma o \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha \iota$,
214.
$\pi \lambda \eta_{\eta} \gamma \nu v \mu$ ， 216.
$\pi \lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma 0,209$.
$\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, 208$.
$\pi \lambda \bar{\eta} т о, 202$.
$\pi \lambda \omega^{\prime} s, \pi \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \tau 0 s, 215$. $\pi \lambda \omega^{\prime} \omega, 214$.
$\pi 0 \lambda v \pi \alpha ́ \mu \mu \omega \nu, 198$ note．
тота́оцає，тотє́огтає， 207.

тотéos， 210.
тоті景є， 125.
тотós， 210.
$\pi \rho a \theta \epsilon i v, 205$.
$\pi \rho a \theta \dot{\eta} \tau о \mu \alpha \iota, 211$.
$\pi р i a \sigma \theta a \iota, 218$.
$\pi \rho i ́ \omega, \pi \rho i ́ \omega \mu \alpha \iota, 219$.
$\pi \rho \dot{\beta} \beta \alpha, \pi \rho \circ \beta \omega े \nu \tau \epsilon s, 37$.
три́є $\theta \epsilon \epsilon, \pi \rho о є ́ \sigma \theta a \iota, 116$.
троєтте́aтє，троє́бтатє， 187.
$\pi \rho о$ éw $\sigma \alpha, 219$.
$\pi \rho o ́ \eta \tau \alpha \iota, 116$.
$\pi \rho о$ и́кабөє， 116.
$\pi \rho o u ̈ \phi a v e s, 250$.
$\pi \rho o \bar{\chi} \chi, 7$.
$\pi \rho о$ Ө́́ovби， 125. троî́t， 116 note． $\pi \rho o i ̂ \epsilon \iota v, 116$.
$\pi \rho o i ̂ \sigma \sigma o \mu a \iota, 142$. $\pi \rho о о$ ïбтає， 253. $\pi \rho o o v, 116$.
тротарท̆бєтац， 30. $\pi \rho о \sigma \delta$ ย́єтаи， 65. тробєєкє́vat， 81. тробєivat， 87.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \nu, 84$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \frac{\cup}{\rho}$ оиу， 196 note．
$\pi \rho о \sigma є ́ \pi є \sigma \alpha, 212$.
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda a \zeta \epsilon, 203$.

$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tilde{\xi} \xi \alpha, 7$.
$\pi \rho 0 \sigma \theta i \xi \varepsilon \iota s, 125$ note．
$\pi \rho о \sigma к а \theta_{\iota} \zeta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota, 131$ note．
$\pi \rho о \sigma к є к є \rho \delta \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha \sigma \iota, 145$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v \nu$ ย́ $\omega, 160$.
$\pi \rho о \sigma о ф \lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota, 197$.
$\pi \rho п \sigma \sigma \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta о \nu, 203$.
$\pi \rho \circ v \sigma \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i v, 84$.
троขбкє́ттєто，227， 228 note．
$\pi \rho о ф v \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \rho о ф v ́ \lambda a \chi-$ $\theta \epsilon, 260$.
$\pi \rho \circ \omega \theta \in ́ \omega, 219$.
$\pi \rho o ́ \omega \mu \alpha \iota, 116$.
$\pi \rho о \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha, \pi \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha!, \pi \rho \omega ́=$ oas， 219.
$\pi \tau$ т́の日ル，97， 206.
$\pi \tau \eta \dot{\sigma о \mu u \iota, ~ \pi \tau о ́ \mu є \nu o s, ~}$ 206.
$\pi \omega \lambda є ́ о \mu u \ell, 204$.

## P．


рєov́pevos， 222.
рєрїфөи， 223.
¢́є́vooual， 222.

ค́⿱亠䒑$\sigma \sigma \omega, 222$.
¢ $\ddagger$ тós， 88.
роіً абкє， 223.
$\dot{\nu} \eta^{\prime} \sigma \rho \mu$ ， 222.
ค์v $\alpha \alpha \mu \eta \nu, 104$.

## $\Sigma$.

इaô̂，ซáov，$\sigma \alpha 0$ v̄สt， 233. баó $\omega$, ба $\omega \dot{\sigma} \omega, 232,233$.
oupón， 224.
бá $\omega, 233$.

$\sigma \beta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega, \sigma \beta \dot{\sigma} \sigma о \mu \alpha, 224$.
бєбарvîa， 224.
бє́ $\sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \mu \alpha, 225$.
бє́бทтa， 5 note， 226.
бє́бŋрра， 224.
$\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \iota \mu \mu \iota, 12$ note， 226.
$\sigma \epsilon \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \iota, \sigma \epsilon \in \sigma \omega \sigma \mu a \iota, 232$.
бєчิтat， 226 note．
бípas， 224.
бкád $\lambda \omega, 227$.

бкліґборає，$\sigma к \lambda а i ́ \eta \nu$ ， $\sigma \kappa \lambda \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota, 227$.
бón，бöทุs， 233.
$\sigma o \bar{v}, \quad \sigma o \bar{v} \mu a \ell, \quad \sigma o v ̄ \sigma \theta a \iota$, $\sigma o \hat{v} \sigma \theta \epsilon, \sigma o v i \sigma \theta \omega$, $\sigma$ où－ бо， 226.
бó $\omega \sigma \iota, 233$.
$\sigma \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu, \sigma \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} 0, \sigma \pi \hat{\sigma}, \sigma \pi \hat{\varepsilon}-$ $\sigma \theta u \iota, \sigma \pi o \hat{v}, \sigma \pi \dot{\omega} \nu, 97$.
бтаӨі́јонає， 134.
бтаíŋv，бтаі̄цєv，73， 134.
бта́бко»， 134.

атєio $\mu \in \nu, 236$.
бтєíw，7：3， 135.
бтєиิтสt， 230.
бтє́ $\omega, 73,134$.
बтท̆́ns，73， 135.
ати́кєтє，атйкоутєร， 135 note．
$\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，$\sigma \tau i ́ \mu \epsilon \epsilon \alpha, 134$.
бти́ן $\omega$ ，$\sigma$ ти́то $\mu \alpha, 134$.
бтрผ่ $\nu \nu \nu \mu, 231$.

 143.
$\sigma v \mu \beta a \lambda \lambda \epsilon$ ó $\mu \in \nu o s, \quad i 4$ note．
бvц弓eßávat， 38.
бข́ $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\prime}$
бขццахє́єтає， 171.
бvvaî $\gamma \delta \eta \nu$ ，$\sigma v \nu a \hat{k} k t \eta \nu$ ， 11.

бuvavaфupévites， 261.

бvvєi入o $\chi$ ， 164.
बvขє入ך入а́ $\epsilon \in \nu 0 \iota, 93$.
боререікєта！， 252.

बvvท̄屯as， 114.
สvข $\eta$ Хīs， 7.
 179.

бขvохшко́тє， 112.
бvбхо́ $\mu \varepsilon$ vos， 112.
$\sigma \chi$ є́， 112.
 112.
$\sigma \chi \epsilon i ̄ v, 97,111$.

$\sigma \omega \pi \bar{q} \nu, 43$ ．
$\sigma \omega \bar{\omega} \ell, 224$.
ซต่ 232.

## T．

T $\alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, 243$.
гарлш́ $\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha, \quad \tau \alpha \rho \pi \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ ， 236.
$\tau \alpha \dot{\rho} \phi \theta \eta$ ，та́p $\phi \theta \epsilon \nu, 236$. тє́Өu入a， 122.
$\tau \in \theta \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta \omega, 123$.
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \dot{\kappa} \boldsymbol{a}, 76$.

тé $\theta \eta \lambda \alpha, 123$.
тє́Ө $\eta \pi \alpha, 123$.
тє $\theta \lambda a \gamma \mu$ ย́vos， 125.
тє $\Theta \lambda \iota \mu \mu$ с́v $\eta, 126$.
тє́ $\theta \nu \alpha \mu \in ⿺ 廴, 126$.

126， 127.
тéधopa， 128.
тє́ $\theta \rho a \mu \mu \alpha, 245$.
т $\epsilon$ Өраф $\theta$ ， 245 note．
тє́ $\theta \nu \mu \mu a \ell, 248$.
тє́кєто， 241.
$\tau \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega, 243$ note．
т́́ $\xi \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota, \tau \in ́ \xi \in \sigma \theta a t, 241$.

тє́таүرа兀， 234.
тєтаүஸ́v， 233.
тє́така，233， 234.
тє́та入 $\mu \alpha$ ， 235.
те́тана！，208， 234.
тєта́vvбциє， 234.
тєтарто́л $\nu, 236$.
тє́тафа， 122.
тє́єє $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu \alpha$ ， 241.
тєтє่ $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \mu$ ц८， 235.
тє́тєvү $\mu \alpha$ t， 239.
тєтєччонає，238， 239.
тє́тєข $\chi^{\alpha}, 238$.
тєтєúxatal，teтєúұato， 299.

тєтєи́Хатоу，тєтєúXetov， 239 note．
$\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon v \chi \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota, 237$.
тє́тทка， 5 note， 240.
 240.

тєтín．$\sigma$ Ov， 240.
тєтıทш＇s，37， 240.

тє́тлךка， 243.
$\tau \epsilon \tau \lambda \eta \omega$＇s，37， 243.
тє́тцทุ， 237.
тє́т $\mu \eta \kappa \alpha, \tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \mu \eta \mu \alpha \iota, 235$.
тє́ $\tau \mu \eta$ ， 237.
тєт $\boldsymbol{\text { íлогыая }} 235$.
тєт $\mu \boldsymbol{\omega}{ }^{\prime}$ ，37， 235 note．
тє́т $\mu$ о， 237.
тє́тоүнає， 241.
тє́тока， 240.

тєторйш $\omega$ ，те́торог， 243. тє́траццац，тє́тратто， 244.
 тра́фато， 244.
тє́трафөat， 245 note．
$\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \theta \omega, 244$.
тєтрахице́vos， 12 note．
тє́трŋка，тє́тр $\eta \mu \alpha \iota, 241$.
тєтрíg $\omega, 241$ note．

тє́трıяа，тєтрıүш̄таs， 247.

тє́трь $\mu \mu \alpha, 247$.
тє́трофа，151，24．3， 245.
тєт $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{\chi} \boldsymbol{\sim} \mu$ е́vos，24т．
тєтршцє́vos， 241.
тє́тv $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ ， 238.
тєтvкєî̀，тєтикє́бӨんt， 239.

тєтú $\eta$ ๆка，238， 239.
тє́тv ${ }^{\text {®at，} 238 . ~}$
$\tau \epsilon v \chi \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu, \tau o ́, 239$.
$\tau \bar{\eta}, \tau \eta \uparrow \tau \epsilon, 233$.
тıтаivin， 240 note．
тเти́бк $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ，тєті́бко $\mu \alpha, 240$.
т $\lambda$ ás， 242.
$\tau \mu \dot{\eta} \gamma \omega, \stackrel{236 .}{ }$
торє́v， 243.
тратєío $\mu \epsilon \nu, 236$.
тралє́ $\omega, 244$.
$\tau \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon ́ \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, 236$.
тра́тн， 244.
$\tau \rho a \pi \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon, 236$.
т $\rho a \phi \theta$ єis， 244.
тра́х $\omega, 246$.
трєі́ $\omega, 247$.
т $\bar{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \epsilon, \tau \rho \in ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu, 247$.
трє́बw， 247.

$\tau \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \omega, 241$.
$\tau \rho \omega \sigma \omega, 241$.
т $\rho \omega{ }^{\omega} \omega, 242$.

## r．

＇Y $\pi \pi \lambda \in \dot{\prime} \in 0,15$.
i $\pi \epsilon \mu \nu \eta^{\prime} \mu \nu \pi \pi, 122$.
ітє $\rho \beta$ ЗалАє́єє $\nu, 74$ note．
ілє́рßルбル）， 3 ．
 ітєє Өор $^{\prime} \nu, 128$.
$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \sigma \chi \circ \not \mu \eta, 114$. іั $\pi \iota \sigma \chi^{\nu \in ́} о \mu \alpha \iota, 114$. іто́єєкоу， 80. $\dot{i} \pi о є i \xi о \mu \epsilon \nu, 80$. ілокрігоная， 156. ข̇то ó $^{2}$ єขтоs， 188.
 i $\pi о \sigma \chi$ Є $Ө \eta \tau \iota, 114$. iтобх ${ }^{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, 113$. iтофஸ்бкєь， 251 note．

## $\Phi$.


фáє，фаєîv，фаєívш， 250.
$\phi a^{\prime} \ell$ ，фаínv， 254.
$\phi а i ̄ \epsilon \varepsilon, 255$.
фа́ $\mu \in \nu 0$ ， 254.
$\phi a^{\nu}, 255$.
фávaı，254， 255.
фа́ovбац， 250.
фás，фáбӨal，фá $\sigma \kappa \omega, 254$. фє́рєбкє，фє́рךбц，фє́ртє， 253.
$\phi \eta \mathfrak{\eta}, 255$.
$\phi \eta \mu i, 89,254$.
$\phi \bar{\eta} \nu, 255$.
$\phi \theta$ ás，$\phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon v 0 s, \phi \theta \dot{a}^{\prime} \xi \omega$ ， 255.

фөарйбонац， 256.
$\phi \theta$ їто， 256 note．
$\phi \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \sigma \omega, \phi \theta \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}, 256$.
$\phi \theta \dot{\prime} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha, \phi \theta \hat{\omega}, 255$.
$\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota$（false read－ ing）， 251.
форе́є， 253.
$\phi \rho$ cí $\eta$（false reading）， 258.

X．
Xaì ${ }^{1} \omega, \chi^{\alpha v o v ̂ \mu c t, ~} 264$.

$\chi^{є}$ Өйทаı， 266.
хєі́оонає， 263.

$\chi \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$ ，fut．， 265.
$\chi \in \dot{\chi} \omega$ aor．1．conjunct． 265.

хі́ңрато， 263.
хра̂тац，хра̂бөa！， 268.
хрє́єтац， 268.
$\chi \rho \epsilon i \omega \nu, 267$.
хрє́є， 268.
хрทїбкодац， 269.
$\chi \rho \omega ́ \zeta \omega, 271$.

$\chi \omega \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha, 266$.
хшболає， 271.
$\chi \omega \sigma \omega, 266$.
$\Psi$.
$\Psi v \omega, 220$.
$\Omega$.
${ }^{7} \Omega, 115$.
ஸ்ธv $\sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu, 183$.
ひ̈ $\zeta є \sigma \alpha, ~ \ddot{\omega} \zeta \eta \sigma \alpha, 183$.
ஸ้귀 $\theta \nu, 184$.
ஸ̈〒ขvขто， 183.
む゙iぞその， 183.
 $\sigma \theta \eta \nu, 185$.
ढ̈ $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \alpha, \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu, 187$.
$\dot{\omega \lambda i \sigma \theta \eta \kappa \alpha, \quad \dot{\omega} \lambda i ́ \sigma \theta \eta \sigma \alpha, ~}$
187.

ผَّаı， 116.
фै $\mu \eta \eta^{\prime}, 184$.
งึ $\mu \mu$ и， 191.
$\ddot{\omega} \mu \nu \boldsymbol{}$ є， 188.
ॐّ $\mu \boldsymbol{\rho} \xi \alpha, 188$.
ڤ̈ $\mu \sigma \sigma \alpha, \dot{\omega} \mu \dot{\prime} \forall \eta \imath^{\prime}, 188$.
$\omega^{\mu} \mu \omega \xi \alpha, 184$.
$\dot{\omega} \nu \alpha \dot{\mu} \eta \nu$ ，from óvi $\nu \eta \mu$ ， 189.

ஸ̀vá $\mu \eta \nu$ ，from övo $\mu a$ ， 190.

ढ̈ $\nu \eta \sigma \alpha, 189$.
ஸ้ó $\sigma \eta \eta \nu, \dot{\omega} \nu \circ \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu, 189$.
$\dot{\omega}^{\circ} \mu \eta \nu, 184$.
๗゙彑a， 183.
ш̈рєоข， 191.
డ́рєто， 18 note， 193.
$\dot{\omega} \rho \in ́ \chi \theta \eta \nu, 193$.
ш̈р $\rho \eta \nu, 158$ note， 193.
$\dot{\omega} \rho \nu \dot{v} \mu \eta \nu, 193$.
ढ̈роуто， 194.
ڤ̈рорє， 6 note， 193.
ढ̈риурає， 195.
ஸ́р́́рєє， 193.
ఉं $\rho \sigma a, 53,193$.
ஸ．рто， 18 note， 51 note．
$\ddot{\omega} \rho \omega \nu, 191$.
$\dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho \dot{u} \mu \eta \nu^{\prime}, \dot{\omega} \sigma \phi \rho \dot{a} \mu \eta \nu, \dot{\omega}-$ $\sigma ф \rho \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu, 195$.
$\omega ँ \sigma \omega, 272$.
$\check{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu, \omega ̈ \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu, \check{\omega} \phi \epsilon \iota^{-}$ $\lambda o v, 196$.
由゙ $\phi \theta a \iota, ~ \grave{\omega} \phi \theta \eta \nu, 191$.
ढ̈ $\phi \lambda \epsilon, 77,114,197$.
凶゙ $\phi \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha, \omega^{\top} \phi \lambda o \nu, 197$.
थैХ $\eta \mu a \ell, 186$.


## END OF THE INDEX．
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# PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE <br> CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET 

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY


[^0]:    * Of these $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$ only has an aor. 2., consequently is placed in the following Catalogue as an exception to a general analogy.

[^1]:    Soph. Aj. 269. and Eurip. Suppl. 182. The former is decisive in favour of the length of the $\alpha$, in the latter it is uncertain.-ED.]
    [ $\ddagger$ The active does not occur in Homer, Hesiod or Herodotus. Pindar is the earlicst writer in which it is found.-ED.]

[^2]:    * Bekker has however, following the majority of his manuscripts, placed it in the text at the former of these passages; in whic's I think he has acted less judi-

[^3]:    * [Hermann says this aor. is never used in tragedy-perhaps never at all by the older writers. On referring to the passage in question in Sophocles, the sense so plainly requires the future, that I feel cer-

[^4]:    tain Buttmann must have confounded this with some other passage.]
    $\dagger$ [Yet Schweighäuser has retained র́ $\pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda 0 \nu$ in Herodot. 4, 153.$]$
    $\ddagger$ [Dindorf reads $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \gamma \dot{\beta} \lambda \theta \geqslant \geqslant$ s.]

[^5]:    - Formed according to the general rule of verbs in $\mu_{2}$ from the obsolete $\ddot{a} \gamma \omega$, like $\triangle$ EIKO, íธixyvju, ívik $\omega$, \&ic.

[^6]:    $\dagger$ As the perf. 2. generally gives the preference to the intrans. sense, we find in a great number even of transitive verbs

[^7]:    ＊Thus we find in prose the similar form $\eta \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa о \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon i ̄ \nu$（see $\phi \in ́ p \omega$ ）；and the following poetic aorists：च̄pવ̆pov，conj． $\alpha \rho \alpha ́ \rho \eta \& c$ ．；see $\mathrm{AP} \Omega$ ．ท゙к $\alpha \chi 0 \nu$ ，ג̇ка́ $\chi \omega \nu$ $\& \mathrm{c}$ ；see $\mathrm{AX} \Omega$ ． $\boldsymbol{\eta} \pi \alpha \phi 0 \nu$ ，$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega \nu$ ；see
    
     3．pers．－see ốpvvpu（perf．ốpшрa）．Є̀ย́－
     compare these forms with $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma a \gamma o \nu, \lambda \in$－ $\lambda a \theta \mathrm{ov}, \pi \epsilon \pi \pi \lambda \eta \gamma o \nu$ ，we shall sce that they

[^8]:    Hom. Hymn. 5, 2. Less pure is the fut. q. $\sigma \omega$, but found sometimes in the Attics, as in Eurip. Herc. F.681. Dor. $\alpha, \sigma \bar{\omega}$, Theocr. 1, 145. 'Aci $\sigma \omega$ is used by the non-Attic poets, and is found in Hom. Epig. 14, 1. attributed by Pollux to Hesiod.-Passow.]

    * [Homer uses in the present both ai-

[^9]:    * See note under $\Delta \epsilon^{\prime} \epsilon$, I bind.
    + Not a few instances of the others are however to be found in the dialects; áф́́ $\lambda \alpha \iota$, Inscr. ap. Chishull. p. 138. 1. 5.$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda a \iota$ in Maittaire from a Byzantine writer, and the part. á $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{y} a s$ in Hesy-

[^10]:    * The sense of this passage has however been obscured by all the editors before Seidler, by misunderstanding the construction of $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu-\delta \dot{́}$.
    $\dagger$ Porson (on Eurip. Med. 848.) first introduced this spondaic future, but by a

[^11]:    *This is the article Aifcí $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$; for so it is now written, and the spiritus is repeated several times, until the grammarian quotes the form again; and then, as well as in the verse of Hesiod which is subjoined, it is expressly written aipcú $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$. But the beginning of the article, until we come to one grand mistake, is quite correct in the old Venetian editions, of which I will here transcribe the whole: A i $\rho \in \underline{v}-$
     aiןw тọ $\sigma \eta \mu a i ̄ \nu o \nu ~ \tau \grave{~} \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu \omega, \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon 0 \nu a \sigma \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ aip $\hat{\omega}$, aipo $\bar{v} \mu a \iota$, aipov́$\mu \in \nu 0 \nu \cdot \kappa \alpha i \cos \pi \hat{y}$ Aío入ıкй aipev́ $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$. :Hriodos, \&c. In Sylburg's edition the first word and the three which follow $\pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu \alpha \sigma \mu_{0} \nu$ have the aspirate ; whence arose the unintelligible sentence, aipos $\ldots . . \kappa а т \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu a \sigma \mu$ ò $\nu$ ai $\rho \bar{\omega}$, which Sylburg himself confessed he did not understand. It must be ailpo....катà ' $\pi \lambda \epsilon \frac{\nu \alpha \sigma \mu o ̀ \nu}{\alpha i \rho} \bar{\omega}$, and the pleonasm consists in the circumfiex, i. e. in the 6 concealed under it, from which now comes

[^12]:    * Before the termination $\mu \alpha$ of the perf. pass. the $\nu$ undergoes three changes:

    1. Into $\mu$ in $\eta \ddot{ } \sigma \chi v \mu \mu \alpha \iota$; in $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\eta} \rho a \mu \mu \alpha t$ ( $\xi \eta \rho a i v \omega$ ), Athen. 3. p. 80., and in $\sigma \epsilon$ $\sigma \iota \mu \mu \alpha \iota(\sigma i \nu \omega), \sigma \in \sigma \iota \mu \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 s$, Inscr. Chish. p. 130.
    2. Generally into $\sigma$, as in $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$, $\mu \in \mu i \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \mu \in \mu o ́ \lambda v \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \& с$.
    3. The $\nu$ is rejected and the vowel remains long, rєт $\rho a_{\chi} \mu$ évos, Aristot. H. A. 4,9. This takes place very rarely.

    + See note on á $\gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon \bar{\iota} \nu$ under "A $\gamma \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ From the aor. 2. act., as being a most necessary and consequently a most ancient

[^13]:    occurs three times in Lycophr．，then in the LXX and the N．T．，and more frequently in later writers，as Dion．Hal．，Lucian Navig．11．Jacobs＇Anth．Poet．vol．i．p．l．， vol．3．pp．552．580．1024．and particularly Schæf．Appar．Demosth．vol．2．p．232．－ Passow．］

[^14]:     ＇alo．－Passow．］

    + One can hardly help suspecting that this，by a very common mistake，is cor－ rupted from $\alpha \lambda \delta i \sigma \kappa \omega$ ：but the great unanimity of authorities forbids it．［Pas－ sow marks $\alpha \lambda \delta i \sigma \kappa \omega$ in his Lexicon as very doubtful．Schneider gives a transi－ tive sense of $\alpha \lambda \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ from Schæf．Theocr． 17，78．］

[^15]:    * 'A $\lambda a \lambda \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu$ is, as far as I know, always correctly written thus, and with the infin. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda a \lambda \kappa \in i \nu \nu$ will therefore prove $\boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda a \lambda \kappa 0 \nu$, $a \tilde{a} \lambda a \lambda \kappa \circ \nu$ to be undoubted aorists; although the only Homeric passage of this indicative (II. $\psi, 185$.) requires the imperfect. ${ }^{4}$ But then in Hes. $\theta, 527$. it is as plainly an aorist. This single exception in Hom. may quite as likely arise from a false reading having crept in during the transmission of

[^16]:    those very ancient poems, as from an indistinctness of tense: and as á $\mu \dot{v} \nu \alpha \circ$ is a various reading for á入á $\lambda$ roє at II. $\phi, 138$. 539., so may ${ }_{6}^{*} a \hat{a} \mu v \nu \in$ have been the true reading in I1. $\psi, 185$.

    + See note on $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma a \gamma o \nu$ under" $A \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$. And Buttm. Lexilog. pp. 132. 548.
    $\ddagger$ [Its root seems to be akin to ê $\lambda \omega$, ó $\lambda a i$, ov̉ $\lambda a i, m o l a$, molere: Buttm. Lexi.log. p. 259.

[^17]:    ＊The Epics frequently shorten on ac－ count of the metre the long vowel of the conjunctive，changing $\omega$ and $\eta$ back again into $o$ and $\epsilon$ ；instances may be found in Il $\beta, 440$ ．$\xi, 87 . v, 173$ ．Od．$a, 41 . \delta, 672$. $\kappa, 355$.
    $\dagger$［It is generally used with an accus． but also with infin．I1．ऊ，167．v，356．－ In Apoll．Rh．3，650．$\dot{\alpha} \psi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ is in－ transit．to retire．－Schueid．and Passow．］
    $\ddagger$［We find $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \theta \dot{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$ twice in Hippocr．

[^18]:    7，563．D．＇A $\lambda \theta$ á $\sigma \sigma \omega$ ，Aretæus p．61．B． $\Sigma v \nu a \lambda \theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，Hippocr．p．758．＇A入 $\theta$＇́ $\sigma \sigma \omega$ ， Aret．3，13．＇A $\lambda \theta^{\prime} \epsilon_{\xi \in \tau \alpha,}$ Aret．p．42．C． ＊$A \lambda \theta \epsilon \xi_{\iota s}$ ，Aret．2，1．and a various reading in Hippocr．758．E．－Schneider．］
    § Thus the perfects ${ }^{\prime \prime} \alpha \gamma \alpha$ ，${ }^{\epsilon} \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \gamma a, I$ am broken，torn；in later writers $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \quad$ ， I am struck；in Hom．$\tau \varepsilon \tau \epsilon v \chi$ ćs ；and in the Lat．vapulo．See note p． 5.
    ｜｜See note under $\Gamma$ 「үข $\dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$ ．

[^19]:    ＊These，like many other irregular forms， had originally the digamma，and were therefore＇E－FA $A \Omega \mathrm{~N} F E-F A \Lambda \Omega \mathrm{KA}$ ，＇E－ FEESATQ FE－FESTO．But when the digamma was changed to the aspirate， they took the augment according to the analogy of other aspirated verbs，conse－ quently $\dot{\varepsilon}-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \nu$ ，whence $\ddot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ ，as $\ddot{\eta} \rho \mu \mu_{0}$ گov was formed from $\dot{a} \rho \mu o ́ \zeta \omega$ ．
    $\dagger$ See note on Aí大日ávo $\mu$ ac．
    $\ddagger$［Passow calls it a part．pres．from an obsolete verb ả入íт $\eta \mu \iota$, à ít $^{\prime} \mu \mu \alpha$. ．］
    § I hope to defend dं $\iota \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \in \nu$ о $\mathbf{E} \dot{v}$－ $\rho v \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \alpha$ in this second passage against ＇$\lambda \iota \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ ，which has been taken from the Scholium of Tzetzes and the Etym． Mag．v． $\boldsymbol{\jmath} \lambda \iota \tau \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu$ os．See Hermannin Add． ad Greg．Cor．p．879．The reading of the text has been always so generally pre－ ferred，that the emendation can be offered as nothing more than a various reading．

[^20]:    * [Homer uses the pres. and imperf., which thus supply the place of those tenses in aं $\dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega$. - Passow.]
    $\dagger$ The only meaning of this verb is to be beside oneself-either with grief or joy; those who give it the sense of $\alpha \lambda \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a t$ are in error: in the two passages quoted by Schneider in his Lexicon (11. $\omega, 12$. Apoll. Rh. 4, 1289.) as instances of this

[^21]:    meaning, there is a verb of such a sense ( $\delta \iota \nu \epsilon v ́ \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon, \dot{\epsilon} \rho \pi v ́ \zeta о \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ), but ả入ข́єเข refers only to distraction of mind.- On the doubtful aspirate, ai $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu, ~ a ̀ \lambda v ́ \epsilon \iota \nu, ~ s e e ~$ Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 380. [Passow calls $\dot{a} \lambda \dot{v} \varepsilon \iota \nu$ the Attic form, but says that the later Atticists kept to the older form á $\lambda$ úcev, Locella Xen. Eph. p. 172.]

[^22]:    * Under ' $\mathrm{E} \xi \dot{\eta} \mu \beta \lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon \nu$ we find, it is true, these same words with the form $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\imath} \dot{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\omega} \omega \tau 0$; but beside that the pluperf. does not suit the context when completed as it is under " $H \mu \beta \lambda \omega$, even this very " $\mathrm{H} \mu \beta \lambda \omega$ speaks plainly in favour of the amended $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \dot{\jmath} \eta \mu \beta \lambda \omega$.
    + Verbs in éw sometimes have a present in $\tau \sigma \kappa \omega$, although their tenses are formed from the iufin. of the aor. 2. in civ, as
     -рібкода.
    $\ddagger$ The presentin $\boldsymbol{\sigma \kappa \omega}$ occursinTheagenes ap. Stob. Serm. I. Schow. p. 22., where this

[^23]:    * Elmsley quotes, as an authority of the old Grammarians in favour of the aorist, the single gloss of Photius, $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{v} v a \theta o v, \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \nu-$ $\nu a \nu$; while he passes over in silence the great number of instances in all glossographers of such forms explained to be pres. and imperf. But even if all these forms were really aorists, the accentuation of $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu, \dot{\omega} \nu$ must be a doubtful point, unless there be a precedent for it in the old Grammarians, as these aorists form a very peculiar analogy, which we are not justified

[^24]:    ＊In Æschin．c．Timarch．p．8．9．ává－ $\lambda \omega \sigma \epsilon, \alpha \nu \eta \lambda \omega \kappa \dot{\omega} s$ ，have a various reading， but one of no great authority．

    + Notwithstanding this distinction，the similarity of meaning in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \sigma \sigma \theta$ ą sumi and diva入iocetv consumere，and the rela－ tion of the aorists prove the actual iden－

[^25]:    tity of the root．The active form of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \bar{\omega} \nu \alpha \iota, \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \lambda \omega \kappa \in ́ v a t$, shows for instance that the passive sense gave a neuter idea， as in the similar case of vapulare；and so the relation which the aor． 1 ．in $\alpha \nu \alpha \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha \iota$ bears to the above is causative，according to the leading analogy which I have drawn

[^26]:    out in my Grammar, that is to say, to the analogy of $\delta \dot{v}(u$, éovvoa, $\delta \dot{v} \sigma \omega,-\dot{\in} v \nu, \delta \dot{\varepsilon}-$ ivka, סúvouae, belongs, ' $A \wedge O \Omega$ (I take), $\dot{a} \nu a \lambda o ́ \omega, ~ a ́ \nu a ́ \lambda \omega \sigma a$, đ̀va入 $\omega \sigma \omega-\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha, \dot{a} \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma о \mu a \iota$.

    * In these three passages incorrectly quoted as a perfect by Fischer, 3. p. 21.
    † On $\ddot{\epsilon} \bar{\epsilon} \delta \bar{\delta}$, Theocr. 27, 22. suspected as

[^27]:    * Thus $\gamma \in ́ \gamma \omega v a, I$ call, 3. pers. $\gamma \in \in-$ $\gamma \omega \nu \epsilon(\nu)$, he calls,Od. $\zeta, 294$., whence a new form in ov gives a 3. pers. ©ं $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu \epsilon(\nu)$, which, by dropping the allgment, becomes again $\gamma \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \epsilon(\nu)$; see $11 . \xi, 469 . \iota, 703$. Herein it is very conceivable that the meaning of this form fluctuates between the imperf. and aorist. Of this kind we have in Homer the following :

[^28]:    $\delta \in i \delta \iota \epsilon$ pres. Od. $\pi, 306$.-imperf. II. $\sigma, 34$. $\alpha ้ \nu \omega \gamma \epsilon$ pres. Il. $\omega, 90$-aor. Od. $\epsilon, 276$. ávipo $\theta \in$ pres. Od. $\rho, 270$.-inperf. 11. $\lambda$, 266.

    غ̀juvo $\theta \epsilon$ pres. Od. 0,365 --imperf. II. $\beta$, 209.

    + [Passow however has civtéw, Ion. for $\alpha \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \omega$.]

[^29]:    * 'Avv́r (like ápv́ $\omega$, ápv́r $\omega_{3}$ ) is the common form in the older Attics, so that for this dialect we may form aivv́ $\omega$, ávv́бw. But as duv́n, dंvv́ow, was the usual formation in the oldest Epic, as well as afterwards in the common language of the day, we had better take this as the leading form, and the other as a sister-

[^30]:    * But whoever examines the whole context of that passage will perhaps agree with me in thinking it still more probable that j̄véyєє, supported by the same digamma, was copied from v. 386. and used again here (v. 394.) where I'riam's words are repeated from v. 375.

[^31]:    ＊As these are aor．，not imperf．，the correct accentuation of the part．is $\alpha \pi \alpha-$ $\phi \dot{s} \nu($ not $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega \nu)$ as we find it in Hymn． Ven．38．Eurip．lon．705．：and other pass－ ages ought to be corrected according to these．As to the reduplication see note
    

    + Nothing however is more probable

[^32]:    * [From an obsolete root $\ddot{\pi} \pi \omega$, answering to the old Latin apo, whence apiscor, capio, capto, and apto. Some (but without any grounds) consider $\ddot{a} \pi \tau \omega$, $I$ set fire to, a different word from üтто I fasten, deriving it from av̋w.Passow.]
    $t$ The same holds good of the subst. ápá. But in Homer a regular distinction is observed between ápij with a long,

[^33]:    * Formed with the reduplication; see note on $\alpha^{\prime} \gamma a \gamma \epsilon i \nu$ under "A $\gamma \omega$.
    $\dagger$ The temporal augm. of the second syllable is sometimes omitted. In the poetical verb $\tilde{a} \rho \bar{a} \rho \alpha$ however, which, from the mere formation of the perf. 2. and without any regard to the augment, ought to have the $\eta$ in its middle syllable, and is therefore written in Ionic poetry $\tilde{a} \rho \eta \rho \alpha$, the $a$ in the Attic form is only a consequence of the $\rho$ preceding (compare the termination $\rho a$ of the 1. declension, the contractions like $\dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma v \rho \bar{a}$, the fut. in

[^34]:    - $\rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega)$, and the angment is therefore not so much omitted as invisible.
    $\ddagger$ At Od. $\epsilon, 248$. we find á $\rho \eta \rho \epsilon \nu$ transitive, but from the Scholia it is evidently a false reading for $a \neq \alpha \sigma \sigma \epsilon \nu$.
    § The lengthened vowel of the perf. 2. may be shortened again, of which we have examples in the Epic participles $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \alpha \rho v_{i} \alpha, \mu \epsilon \mu \alpha \kappa v i ̂ a, ~ \tau \epsilon \theta a \lambda v \bar{a} \alpha$, etc., where the $\breve{a}$ is rectored in place of the $\eta$. In Hes. $\theta, 607$. aj $\bar{\rho} \rho \bar{\iota} \alpha \nu$ is undoubtedly false for á $\rho \eta \rho v i a \nu$.

[^35]:    - This participle occurs three times in Apollon. Kh. 1, 787.3, 833.4, 677. where Brunck changed it into an aor. $a^{\prime} \rho \eta \rho \alpha \alpha_{-}$ $\mu \in \nu o s$, which was a reading of the first passage in some manuscripts. Now from $\ddot{\alpha} \rho \eta-$ $\rho u$ it may be allowable to derive a pres. ápйроцaє; but for an aor. 1. formed again from this pres. or inmediately from the perf. I know neither proof nor authority : for I do not reckon as such Quintus Sm., who has this $\alpha \rho \eta \rho a ́ \mu \epsilon \mathcal{\nu}$ os frequently, and read it so in Apollonius. In the first of the three passages quoted above the aor. 1. would be unnatural.
    $\dagger$ The word however is suspicious in this passage. That is to say, its construction there depends on $\epsilon \vec{v} \boldsymbol{r}^{\prime} \tilde{a} \nu$, and it is therefore conjunct. for $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma a \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \tau \alpha$.

[^36]:    * Verbs which do not lengthen their vowel in the future take a $\sigma$ in their perf. passive; as $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega-\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \mu a \iota$;

[^37]:     е゙бтабния.
    $\dagger$ The text and many MSS. have $\dot{\alpha} \rho o ́ \mu=$

[^38]:    $\mu \in \nu \alpha t$ ，many have also $\alpha \rho o ́ \mu \in \nu \alpha$ ，which was the only reading of the Scholiasts， who merely recommend its being read and written in the former way．This ápó－ $\mu \in \nu a \iota$ is by syncope for ápoé $\mu \in \nu a t$ ，and may be therefore classed with $\bar{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \mu \in \nu a$ and $\operatorname{sip} \hat{\rho}^{\mu} \mu \mathrm{v} \boldsymbol{a}$ ．But a great number of
     $\mu \in v a t$ ，and it was and still is a question for the critic in what way the oldest wri－

[^39]:    * See both examined more at length in Buttm. Lexil. p. 144. \&c.
    $\dagger$ If I am right in my conjecture (Lexil. p. 145. \&c.) we may add a future also in the various reading $\dot{\alpha} \pi<v \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma 0 v \sigma \iota \nu$ (Il. $\chi$, 489. where the common reading is $\alpha \pi 0 v$ -

[^40]:    pí $\sigma \sigma v \sigma t \nu$, ) from a verb, which does not occur again in Homer, áфo $i^{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} \omega$; under which some of the Grammarians, contrary to all analogy, place also the acknowledged form ámov́pas.
    $\ddagger$ See last paragraph under Aípéw.

[^41]:    * Verbs beginning with $\alpha, \alpha v, o \iota$, followed by a vowel, do not take the augment ; as át $\omega, \tilde{a} \eta \mu$, á $\eta \delta i \zeta, \quad \mu a \iota$, a vaiv $\omega$, oiós, oiariל $\omega$, oi $\omega v i \zeta$ о $\mu$ : : but the a if

[^42]:    short becomes long, as "äïov, av̉aivєro; oiáкıఢєv, \&c.-By ̇̇тафаvávөŋv, (Aristoph. Ra.n. 1089.), we see that avaip, in the Attic pronunciation had the aspirate.

[^43]:    * See note under $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ Һур $\dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$.

[^44]:    * See Heraclid. ap. Eust. 11. a, 24.p. 22, 14. Od, $\mu$, 89. p. 478, 12. Basil.
    + We always find for instance in the

[^45]:    ＊We know that in general there is no conjunct．or optat．of the perf．pass．，partly from the difficulty of forming them，part－ ly from their being seldom wanted，but that they are made up of the participle and a tense of cival．There are cases however where，for the sake of greater expression，of clearness，or of conciseness， such moods are formed．Thus $\delta \iota a \beta$＇́－ $\beta \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，Andocid．p．22，41．єंктє́т $\mu \eta \sigma \theta$ о ， Plat．Rep．7．p．564．c．
    $\dagger$ See note under 「＇ィуขш́бкш．
    $\ddagger$ The various reading $\beta \lambda \bar{y} 0$ arises from a twofold opinion of the old Grammarians；

[^46]:    * See Græv, ad Lucian. Sol@c. 7. Tho. M. v. $\beta a \rho \dot{\prime} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, where the intrans. $\beta \in \beta \dot{\alpha}-$ $\rho \eta \kappa a$ is given as the genuine Attic form, and the rhetorician Aristides quoted in confirmation of it, but his words appear to be an intentional imitation of Homer. With respect however to the authority quoted above from Plato for $\beta \in \beta \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ it

[^47]:    * On the analogy of this verb with some others by metathesis of the stem or root BOP, BPO, see note under Bád $\lambda \omega$, and Buttm. Lexil. p. 84.
    
    $\ddagger$ Like $\pi i \pi \tau \omega$, perf. $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega \kappa \alpha$, part. $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega \kappa \dot{\omega} s$, by syncope $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau$ és and $\pi \varepsilon$ $\pi \tau \epsilon$ ós.
    § There is one other instance, viz. кa-

[^48]:    $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \rho \omega \xi \in \nu$ in Schol. Pind. OI. 1, 38., of the eating up the shoulder of Pelops. It is diffieult to say whether this should be suffered to remain as the incorrect form of a faulty writer, or altered to кacé$\beta \rho v \xi \Leftarrow v$, upon a supposition that it was copied from an older narrative of the story.
    

[^49]:    * Perhaps from Pherecydes, who is mentioned there, and from whom the story is quoted in Schol. Pind. p. 3, 96. with the expression ávaßıoūv éтои́єє.
    $\dagger$ See following note under $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$.
    $\pm$ All verbs beginning with $\gamma \nu$, and some with $\gamma \lambda, \beta \lambda$, take in the perfect, instead of the reduplication, the syllabic augment $\epsilon$. Of verbs beginning with $\beta \lambda$, the only one which I find with the reduplication is $\beta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega, \beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota$; and of

[^50]:    ＊We find also in Aristoph．Pac． 1154. $\beta \dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha \tau 0$ ；and in the Etym．M．véviutat is quoted from a satirical piece of Sophocles． + Of all the changes which take place in forming the different presents of verbs， the easiest is that of $w$ into $\dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ ，as $\dot{\rho} \dot{i} \pi \tau \omega$ and $\dot{\rho} \ell \pi \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega, \kappa v ่ \omega$ and кvé $\omega, \gamma a \mu \epsilon ́ \omega$ from「AM $\Omega$ ．Hence as often as the regularin－ flexion of a verb presented any difficulty， sounded badly，or caused obscurity，it was inflected as jf the present had been in $\varepsilon$ c．
    $\ddagger$ ln the three verbs $\beta_{0} \dot{v} \lambda \circ \mu a \iota$ ，סé－ $\nu a \mu a \iota$ ，and $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda(\omega$ ，the Attics very com－ monly increase the syllabic augm．of the

[^51]:    ＊［I compile from that untranslated Lexicon the following：

    Intrans．－to boil up，foam，ferment ；rov̂ тótov $\lambda a \mu \pi \rho \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\beta} \rho a ́ \zeta$ ovtos，Heliod．p． 193．where Jacobs conjectures $\beta \rho v a ́ \zeta o \nu-$ tos．Oivos $\beta$ pá $\zeta \omega \nu$ ，fermenting，Alex． Aphrod．Probl．p．282．Bрáそ $\omega \nu$ vóos，a turbulent spirit．It also expresses the roaring of the bear，Pollux 5,58 ．Its com－ pound is used for the rushing forth of fire， $\pi o \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \pi v \rho o ̀ s$ é $\xi \in \epsilon \in \rho \alpha \sigma \epsilon$ そá $\lambda \eta$ ，Apollod． 1， 6.

    Trans．－to throw up with violence（as boiling water or a tempestuous sea does），
     Oppian．Hal．1，779．＇O $\sigma \tau \in ́ \alpha \beta \in ́ \beta \rho \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \ell$ $\pi \alpha \rho '$ ýóvt，Antip．Thess．Epig．61．＂E $\beta \rho \alpha-$ $\sigma \in \nu$ és グióva，Laur．Tull．Epig．2．Tả $\mu$ c̀v
     cand．A1．25．Tà $\delta$ á apóa vєtó $\theta \in \beta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma=-$ oats， ib .137 ．In the same sense is used

[^52]:    * [According to Moeris $\beta \rho \dot{u} \chi \omega$ was the common form, $\beta \rho u{ }^{\prime} \kappa \omega$ the Attic : in opposition to which see Herm. Soph. Phil. 735. -Passow.],
    , $\dagger$ [Yet I find in Passow's Lexicon, under B $\rho \dot{\kappa} \kappa \omega, \dot{a} \lambda i \beta \rho v \chi \theta \epsilon i ́$, Phil. Thes. Epig.

[^53]:    77. Bрӣкоу бтó $\mu a$, Nicand. and aor. 2. є̋ßрй $\chi \in$, Epigr. Adesp. 418.-under Bpú$\chi^{\omega}$ the perf. $\beta \in \in \rho \bar{v} \chi є, \beta \epsilon \beta \rho \bar{v} \chi \dot{\omega} s$, pluperf. $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \epsilon \beta \rho \dot{\chi} \chi \in \omega$ In addition to which the aor. 1. $\in \beta \rho v \xi \epsilon$, Eryci. Epig. 2. $\beta \rho v \varepsilon^{\xi} a s$, Diodor. 16.-ED.]
[^54]:    ＊See note under＇$\Delta$ é $\omega, I$ bind．［But Passow gives it as his opinion that wher－
    ever this form occurs there are reasons for suspecting it to be spurious．］

[^55]:    * There are three verbs which do not follow the general analogy of verbs in $\nu v \mu \iota$, viz. a่vv́ $\omega$, таvv́ $\omega$, $\gamma a ́ v v \mu a \iota$, all three with $v$ short.
    $\dagger$ See Buttm. Lexil. p. 202. note.
    $\ddagger$ At Od. $v, 347.390$. we find however another form, $\gamma \in \lambda \lambda^{i} \omega \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \in \in \lambda \omega \nu$, and the part. $\gamma \epsilon \lambda o i \omega \nu \tau \epsilon s$, although in both passages the text is uncertain, from their being various readings without the diphthong. In itself it is very conceivable that, as the resolution of ow is by far the

[^56]:    $\lambda$ oí $\eta \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha$ єincy）；therefore $\gamma \epsilon \lambda 01 \hat{q} \nu$ from ү＇ $\begin{gathered}\text { otor．And this meaning is most suited }\end{gathered}$ to Od．$v, 390$ ．，where the suitors get ready for their banquet $\gamma \in \lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \omega \nu \tau \epsilon s$, laughing and joking；which therefore，according to this second analogy must be written $\gamma \epsilon$－
     （ $\gamma \boldsymbol{\text { el }} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ óvets）we want nothing more than simple laughing ；and so at $v$ ，347．instead of $\gamma \in$ doi $\omega \nu$ we must restore the old read－ ing $\gamma^{\epsilon \lambda} \hat{\omega}_{\omega} \omega \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ ．

[^57]:    ＊For an account of the meaning of this form see note under＂ $\mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \mu$ ．
    $\dagger$ Instances of this use of $\gamma$ є́ $\gamma$ ova are， oi távtes $\beta$ aбi入eîs $\gamma$ e $\gamma$ óvaбi，who have all been kings，Plat．Alcib．I．41．c．p．
     ク̉ $\rho a \dot{a} \sigma \theta \eta$ ，ib．55．a．p． 131.
    $\ddagger$ For instance，in Plat．Phæd．p．76．c．
     are men，i．e．have been born men．Hence
     old，i．e．have been born sixty years．

[^58]:    * [ Fivo $\mu$ at was unknown not only to Homer but also to the Tragedians.-Passow.]
    + These passive aor. are formed from the simple present of the verb; and when that pres. is the one in common use, they are distinguished from the imperf. and the moods of the pres. merely by this syncupe. Hence they are exactly like the perfect

[^59]:    and pluperfect pass. of those verbs, but without the reduplication; and may therefore be compared, but must not be confounded, with them. In meaning, whether, active, passive or middle, they follow their pres. in $\mu \alpha \iota$; and they belong only to the oldest period of the language.
    e. g.-
    

[^60]:     and some others, as $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \nu \tau 0, \epsilon \bar{v} \kappa \tau 0, \dot{u} \lambda \tau 0$,
    

    * The Epics allowed themselves the liberty of pronouncing the accented $o$ in the oblique cases of the part. perf. long, as $\tau \varepsilon$ $\tau \rho \iota \gamma \bar{\omega} \tau \alpha \mathrm{s}$ for -ó $\boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha \mathrm{s}$.

[^61]:    * [Passow has the form yij $0 \omega$ as a pres. not in use, from which he deduces the perf. $\gamma^{\prime} \mathcal{\prime} \eta \eta$. .]
    + [The earliest writer in which it occurs is Quintus Smyrn.-Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ In Simonid. 1. (Gnom. Brunck.) the active form $\gamma \eta \rho a \sigma \sigma \varepsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$ occurs, in whirh the double $\sigma$ at all events is false: but it is possible that the true reading there
     үทрабкє́ $\mu є \nu$, ойтє Өavєíб0аเ.
    § See note under l'ı $\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$.

[^62]:    * Many verbs have a syncopated aorist which must be either compared with the aor. 2. or reckoned as such. The 1 st pers. of this aor. always ends in $\nu$, and the vowel preceding it is (with the single exception of $\phi \theta a \dot{a} \nu(\omega)$ the same as that of the perfect ; thus it corresponds exactly with the aor. 2. of verbs in $\mu t$ in all its moods and its participle: thus-
    $\sigma \beta \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \nu v \mu, \quad \Sigma \mathrm{BE} \Omega, \quad \ddot{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \eta \alpha \alpha-\stackrel{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \sigma \beta \eta \nu$, $\epsilon \sigma \beta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \beta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha t, \sigma \beta є$ є́ $\eta \nu$.
     ß ̄̀vat, ßaìŋv, ßás.

[^63]:    * With the syncopated act. aor. described in the last note may be classed a passive aor. in $\mu \eta \nu, \sigma о, \tau 0, \& c$, corresponding therefore with the regular aor. 2. midd., in which however three things may be remarked: 1 . that most of the instances of this aor. have a completely passive sense; 2, that they follow the vowel of the perfect passive; 3 . that they belong only to the language of the older poets. Some of them do indeed serve as passive to the above-mentioned active aos ists, for in-

[^64]:    * The two passages from Demostl. c. Dionysod. pp. 1291. 1293. are quoted erroneously, as they come from the verb mapaбvy $\rho \alpha \phi \in i v$, to act contrary to agrecment.
    $\dagger$ The verbal termination of aíw for á $\omega$ in the Epic language is not, like cie for $\dot{\epsilon} \omega$, a mere help to the metre; for $\dot{a} \omega$ is seldom used withont the contraction, and the a might be long of itself: but ailu, like $\dot{\sigma} \zeta \omega$ and $\dot{a} \nu \nu v \mu$, is a mode of strengthening in the pres. the $a$ which is short in the inflexion : beside the above-mentioned

[^65]:    - This last is generally but erroneously given to déda with the other meaning. That it was the old aor. is shown by the
     $\delta a \xi(\pi \nu$.
    $\dagger$ See for this formation $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \alpha \alpha$, \&c. under Baiva.

[^66]:    \# According to the Etym. M. v. $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o s$, Alcæus had a pres. Eéw, I find; which coincides with our adoption of ס́r $\omega$.
    § An exactly similar contraction we find in one of the declensions of nouns, viz.
    

[^67]:    * In forming a new present $\nu$ is sometimes inserted before the termination; as $\delta \dot{\alpha} \kappa \nu \omega$, aor. єै $\delta a \kappa 0 \nu$ : compare $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \omega$, тіл $\nu \omega$.
    $\dagger$ Little importance can be attached to quotations like $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \dot{\alpha} \rho 0 \eta$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \rho \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta$ in $\mathrm{He}-$
     a Comic writer in Lex. Seguer. p. 349., will,

[^68]:    as to meaning, stand pretty much on the same ground as the compounds of кatá.
    $\ddagger$ I think that the account which I have given above is one which may fairly stand valid as long as no historical grounds can be adduced to the contrary, and notwithstanding the mere unsupported objection of Porson on the passage of Plutus.

[^69]:    * Though many passages still have $\delta \epsilon i \xi a t$, at least among the various readings, andeven taken from good manuscripts, this ouglit not to militate against the correctness of restoring סégat universally.

[^70]:    - That is to say, many bring the form סeióerto under $\delta \in ́ \chi o \mu a \ell$, by which they hope to deduce the meaning of to receive, welcome, with greater facility. But the above forms ought not to be separated from the present $\delta \in i x v v \mu a t$, which occurs in a similar sense, nor from its sister-form ¿єıкаขāб日at; and to these again belong the synonymous presents $\delta \epsilon t \delta i \sigma \kappa о \mu a t, \delta \epsilon-$ ö́бконаь; whence also A pollonius $1,55 \mathrm{~S}$. might say $\delta \epsilon \iota \delta i \sigma \kappa \in \tau 0 \quad \pi a \tau \rho i ́ i n ~ t h e ~ c o m-~$ mon sense of $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \epsilon i x \nu v \epsilon$. The original idea is indisputably the stretching out and offering of the hand, the cup, \&c., with which that of pointing with the finger, or showing, corresponds very well.

[^71]:    * The only exceptions to an immense number of instances are $\dot{v} \pi \mathbf{o \delta \varepsilon i \sigma a t \epsilon , ~} \mathrm{Od}$. $\beta, 66$. 'ă $\delta \epsilon \iota \eta$ я, I1. $\eta, 117$. $\delta є \delta \delta i \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$, Il. $\omega$, 663., the last of which, as being taken from $\omega$, is of no weight.
    $\dagger$ And thus it includes $\delta$ ei $\sigma \alpha l$, accorling to the statement here given of it. But when we consider the peculiarity of this verb, as noticed above, according to which the $\delta$ in its stem or root was originally equivalent to $d w$, it follows that in Homer's pronunciation the first syllable of both $\delta$ édotka and $\delta e ́ \delta t a$ must have been also long by position. After the disappearance of the digamma the syllable $\delta \in \iota$ discharged the same office in these forms
     the most accurate and detailed account which I can give of these perfects.
    $\ddagger$ This form is a clear proof how firmly the length of the augment-syllable had established itself in the old Epic; otherwise they would have said $\delta \in \delta \in v i a$, the sound of which could have been no objection to those who used $\pi \in \phi v v i a$. The form $\delta \in \dot{\delta} i a \sigma \iota \nu$ in Il. $\omega, 663$. has been al-

[^72]:    * Nay the theme exists unshortened, but in a poem which can hardly be quoted with such a view as this, in Orph. de Lapid. 335. סєєéfєv, where however Hermann has adopted (I see no reason why) Tyrwhitt's correction $\delta \in t \delta \in \dot{c} \mu \in \nu$. See the preceding note.
    + The pretended verb $\delta i \eta \mu t$, said to have the same meaning as dıaive, to water, and which is so described in Schneider's Lexicon, is erroneous. All the forms of that kind belong to $\delta i$ i $\eta \mu$ : see Riemer's Lex. and Lobeck ad Phryı. p. 27. [Passow places the different forms $\delta \iota \in i s, \delta i \epsilon ́ \mu \in \nu o s$,

[^73]:    - Beside these two synonymous aorists there has been quoted a syncop. aor. $\varepsilon \delta \delta \mu \tau 0$; the only authority for which is Antim. Fragm. 19. ap. Pausan. 8. p. 651. ; where however the reading $\gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \mu \eta \theta^{\prime}$ is false. The mannscripts have $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \delta \mu \eta \theta^{\prime}$ contrary to the context. But Schellenberg saw that the true reading is, "Os $\dot{\rho}$ к тóт"
    
    + Like $\pi \epsilon \rho \nu a ́ \omega \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \eta \mu$ from $\pi \epsilon \rho a ́ \omega$; and with the change of $\epsilon$ into $\ell, \kappa \iota \rho \nu a \dot{\omega}$ $\kappa i \rho \nu \eta \mu \iota$ 'from кєра́ $\omega$ (кғра́vขv $\mu \iota$ ), $\pi i \lambda$ -

[^74]:    * This verb, like aivé $\omega$, aipé $\omega, \pi o \theta^{\prime} \epsilon$, and many others, inflects some of its tenses regularly with $\eta$, e. g. its future and

[^75]:    * Compare the preceding verb, particularly toward the end of the first paragraph.
    † $\Delta \in \in \sigma \theta$ aı, Mem. 1, 6, 10. Anab. 7, 7, 31.; סє́єта८, Anab. 7, 4, 8.; סéctat and $\pi \rho о \sigma \delta \dot{\delta} \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ three times in Mem. 3, 6, 13. 14.; éȯéєто, Hell. 6, 1, 18. In some of these passages no manuscriptcan be quoted against this reading, in others very few ; notwithstanding which, the common form has been of late introduced by the editors into all; while in another passage (Mem. $4,8,11$.) this was done long ago, although the old editions and four manuscripts have $\pi \rho о \sigma \delta \in \epsilon \epsilon a \iota$. Eight passages in a single author, while not one is quoted from any of the older writers, are sufficient to warrant our attributing with certainty to this author at least, an Ionicism, of which the existence is very probable at that æra of the Atticism and in that particular verb; while we can see no reason for this form, which was unknown to the other Attics, having been foisted into this one writer by copyists or grammarians. In addition to this we have the gloss of the Antiatticist in Bekker p. 94. 'Eס́éєто ḋvti той écieito, which merely proves the great probability of what was most probable before. The only usage of later writers and Grammarians (see Schæfer ad Greg. p. 431.) at a time when certaibly

[^76]:    tirely omitted, as in $\delta \in \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega,{ }^{c} a \hat{\delta} \epsilon \nu$. Hence also we may find it easier to explain how $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha t, \& c$. remained longer than others in a state of resolution; and to bring $\pi \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon$ within the same analogy we may adduce the formation $\varepsilon \neq \pi \lambda \in v \sigma \alpha$. But the steps by which we advance here are not so sure as in $\epsilon v \hat{v} a \delta \in \nu$ and ravá\}as: we will therefore content ourselves with merely pointing out the probability.

[^77]:    * The circumflex need not excite our suspicion against this form; not only because we find it so often erroneously placed over the termination in ávat, but because the radical long $a$ in this verb might certainly produce a present in $\bar{a} \mu t$, «̀рa.
    + Thus it is easy to conceive that $\dot{a} \pi 0^{-}$ $\delta \rho a \dot{\sigma} \alpha s$ and $-\dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \alpha$, wherever they are now met with in Attic writers, are corruptions of $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \delta \rho \alpha ́ s$ and $-\hat{a} \sigma \alpha$. See Bekker on Andoc. Myst. 125. Lys. c. Andoc. 28. and compare Гŋpáw.
    $\ddagger$ Thus the Dorics and Epics use ${ }^{n} \theta c \nu$,
    

[^78]:    * On this iterative see dúokey toward the end of $\Delta \dot{v} \omega$.
    $\dagger$ See Mus. Ant. Stud.1. p. 242. sqq.
    
    § In Apollon. 1, 1208. the reading oi $i-$ そєто крұขaíns has been preferred perhaps a little too hastily, on account of the rare

[^79]:    ＊I suppose fur instance that $\gamma \delta 00 \pi-$ and $\kappa \tau v \pi$－are essentially the same ono－ matopceia for the sound proceeding from a heavy body，whether striking or struck；

[^80]:    ＊Thus $\beta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \in \tau a t$ in Hom．for $\beta \lambda \dot{\lambda} \pi \tau \omega$ ，入iтоцат in the Hom．Hymns for 入íббоцає， отеváұш Epic for $\sigma \tau \in \nu a ́ \zeta \omega$.

    + On the double augment see Boúdoptat and note．

[^81]:    * Notwithstanding $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu a \iota$ as a proparoxyton is the only form in use, according to which we find ivivjar (II. $\zeta, 229$. ) accented in the same way, yet the Ionians admit the resolution and write $\delta v v e ́ w h a t ;$ e. g. in Herodot. 4, 97. Compare 'Eni$\sigma т \alpha \mu \alpha ц$.
    $\uparrow$ [Yet Passow says that $\hat{c} u ́ y p$ is in good writers conjunctive only, though it does occur in Eurip. Hec. 257 ., and that the Att. and Dor. is dévec, Sclæ£. Soph. Phil. 798.$]$

[^82]:    \# That is, of Buttmann's large detailed Grammar (Ausführliche Sprachlehre), of which this Catalogue forms part of the second volume. The section referred to, consisting of twelve pages, is of course too long to be inserted here, and to make extracts or an abridgement would be most unsatisfactory.--ED.]
    § Like $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{u} \theta \eta \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \dot{v} \theta \eta \nu$, and the perf. pass. $\lambda \in ́ \lambda \grave{v} \mu a t$, although from $\lambda \dot{v} \omega$, ivi $\omega$, Gíw, fut. -ñ(u, \&c., all with $v$ long. See sico, I bind, with note ; also Teiver.

[^83]:    - For an account of this aorist see note under 「ıури́бкєи.
    $\dagger$ See Buttm. Lexil. p. 425. and note.
    $\ddagger$ Amidst the uncertainty which prevails in Homer's text between éóv́varo and -єто, it is very probable that the form in -aro crept into it from common analogy, and

[^84]:    that the true reading in the Epic poets is
     time it is possible that usage might have attached a distinct meaning to each form, and that Homer might have said in every instance ¿и́бєто ö $\mu \boldsymbol{\lambda}$
    

[^85]:    * Thus we find $\sigma v \mu \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \epsilon o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s, v \pi \epsilon \rho-$
     rodot.
    $\dagger$ The following verbs do the same: ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \chi\left({ }^{( }\right)$, $\xi_{\epsilon} \rho \pi \omega$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \pi \dot{v} \zeta(\omega, \ddot{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \theta i \zeta \omega, \dot{\epsilon} \lambda i \sigma \sigma \omega$,
    
    + See Reisk. Ind. in Isæum. It is remarkable too that the aor. 1. $\dot{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{v} \gamma \gamma \dot{v} \eta \sigma a$, évє $\nu \gamma v \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ occurs frequently: see Budæus p. 76. 77. Stephan. Thesaur. and

[^86]:    * See note under " $A \gamma \nu \nu \mu$.
    $\dagger$ The participle $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma o \rho o v ̄ \sigma a$ in Hippocr. de Insomn. 1. is therefore defensible,

[^87]:    although we find just before as a present, є̇үрйүорєข.
    $\ddagger$ In the same way from $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\omega} \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \dot{a} \nu(\omega-$

[^88]:    the perf. pass. quite as well as the perf. active, just as in $\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon ́ \varphi \gamma a$ and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\nu} \varphi \gamma \mu a \iota$ : but this passive might, according to the analogy of ä $\omega \rho \tau 0$ ( ${ }^{\eta} 0 \rho \tau 0$ ), retain the 0 ; and thus $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho \dot{\eta} \gamma \rho \rho \mu a \iota,-о \rho \theta \epsilon$, -ó $\rho \theta a \ell$ are regular. That the active forin غ̀ү $\eta \gamma \gamma^{\circ} \rho-$ $\theta a \sigma \iota$ arose again from this $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma>\rho \theta \epsilon$, might have been only an appearance, but devoid of truth. As from á $\gamma$ єíp $\omega$ came $\dot{\alpha} \gamma$ є-
     and $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\varphi} \rho \theta \omega$; of which latter theme the regular perf. 2. would be $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho$ ing o $\rho \theta$ a.

[^89]:    * See note on ${ }^{2} \gamma \dot{\eta} 0 \chi \alpha$ under ${ }^{*} A \gamma \omega$, and Euttm. Lexil. p. 136. \&c.
    + Those who attributed to cil $\delta \omega$ as a present the two meanings of to see and to know were guilty of an inaccuracy: eíio $\omega$ meant I see, I see into it; the perf. oida, $I$ have seen into $i t$, and consequeutly $I$ know.

[^90]:    * On these syncopated forms of the dual and plural see Piers. ad Moer. p. 174.
    $\dagger$ Isocr. ad Demonic. 4. $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$; 5. cioj $\dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon 1 s$; more frequently in the Ionic dialect.
    $\ddagger$ Hippocr. De Dec. Orn. 3. De Vict. Acut. 46. Aristot. Eth. 8, 3. Theophr. Proœm. extr.

[^91]:    
    
    $\dagger$ In the three perfects $\tilde{\varepsilon} 0 t \kappa \alpha, \tilde{\epsilon} 0 \lambda \pi \alpha$, Eopya the $o$ is the usual change from the

[^92]:    * [Buttmann in his Grammar divides the tenses of the verb into principal, viz. pres. perf. and fut., and historic, viz. imperf. pluperf. and aor.-Ed.]

[^93]:    * See the conclusion of Eï $\delta \omega$.
    + Some of the Grammarians, principally the more modern, class these forms by themselves under a theme AAHMI, which

[^94]:    they join partly with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \in \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \mu a \iota$ partly with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \in \in S$, comferti, \&.c.: but genuine grammatical tradition agrees with our statement. See Buttm. Lexilogus.

[^95]:    * These two forms (ėó $\lambda \epsilon \iota, \& c c$.) together with Bockh's derivation of them are examined fully in Buttm. Lexil. p. 63.
    $t$ This is a point which still requires critical examination: see l'iers. ad Moer. p. 172. Fisch. 2. p. 502. Lobeck ad

[^96]:    Phryn. p. 152. Schæf. ad Long. p. 423.
    $\ddagger$ Compare Herm . De Legg. quibusd. subtil. Serm. Hom. 1. p. 16. Matth. Gr. Gramm. p. 415. Schæf. Hes. Op. 538. 567. p. 238. Gnom. Gr.

[^97]:    *This form has always the $\nu$, whether before a vowel or consonant.

    + As far as this is supposed to depend on prose authorities, it arises from entiremisunderstanding: see Sturz. Lex. Xen .2. p. 47. Herodot. 5,12 . where the nom. which follows it is not a plural but two singulars.

[^98]:    * See these exceptions in Herm. de Æschyl. Danaïd. p. 8.
    + Two other passages quoted also in confirmation of it, (Herodot. 5, 108. £schyl. Suppl. 300.) may be classed with that of Hesiod.
    $\ddagger$ I deduce $\delta \iota a \in \iota \mu$ é $\nu$ os (Apollon. Rhod. 2, 372.) rather from $\epsilon i \mu t$, ${ }^{t} \in \mu(\tau t$, than from $\delta t \eta \mu \iota$. A perfect $\epsilon i \mu \alpha \iota$ from that verb is not more surprising than eiloaro, катaeívato, according to which it is formed.

[^99]:    * In Plat. Soph. p. 240. d. єi $\pi \alpha \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ has been restored from the best manuscripts. So has also eimatev in Demosth. c. Nicostr. p. 1254. This opt. is more frequent in Aristotle. There is also an instance of єїтєєє.
    $\dagger$ See Buttm. Lexil. p. 131. The occurrence of $\bar{\epsilon} \pi$ ovat (e. g. in Nicand.Ther. 738.) shows only the usage of a late gram-marian-poet.

[^100]:    - This syllable et is found instead of the reduplication in the perf. of several verbs beginning with a liquid, in which case the pluperf. is the same: thus
    $\epsilon \grave{\lambda} \eta \phi \alpha$ from $\Lambda H B \Omega$. See $\Lambda \alpha \mu \beta a ́ v \omega$.
    $\epsilon i \lambda \eta \chi^{\alpha}$ from $\Lambda H X \Omega$. See $\Lambda a \gamma \chi^{\alpha} \nu \omega$.
    cì $\lambda o \chi^{a}$, єï $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu a \iota$ from $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \omega$.
    єï $\mu \rho \tau \alpha \iota$ from $\mu \epsilon і \rho о \mu \alpha$.
    + We may indecd, as many do, form єípŋка from $\epsilon i \rho \omega$, or even from the fut. $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \in \dot{\in} \omega$, as a new theme by means of the augm. ct; but by the method which I have followed above, the perf. pass., the aor. pass. and the verbals $\dot{\rho} \eta \boldsymbol{p} \mu a, \dot{\rho} \eta \tau$ ós, all agree together; and the grand analogy of the language is in favour of this plan.

[^101]:    $\ddagger$ Struve has pointed out two passages in Hippocrates, viz. $\delta$ र $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ àv... $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \in \omega$, I say, in Præcept. p. 64., and गैpєov, they said, Epidem. 2. p. 691. If the syntax and reading of these passages are to be depended on (which I cannot take upon myself to assert positively) the two forms belong to the analogy of other Ionic presents sprung from the future, as $\mu \alpha \chi$ ćo$\mu \alpha t$; and $\boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \in \sigma v$ is then a proof that the augm. $\epsilon t$ cannot be used in the way noticed in the preceding note.
    § Not that $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \gamma o ́ \rho \epsilon \cup \sigma a, \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \in \dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \xi a$, could not be used, but the compounds of $\varepsilon i \pi o \nu$ were far more common.

[^102]:    * See Od. $\gamma, 93$. Eurip. Suppl. 435. In Hes. $\theta$, 369. the old accentuation must therefore be restored from the first edition. In Apollonius the modern editors have most arbitrarily rejected the circumflex; see Beck on Apoll. 1, 1333. and 3, 917.
    $\dagger$ The same editors have given to Apollonius 2,1165. from some manuscripts the non-llomeric form є́vé $\psi \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ The above observation is grounded on

[^103]:    * It is siugular to find this form in Thucyd. 5, 11. where $\pi \epsilon \rho i \epsilon \rho^{\rho} \xi a v \tau \epsilon$ is the reading of all the known manuscripts except one which has $\epsilon t$; for in all the other passages of this writer we find the diphthong. We may however compare with it äфєркгоs in Eschyl. Choeph. 444.
    $\dagger$ This is also proved in various instances by the manuscripts : compare for example the passages in Sturz. Lex. Xenoph. and Brunck's Index to Aristophanes, as well as Andoc. 4. p. 31, 27. 32,36 . There are however manuscripts which have eï $\rho \gamma \omega$ without exception (see

[^104]:    * Once in the text of our Homer we
     but it is indisputably a false reading: for as cïpy $\omega$ is contracted from é $\in \rho \gamma \omega$, it cannot have had the digamma, which the hiatus before the verb shows to have been in the verse; for $\dot{\varepsilon} \in \dot{\rho} \gamma \omega$, i. e. EFEPIS, has

[^105]:    it not before the first $\varepsilon$; compare II. $\beta$, 825. є́vтòs éép $\gamma \in$. Bentley's emendation of this passage is therefore, certainly correct, $\mu$ ' éépyovol.
    † The augment is occasionally omitted in syllables naturally long, as $\varepsilon ้ \nu \tau v є, ~ \ddot{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa є$,
    

[^106]:     cior $\omega$ ，which in the older language had the digamma．
    +It is however to be observed that this diphthong is found also in the present，and even，though not frequently，in prose：see

[^107]:    Lobeck ad Phryn．p． 30.
    $\ddagger$ In stating these rules we must how－ ever remember the rarity of this form， and that I know only some instances of it quoted by Maittaire from Pausanias．

[^108]:    ＊Yet the Ionic conj．is $\dot{e} \pi \iota \sigma \tau_{\dot{e} \omega}^{\omega} \mu a \iota$, Herodot．3， 134.

[^109]:    * [Yet Homer has frequently $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ r $\epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \epsilon^{\prime}$ é $\pi=v \sigma \iota \nu$, e.g. in 11. o, 555. $\alpha \mu \phi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} O \delta v \sigma \bar{\eta} \alpha$ غ゙ $\pi ⿰ \nu, 11 . ~ \lambda, 483$. and many other similar expressions, which Buttmann, it would seem, considered as compounds.-En.]

[^110]:    * See the note in Buttm. Schol. Od. ad h.

    1. Bekker in his critique on Wolf's Homer has ventured a conjecture that all those Epic moods $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota \& c$. have crept into llomer's poems by false readings, because in every instance the verse would admit
     the later Epics, in whose verse this is not always the case, imitated the false reading. This view of the subject is much strength. ened by the circumstance of the compounds being invariably written in Homer $\epsilon \pi \iota-$ $\sigma \pi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \sigma \pi \delta \quad \mu \epsilon \nu$ os \&c. However as the origin of such a reading, if there were no grounds for it in the language, is difficult to be conceived; and (which is the most important point) these forms are as fixed in Pindar (O. 8, 123. 9, 15. Istlı, 4, 40.) as they are in the Alexandrine poets,
[^111]:    * As this aor. 2. occurs in no other passage, it is not to be wondered at if later poets used it transitively: thus Euphor. Fr. 40. and Alex. Etol. in Piers. ad Moer. p.

[^112]:    194. whose admirable emendation of the whole fragment was not understood by his neglecting in this verse to change кa入óv
    
[^113]:    * Of this aorist $\eta \not \rho \iota \pi 0 \nu$, which is frequent in the poets, we find one instance of a transitive meaning in the latest editions of Herodot. 9, 70. But the old reading y้pєוтov ought not to have been changed, even though the new reading had been favoured by manuscripts. A fixed line of distinction between imperf. and aor. is not possible in these older remains of antiquity. If Herodotus had intended to use the aor., we cannot but suppose that he would have said $\eta \rho \in \iota \psi \alpha \nu$, as he has $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \varepsilon i ̂ \psi a \iota ~ a t ~ 1,164 . ~$
    $\dagger$ There are no grounds for the theme $\dot{a} \nu \in \rho \in i \pi \tau \omega$ in the lexicons; nor must we be misled by the usage of this word in some later writers( $\alpha \nu \eta \rho \epsilon i \not \psi a \sigma \theta \epsilon \pi o ́ \nu o \nu$ '

[^114]:    ＊I know not whether this perf．occurs in any other passage beside the fragment of Hesiod ap．Clem．Alex．in Strom．p． 716. （603．）et in Cohort．p．63．（48．）or No． 53. Gaisf．：but there，notwithstanding the faults of transcribers，its connexion with the context makes it unquestionable；and by comparing the two quotations it most probably ran thus，Aútòs yà $\rho \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ ßaбı入єv̀s каì коípavós é $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ，＇A $\theta a \nu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$
    
    $\dagger$ This way of writing it Wolf has very

[^115]:    properly rejected：and thence we must conclude that the Greeks expressed this lengthening of the vowel，not by merely
     by the accent or ictus．This however does not appear to me grounded on suffi－ cient analogy ：and it is therefore worth remarking，that the old Grammarians，ac－ cording to the Scholium in Heyne，had another reading $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \iota \zeta$ そ́ $\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．Compare the double way of writing áti̋ $\eta \lambda o s$ and びちワ入os in Buttm．Lexil．p．53．8c．

[^116]:    * That the Greek Grammarians supposed ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ to be falsely accented is clear from the Etym. M.v. Eipio and Ac$\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$, however faulty these articles may be in other respects.

[^117]:    + In that passage however Bekker pro-
     to read $\chi \rho \eta \sigma a \mu \epsilon \in \mathcal{\nu} \circ$.s.

[^118]:    * I have inserted this fut. without hesitation as it is the necessary result of the analogics laid down in my grammar, and

[^119]:    * This distinction of $\boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \nu \theta 0 \nu$ and $\vec{\eta} \lambda \theta 0 \nu$ into Ep. and Att. is not quite accurate, as Homer has both forms ; so has Pindar; but afterwards the latter became the one in general use.
    + The 2. sing. imperat. act. of five verbs is an exception to the general analogy of accentuation; thus, $\epsilon i \pi \dot{\varepsilon}, \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \dot{\varepsilon}$, , $\dot{v} \rho \dot{\rho}$ in the common, and $\lambda \alpha \beta \dot{\varepsilon}, i \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ in the Attic language.
    $\ddagger$ In this word the first production only is pure Lipic, as in $\dot{e} \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu v \kappa \epsilon$. The $o v$ is

[^120]:    * Instances of this meaning are the following ; $\mu \dot{\eta}$ c่̈ $\lambda \theta \eta \mathrm{s}$, do not go (away), Soph. Phil. 1182. єi є̂̀ $\lambda$ Oot tıs, Xen. Anab. 7, 8, 9. although this may be interpreted as a coming to the distant place: $\sigma v \mu \beta o v-$
     $3,1,5$. that is ív่vą єis $\Delta$., rai é $\lambda \theta$ óvta àvaкoยข $\omega \sigma \alpha \iota$.
    $\dagger$ They principally occur only where the immediate context expresses a coming, as $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma 0 \nu \ddot{i} \tau \epsilon$, or oủx $\dot{j} \tau \epsilon \epsilon$ is $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho \alpha \nu$, Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 6. or in an antithesis as ióvtes rai ámıóvtes.
    $\ddagger$ A more accurate examination will show that the distinction of the meanings go and come does not depend so much on the radical sense of the verb as on the ideas which we have of the time. The German and Latin with their cognate languages express, for instance, the going to the place where the speaker is or to which the thought is directed by the verb to come, venio. In Greek $\epsilon \rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a t$ is both, as the particular relation come is announced by the context. The Aorist $\boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \theta$ ov, as expressing the moment when the action is com-

[^121]:    * We can scarcely reckon as belonging to the Greek language solitary forms from the root ФAГ - which are occasionally found in the later writers, as $\phi \dot{a} \gamma o v \sigma \iota$ in

[^122]:    * For the accentuation of this imperat. see the second note under "Epxo $\mu a$. + See the last note under 'Epúv. $\pm$ [The active voice is found in Aschyl.

[^123]:    Fr. 296. Soph. Aj. 459. Phil. 510. Eurip. Med. 118. Androm. 212. but the pass. ex $\chi$ Өогal is more common.-Passow.]

[^124]:    * Bekker has never yet found it in any manuscript. The quotation of the abovementioned rerse of Eurip. in Plutarch with $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon \bar{\imath} \sigma \theta \omega$, contains a trace of it; see Elmsley, who has written it $\alpha \pi \epsilon \chi \theta$ é $\sigma \theta a$. $+[$ Theognis has for the 2.sing. $\mathcal{\epsilon} \chi \in \iota \sigma \theta a$, 1316. like $\sigma \chi \mathfrak{j} \sigma \in \iota \sigma \theta$ a beluw.-Passow.] $\ddagger$ [Homer has the imperf. also without the augm. © $\chi$ Ou.—Passow.]

[^125]:    * The reading $\in \pi \notin \chi a t o$, from a supposed pres. غं $\pi 0 i \gamma \nu v \mu c$, is quite untenable; for as the simple oirvúvat means to open, this compound of it cannot mean to

[^126]:    shut. Derived from oí $\chi$ ofas it might be in itself defensible, but in the passage in question it gives no idea recommended by its combining easily with the context.

[^127]:    * The critic must not be misled by finding the reading $\alpha \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi \circ \hat{\alpha} \mu \in \nu \circ \nu$ in Aristoph. in so excellent a manuscript as the Cod. Ravenn., when the internal analogy is so decisive. Besides it is clear that a form so strange to the common grammarian as $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi \nu 0 \bar{v} \mu \alpha t$, and which is verified by such pure analogy, cannot have come into the manuscripts by chance or mistake; consequently that the worst which has it, is in such a case of more weight than the best which has it not.

[^128]:    ＊It may however be shortened in Att． poetry；see Lex．Seg．6．p．471，10．Dobr． ad Aristoph．Plut． 75.
    $\dagger$［Instead of ićval Homer has ié $\mu \in \nu a \ell$ ， Hesiod $i \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$ ：and in the imperf．Homer has＂̈ $\epsilon \nu$ 3．plur．for ${ }^{\iota} \in \sigma \alpha \nu$ ，Il．$\mu, 33$ ．－ Passow．］
    $\ddagger$ For ${ }^{\circ} \omega \kappa \alpha, \dot{a} \phi \epsilon \epsilon \omega \kappa \alpha$ ，and the pass． $\dot{a} \phi \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ in N．T．see the note on $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\eta}-$ oxc under $\tilde{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ ．I will mention here a trace of the same form in Herodot．2， 165. where the text has ávéovtac és tò $\mu \dot{\alpha}$－

[^129]:    ＊Examples may be found in Fisch．ad Well．2．p．484．where we must restore $\pi \rho \circ \eta \dot{\pi} \kappa \alpha \sigma \epsilon$ ．
    ＋Xenoph．Hier．7，11．Eurip．Suppl． 1199.
    $\ddagger$ Yet we find in the Attics instances of the regular form，as $\pi \alpha \rho \iota \omega \omega \in \nu$ Plat． Phæd．p．90．，á $\phi \stackrel{\eta}{\tau} \in$ Xen．Hell．2，4， 10. （16．），$\dot{\alpha} \phi \iota \in \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \mathcal{\nu}$ ib． $6,4,2$ ．and 3 ．，still with the various reading a oíotev in both pas－ sages．
    § For instance $\dot{\alpha} \nu t \in i$ is from＇IES，but ávít pres．of＇I $\Omega$ ．Compare II．$a, 326$ ． with $336 ., \beta, 752$ ．with $\gamma, 118$ ．where

[^130]:    ＊It might appear as if the fut．$\dot{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma-$ $\sigma \in \sigma \theta a \iota$（Il．$t, 455$ ．）could not be sepa－
    
    
     derstood by all commentators thus，＂that a son born of me may never sit on his knees，＂and in this sense we find＇ंфє́द̆єто

[^131]:    at Il．$\phi, 506$ ．But a much more evident comparison is furnished by $\mathrm{Od} . \pi, 443$.
     є́ $ф \in \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ ．The meaning of غ́фє́ $\sigma \sigma \epsilon-$ $\sigma \theta \alpha t$ therefore in the above passage of the Iliad is＂he will never seat，＂consequently it must not be separated from ẽ $\sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ ， モ̈бの九．

[^132]:    * This writing é $\sigma \sigma \sigma a \tau 0$, with the lenis, to distinguish it from éé $\sigma \sigma a \tau 0$ the aor. of " $\nu \nu v \mu$, is an arbitrary proceeding of the Grammarians, and scarcely correct, as the syllab. augm. takes the aspirate before aspirated vowels, as in $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\omega} \rho \omega \nu, \not{\varepsilon} \eta \kappa \alpha$.
    $\dagger$ This form may be considered either as a perf. pass. (I have been seated, or $I$ have seated myself, consequently $I$ sit), or as a separate formation in $\mu$, like $\delta i ́-$ ढицаи: the former appears to me the

[^133]:    ＊It is singular that Pierson（ad Mocr． p．148．）was so far misied by Herodian＇s authority as to reject contemptuously the very intelligible opinion of the gramma－ rian in the Etym．M．p．413，8．（to which we may add lb．p． 410,49 ．\＆c．and Tho． M．v．$\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta(\omega \nu)$ ，and to defend $\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \eta \nu$ ，which is there much censured，as the true reading of Eurip．Alc．651．where some Codd． certainly have it．It is anything but probable that transcribers should have introduced into so many passages of the old writers $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \zeta(\omega \nu$ ，which sounds so dif－ ferently from ${ }^{6} \zeta_{\eta} \eta$ ，nay the contrary is the more probable．See Fischer，1．p． 125. In Uemosth．Timocr．702，2．we certainly find $\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \eta \nu$ without any known various

[^134]:    * This formation may be supposed to arise from the mere lengthening of そá $\omega$, $\zeta \bar{\omega}$, making $\zeta_{\dot{\omega} \omega} \omega$; but when I compare $\beta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta e$ (see Bów) and $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} о \boldsymbol{o} a t$ with $\zeta \dot{\omega} \epsilon \in \nu$ and $\zeta \bar{\eta} \nu$, and the well-known forms

[^135]:     $p \in \theta \rho o \nu$, it seems to point out to me a radical identity in the verbs $\zeta \bar{\eta} \nu$ and $\beta \iota \omega \bar{\nu} u$, which accounts for thcir being so mixed up together in usage.

[^136]:    * Schneider's remark in his Lexicon must be taken in this limited sense. See the word in Lucian Piscat. 14. Paus. 10, 6, 32. Some older examples would be desirable. I find it also in Hipp. Min. p.

[^137]:    ＊The conclusion that because we have $\dot{\eta} \tau \tau \tilde{u} \sigma \theta a \iota$ we must necessarily have $\dot{\eta} \tau$－ $\tau \bar{\alpha} \nu$ is false：$\dot{j} \tau \tau \bar{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is a neuter idea， ク̈テ $\tau \omega \nu$ єiцít८vos，whence it can be joined only with the gen．$\dot{\eta} \tau \tau \bar{\alpha} \sigma \theta a i ~ \tau \iota v o s . ~ T h e ~$ passive form，as in many other verbs， took this meaning，$\dot{\boldsymbol{j} \tau \tau \boldsymbol{j} \theta \eta \nu}$ like $\dot{\epsilon} \phi 0-$ $\beta i, \theta \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \theta \eta \nu, \& \dot{\text { c．and might there－}}$ fore have an active voice in a causative sense，but not necessarily．The com－ mon reading in Isæus condemns itself． If the orator had wished merely to con－ trast the active and passive，he must
    

[^138]:    * A perfect $\tau \in \theta a \phi \alpha$ with a causative meaning, I astonish, in Schweighæuser's Athen. 6. p. 258. c. is suspected, because the manuscript has (contrary to the metre it is true) тé $\begin{aligned} & \text { asde. Now the aor. p. }\end{aligned}$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \dot{a} \mu \beta \eta$ in Hesych. supposes a theme $\theta \dot{c} \mu \beta \omega$; perhaps therefore it ought to be,
     instead of $\mu \in \tau 0 \bar{u} \sigma 0 \bar{v}$.

[^139]:    * Blomfield on Eschyl. Sept. 378. (he has made some mistakes) and Elmsley on Eurip. Heracl. 272. We must not be

[^140]:    surprised at the $\epsilon$ in an aor. 2. any more than in $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \mu \circ \nu$ : it was necessary on account of $\vec{c} \theta a \nu o \nu$.

[^141]:    ＊Six verbs in $\epsilon \in$ take $\epsilon v$ in the fut．or in some derivative，viz．$\theta \in \in \omega, \nu \varepsilon ́ \omega, \pi \lambda \in ́ \omega$ ，
     $\nu \in v \sigma \alpha, \chi \in \bar{v} \mu \alpha, \& c$ ．And two in ait take $a v$, viz．кaíw，к入aíw（Att．кáw，к入áw）， fut．каv́бш，к入аv́бо $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\iota}$
    ＋In Eurip．Heracl．652．the reading of the text was $\pi \rho o \sigma \theta i \xi_{\varepsilon \iota s}$ ，but it is now amended from the manuscripts to－et． ［Passow has a fut．act．$\theta i \xi \omega$ ，but without example or remark，further than that $\theta i$－ $\xi_{0} \mu a i$ is more general．］
    $\ddagger$ Schncider in his Lexicon quotes ${ }^{\text {E }} \theta_{\text {c }}$－ $\gamma \in \nu$ from Apollon．Rh．4，1013，as an im－ perf．and $\theta i \gamma \omega \nu$ from Eschyl．Prom． 855. as a present：but the immediate context does not agree with this statement．If we

[^142]:    * An unwillingness to recognize the idea of a perfect in $\tau \in \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\xi} 0 \mu \alpha t$ arises partly from the custom of our language, particularly from such expressions as $\beta \iota \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \tau<\iota ~ \grave{\eta}$

[^143]:    * Even in Quint. Sm, 1, 542. Oopei should be amended to the farmore suitable poetical aor. Өóper.

[^144]:    + On this perf. compare $\Delta \in \in$ with note, and $\Delta \dot{v} \omega$ with second note.

[^145]:    ＊Instances occur where there is no $\nu$ in the pres．of a verb，and yct it is found in the aor．1．pass．，as $\dot{i} \delta \rho v \dot{\nu} \nu \eta \nu, \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \nu v v^{\prime}-$ $\theta \eta$ under＇I $\delta \rho \dot{v} \omega$ and $\Pi \boldsymbol{\nu}$ é $\omega$ ．In such cases it is not necessary to suppose an actual theme in $-\boldsymbol{i} \nu \omega$ ．Compare $i \theta$ v́v－

[^146]:    + ［Passow has also a fut．$i \zeta \eta \sigma \omega$ ，Att． $i \bar{\omega}$ ；and in the compound he has fut．ка－ $\theta \iota \zeta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ，Dor．$\kappa \alpha \theta_{i}^{\prime} \xi \omega$ ，Att．$\kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \omega \bar{\omega}$ ；aor． 1. є́кáӨĭ $\sigma$ ，also каӨї $\sigma \alpha$ ，Thuc．6，66．7， 82. Aristoph．Ran．911．The Epic part．кco－ $\theta i \sigma \sigma a s$ is used by Homer．］

[^147]:    ＊［Wolf always accents the imperf．cá－
     the more correct way if we suppose the original form to be＇́к $\theta_{1} \zeta$ оv：but Butt－ mann docs not allow this to hold good in all cases．－Passow．］

    + ［Diogen．Laert．has also a fut．$\kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon-$ бท்бо $\mu$ а．－Passow．］
    $\ddagger$ In Lucian Solcec．11．ró $\gamma^{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$
     Here is a various reading $\kappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ ． Now when we find further on，זoे $\delta \dot{\text { e }} \kappa \alpha-$
    
     pov סр $\bar{\omega} \mu \in \nu$（we do that to another），тò
    

[^148]:     read here also $\kappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \sigma \mu \tau t$ and $\kappa \alpha \theta i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ ： for it is clear that the point in discussion is the difference between the midd．and act．voices，in the same way as кагaסov－ $\lambda o \bar{v} \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \delta o v \lambda o v \bar{\nu}$ are spoken of just afterwards．But in the direction given
    
     an interpolation，for among the preceding forms which are rejected there is no pre－ sent：and in Lucian Philopseud．27．the reading $\kappa \alpha \theta$ é $\xi_{\epsilon \tau \alpha} \alpha$ is uncertain．In Eurip． Heracl．33．＇Iкє́т $\alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a$ the aug－ ment is in the synalopha，and the context requires cither we are sitting（ $\kappa a \theta \dot{\eta} \mu \in \theta \alpha$ ）

[^149]:    ＊That is to say，that in this verb the short syllable of the stem or root，as seen in the aorist（iкєiv）irćo ct ，instead of being strengthenedin the present by chan－

[^150]:    ging it to $\epsilon \iota$ ，as in $\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega \pi \epsilon \theta \epsilon i \nu$ ，passed over into $\bar{i}$ or $\eta$ ；making therefore＂ixw or $\ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ instead of $\varepsilon$ ह̈кw．

[^151]:    ＊We must compare these imperatives with $\sigma \tau \bar{\eta} \theta \iota$, č $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha, \&$ c．，and suppose that the pres．and aor．1．took the causative sense to make gracious ；of which i idáouat， i入a $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ，would then be the middle，$I$ make gracious to me，appease．
    $\dagger$ The characteristic $\sigma \sigma$ of this verb may

[^152]:    be doubted，for i $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$（II．o，17．）may be the conj．aor．，as it is in Hesychius；nor do I know other authority for the pres．than $i \mu a \sigma \sigma o f \in \nu \circ \iota$ in Archiæ Epig．22．which was perhaps first made from the passage of Homer．

[^153]:    * The length of the $a$ is sufficiently evident from two passages in Menand. ap. Suid. v. ámóбtu. We see in lex. Seguer.

[^154]:    p. S1. Chat some Atticists considered this form inferior to the other.

[^155]:    * In the lat and corrupted state of the language a pres. was formed from "̈б $\quad \eta \kappa \alpha$, viz. $\sigma \tau \dot{j} \kappa \omega$, whence $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \in \tau є, 1$ Cor. 16,

    13. and $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \epsilon$, Alex. Aphrod. Probl. 1,49. And again another pres. $\dot{\text { é}} \boldsymbol{\text { t }} \boldsymbol{j} \kappa \omega$, Posidippi Epigr. 15.
[^156]:    * For which Homer has é $\sigma \tau \dot{c} \mu \epsilon \nu$ and غ் $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu a \iota$.
    + For which Homer has also évr $\eta \tau \in$, II. $\delta, 243.246$.
    $\ddagger$ In Andoc. 2, 8. ка日'є $\sigma \tau a \tau 6$ is pluperf., and at 1, 112. $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau a \mu \epsilon \nu$ according to Bekker is the same. [llomer has ধ̈́т as dual of both perf. and pluperf.; and
     $\sigma \alpha \nu$ as pluperfects.-Passow.]
    § We may gather from different parts of Buttmann's Grammar the following for-

[^157]:    lium, has been admitted by Wolf into the text instead of éor $\eta \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\text { , }}$, which was directly contrary to the sense.

    * See the unanimity of the best Codd., e. g. in Plat: Parmen. pp. 63, 15.16. 64, 2. 12. Bekk. Compare also Plat. Tim. pp. 30, 7. 41, 6., \&c. Thucyd. 3, 9. 4, 10. Hence Bekker always reads éotós, as docs Hermann in Soph. Ed. T. 632. Compare Dind. Aristoph. Equ. 567. The other

[^158]:    * An opposite case is found in Callim. L. P. 83. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\theta} \eta$ with a long ; if it is not a. false reading for є̇ $\sigma \tau \alpha \mathfrak{c} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ( $\epsilon \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota$ ); for it is translated stabat, and we shall find that the sense gains by this correction, particularly in comparison with the unsuitable passive. [In the above passage from 11. $\mu, 55,56$. Passow differs in one

[^159]:    point only from Buttmann : he reads with
     $\sigma a \nu$ in Il. $\beta, 525$. Od. $\gamma, 182$. and $\sigma, 306$., but he also reads it in both lines 55 and 56 of Il. $\mu$., whereas Buttmann reads in the former of the two the pluperf. Égraбav with the force of an imperfect.]

[^160]:    * For the terminations $-\nu \omega$ and $-\nu v \mu$ are essentially the same; as in tive tiv$\nu v \mu$, ктєі́vळ ктірขvpц.
    + [lassow supposes it to be probably from каiv $\omega, \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu(\omega$, consequently from a radical form KEN $\Omega$ in the sense of to overpower, conquer.]
    $\ddagger$ The above account does not agree with the usage of Eurip. in Elect. 616., where the walls of the town Фpovoaís xékagtat
     cvidently means arc furnished, equipped,

[^161]:    －As $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \omega$ for $\sigma \tau \in \dot{\epsilon} \omega, \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} y s$ for $\sigma \tau \in ́ y s ;$ again $\sigma \tau \epsilon \boldsymbol{i} \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\sigma \tau \in ́ \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \eta \in \epsilon \tau \nu$ for отท́クrov，\＆c．See Baìw and＂I $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$ ．
    $\dagger$ The form with $\epsilon \ell$ is found once in Sophocl．El．759．кeiantes with the va－ rious reading кnavtes，the alteration of which to кéaytes I cannot approve of．

[^162]:    $\mu \alpha \chi \varepsilon ́ \sigma о \mu \alpha t-о \bar{v} \mu a t$ ．From KA $\Omega \Omega$ was formed кє́к入 $\eta \kappa \alpha$ by metathesis like тé－ $\tau \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$ from т́́ $\mu \nu \omega, \kappa \epsilon ́ \kappa \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$ from $\kappa \alpha ́ \mu \nu \omega$ ： see also $\beta \in ́ \beta \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$ under $\mathrm{B} \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \omega$ ．In－ stances of this fut．may be seen in $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \bar{\imath}$ ， Xen．Symp．1，15．к $\alpha \lambda \epsilon \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，Demosth． Lept．5．$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda o v ̄ \nu \tau \alpha s$, Xen．Hell．6， 3，2．See this formation also under $\Delta \hat{f} \mu$ iv． Of the fut．$\kappa \alpha \lambda$ é $\sigma \omega$ the only instances which we find in the older writers are in Æschin．c．Timarch．p．10．and Lycurg． c．Leocr．p．150．є่ $\pi \iota \kappa a \lambda \in ́ \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$ ．In Ari－ stoph．Plut． 963 ．Brunck has mistaken the aorist for the future．
     under Té $\mu \nu \omega$ ．

[^163]:    $\dagger$ I cannot think there are any grounds for $\kappa є \kappa \mu \eta \omega \bar{\omega} \alpha \alpha$ in Thucyd．3，59．however supported it may be by the manuscripts against the various reading кєкипко́таs． It can hardly have been introduced by the antiquated meaning（the dead）or by the solemn tone of the oration，as $\kappa є \kappa \mu \eta \kappa o ́ \tau \epsilon s$ is used even by Euripides in the same sense．
     rodot．3，36．катат $\rho$ оt $\xi_{\epsilon \tau \alpha \iota, ~ i b . ~ 3, ~}^{156 .}$ Archil．Fr．23．Aristoph．Nub． 1240.
     105．Aristopl．Vesp．1366．Thesm． 566. Equ． 435.

[^164]:    * Brunck thought indeed that he had found in the Argument of the Antigone of Sophocles an aor. pass. ка兀 $\alpha \pi \rho \circ \iota \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ in a different form and meaning; but it is a mere error of transcription for $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \rho \eta$ $\sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$.
    $\dagger$ That is to say, $\pi$ poi $\xi$ had the general sense of a gift, as originally dos had in Latin; thence $\pi \rho o i ̂ \kappa \alpha$, like $\hat{\delta} \omega \rho \in a ́ \nu$, without pay or reward, gratis. The verb from which this word is terived meant therefore to make a present of; and thus кат $\alpha \pi \rho \circ i \xi_{\epsilon \iota}$ is a neat sarcasm, " thou sbalt not give me that for nothing," i. e. I will give thee something in return, I will pay thee for it. The connection is here plain and certain.

[^165]:    * céarat is properly the Ion. 3. plur. shortened from кeiaral, but used as a 3. sing. by those later writers to whom the Ion. dialect was no longer natural. See Reitz ad Luc. de D. S. 6.
    † See Herm. ad Vig. not. 526. and De Metr. 1. p. 86. where the very analogous

[^166]:    * It is generally acknowledged that кé $\lambda \omega$, of which $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ is properly the inf. aor. and $\kappa \kappa \lambda \omega$ the fut., (compare катактаע $\bar{\omega}$ ), is the one original verbal stem, which afterwards branclied off according to difference of meaning into three verbs, кє́ ${ }^{\prime} о \mu a \ell$, ка入є́ $\omega$ and $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \in \omega$.
    $\dagger$ If we examine this more closely we shall certainly find that the adopting a stem KENT- to unite the above-mentioned forms is the most suitable plan;

[^167]:    better for instance than KENQ, which does not explain $\kappa є \sigma \tau$ ós satisfactorily, and than $\mathrm{KE} \Omega$ through which we cannot immediately get to кévrш $\rho, \& \mathrm{cc}$. We must not however try to unite the ideas to prick, whence кєขrєiv, - to cleave, whence $\kappa \in a ́ \zeta \omega$,-and to beat, whence in all languages comes the idea of to kill, ктєi(v, raive; nay we must rather endeavour to keep them separate.
    $\ddagger$ Kєрávขvuı and its sister-form Ke-

[^168]:    ＊［See Sophocl．Aj．634．El．868．Ed． T．968．Ant．911．，Eschyl．Sept． 590. Ed．］
    $\dagger$ In order to explain it in that way we must first understand $\chi$ á $\zeta_{\epsilon \sigma \theta a i ́ ~ r ı \nu o s ~}^{\text {res }}$ （which in its common acceptation means to give way to any one）in the sense of to cease from pursuing any one；and then sup－ pose that the two goddesses blame them－ selves with a certain severity of expres－ sion，because，when their friends are pur－ sued by the enemy，they do not assist them against the pursuit of the other

[^169]:    * Grammatical analogy also is in favour of it. For while кvข'́ $\omega$, from $\mathrm{K} \Upsilon$ - ễкvoa, retains the $v$ short, $\kappa \iota \nu$ ć $\omega$ has the $\iota$ long: in the same way кivvual is remote from the analogy of $\zeta \dot{\omega} \nu \nu v \mu \ell$, そ́ $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \nu v \mu \iota$, because it is written almost invariably with a single $\nu$, and therefore (with $\gamma \dot{a} \nu v \mu a \iota, \lambda a ́ \zeta v \mu a \iota$,

[^170]:    * See Monk and Matthiæ on Eurip. Hipp. 1434. (1442.). Hitherto however this reading has not been introduced into any passage of the tragedians from manuscripts, except that Victorius has written it so on the margin of a copy in the Alcest. 480. (495.). These critics appear to me therefore to have been very premature: for Hesych. and the others quote peculiarities from all writers. Now that Photius and Suidas expressly quote $\kappa \iota \gamma \chi$ ávєเข from Solon; that Eustathius (on Od. p. 209,32 .) cites not merely $\kappa \iota \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ but also i$\gamma \chi a ́ \nu i v$, and that as "more analogi-cal"-these two things appear to me much more against than in favour of the intro-

[^171]:    ＊Some verbs in $\zeta$ have $\gamma \gamma$ for their characteristic，as for instance $\kappa \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$ ， $\pi \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega, \sigma a \lambda \pi i \zeta \omega$ ．
    $\dagger$［Passow however makes no mention of $\kappa \lambda a \gamma \gamma a \dot{\nu} \omega$ being a suspected form，and quotes it from Eschyl．Eum．126．and Xen．

[^172]:    Ven．6，23．He has also $\kappa \lambda \alpha y \gamma \alpha i v \omega$ ．］ $\ddagger$ This aor，was formerly quoted from Archiæ Lpigr．28．，but the true reading $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \xi_{\alpha \sigma \alpha}$ is now adopted by Jacobs．
    § On the formation of this future see Өヒ́w．

[^173]:    * [The article in Schneider runs thus: $\mathrm{K} \lambda \epsilon i ́ \omega$, -єí $\sigma \omega$, whence perf. pass. $\kappa \in \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota-$ $\sigma \mu$ évos. According to the Etym. Mag. кéклєєцає was used for кє́клєєбргь. In Demosth. l'hilipp. p. 22. Bekker reads xe-
    $\kappa \lambda \eta \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi о \rho i \omega \nu$. In Eurip. Hel. 983. stands $\kappa є \kappa \lambda y \dot{y} \mu \theta \alpha$ : ant in Eschyl. Suppl. 957. кєк $\boldsymbol{\kappa} є \mu$ ย́vos for $\kappa є \kappa \lambda є є \sigma \mu$ évos. -F.d.]

[^174]:    ＊It is certain that in the older language the 0 ，which is supposed to be peculiar to the perf．2．（perf．midd．），belonged to the perf．1．act．；but as it is not generally so in the language as now grammatically formed，we put down as deviations from the established analogy three perfects， viz．，$\pi є ́ \mu \pi \omega-\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi о \mu \phi a$ ，клє́ $\pi \tau \omega$－кє́－ $\kappa \lambda о ф a, \tau \rho \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \omega-\tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \circ \phi a$ ．But this o never goes into the perf．passive．
    $\dagger$ This form，which does not appear to have been ever in use，but which I have

[^175]:    ＊See also そŷv from Z $\dot{\alpha} \omega, \chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$ from X $\rho a ́ \omega, \delta \iota \psi y \nu, \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\nu} \nu, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．
    $\dagger$ Most of the polysyllabic verbs in－i $\zeta_{\omega}$ prefer the Attic fut．to the other；but of those iu $-\alpha \dot{\zeta} \omega$ nothing like a dccided ana－

[^176]:    $\log y$ can be laid down ：for while in $\beta_{1-}$
    $\beta \dot{a} \zeta \omega$ the Attic fut．is very common，in $\beta \dot{a} \zeta \omega$ the Attic fut．is very common，in $\dot{a} \gamma o \rho a ́ \zeta \omega$ and others it is a barbarism：see Lex．Seg．p．331．and Maitt．pp．47． 48.

[^177]:    ＊See the examples in Stephens，and compare the various readings．Brunck was therefore quite right in Theocr． 1,30 ． in preferring the reading of the majority of the manuscripts；as was Jacobs in He－ gesippi Epigr．3．（Anth．Vat．p．164．）in suspecting the reading of the Vatican manuscript кєкоข $\eta \mu \in \dot{v} \boldsymbol{v a}$ to be，what is much more probable，and must at all events be preferred in the hexameter，$-\iota \mu \in \dot{y}$ ． The assertion of Hemsterhuys（on Lucian

[^178]:    * As the Epic aor. of фaívw is é $\phi a a ́ v-$ $\theta \eta \nu$ because that verb is contracted from фaciv $\omega$, so is the remarkable production of the tenses of $\kappa \rho a i v \omega$ the result of contraction, and most probably of kpaivw from kpeaiv $\omega$ : in which this striking peculiarity is to be observed ; that it is not

[^179]:    * On the accentuation of these forms see $\Delta v ं \nu a \mu a t$.
    + Stephens quotes it from two works falsely attributed to Aristotle; Hist. Mirab. c. 6. and OEc. 2.
    $\ddagger$ This verb is the only instance of the change of $\epsilon$ to $\eta, \kappa \rho \epsilon \mu a \dot{\omega} \omega$ and крє $\mu \alpha \nu_{\nu \nu-}$

[^180]:    - On the formation of the two perfects and the aor. 1. pass., see Teivw.
    $\dagger$ Aristoph. Ach. 459. according to the manuscripts.
    $\ddagger$ The perf. кéкт $\eta \mu \alpha \iota$, like $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \mu a t$ from $\mu \nu a \omega$, is formed with the regular reduplication; but ékr $\eta \mu$ at follows the analogy of verbs beginning with two conso-

[^181]:    nants (not mutes before liquids), which take $\epsilon$ instead of the reduplication. This latter is properly Ionic, but used occasionally by the Attics, as Plat. Menop. 97. e. et sæpe. See Heindorf. ad Plat. Protag. 75.
    § The $\omega$ in this form may be thus accounted for. As the perfects with the sense of a present borrow more or less

[^182]:    greatest certainty restore from the manu－
     ктаүкєข＇Eג入ךขєк̄̄s，speaks more con－ cisely to the same point．And lastly， Sextus，who（Adv．Gramm．10．）says，кTGí－
     tat，speaks not of the language of common life，but of that taught scientifically by the Grammarians．The only thing therefore which we learn from this passage also is， that ékтаүка was rejected．

[^183]:    ＊From xtcinw we suppose a form
     from which comes regularly éктóvŋка．

    + In all verbs which have in the perf． the augment instead of the reduplication， the indicative of this pass．aor．cannot be distinguished from the pluperf．：$\omega \rho \mu \eta \nu$ ， $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \phi \theta \dot{i} \mu \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \dot{u} \mu \eta \nu$ ．
    $\ddagger$［Or still more literally，＂war is accus－ tomed to slay the slayer．＂－Ed．］

[^184]:    ＊Phrynichus in Lex．Seguer．1．p．29， 7．prefers writing $\kappa \tau i \nu v \mu \iota$ and rejects the $\nu \nu$ ；but he has no grounds for doing so． If we suppose that this form came from a root without any $\nu$ ，there is nothing to lead us to a stem кTC－or ктec－only to кта－（ёктаע，ёкта），and analogy would therefore require $\kappa \tau \dot{a} \nu \nu v \mu$ ．But if it is formed from $k r e t \nu$－as a stem，we have （like ieíxvvuı）the completely analogous word $\kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu-\nu v \mu \iota$ ：and as a diphthong be－ fore $\nu \nu$ is something unusual，it was to be expected that the pronunciation would

[^185]:    * The fut. кvг向 $\sigma \boldsymbol{\mu} a \iota$ depends entirely on the corrupted passage of Eurip. Cycl. 171.: the comp. $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \kappa v \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ (Plat. Rep. p. 469. a.) is no argument in favour of the simple form, for in the comp. we find $\pi \rho o \sigma-$
     simple ểvvaa only. In Aristoph. Thesm. 915. 火र́vo is conjunctive.
    + The midd. кvøá $\mu \in \nu a l$, kissing or caressing each other, is in Athen. 9. p. 394. d.
    $\ddagger$ Kєкvр $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ кóta in the Second Alcibiades 6. belongs to the orthography of Plato,

[^186]:    * In Hippocr. I find more than once кvéovoa (e.g. in De Superfetat.), which I think may be reconciled with кv́cı occurring frequently in the same writer.
    + Macrob. De Verbo Græco cap. 5. acknowledges both forms; but they are not easy to be recognised there on account of an error of transcription in $\iota$ for $v$.
    $\ddagger$ Schneider in the Supplement to his

[^187]:    * In order to bring this change of vowel into an acknowledged analogy, it is perfectly allowable to suppose a change of the stem to $\mathbf{A E I X}$ - on account of $\pi \in \dot{y} \boldsymbol{y}-$ $\theta$ os, $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i ิ \nu, \pi \in ́ \pi о \nu \theta \alpha$.
     $\chi \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \nu \omega$ ë $\lambda a \chi \circ \nu$, and see note under Aí $\sigma \dot{\alpha}-$ ขоисt.
    $\ddagger$ The infin. $\dot{\alpha} v a \lambda \epsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \theta a \iota$ stands in the text of Hippocr. Offic. Med. 7. The

[^188]:    * [The old pres. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, midd. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{0}-$ $\mu a c$, is seldom used by the Attics, frequently by Homer, who on the other hand never uses $\lambda a \nu \theta a ́ v \omega$, though he has the imperf, of it three times and the imperf. midd. once.-Passow.]
     $\kappa о \bar{v} \sigma \alpha$, for $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta_{0}$, is an Epic inaccuracy.
    $\ddagger$ It is quite a mistake to compare this form with those presents of Theocritus

[^189]:    * Through Aristarchus this is now become the established reading. That this adj. occurs nowhere else would be no objection to it, but there is nothing in the passage to render its adoption necessary. The common meaning too of the simple $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ may be considered as the causative of $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ o $\mu a \iota, I$ forget ; in as much as to forget is "to lose the consideration of an object," but $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ тוvá is "to withdraw oneself from the observation or consideration of another." This therefore has the causative idea from the object itself, but $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \ell \nu$ from a third object. It is however conceivable that usage adopted dififcrent forms to express that difference, and thus $\lambda \in \lambda a \theta \varepsilon i \nu$ and the compound

[^190]:    * There is also the regular augment with this meaning; e.g. $\xi v \lambda \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \circ \mathrm{~s}$, Aristoph. Eccl. 58. and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t \lambda \in \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \dot{\mathcal{c}} \nu \mathrm{\nu}$ os from

[^191]:    ＊The difficulty of ascertaining whether the Greeks ever used a fut．入cv́б人 is greatly increased by our finding the pre－ sent very commonly written in the manu－ scripts with a single $\sigma$ ．

    + ［Passow says that $\lambda i \zeta_{10}$ occurs only

[^192]:    * The Germans say "the heavens are (gestirnt) starred," but they cannot say "God (stirnte) starred the heavens."[So our word frosted is formed like a participle, without however the existence of a verb to frost.-ED.]

[^193]:    ＊The Scholiast on Aristoph．Plut． 657. has both opinions；＇E入o $\hat{v} \mu \in \mathcal{V}$＇$\dot{a} \pi \bar{o} \tau 0 \bar{v}$ $\lambda o{ }^{\prime} \omega$（the corrupted $\lambda \dot{v} \omega$ of the first edi－ ditions has been erroneously altered to
     кoாjıv．But Plutarch（De Poesi Hom．） quotes $\lambda$ oṽtą and oīpą as instances of
    

    + If those forms were abridged by syn－ cope，then，according to general analogy， we should find between $\lambda о \bar{v} \mu a-\lambda о \bar{v} \tau a \iota$ and between $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda o v ́ \mu \eta \nu-\dot{\epsilon} \lambda o \tilde{\tau} \tau o$ the second persons $\lambda o v ̄ \sigma \alpha t$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} \lambda o v \sigma o$ ，nor would the imperat．$\lambda$ noṽo be defective．But these nowhere occur either in authors or grammarians：for $\lambda o \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \boldsymbol{\prime}$ ，which stands in some editions of Phrynichus，（see Ed． Pauw．p．80．）is a mere corruption of入ovitas．Lobeck has extracted the whole article from the first edition，according to which the forms disapproved of by l＇hry－ nichus（and they are the common ones） are the following－$\dot{\epsilon} \lambda o v o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ，є̀ $\lambda o$ únv， غ̀入ои́єто，入оv́о $\mu \alpha \iota$ ，入оv́єт $\alpha$ ，è $\lambda$ оvó $\mu \in \theta \alpha$ ， غ่ $\lambda o v ́ o v \tau о, ~ \lambda o v ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a \imath ; ~ t o ~ w h i c h ~ a r e ~ o p-~$ posed as pure Attic $\lambda_{0} \bar{v} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ k a i ~ \lambda o v ̃ \mu a \iota, ~$
    
     first series between $\lambda_{0}$ v́oucu and $\lambda_{0}$ vectal， and is therefure silently approved of： while no notice is taken of Xó $\epsilon \ell$（which we have brought forward above），pro－

[^194]:    - [Passow says that the Attics use $\mu \pi-$ $\nu \dot{j} \sigma \rho \mu a \ell$ as a kind of exclamation, as we

[^195]:    * See Heyne's critical notes on Il. a, 153. $\beta, 801$. $\gamma, 137.254$. and on $a, 304$. $\beta, 377 . \gamma, 393.0,633$. It would be a very hazardous step therefore to follow Aristarchus and Wolf in introducing the reading with the $\eta$ in all the passages. Besides, if we wish to observe analogy, we should rather make the $\epsilon \sigma \sigma$ the universal reading, as some of the older critics have proposed : see Heyne on 11. a, 298. Compare the verb Aidoual (for although aiócopar became the common form in a later period, it is still to be looked upon like $\mu a \chi \dot{\varepsilon} о \mu a \iota$ ), of which the fut. ai $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma-$ $\sigma o \mu a \iota$ is the only defensible form in 11. $\chi, 419$, while in Od. $\xi$, 388. it is opposed by aidinбoual: on this passage see Porson. in Postscripto.
    $\dagger$ The three verbs which we have here joined together on account of their having the same letters in the stem, are certainly so similar to each other in meaning also, that no one would take it on himself to

[^196]:    *We find in the lexicons for $\mu \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ a present $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, fut. $\mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$; but there are no grounds for such a present, nor does any such éxist. Má $\sigma \sigma \omega, \mu a ́ \xi \omega, I$ knead, although perhaps akin to it, is a different verb.
    $\dagger$ In the well-known Alcaic fragment, instead of $\mathrm{N} \bar{v} \nu \boldsymbol{\chi} \boldsymbol{\rho} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \theta \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ we must read $\mu \epsilon \theta \dot{v} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, Eolic infin. for $\mu \epsilon \theta v$ $\sigma \theta$ ติข

[^197]:    $\ddagger$ [Thus Passow has $\mu$ кiро $\quad$ cut ; aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu о \rho о \nu$; perf. $\epsilon \mu \mu о \rho a$.]
    § In many primitive verbs the fut. and aor. 1. act. give the preference to the causative meaning; the aor. 2. and perf. act., particularly the perf. 2., (perf. midd.) prefer the immediale and indeed principally the intransitive.

[^198]:    * The aspirate on this word may be compared with that on $\begin{gathered}\text { co } \\ \sigma \\ \\ \kappa\end{gathered} \kappa \alpha$, and on the presents " $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$ and "i $\pi \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$, whence we may conclude that it was intended as a substitute for the reduplication; but this principle, like many others, was observed only partially. We find however a trace of its having extended in the dialects further than might at first appear, by a

[^199]:    frequently recurring form in the Milesian Inscription in Chishull, p.67. á $\phi \in ́ \sigma \tau a \lambda \kappa \alpha$, which supposes the existence of $\epsilon \sigma \tau a \lambda \kappa a$. On the other hand the instances of cifap$\mu$ évos with the lenis, which Schæfer (Melet. p. 22. and ad Soph. ©Ed. T. 1082.) has quoted from the later writers, are to be considered as mere sophistry of the later grammarians.

[^200]:    * As no other forms occur than the 3. sing. $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \beta \lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha t, \mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \epsilon \tau 0$, a first person $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \beta \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota$ has been supposed to exist as the present from which these might be

[^201]:    * The verbs in $\mu \omega$ ( $\nu \epsilon \in \mu \omega, \delta \in ́ \mu \omega, \beta \rho \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\mu \omega, \tau \rho \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega)$ cannot follow the analogy of verbs which have $\lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho$ as their characteristic, further than the fut. and aor.; hence in their other tenses they are some-

[^202]:    times defective, and sometimes form them as from a verb in - $\epsilon$, $\omega$, in which latter case $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \omega$ may be joined with them, as $\mu \epsilon \mu \dot{\epsilon}-$ $\nu \eta \kappa \alpha, \nu є \nu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta \kappa \alpha, \delta \in ́ \delta \mu \eta \kappa \kappa$ \&ะ.

[^203]:    * I must not conceal that in a Cretan inscription in Chishull, p. 111. $\delta t \in \lambda \epsilon \gamma \eta \nu$ occurs as a plural ; but as the other Cretan inscriptions in the same collection have $\delta \iota \in \lambda \epsilon \gamma \in \nu$, it naturally throws great suspicion on the former, which however, whether true or not, would be of very little authority in deciding on a Homeric form.

[^204]:    * See Hemst. ad Lucian. Tim. 8. and Schneider's Lexicon. That $\mu \dot{v} \zeta \omega$ is the older form appears certain not only from the glosses of Hesychius, who explains
     $\pi . \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi$. 8. we find $\mu \dot{\nu} \zeta \epsilon \iota$ and $\tilde{\kappa} \mu \nu \zeta \epsilon \nu$, and

[^205]:    in Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 27 ., where the text now has cis тò $\sigma \tau o ́ \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{v} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$, it is evident that this last form, which occurs nowhere else, is corrupted by the addition of a superfluous $a$.

[^206]:    * That this was the old traditionary form is clear from the observations of the Grammarians in Schol. 11. $\gamma$, 387. in the Etym. M. in voc., and particularly from Aristarchus having written vatєrówoa (Schol. II. $\zeta, 415$.). Uncritically enough. For if we suppose that Homer, having used vateráoval, could not use vaterá $\omega \sigma a$, both analogy and the old way of writing lead us to vaıє manuscripts have here and there, and which in Hymn. 17, 6., is the only reading. And if this be the traditionary form, there

[^207]:    ＊We find $\nu \epsilon \mu \eta \theta \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ ，Demosth．Neær． 1380．ult．and $\nu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon i \sigma \eta s$ ，id．Phorm． $956,12$.
    $\dagger$［Passow in his Lex．has the follow－

[^208]:    * Photius has also Nêvtos, owpev́ovros, belonging therefore to $N \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ 1. This agrees also very well with the sup-

[^209]:    position, which indeed is pretty certain, that the meanings of to heap $u p$ (glomerare) and to spin, are properly the

[^210]:    spin, formed $\nu \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota$, from $\nu \in i \nu \nu$, to swim$\nu$ ย́ovøเข.

    * Thom. Mag. admits both forms ; кai
     of the manuscripts. The note of Hemisterhuys, which exactly reverses the usage, is incorrect.

[^211]:    ＊See Stephan．Thesaur．in кatavvб－
    10．（ìvข́a $\alpha a \sigma \epsilon)$ ．

[^212]:    - [Passow says that the Attic fut is $i \mu \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\xi}$ o $\mu a i$, not oi $\mu \dot{\omega} \xi \omega$, which last occurs
    only in the Orac. Sibyll.: see Jac. anim. in Athen. p. 170.]

[^213]:    * The formation of this perf. corresponds exactly with that of ox $\bar{\chi} \omega \kappa \alpha$ from é $\chi \omega$; thus oí $\chi \omega$, perf. oi $\chi a$, with redupl. oîk $\omega-$ $\chi \alpha$ (for the $\iota$ of the second syllable could be omitted for no other reason than because there was one in the first; compare סeíieкто from $\delta$ eikvv $\mu a \ell$ ), and thence, by transpo-

[^214]:    * [According to Porson $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ is the only form used by good writers, but ob $\lambda c$ $\sigma \theta a i \nu \omega$ is found in Aristoph. Equ. 494. and is therefore as pure Attic as the other : $\dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \boldsymbol{\iota} \sigma \theta \in \mathrm{c} \omega$ on the contraxy is not a genuine form.-Passow.]
    $\dagger$ If we compare the analogy of $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \gamma \nu v-$ $\mu c, \& c$. with this verb, we shall see that the latter is an euphonic change for ő $\lambda \nu v \mu$.

[^215]:    * This verb is formed according to the analogy of ă $\gamma \nu v \mu \iota$ : compare also $\Delta \epsilon i$ $\kappa \nu \nu \mu \iota$, "O $\lambda \lambda \nu \mu \iota$.
    + In Andoc. de Ince, p. 27, 43. the text still has $\delta \mu o \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$; in Hy -

[^216]:    perides ap. Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 725. $\dot{v} \pi \rho \mu \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon i \sigma \eta s ;$ and in Eurip. Rhes. 816., without any necessity from the metre, б $\mu \dot{\omega} \mu о \sigma т а \iota$.

[^217]:    * See Grammat. ap. Herm. de Em. Gr. Gr.
    + [The imperf. midd. however occurs in Plato. The perf. $\omega \nu \eta \mu a c$ is also found, but rarely.-Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ The manuscripts fluctuate indeed between dyivat, -ivat, -eivat, - $\bar{\eta} \nu a t$, and Bekker has thence adopted óv $\bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$; but I

[^218]:    * [The radical idea of the old root $0 \mathrm{~N} \Omega$ was perhaps to speale of a person in his absence, give him a good or bad character; whence $0 \nu 0 \mu a$ (by some incorrectly derived from $\nu \epsilon \in \mu \omega)$, a good or bad name; and the same double meaning was originally in ôvє $\boldsymbol{\delta} 0$ (likewise a derivative from this word), as in the Lat. honos: oviv $\eta \mu$ o on the other hand belongs to a different root, and has no connection with буонак.-Passow.]
    $\dagger$ Both ancient and modern commentators, mistaking the Epic language, were
     place this form under , $\dot{\nu} i \nu \eta \mu$. . But grammatical analogy gains nothing by

[^219]:    * The general form of this perfect as handed down to us in all the writers both of the Attic and common dialect is é $\dot{\rho} \rho a-$ ка. But as in Aristoph. Plut. 98. 1046. Av. 1572 . and in Comic. ap. Athen. 1. p. 15. 7. p. 279. a trisyllable was required, Dawes (Misc. p. 202. and 313.) introduced as an Attic form the Ion. ש̈paca. There were however other passages where this did not suit; these he altered arbitrarily, substituting for instance in Aristoph. Thesm. 32. 33. éẃpas: and he supported his general principle by the analogy of $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \nu$ and $\ddot{\eta} \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha$, both Attic forms. Tyrwhitt however (ad Dawes. p. 454.) quoted two passages of the Alexandrine comic poet Machon, from Athen. 6. p. 244. with є́ $\rho a \kappa a$, as M $\boldsymbol{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho \in \dot{\omega} \rho a-$
     $\kappa \boldsymbol{\kappa} \pi \rho \bar{\omega} \tau 0 s .$. , both of which verses re-

[^220]:    * [Passow speaks of the aor. midd. $\dot{\omega} \psi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ being merely a rare form, whence the 3. plur. opt. ö $\psi a \iota v$ тo in Herm. Sopl.

    EEd. T. 1271. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 734.]

[^221]:    ＊The same phrase ought undoubtedly to be restored to Plat．Legg．12．p．947．c． in the following passage，＂a hundred youths from the Gymnasia ovs $\hat{\alpha} \nu$ oi
     common reading is $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \mathbf{r o}^{\chi} \psi 0 \nu \tau a \iota$ ，but the best manuscript has $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\sigma} \neq \omega \nu \tau a \ell$ ，which is evidently a corruption of that old Attic and unusual form．

    + Homer forms his imper．from the verb in $\mu \ell$ ，о́ $\rho \nu \check{v} \theta c$, ó $\rho \nu ข ั \tau \epsilon$ ，but the rest of the pres．and the imperf．from $b \rho \nu v v^{\prime}(-ь-)$ ．－ Passow．］

[^222]:     under Фé $\rho \omega$ ．
    § This perfectly regular form was for a long time ejected from Il．$\theta, 474$ ．by $\overleftarrow{\omega} \rho-$ $\theta a \ell$ ，because oै $\rho \theta a \iota$ was considered to be the perfect（see Heyne），the cause of the abbreviation being unknown．But Ho－ mer never uses the perf．むp $\mu a t$ ，while he has the aor．© $\rho \tau о$ ，$\rho \rho \sigma 0$ ，ó $\rho \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ fre－ quently．The true reading of $\rho \theta a t$ is now restored to the text from the most un－ doubted sources．

[^223]:    ＊［Passow has given this verb a place in his Lexicon，and supposes it to be sy－ nonymous with oै $\rho \nu v \mu a \ell$ ．］

    + ［Passow has the following article：
    ＂Oporat（from ov̉pos，ó $\rho a ́(v) ~ I ~ w a t c h, ~$

[^224]:    keep watch，Od．$\xi, 104$ ．Others place the verb in this passage under $O P \Omega$ ，ő $\rho \nu v \mu \iota$ ； but neither ö $\rho \omega$ nor ő $\rho \circ \mu \alpha$ is ever found in actual usage，and the sense of the pas－ sage is contrary to it．］

[^225]:     took the syllabic augment instead of the temporal ; thus, $\pi$ poocoúpovv, Demosth. c. Conon init. є́vєоขр $\boldsymbol{\text { cótas, Aristoph. }}$ Lys. Ėov́pé, Lucian. Conviv. 35. Compare éocka under Eitcw.

    + O $\dot{v} \rho \hat{\eta} v$ is joined by the Grammarians Gaza and Chrysoloras (see Fisclı. 1. p. 127.) with $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \bar{y} \nu$ and $\delta \iota \psi \bar{y} \nu$ as an acknowledged form ; we may therefore be sure that they had precedents for it from the older Grammarians.

[^226]:    ＊If all the above suppositions are cor－ rect，it will follow that there was an old verb $\delta \phi \dot{\theta} \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，imperf．$\omega_{\phi} \phi \lambda \lambda 0 \nu$ ，aor． 1. $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda a$ with 3 twofold meaning；1．I increase：2．I owe：of which the former became obsolete，and the latter took in the present the form of $\dot{o} \phi \in i \lambda \omega$ ．

[^227]:    $\dagger$ Some verbs have a pres．both in－$\sigma \kappa \omega$ and－áv $\omega$ ，as $\dot{a}^{\mu} \beta \lambda i \sigma \kappa \omega$ ，$\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda \iota \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ ： see $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \alpha \nu \in$ under＇A $\lambda \dot{v} \sigma \kappa \omega:$ but in óф入ıoкávw no other present is in use than the one thus doubly strengthened by com－ bining both terminations．

[^228]:    ＊See Пı́́と $\omega$ ．
    $\dagger$ A false reading $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi a \mu \mu a \ell$ ，as also $\pi \circ \lambda v \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \omega \nu$ ，is now banished from the printed text．Compare the subst．$\pi \hat{a} \mu u$ ， $\kappa т \bar{\eta} \mu \alpha$ ．

[^229]:    ＊Dœderlein has a very good remark， that while from MA $\theta$－is formed $\pi \dot{\alpha}-\sigma \kappa \omega$ by affixing the termination $-\sigma \kappa \omega$ ，the aspiration of the $\theta$ ，which disappears，is thrown on the $\kappa$ ，making $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \omega$ ．
    $\dagger$ The fut．$\pi a \theta j \sigma \omega$ ，which is quoted by the old Grammarians，rests on a false separation of $\epsilon \dot{v} \pi a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ ．
    $\ddagger$ It occurs here and there as a various reading，e．g．in Herodot．9，37．Xen．Cy－

[^230]:    rop．7，3，10．See also Schweigh．In－ dex to Polybius．
    §［The regular fut．midd．is $\pi a v \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, but the purer Attic writers prefer $\pi \epsilon \pi a \dot{\prime}-$ боиає，Soph．Ant．91．Piers．ad Mœr．p． 293．－Passow．］
    ｜｜［There is said to have been also an aor．غ̇ォá $\eta \nu_{,}$Chœroboscus A B．3．p．I324． －Passow．］

[^231]:    * It must be observed, however, that even in Thucydides (2, 77. 5, 91. 100.) the reading $\pi a v 0 \hat{\eta} \nu a c$ has bcen restored from the best manuscripts.
    + [Of this tense Homer has only the

[^232]:    opt. $\pi$ eiacte, Od. $\xi$, 123.—Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ Bœeckh says the same of the simple aor. part. $\pi t 0 \dot{\omega} \nu$, Pyth. 3, 28. (50.), but I cannot subscribe to his opinion.

[^233]:    * As the verb occurs but seldom, (in the former sense кeipetv is more usual, in the latter $\left.\kappa \tau \epsilon \nu i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu, \xi_{\alpha} \dot{\prime} \nu \in \iota \nu\right)$ little can be said with any certainty on the use of its forms. Whether $\pi$ éк $\omega$ is ever found I know not. Stephens has $\pi \epsilon \kappa o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \nu$ ס́ $\rho \mu \alpha$, but without giving the passage from which he has taken it. The Epics have $\pi \epsilon i \kappa \omega, \pi \varepsilon \in \omega, \& c$. ; and this is the only formation which occurs. That the old Grammarians also considered $\pi$ cíkw as the pres. of $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\xi}(\omega$, is clear from Schol.

[^234]:    * Wherever we find in the common language a verb in $-\dot{a} \zeta(\omega$, which is not adnissible in the hexameter, the Epics generally use a sister-form in -áw.
    $\dagger$ This aor. must not be confounded with $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ under $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$.
    $\ddagger$ According to general analogy, this

[^235]:    * Homer has also a 2. sing. imperf. midd. $\pi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon 0, ~ I 1 . ~ \chi, ~ 433 . ~ a n d ~ i n ~ H e s . ~$ Fr. 22, 4. is the 3. sing. $\pi \epsilon \lambda$ é $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \tau$. Passow.]

[^236]:    * Like кє́к入офа from $\kappa \lambda \in ́ \pi \tau \omega$, and тє́т $о \neq \alpha$ from т $\rho \in ́ \pi \omega$ : see note under К入є́ $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\tau}$.
    + I have not yet found any certain instanees of this meaning in its strict and

[^237]:    * [Passow adds the perf. act. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$ : on which see however the end of this article.]
    + Porson did not venture to reject the imperfect which occurs in Euripides, al. though he remarks that in both the passages where it is found (Iph. A. 1608. and Fragm. Polyidi 1.) the aorist would be more accurate. Doubtless he was deterred by the somewhat bold alteration of $\dot{i} \pi \dot{f}-$

[^238]:    * [The earliest occurrence of the pres. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \phi \nu \omega$ scems to be in Oppian. Hal. 2, 133.-Passow.]
    $\dagger$ Sce "A $\gamma \nu v \mu$, " ${ }^{\prime} \xi{ }^{\prime} \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ See ${ }^{\kappa} \alpha \gamma \alpha$ under " $A \gamma \nu v \mu$ 。.

[^239]:    - An aor. 2. act. of this form, ${ }^{\circ} \pi \lambda \eta \nu$ like $\kappa \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, appears also in the later language, but contrary to general analogy it has the same causative sense as $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta$ $\mu t$, ${ }^{\text {en }} \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$; if indeed the reading $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\nu}$ $\pi \lambda \eta \mu \in \nu$ in Alciphron 3, 46. be genuine.
    $\dagger$ We have shown in the note on $\beta \lambda$ cio under $B \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$, that there are no grounds in the analogy of this optative for anything but the pure diphthong $a \iota$ or $\epsilon$. I cannot therefore adopt $\pi \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ as proposed by Dawes, although in Aristoph. Ach. 236. the reading $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ is supported by the Cod. Rav. instead of the common $\epsilon \mu-$ $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \mu \eta \nu$; and in Lysistr. 235., where the opt. is required, the emendation first suggested by the common corrupted reading $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta$ is that judiciously adopted by Dawes, $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \bar{p} \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta}$. In this case then, as in $\beta \lambda e i ̂ o, \beta \lambda \hat{j} 0, I$ rccognise a twofold
    decision of the old grammarians, and declaring myself in favour of the former, $I$ would leave the old reading untouched in the passage of Ach. 236., but in Lys. 235. I would complete the emendation by reading $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda e i ̈ \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \kappa u ́ \lambda \iota \xi$.
    $\ddagger$ This $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ is very commonly supposed to be the radical form, principally on account of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$; but the supposition is erroneous, as we may learn from comparing it with $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ and others. We should much rather say that $\pi \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta}^{-}$ $\theta \omega$ and $\pi \rho \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ may be quite as well deduced immediately from a radical form in $-\dot{\alpha} \omega$, as $\sigma \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ and $\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ are from similar forms in $-\dot{\alpha} \omega$ and $-\dot{\epsilon} \omega$. For the actual usage of the pres. $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ in the causative sense of $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ we have but a bad authority in Pseudo-Phocyl. 154. On the other hand we find a striking instance of

[^240]:    the aor, $\dot{a}^{\pi} \pi \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ in a neuter sense in Herodot. 8, 96. $̈ \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \pi о \pi \lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota ~ \tau \delta \nu$ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu o ́ \nu$ : for nothing but a very improbable degree of violence can supply a subject to the verb, so as to give it the sense of to fulfil. So decisive however is the usage of the same aorist in its common sense in all the other passages of He rodotus (see Schweigh. Lex. Herod. for the simple verb and all its compounds), that this reading cannot but be looked on

[^241]:    with the greatest suspicion. And may not the syncop. aor. $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$, which we have seen above in the Attic usage, have belonged to Ionic prose also?

    * The various reading $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \iota \pi \rho c i s$ in Herodot. 8, 159. deserves also in this respect our attention. It may be an ancient form and grounded perhaps on some old uncertainty in the actual usage. Compare Iŋ $\quad$ á $\omega$.
    $\uparrow$ Compare $\beta \omega ́ \sigma \in \sigma \theta \varepsilon$ under Btów.

[^242]:    * It is true that in Heyne I find no variety of reading mentioned; but in Scber's Index this verse is quoted under $\pi \varepsilon$ -

[^243]:    * [See Draco, p. 73, 18. 79, 21. Hermann ad Eurip. Herc. F. 1371.-Passow.] † Compare é $\delta \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \tau 0$, p. 73. and oī $\epsilon$ under Ф́́ $\omega \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ That the common form should be found in both passages even in the best manuscripts as a various reading, is natural ; but this can be no reason why any one should reject here, more than in other similar cases, the less usual form selected by the poet, unless it be from having fallen into the error (certainly a very pardonable one) of condemning it at once as a barbarism because it is found in the Alexandrine dialect: in which, to mention particulars, it appears to belong to the class of aorists ending in a instead

[^244]:    * In the passage of Soph. CEd. Col. 1732. I consider the sense of eै $\pi \tau \iota \tau \nu \epsilon$ to be evidently that of an aorist, though Reisig doubts it ; for the imperfect can hardly be compatible with the meaning of ära$\phi$ os (cadebat insepultus). On the other hand he appears to me to be perfectly right in his opinion that $\pi$ rrvóvr $\omega v$ in Eurip. Supp. 691. is a present. But then

[^245]:    * Sce also Xen. Anab. 5, 0, 5. This passage alone would however leave the point still problematical. The old reading is $\tau d \nu$ ảv $\theta \rho \omega \pi 0 \nu \pi \in \pi \lambda \eta \chi^{\varepsilon} \nu \alpha \iota$, a form for which there are nowhere any grounds; with a various reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta$ yévat. But from the context it would be

[^246]:    - On the formation of the two perfects and the aor. 1. pass. see Teivw.
    † A more strict analogy would have given $\varepsilon \not \approx \pi \nu \bar{v} \nu, \hat{\alpha} \mu \pi \nu \bar{v} \theta \iota$, to which $\alpha \mu \pi \nu v \in$ bears the same relation as $\pi i \epsilon$ does to $\pi \hat{i} \theta \iota$, only that $\hat{\varepsilon} \pi \iota o v$ is actually in use.
    $\ddagger$ It has been stated rather hastily that the Doric $\pi \nu t \xi_{0} \bar{v} \mu a t$ is the only acknowledged future of this active verb. I find but one instance of it, viz. in Stephan. Thesaur. h. v., but the passage is useless as a proof on account of its being in the Doric dialect and from the uncertainty of the reading :
    

[^247]:    * Perhaps this verb might have arisen $\pi \alpha \dot{a} a$ it is there. from the sense of the preposition rapá, as

[^248]:    - [With the exception of the Tragedians, who always use $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, Herm. ad Soph. Phil. 1435.-Passow.]
    $\dagger$ That the perfect in -ya was the older form, is clear from the Epic poets generally using the perfect 2 . But as the perfect active, particularly in transitive verbs, was not much wanted in Greek, it is conceivable that the ear might have become accustomed to what was of most frequent occurrence, $\kappa \alpha \kappa \bar{\omega} \bar{\omega}$ 勆-
     when it was wished to express the transitive sense in the perfect, they endeavoured to represent it by the other form, which is also agreeable to analogy. I do not think the above decision of the At-

[^249]:    the Attic style the whole aorist $\dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu \eta \sigma \alpha-$ $\mu \eta \nu$, and even the perfect $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\omega} \nu \eta \mu a \iota$ in cases where the aorist $\dot{\in} \pi \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ would supply its place. Compare Herodian Ed. Piers. p. 453.
    *To the verbs mentioned under ápów, as taking the $\sigma$ in the passive, may be

[^250]:    －Like $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega, \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega, \lambda \alpha \mu \beta a ́ \nu \omega$, $\lambda \alpha \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \mu \alpha \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ ，and others：see note under Alo0ávoual．
    $\dagger$ Perhaps also пevoov̀ $\mu a t$ ，see Brunck．
    ad Eurip．Hippol．1104．庪schyl．Prom． 987.
    $\ddagger$ On the $v$ of this perf．see note under X ＇́ $\omega$ ．

[^251]:    *Though there is neither $\delta$ nor $\zeta$ in the present to account for the $\delta$ in this form, yet there are sufficient grounds for it in the $\sigma$ of $\varepsilon \in \rho \dot{\rho} \subset \sigma \mu \alpha t$; for this perf. may be considered as the connecting link with a form in - $\dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$, from which comes $\dot{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma a \tau \varepsilon$.

[^252]:    * Here the Teutonic languages offer us a comparison so palpable and unsought for, that we cannot but make use of it ; namely, in the English verb work, whence the perf. wrought, and the subst. wright; in which the $w$ before the $r$ is not pro-

[^253]:    nounced; therefore wright is $\dot{\rho}$ écr $\eta$ s. Compare Buttm. Lexil. p. 376 .

    + [A pres. ீ́éopa九 occurs also in the poets.-Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ See ${ }^{*} \Lambda \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ 。

[^254]:    * [The form $\dot{\rho} \iota \pi \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \omega$ is found only in the pres. and imperf., and seems to bear the same relation to $\dot{\rho} i \pi \tau \omega$ as jactare does in Latin to jacere, i.e. it has the collateral idea of frequency, Herm. Soph. Aj. 235. Antig. 131. It occurs first in He-

[^255]:    *The direction in Phryn. Appar. p. 16. that the aor. 1. act. should be written with an $\eta$, not with $\epsilon$, appears to be an error. Aristophanes Plut. 668. has ámoбßéбas.

[^256]:    * On the change from the diphthong to the $v$ of this perf. pass. see note under X'́cw.

[^257]:    * As $\sigma \in \bar{\tau} \tau \kappa$ is indisputably a syncopated form, we class the others with it on account of the greater simplicity of the analogy; therefore $\sigma \epsilon v ์ \omega$, $\sigma 0 v \omega^{*} \sigma \epsilon v ิ \tau a t$, ซovิrac. Otherwise we may suppose a theme $\Sigma O \Omega$, particularly on account of $\sigma o v ̄ ;$ as then $\sigma o v \overline{\sigma o}$ would be from $\sigma$ óo$\mu a \iota$, contr. $\sigma 0 \hat{\mu} \mu a t$, like そsúyvvoo from

[^258]:    Cev́yvvuat. In case we adopt the syncope, $\sigma 0 \bar{v} \sigma o$ will be quite regular, and $\sigma o \hat{v}$, which occurs only as a kind of interjection, (Aristoph. Vesp. 209.) will be a very natural abbreviation for such an usage. Compare a similar argument under $\Lambda$ ov́v.

[^259]:    * The above account of the genuine Attic usage of this verb does not, it is true, rest on any, statement of the old

[^260]:    Grammarians; but that the great rarity of the pres. $\sigma \kappa$ ќл $\tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ is not accidental, is proved by the very frequent occurrence

[^261]:    $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ av̉roîs $\pi \rho \circ v \sigma \kappa \in \in \pi \tau \epsilon \tau 0$. There is no objection here to the imperfect as a tense, but as the imperf. of a depon. in a pass. sense, it excites suspicion. If now we read $\pi \rho \circ \tilde{v} \sigma \kappa \in \pi \tau 0$, the connection is as correct, and perhaps more suited to the context thus, "and they considered beforehand all that was to be brought forward :" and this sense Heilmannen gave it, although he did not contemplate any alteration in the reading.

[^262]:    －［Reisig conjectures that we should 1710．－Passow．］
    read a fut．$\sigma \tau \in \nu \in \hat{i}$ in Soph．©Ed．Col．

[^263]:    
    $\dagger$ Stephens in his Thesaurus quotes $\kappa \alpha$－ тебтбрŋ $\frac{1}{}$ from Herodot．8，53．，where

[^264]:    * [Hence the part. $\sigma \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{o} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{Od} . \iota, 4 \overline{3} 0$. and the Ionic imperf. $\sigma \omega \in \sigma \kappa 0 \nu$, Il. $\theta, 363$. A poll. Rhod. has also $\sigma \omega \in \tau \varepsilon$, and the midd. $\sigma \omega \in \in \theta$ at.-Passow.]
    + Bekker has in many cases restored the old form from the manuscripts.

[^265]:    ＊The false reading oáoval，and the similar error of $\sigma a ́ o l$（amended by Bekker in the above－quoted passage of Theognis）
    gave rise to the adoption of a form $\sigma a ́ \omega$ ． $\dagger$ Compare $\in \tau \mu a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$ under T $\dot{\rho} \mu \nu \omega$ （тє́т $\mu \eta \kappa а$ ）．

[^266]:    * See the end of the article on $\Sigma \dot{\omega} \dot{\zeta} \omega$, and the references there given.
    $\dagger$ [Thucyd. 7, 36. has the fut. midd. ткра́彑орає in a passive sense.-Passow.]

[^267]:    ＊［In Homer，where the metre re－ quires it，$\tau \in \lambda \in ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$. －Passow．］

    + See the note on Th $\bar{\eta} v a l$ ．
    $\ddagger$ The part．perf．тєтرๆús is found in

[^268]:    Apoll．Rhod．4，156．in a passive sense． See кєкорך $\dot{s}$ under Kорє́ $\nu \nu v \mu$ ，and
    

[^269]:    * Indeed the use of the two forms éré $\rho$ $\phi \theta \eta \nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \dot{c} \rho \pi \eta \nu$, as there is no metrical cause for it, is very remarkable, and is perhaps one of the numerous traces of these poems having passed through a variety of mouths. Probably therefore $\tau \alpha \dot{\rho}$ $\phi \theta \eta$ (for which indeed at Od. $\tau, 213$. some have read $\tau \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \eta$, ) is a mixture of the two genuine old readings above-mentioned.
    + lleyne's objection to the derivation

[^270]:    * It is true that there is no other instance of an aor. 2. pass. in $\sigma \eta \nu$; but this arises only from there being in the common language no verb with $\sigma$ as its characteristic. This aorist is therefore quite regular ; and consequently to suppose an intransitive active TEPSES, to which these infinitives might belong according to the analogy of форӣvat, форй$\mu \in \nu a \ell$, would be to increase unnecessarily the number of themes. Besides these forms must then be in the present, synonymous with $\tau \epsilon \in \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, the meaning of which is " to continue to get drier," whereas in both the above passages the idea is that of "being completely dry." And the plan of the older grammarians of joining

[^271]:    - On the change of the diphthong to $v$, see note under Xé $\omega$.
    + See the end of Art. on $\Lambda \varepsilon i \pi \pi \omega$.
    $\ddagger$ Wherever the causative and the immediate meaning are expressed by different active forms, the perf. (whether perf. 1. or 2.) and the aor. 2. belong always to the immediate sense, as,
    

[^272]:    * [Passow is of opinion that Buttmann has not sufficient grounds for suspecting these two forms.]
    + We find also in Hippocr. De Nat.

[^273]:    Puer. c. 4. an Ionic form $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \nu \omega$, which Passow pronounces to be a false reading for $\tau \in \tau \rho a i \nu \omega$.

[^274]:    * [Passow objects to the writing of this form with $\nu \nu$, and prefers tivvpl in all eases, with the $c$ long in the Epic, and
    short in the Attic writers, like rivw.] $\dagger$ The conjunctive is not in use.

[^275]:    * The conjunctive is not in use.
    † There is no doubt of the verb $\tau^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ having had in the older language the meaning of to bear, traces of which we see in the Lat. tollo and tuli. Now $\boldsymbol{T} \lambda \bar{\eta}-$ $\nu \alpha, T \lambda \alpha i \eta \nu$ have the same relation to $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$, as $\sigma \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, $\sigma \kappa \lambda a i \eta \nu$ have to $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$. In the course of time forms disappeared, and the meaning became modified, but was still quite perceptible in $\tau \lambda \bar{\eta} v a \iota$ and tollo. The simple meaning of to bear remained only in tuli. The present $\tau \in \in \lambda \lambda \omega$ disappeared entirely as a simple verb; in its compounds, in which

[^276]:    Andocid. Myster. p. 17, 13. Ald. and in Soph. Trach. 1009.; but it is probable that at a very early period, in order to avoid confusion with тє́т $\rho \circ \phi$ a from т $\rho \in ́ \phi \omega$, it was changed to $\tau$ є́ $\rho a \phi \alpha$, although from the uncertainty of the readings it is difficult to ascertain with any degree of accuracy when this change took place. We find, for instance, in Demosth. Pro Cor. $324,27$. , in the same passage quoted by Longin. 32., and in Eschin. c. Timarch. p. 179. Ctesiph. p. 545. ávarétpaфa always accompanied by the various reading àvaтéт $\rho \circ \phi a$, which latter Reiske has adopted in his text. Again in Dinarch. c. Demosth. pp. 23. 73. and c. Philocl. p. 93. we find тét $\rho a \phi a$, but without any various reading hitherto discovered.

    * This $a$ is peculiar to the three per-

[^277]:    * On the formation of this future see T T $\rho$ '́申ю, Ө $\rho$ é $\psi(\omega$ and note.

[^278]:    * Dinarchus has $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \pi \dot{\pi} \phi a \gamma \kappa \boldsymbol{q}$ twice.

[^279]:    - See note under K $\rho a i(\nu \omega$.
    $\dagger$ It is singular that Apollonins does not, as might have been expected, quote $\dot{a} \rho \bar{\omega}$ from aip as similar in quantity to $\phi a \nu \bar{\omega}$, but $\dot{\rho} a \nu \hat{\omega}$, of which the proofs are not so strong as they are of the two others. But perhaps the original word there was $\kappa \rho \alpha-$ $\nu \bar{\omega}$, which is very similar to paivw and

[^280]:    * ["A $\mu$ ' ì $\mu \epsilon ́ \rho y$ סıcффavarov́ $\sigma y$, Herodot. 3, 86. $\Delta \iota \epsilon \pi \iota ф \dot{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \omega$, Dionys. 9, 63.
     De Herb. 25. 'rлофஸ́бкєє ท̀ $\mu \in ́ \rho \alpha$, Diod. Sic. 13, 18.]
    $\dagger$ To these must be added the Epic infin. oioć $\mu \in \nu$, oioé $\mu \in \nu a \iota$ (which occurs as

[^281]:    ＊Compare also $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$ ，which is evidently a reduplicatiou from the stem $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ．

[^282]:    * The Grammarians are at variance on the accent of this form: see Schol. Aristoph. Equ. 22. Lobeck (ad Phryn. pp. 60. 172.) unhesitatingly rejects $\phi$ á $\theta \iota$, but I prefer it to $\phi a \theta i$, as this imperative is not enclitic like $\phi \eta \mu$ í.
    $\dagger$ Matthix in his Grammar directs that the 2. sing. indic. should be written with-

[^283]:    - However, in Plat. Hipp. Maj. p. 289. 9. фávat is considered as a genuine present.
    $\dagger$ [The $a$ is long in the Epic, but short
    in the Attic writers; and in the later authors common; see Jacob. Anthol. Poet. p. 884.-Passow.]

[^284]:    * $\Delta t e \phi$ Oapéaro in Herodot. 8, 90. would be 3. plur. aor. 2. midd., of which tense however there is no other instance whatever. Some manuscripts have the imperfect, but we must adopt, with Hermann,

[^285]:    

[^286]:    * 'E $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \rho \in$ is is also quoted by Hermann from Eurip. Phaëth. 2, 50.
    $\dagger$ This form is mentioned by all the Grammarians and in Stephan. Thesaur. in voc., but I know not from what writer it is taken. The simple $\phi \rho$ és is in the Etym. M. p. 740, 12. This compound surely could not have found its way into such general tradition, (as there is nothing elsewhere to lead to it,) had it not been in actual use at some earlier period. I almost think that éc $\phi \rho \in s$ must have been the original reading in Aristoph. Vesp. 162. instead of ërøepe, which cannot be the true one.

[^287]:    $\ddagger$ [Passow has 'Eкфреíw Poet. for 'Ex$\left.\phi \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega_{0}\right]$
    § [In Schncider's Lexicon we find 'E $\mu$ $\pi i \phi \rho \eta \mu$, like ধ́ $\mu \phi \rho a ́ \tau \tau t, I$ thrust in, in order to fill up an aperture, Aristot. 1I. A. 5, 6. غ́ $\mu \pi \iota ф \rho a ́ v a \iota ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \mu и к т \eta ̄ \rho a . ~ B u t ~$ the word is suspicious.-Passow omits it altogether in his Lexicon.]

    II Ф९éw has been most improperly reckoned among the sister-forms of фóp $\omega$ : for though it may be wished to class it etymologically with that verb, still its totally distinct meaning requires a grammatical treatment equally distinct.

[^288]:    －In Xen．Cyr． $8,6,3 . \delta \iota \alpha \pi \epsilon \phi v \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \alpha \sigma \iota$ is a false reading for－$\lambda$ á $\chi a \sigma$ e．

    + Whether both were used in Attic prose，is still a question．In Thucyd．

[^289]:    3，49．criticism has declared in favour of $\pi \varepsilon ф v \rho a \mu \epsilon$＇⿻丷 ：but the exclusive usage of $\pi е \phi v \rho \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s$ in succeeding writers，e．g．in Lucian，Plutarch，and others，leads us to

[^290]:    ＊［There is no instance of the simple $\chi \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ in the active voice，－D＇assow．］

[^291]:    * Lobeck (ad Phryn. p. 740.) is wrong in speaking of this reading as suspicious. The expression ov่ $\chi$ aı $\hat{\jmath} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$, "you shall have cause to rue it," was so common, that the transition to the aorist became quite natural, and it is at the same time very conceivable that ove $\dot{\in} \chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta$ would

[^292]:    * [Buttmann, in his Lexil. p. 181. s:1pposes another fut. $\chi$ y $\quad \sigma 0 \mu a \ell$, of which the 3. sing. xiferat may be read in a corrupted passage of Hom. Hymu. Ven. 253.]

[^293]:    + [According to Ap. Dysc. there was also a perf. кє́ $\chi$ वук九. - Passow.]
    $\ddagger$ The mention by Chrysoloras in his Grammar that $\chi$ uiver was not in use, shows that the older. Grammarians had before taught the same.

[^294]:    *Some verbs change the diphthong $\epsilon v$ of the radical syllable in the perf. pass. to $v$; e.g. тєú ${ }_{\psi}^{\omega} \tau \epsilon ́ \tau v \gamma \mu a \iota, \phi \epsilon v ̌ \omega \omega \pi \epsilon \phi v \gamma-$
     $\mu \alpha \iota$. Xé $\omega$, as one of the verbs in -é $\omega$ which take $\sigma v$ in the inflexion, follows the same analogy. In all these perfects the $v$ is short.
    $\dagger$ Whatever appearance there was in Homer of these forms, has now been changed on the best authority to the Epic formation mentioned above ill the next paragraph.

[^295]:    $\pm$ Elmsley very correctly compares this future with $\tau \in \lambda \in ́ \omega$, whose fut. тє $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \sigma \omega \text {, by }\end{gathered}$ the Ionic omission of the $\sigma$, becomes again $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in \omega$, Attic $\tau \in \lambda \bar{\omega}$; the only difference is, that the shorter word did not admit the contraction in $\hat{\omega}, o \hat{v}$, as it does in the present. But that $\chi^{\prime} \epsilon \omega$, $\chi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$ was the original formation is shown by the aorist $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \nu$, which remained In common use to quite a late period: an additional cause for the other formation without the $\sigma$, was the coincidence of the fut. and aor. of $\chi^{\dot{\epsilon}(\omega)}$ with those of $\chi \in \dot{\epsilon} \zeta \omega$.

[^296]:    －If we suppose a present from which to form this perfect，it must be $\chi \lambda \dot{\eta} \delta \omega$ （like $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \theta \alpha$ ）；which is con－ nected with $\chi \lambda \iota \delta \dot{\eta}$, ，but not with $\kappa \alpha \chi \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$ ， a term signifying sound；nor is it akin to $\kappa \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega$ ，partly because the stem of this latter has $\gamma \gamma$ ，partly because analogy gives us the change of $\chi$ to $\kappa$（in $\kappa \in x a \delta \dot{\omega} \nu$ and the like），but not the converse of $\kappa$ to $\chi$ which would be required in this case． ［Passow，however，forms this perfect from a present $\chi^{\lambda} \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ ，Dor．$\chi \lambda \dot{\eta} \zeta \omega$ ，which he makes exactly synonymous with its com－ pound ray才入ú乡由（Pind．01．7，2．каү－

[^297]:    
    

    + ［This meaning properly belongs to

[^298]:    the Epie poets，but there are instances of it in the Attic also，e．g．in Elmsl．Eurip． Heracl．801．－Passow．］

[^299]:    * All the above-mentioned forms are undoubtedly pure Ionic; and this uncertainty of usage is not otherwise than surprising, even in a dialect. That the same writer should have had a twofold usage in the same form, is an unreasonable supposition. Undoubtedly, therefore, the variation in the forms of this verb in Herodotus arose entirely from the uncertainty of tradition, and from the different Grannmarians who employed themselves on the

[^300]:    * Perhaps the shorter form $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \nu$ had become so general in common life, that
    the augmented one was made by degrees to conform to it.

[^301]:    * Such an irregularity could arise only from the original meaning of the expression being entirely forgotten. In these compounds the active $\chi$ póc is used exactly in its true sense. The thing supplies us with what we need; in $\dot{a} \pi 0 \chi \rho \bar{a}$, Ex $\chi \rho \hat{q}$ it supplies us to the extent of our need; in $\alpha \nu \tau \iota \chi \rho \underset{̧}{\text { it }}$ it supplies us by acting in opposition to our need. The similarity of the German expression to the Greek illustrates this in a most striking manner : in German darreichen means to reach

[^302]:    THE END.

