

Philoso

THE LIBRARY

OF THE

University of Toronto,

FROM

THOMAS HODGINS, M.A.



Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2007 with funding from Microsoft Corporation





A CATALOGUE

OF

IRREGULAR GREEK VERBS.

THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE

CHARLES CHARLES A VALUE OF

A CATALOGUE

OF

IRREGULAR GREEK VERBS,

WITH

ALL THE TENSES EXTANT,

THEIR

FORMATION, MEANING, AND USAGE.

By PHILIP BUTTMANN, LL.D.,

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

TRANSLATED AND EDITED,

WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES AND A VERY COPIOUS INDEX,

BY THE REV. J. R. FISHLAKE,

Late Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford; Translator of "Buttmann's Lexilogus."

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1837.

337 B813

contract against and 1973 of contract

(KORO) 1890

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND JOHN E. TAYLOR, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Irregular Greek Verb, though all acknowledge its importance and difficulties, has been hitherto confessedly neg-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 Butt-' mann'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 -άζω, -iζω, -aiνω, -iνω, -είω, -όω, -άω and -έω, 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 -κα, and are invariably defective in the aor. 2. active and passive. For the same reason he has excluded those also which are formed in -ω with the preceding syllable of the radical word strengthened; consequently those ending in $-ai\rho\omega$, $-\lambda\lambda\omega$, $-\pi\tau\omega$, $-\tau\tau\omega$, and $-\sigma\sigma\omega$ *. Where, however, we find a verb with either of the above terminations not derived from a noun or other word, but only a lengthened form of some simple stem or root, it is manifestly a deviation from ge-

^{*} Of these ἀλλάσσω only has an aor. 2., consequently is placed in the following Catalogue as an exception to a general analogy.

neral analogy; and as an aor. 2. may be formed from the original root,—e. g. in ἀλιταίνω, aor. 2. ἤλιτον; in κτυπέω, aor. 2. (from ΚΤΥΠΩ) ἔκτυπον,—such verbs have a place in the following Catalogue; as have also all those ending in -άνω, 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 to their respective families, are distinguished by capital letters, that the eye may not become accustomed to such unusual forms by seeing them printed in the common character. And, to spare the ear as much as possible the formation of these verbal stems into a present in $-\omega$, they are generally distinguished merely thus, $\Delta - \Delta + \Delta = 0$. 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, agrist 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 o," it is to be understood as referring to the perf. and aor. 1. passive; this expression is however used only where that circumstance does not follow of itself. The frequent references to Buttmann's Lexilogus are to the English translation published in 1836.

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

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

Whatever meaning—active, passive or middle, transitive or intransitive—is given to the present, the same is supposed to belong to every succeeding tense not expressly marked with a different meaning. If, for instance, under $\beta o \hat{\nu} \lambda o \mu a \iota$ we find the fut. $\beta o \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma o \mu a \iota$ from the middle, and the aor. $\hat{\epsilon} \beta o \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$ from the passive, this shows that these are the only two forms which occur in the sense of the present $\beta o \hat{\nu} \lambda o \mu a \iota$, and consequently that there is no instance of an aorist $\hat{\epsilon} \beta o \nu \lambda \eta \sigma \hat{a} \mu \eta \nu$, or of a future $\beta o \nu \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma o \mu a \iota$.

The insertion, in their alphabetical places, of supposed verbai stems or roots is intended less for the accommodation of the student, than to complete the plan of the work: and this may be said not only of those which must necessarily be supposed in every methodical treatise of this kind, as $\Lambda HB-$ for $\lambda \acute{n}\psi o\mu a\iota$, $\check{\epsilon}\lambda a\beta o\nu$, but of many which are merely apparent, i.e. where a change, for which there is no foundation in the regular inflexion, but which has been effected by the operation of syncope or metathesis,

is referred back to a root formed by that same figure; e.g. KMA- relates to Κάμνω.

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

The attempt, however, to make this Catalogue etymologically complete might in some particular cases produce confusion; as, for instance, when certain verbs, springing from the same stem or root with different yet cognate meanings, are placed together as belonging to one and the same verb. In such cases it is rather the province of grammar to keep separate what usage has already separated. Thus it is certain that χάσκω, χάζομαι, χανδάνω are etymologically the same, and yet each must be preserved distinct from the others, to render the explanation of each the more clear and intelligible; χαδεῖν must be confined to the sense of containing, xáoaobai to that of yielding, and xaveiv to that of standing open; in order that, where it is not sufficiently clear from the context which of these different senses a form has, we may not be led to give it a meaning which does not belong to it.

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

Of the work itself I need only add, that, like the 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. however that could not be so easily done, from the shortness of the quotation or from its breaking into the middle of a paragraph, I have merely inserted it within brackets. Beside a few occasional remarks, entirely explanatory, and always distinguished by "Ed.," I have myself added nothing: it would have been indeed the height of presumption in me to imagine that I could improve, by adding to or taking away from, a subject which has been handled in so masterly a manner by Buttmann and Passow.

J. R. FISHLAKE.

LITTLE CHEVEREL, Nov. 1837.

TI PATOMENTS 4 1

IRREGULAR VERBS.

A.

' \mathbf{A} άω, I harm, lead into error. Of this verb Homer has the 3. prespass. ἀᾶται*, the aor. 1. act. ἄασα, contr. ἆσα (Od. λ , 61.), and of the pass. and midd. ἀάσθην, ἀασάμην, ἄσασθαι. Both alphas are common. Verbal adj. ἀατός, whence with ἀ priv. ἀάατος ($\sim - \sim$) inviolable.

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

ἀτέοντες, senseless, desperate.

It may perhaps be thought that $A\Omega$ is the original form of this verb, and $\dot{\alpha}\dot{\alpha}\omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ a resolution of it: but general analogy is contrary to the idea of a resolution, unless where there has been previously a contraction, As little disposed am I to consider $\dot{\alpha}\tau\dot{\alpha}\omega$ the original, and that the τ was dropped afterwards. The true original form is AFA Ω , as is evident from the Pindaric $\alpha\dot{\nu}\dot{\alpha}\tau\alpha$ (Pyth. 2, 28.), and the Laconian $\dot{\alpha}\dot{\alpha}\beta\alpha\kappa\tau\sigma$ s (Hesych.) for $\dot{\alpha}\dot{\alpha}\alpha\tau\sigma$ s. On the other hand the meaning of to satiate is classed under $\ddot{\alpha}\omega$, because in that meaning the double α is rare and even suspicious. This is the only way of marking clearly the distinction between the two Homeric epithets $\dot{\alpha}\dot{\alpha}\alpha\tau\sigma$ s ($\dot{\alpha}\dot{\alpha}\omega$) inviolable, and $\dot{\alpha}\tau\sigma$ s ($\ddot{\alpha}\omega$) insatiable.

"AAΩ, I satiate. See "Aω.

'Αγάλλω‡, I deck, adorn: fut. άγαλω; aor. ήγηλα, άγηλαι

[* used in an active sense; but see Lexilog. p. 8. and note.—ED.]

[† I find the α in ἀτάω marked long both in Maltby's Lex. Prosod. and in Passow's Gr. and Germ. Lex. I know of only two passages where the word occurs, viz. Soph. Aj. 269. and Eurip. Suppl. 182. The former is decisive in favour of the length of the a, in the latter it is uncertain.—ED.]

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

"Aγαμαι, I admire: Depon. Pres. and imperf. like ἴσταμαι, Od. ζ, 168; fut. midd. ἀγάσομαι; aor. ἠγάσθην, Eurip. Herc. F. 845. Epist. 3, 8., part. ἀγασθείς; Epic ἠγασάμην, but found also in Demosth. pro Cor. 59. and Aristid., and in Il. γ, 181. ἠγάσσατο.

This family of verbs has in the Ionic dialect the collateral sense of to envy, to be indignant; but in the pres. it is only in the form $\mathring{a}\gamma \mathring{a}o\mu a\iota$ in the Epic poets (Hes. θ . 619. $\mathring{a}\gamma \mathring{\omega}\mu e \nu os$, Od. ϵ , 119. 122. $\mathring{\eta}\gamma \mathring{a}a\sigma \theta \epsilon$); $\mathring{a}\gamma \mathring{a}(o\mu a\iota)$ has it in Ionic prose also. The other tenses have both meanings in common, e. g. Il. ρ , 71. $\mathring{a}\gamma \mathring{a}\sigma \sigma a\tau o$, he envied; Od. σ , 71. $\mathring{a}\gamma \mathring{a}\sigma \sigma a \nu \tau o$, they admired.

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

'Αγγέλλω, Ι announce: fut. ἄγγελῶ; aor. 1. ἤγγειλα.— Μιρρ.

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

ciously than at 15. p. 149, 32. of the same work, where he has adopted from one manuscript the imperfect in the place of $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\eta}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\sigma\nu$, which is evidently incorrect.



^{*} 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-

supported, may be defended by the sense against the present, which is found in a great majority of the manuscripts. In Soph. Œd. T. 955, the reading άγγελων is from Triclinius only; the Codd. and the old editions have ἀγγελών, which the glosses in the Cod. Lips. explain to be the aorist (see Hermann*), a tense much more natural in that passage than the future. Compare also the various reading άγγέλωμεν in Eurip. Or. 1539.(1533. Matth.) and my note on Demosth. Mid. 11, 2. Least of all should I have thought of altering παρήγγελε † 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. (ήγγέλης) without any various reading, although ἡγγέλθης; would be admissible. In Æl. V. H. 9, 2. occurs διηγγέλη. In Plut. Galb. 25. ἀπηγγέλη.—In είπεῖν and ἐνεγκεῖν the two acrists are so easily confounded, that great caution appears to me advisable in this verb also. Nor is it unworthy of consideration, that a form which undoubtedly existed, (for this I think is proved by the number of instances adduced,) should never have been branded as objectionable by any Atticist.

'Αγείρω, I collect together: Att. redupl.—Midd.

Of the aor. 2. midd. the Epic language has ἀγέροντο, ἀγερέσθαι, and the syncopated part. ἀγρόμενος.—Compare Ἐγείρω.

From ἡγερέθομαι an Epic sister-form of the perf. and imperf. midd. come ἡγερέθονται, -οντο; to which we may without doubt refer the reading of Aristarchus ἡγερέθεσθαι, II. κ, 127. instead of the common reading ἡγερέεσθαι.—Compare ἡερέθονται under Αἴρω.

tain Buttmann must have confounded this with some other passage.

^{* [}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-

^{† [}Yet Schweighäuser has retained ἀπήγγελον in Herodot. 4, 153.]
‡ [Dindorf reads ἠγγέλθης.]

it is true, stands in the midst of imperfects. But when it is said oi δ' $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\rho\rho\nu\tau\sigma$. Τετρήχει $\delta'\dot{\alpha}\gamma\rho\rho\dot{\eta}$, it is quite as natural to render it, "And now they were assembled [not assembling]: the crowd heaved restlessly." Besides, as $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\rho\dot{\rho}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s (by syncope for $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\rho\dot{\rho}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s) is undoubtedly an aor. particip. assembled, so $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\rho\rho\nu\tau\sigma$ must in every instance be considered an aorist also. Nor is there anything in Od. β , 385. to prevent our accenting, with Barnes and Porson, $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\rho\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, as this form is in all its relations a common aor. 2. (compare $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\iota\tau\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$), and the silent traditionary accent on an infinitive occurring but once can be of no authority.—Compare "E $\gamma\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

"Αγημαι. See 'Ηγέομαι.

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

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

"Αγνυμι, I break (trans.): fut. ἄξω*: the past tenses have the syllabic augment: aor. act. ἔαξα (Il. η, 270. contr. ῆξα, Il. ψ , Ξ 92. Od. τ , Ξ 39.), aor. pass. ἐάγην with a long: the perf. 2. ἔαγα (Sappho), Ion. ἔηγα, has the passive or intransitive sense, I am broken \dagger .—MIDD.

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

Formed according to the general rule of verbs in μι from the obsolete ἄγω, like ΔΕΙΚΩ, δείκνυμι, δείξω, &c.

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

root is long in the aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu$, as we see from some passages of the Attics, (Brunck on Aristoph. Ach. 928.) and from Il. λ , 558. But it is also found in Epic poetry short; although, by the disappearance of the digamma, which belonged originally to this verb, as will be seen below, we cannot now ascertain in some passages the true Homeric form of this tense. See Heyne on Il. γ , 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 $\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\tau\tau\omega$, of which the aor. 2. pass. retains its original length, but shortens the syllable when used in one particular sense.

The digamma, whence the irregular augment comes, is proved beyond a doubt to have originally belonged to this verb by the Hesiodic form $\kappa \alpha \nu \dot{\alpha} \xi \alpha \iota s$ (ϵ , 664. 691.), which can be explained in no other way. That is to say, FAZAI became in composition KAFFAZAI, as $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha \beta - \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$. 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, Υ and F, it passed over into ν , and consequently with the α into the diphthong $\alpha \nu$. See the same process in $\epsilon \ddot{\nu} \alpha \delta \epsilon \nu$, under $\lambda \nu \delta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$.

This makes the occurrence of $\tilde{\eta}\xi\epsilon$ for $\tilde{\epsilon}\alpha\xi\epsilon$ twice in Homer (II. ψ , 392. Od. τ , 539.) the more remarkable. In the same way Hippocrates has $\kappa\alpha\tau\tilde{\eta}\xi\alpha$ (Epidem. 5, 13.); but as he writes the substantives also $\kappa\dot{\alpha}\tau\eta\xi\iota$, $\kappa\dot{\alpha}\tau\eta\gamma\mu\alpha$ (De Artic. 16. 17. De Fract. 16. 28.), it would appear that in the Ionic dialect the whole formation, with the exception of the pres. and aor. 2. pass., had the η in the root: in Homer on the other hand, who elsewhere invariably uses $\tilde{\epsilon}\alpha\xi\alpha$, and, dropping the augment, $\tilde{\alpha}\xi\alpha\tau\tau\sigma$, II. ζ , 40. π , 371. (see below the same form under $^{\prime\prime}\Lambda\gamma\omega$), $\tilde{\eta}\xi\alpha$ can be only the augment. If however we compare $\tilde{\alpha}\tau\eta$, which comes from AFATA, we shall be the less surprised at $\tilde{\eta}\xi\alpha$ as a contraction from EFAZA.

It is far more astonishing to find that in this verb the augment is carried on even to forms in which it is naturally inadmissible, and that this takes place in very old writers. Thus Hippocrates has very com-

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

ἄγνυμι-ἄγνυμαι, I break (intrans.); perf. ἔᾶγα, I am broken.

δαίω δαίομαι and δέδηα, I burn (intrans)

έγείρω—έγείρομαι, I wake (intrans.); έγρήγορα, I am on the watch.

έλπω-έλπομαι, and έολπα, I hope. See also κήδομαι κέκηδα, μαίνομαι μέμηνα, οἴγω ἀνοίγομαι ἀνέψγα, ὅλλυμαι ὅλωλα, πείθομαι πέποιθα, πήγνυμαι πέπηγα, ἡήγνυμαι ἔρἡωγα, τό πηπομαι σέσηπα, τήκομαι πέτηκα, φαίνομαι πέτηκα, φθείρομαι ἔφθορα, γίγνομαι γέγονα. Compare also δέρκομαι, μείρομαι and προβέβουλα under βούλομαι. From this its connexion with passive or middle forms arose the improper appellation of the perfect midd.

monly κατεαγή, κατεαγείs, as for instance in De Artic. 35. bis. Vectiar. 1. 2.—Apollon. Rh. 4, 1686. has ἐξεαγεῖσα, which metrical passage, in a poet of some antiquity and a learned grammarian, is of great weight. The passages quoted from the Attic writers must be left for future criticism: Plat. Gorg. p. 469. e., see Heind. and Bekker; Lysias c. Sim. p. 99. κατεαγείs, according to Bekker's MSS. καταγείs; ib. p. 100, 5. κατεάξαντες 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, ἀπεωσθέντος in Pæanius 9., ἐξεώσεις in Theod. Prodr. p. 17., ἐωνησαμένην 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 ἄγννμι, in which verb this irregularity was probably introduced and sanctioned by usage earlier than it was in others, in order to avoid confusion with ἄγω and ἄττω.

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

'Αγνώσσασκε 'Αγνώσασκε 'Αγνώσσεσκε }. See 'Αγνοέω.

, 'Αγορεύω. See Είπεῖν.

'Αγρέω, I take; imperat. ἄγρει, ἀγρεῖτε, used often in Homer as common interjectional particles, like age in Latin and tenez in French. The rest of the verb disappeared before αἰρέω, 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.

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

"Αγω, I lead; fut. ἄξω; takes in the aor. 2. the redupliplication, ἤγαγον, ἀγαγεῖν*; perf. ἦχα, common form ἀγῆοχα†; aor. 1. act. ἦξα, imperat. ἄξετε, Hom.; aor. 1.

* Thus we find in prose the similar form ἤνεγκον, ἐνεγκεῖν (see φέρω); and the following poetic aorists: ἤρἄρον, conj. ἀράρο &c.; see APΩ. ἤκαχον, ἀκάχων &c.; see ΑΧΩ. ἤπαφον, ἀπάφων; see ἀπαφίσκω. ἀλαλκον (Hom. for ἤλαλκον), ἀλαλκεῖν &c.; see ἀλέξω. ὡρορε, 3. pers.—see ὁρνυμι (perf. ὅρωρα). ἐνένῖπον (ἐνένιπτον); see ἐνίπτω. If we compare these forms with ἤγαγον, λέλαθον, πέπληγον, we shall see that they

are undoubted agrists, notwithstanding all which has been said to the contrary.

† With ἀγήοχα we may class some other anomalous forms which change their vowel to o in both perfects: ἔρρωγα (perf. intransit.) from ρήγνυμι. πέπτωκα from ΠΕΤΩ, πίπτω. εἴωθα for εἴθα from εθω. ἄωρτο plusq. perf. pass. for ἢρτο οτ ἢερτο, from αἴρω οτ ἀείρω. ἕωκα, ἀφέωκα, Dor. (whence in N. Τ. ἀφέωνται) for εἴκα, ἀφεῖκα, ἀφεῖνται, from ἀφημι. ἐδή-

mídd. ἢξάμην, seldom in the Attic, but its compounds frequent in Herodotus: perf. pass. ἦγμαι.—ΜIDD.

For a full account of $\partial \gamma \eta_0 \chi a$ see Buttm. Lexilog. pp. 116..139. The use of this form in the letter of Philip and in the resolution of the people in Demosth. pro Cor. p. 238. 249., in Lysias ap. Phrynich. p. 121. and in Aristot. Œcon. 1, 7. shows that it was an old and familiar form, which, being in no respect worse than $\dot{\epsilon}\partial\dot{\eta}\partial\omega\alpha$, recommended itself for use instead of the indistinct $\ddot{\eta}\chi a$, as $\dot{\epsilon}\partial\dot{\eta}\partial\omega\alpha$ took the place of $\ddot{\eta}\kappa a$. The Attic writers, however, preferred the shorter form. See $\pi\rho o\eta\chi a$ in Reisken's Ind. ad Demosth. $\sigma\nu\nu\eta\chi a$ 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 $\ddot{\eta}\chi a$ as obsolete, sometimes rejected $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\eta}o\chi a$ as bad Attic. See Dorv. ad Charit. p. 481. (494.) Lob. ad Phryn. p. 121.

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

The Epic imperat. $\[\[\] \] \epsilon \] \pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \nu$, $\[\] \epsilon \] <math>\[\] \beta \] \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau$, $\[\] \lambda \epsilon \] \epsilon \sigma$, $\[\] \delta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \sigma$, $\[\] is$ one of those aor. 2. which take the characteristic σ of the aor. 1., but are commonly mistaken for anomalous derivatives of the fut. 1. Homer uses it instead of $\[\] \alpha \gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, which would not be admissible in the hexameter; $\[\] \alpha \gamma \alpha \gamma \epsilon$ he does use at II. $\[\] \omega$, 337. With this form we may join $\[\] \alpha \xi \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, II. $\[\] \omega$, 663. as inf. aor. for $\[\] \alpha \xi \alpha \nu \epsilon \nu$.

'AΓΕΟΜΑΙ. The reading ἀγεόμενον in Herodot. 3, 14. might be adopted without hesitation, if Schæfer's opinion, that this too is corrupted from ἀγινεόμενον, were not still more probable. See also ἡγέομαι.

'Aδησαι, to feel dislike. Of this verb Homer has in the Odyssey the forms ἀδήσειεν and ἀδηκότες, which are generally connected with τὸ ἄδος, Il. λ , 88.; and as this last has the first syllable short, but the two others have it always long, they are written, according to the example of some of the grammarians, ἀδδήσειεν, ἀδδηκότες. See this point discussed in Lexilog. p. 22: see also ἀσαι, to satiate, under ' $\Delta \omega$.

"Α,δω, (old and poet. ἀείδω*), I sing: fut. ἄσομαι, ἀείσομαι.

δοκα, and in Hom. pass. ἐδήδομαι, from ἔδω. ἐνήνοχα from ΕΝΕΚΩ. And the very defective Epic perfects ἄνωγα, ἀνήνοθα, ἐνήνοθα.

^{* [}Homer always uses ἀείδω, ἀείσομαι.
"Α σομαι is properly Attic (see Markl. Eurip. Suppl. 932. Brunck. Aristoph. Vesp. 1228. Fr. 1294.), but is found in

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

Hermann has very properly defended $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon i\sigma\epsilon o$ in the 17th Hom. Hymn against $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon i\delta\epsilon o$; (in Hymn 20, where $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon i\delta\epsilon o$ stands without any known various reading, it must remain,) for $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon i\delta o\mu a\iota$ as active is an unheard-of form. Now as the aor. midd. of $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon i\delta\omega$ and $\ddot{q}\delta\omega$ is equally unknown, this $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon i\sigma\epsilon o$ may be an imperative formed from the future $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon i\sigma\rho\mu a\iota$. But there are as little grounds in common usage for the Epic aorist $\dot{\epsilon}\beta\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau o$ as for the one in question; and as that stands in the same relation to $\ddot{\epsilon}\beta\eta\nu$ and $\beta\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\mu a\iota$ (tenses in common use) as $\dot{\alpha}\epsilon i\sigma\epsilon o$ does to $\dot{\eta}\sigma a$ and $\ddot{q}\sigma\sigma\mu a\iota$, it appears that the aor. midd. of some verbs, as well as the fut. midd., had in the old language a purely active meaning. See also Lexilog. p. 226. note.

'ΑΔ-. See 'Ανδάνω.

'Αείδω. See "Α,δω.

'Αείρω. See Αἴρω.

'Αέξω. See Αΰξω.

"Αημι. See "Aω.

Aἰδέομαι, I feel shame: fut. αἰδέσομαι; perf. ἤδεσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἤδέσθην; aor. 1. midd. ἤδεσάμην. The aor. pass. and midd. have the same meaning; but in the Attic language αἰδέσασθαι 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 αἴδομαι*, from which arose the one in common use. It never has the augment: αἴδετο. Of the fut. αἰδήσομαι for αἰδέσομαι see the note to Μάχομαι.

Aἰνέω[†], I praise: fut. αἰνέσω[‡]; aor. ἥνεσα; perf. act. ἤνεκα; perf. pass. ἤνημαι; aor. 1. pass. ἦνέθην. Also αἰνήσω, ἤνησα, in the Epic poets and Pindar.

Aiνίσσομαι, I speak enigmatically: Depon. midd.

Hom. Hymn. 5, 2. Less pure is the fut, $\vec{q}\sigma\omega$, but found sometimes in the Attics, as in Eurip. Herc. F. 681. Dor. $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\bar{\omega}$, Theorr. 1, 145. 'Ac $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\bar{\omega}$ 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-

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

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

! See note under Δέω, I bind.

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

Αἰρέω, I take: fut. αἰρήσω; perf. ήρηκα, Ion. ἀραίρηκα; perf. pass. ήρημαι, Ion. ἀραίρημαι; aor. 1. pass. ἡρέθην*; fut. pass. αἰρεθήσομαι; aor. act. εἶλον, ἐλεῖν, from ἙΛΩ.— Midd.—Verbal adj. αἰρετός, -έος. Compare Ἁλίσκομαι.

A less frequent future is ἐλω; thus we find περιελω, Aristoph. Equ. 290., καθελεῖ, Antiphil. Epig. 15., ἀφελοῦμαι, 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 $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\eta\rho\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau o$, which cannot be rejected as a false reading. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 716.

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

Είλα, έλαι, and εὖρα from εΰρισκω, 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, είλον, εύρον, was in common use elsewhere, it is plain that these are instances of the change of termination from the aor. 2. to the aor. 1. which took place in some unformed dialects. Other terminations beside the 1. pers. sing., as for instance the 2. pers. in as, the infin. in at, the part. in as, are seldom found, but in their place the regular terminations of the agr. 2.† Hence it is clear that the indiscriminate use of $\epsilon i\pi\sigma\nu$ and $\epsilon i\pi a$, of $\eta \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa o \nu$ and $\eta \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa a$, in the oldest and best writers, arises from the same change: all which tends to prove the original identity of the two aorists.—In the aor. 2. midd. είλάμην, -ω, -ατο, -αντο, &c., in εὐράμην, &c., in ἐπαύρασθαι for -έσθαι, in the Dor. γενάμενος, and in ὅσφραντο for ωσφόρντο, 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. είλω, see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 139. 183. The Homeric γέντο will be found in its alphabetical place.

Αίρω (Att. and poet. ἀείρω, I raise) is formed regularly

chius. In the above examples we must not overlook one thing, that only the terminations of the aor. 1. are adopted; the formation of the root remains the same, otherwise it would be $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\bar{\imath}\lambda\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\beta\bar{\eta}\lambda\alpha\iota$.

^{*} See note under \(\Delta \epsilon \omega, I \) bind.

[†] Not a few instances of the others are however to be found in the dialects; $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\iota$, Inscr. ap. Chishull. p. 138. l. 5.— $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\beta\dot{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota$ in Maittaire from a Byzantine writer, and the part. $\dot{\alpha}\gamma\dot{\alpha}\gamma\alpha$ s in Hesy-

according to the rules of verbs having as their characteristic one of the liquids λ , μ , ν , ρ .—MIDD. Compare "A $\rho\nu\nu\mu\alpha\iota$.

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

The aor. 2. active is never used in any of its forms; but in the middle, Homer has the aor. 1. in the augmented indicative only $(\mathring{\eta}\rho\acute{a}\mu\epsilon\theta a, \mathring{\eta}\rho\alpha\tau o)$, and without the augment the aor. 2. $\mathring{a}\rho\acute{o}\mu\eta\nu$; in all the other moods the aor. 2. only, $\mathring{a}\rho\omega\mu a\iota$ (a short), $\mathring{a}\rhoo\iota\mu\eta\nu$, $\mathring{a}\rho\acute{e}\sigma\theta a\iota$. The Tragedians were able to use the same moods when the metre allowed it (e. g. in Soph. El. 34. $\mathring{a}\rhoo\iota\mu\eta\nu$), otherwise they have always the aor. 1. of which the a is long.

For $\mathring{a}\omega\rho\tau o$ see note on $d\gamma\mathring{\eta}o\chi a$ under " $A\gamma\omega$, and Lexilog. p.135. &c. 'Heré $\theta o\nu\tau a\iota$, - $o\nu\tau o$, for $de\acute{\iota}\rho o\nu\tau a\iota$, comes from the Epic $\mathring{\eta}\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\theta o\mu a\iota$, lengthened from $de\acute{\iota}\rho o\mu a\iota$, with the quantity of the root changed. Compare $\mathring{\eta}\gamma\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\theta o\mu a\iota$ under ' $A\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$.

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

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

[†] Porson (on Eurip. Med. 848.) first introduced this spondaic future, but by a

slight mistake he thought to be able to form $\alpha i \rho \hat{\omega}$ also from $\alpha i \rho \hat{\omega}$, in order to approach nearer to the text as handed down: and thus this barbaric form actually crept into some later editions. Elmsley (on Eurip. Heracl. 323.) corrected it.

both the earlier and later Ionisms $\pi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\nu$, $\pi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\zeta\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$, $\pi\iota\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$, &c. And this, which is the only true reading, is actually preserved in the Etym. M., but in an article disfigured by mistakes*.

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

: Aioθομαι also must have been in use, as some grammarians have wished to distinguish it from aioθάνομαι; see Lex. Seguer. pp. 183. 216. 359: and in Plat. Rep. 10. p. 608, a. Bekker has adopted from the manuscripts aioθόμεθα instead of aioθόμεθα, 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.

'Aΐσσω (in Hom. a depon. pass. also), I rush, hasten. In the Attics a dissyllable, and even in the Tragedians \mathring{q} σσω or \mathring{a} σσω, commonly \mathring{q} ττω or \mathring{a} ττω, and so also $\mathring{\eta}$ ξα, \mathring{q} ξαι with and without the iota‡.

From the subst. αικες we may conclude that the ι in the complete form is long by nature, and therefore the infin. aor. must be accented αιτζαι.

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

Aίσχύνω, I make ashamed, treat in a shameful manner:

* This is the article Αἰρεύμενον; 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 aiρεύμενον. 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: Αίρεύμενον, αἴροντα, λαμβάνοντα. παρὰ τὸ αίρῶ τὸ σημαῖνον τὸ λαμβάνω, κατὰ πλεονασμὸν αἰρῶ, αἰροῦμαι, αἰροῦμαι, αἰροῦν. Ἡσίοδος, &c. In Sylburg's edition the first word and the three which follow πλεονασμόν have the aspirate; whence arose the unintelligible sentence, aip w ...κατὰ πλεονασμὸν αἰρῶ, which Sylburg himself confessed he did not understand. It must be αἴρω...κατὰ πλεονασμὸν αίρῶ, and the pleonasm consists in the circumflex, i. e. in the e concealed under it, from which now comes

αἰρούμενον or αἰρεύμενον. Whether the reading of the Hesiodic manuscripts from which Grævius quotes be αἰρεύμενον, or whether it be αἰρεύμενον, which he rejected without mentioning it, is uncertain.

† Verbs of three or more syllables in άνω and some in $\alpha iνω$ come from a radical form without the alpha, which supplies it with some tenses as formed from έω: thus $\alpha \tilde{v} \xi \omega$ and $\alpha \tilde{v} \xi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$; $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, thus $\alpha \tilde{v} \xi \dot{\omega}$ and $\alpha \tilde{v} \xi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$; see also $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\nu} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\nu} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$, $\dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$.

† Most probably the iota subscript in the Attic forms may be ascribed to the accuracy of the grammarians. See Hemst. ad Plut. 733. Valck. ad Phœniss. 1388. and compare the various readings of the passages there mentioned. In pronunciation it was naturally distinguished by

lengthening the a.

pass. I am ashamed; perf. pass. ήσχυμμαι*, part. ήσχυμμένος, Il. σ, 180. with a genuine various reading ήσχυμένος.

Aiτέω, I ask.—MIDD.

Αιτιάομαι, I accuse: Depon. midd.

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

Verbs beginning with a, av, and oι, followed by a vowel, have no augment, as diω, ἀημι, ἀηδίζομαι αὐαίνω, οἰόω, οἰακίζω, οἰωνίζομαι but the a if short becomes long, therefore "αῖον &c.—Οῖομαι and ἀείδω are exceptions; as is also ἐπῆῖσα, (from ἐπαΐω, Herodot. 3, 29. Heind. Plat. Hipp. Maj. p. 289. E.) Herodot. 9, 93. Apoll. Rhod. 1, 1023. 2, 195. with the augment and ι short.

[Passow in his Lexicon marks $di\omega - - -$, and says that in Hom. the first syllable is *short* whenever the third is *long*. In the Tragedians it is common, Seidl. Eurip. Tro. 156. The iota is much oftener short than

long, Heyne Il. o, 252. Spohn Hes. ϵ , 215.]

'Aκαχίζω, transit. I grieve, vex any one. The theme AXΩ gives the following forms: η καχον, dκαχεῖν \dagger , from which is formed the present in common use. From the same aor, as a new theme tame the fut. dκαχ η σω, Hymn.Merc. 286., and again an aor. 1. dκάχησω, Π. ψ , 223.—Midd. dχομαι οι dχννμαι, I grieve (myself); aor. dκαχόμην. Perf. pass. (I am grieved) dκdχεμαιdς, dκηχέμενος, Il. dς, 29., and transposing the quantity, dκdχημαι, dκαχdμενος, Il. dς, 312. infin. dκdχησθαι. 'Ακηχέdαται, Il. dς, 637. is most probably a corruption of dκηχέdαται, which is a various reading, is regular, and supported by dκαχεdατο, Il. dς, 179., (while for the d0 there are no grounds whatever.—To the same intransitive meaning of the middle belongs also the part. pres. act. dχέων, -ονσα, grieving, lamenting.

'Aκαχμένος, sharpened, pointed. Hom.—If this perf. part. pass., (the only part of the verb which occurs) be compared with the substantive \grave{a} κ \acute{h} and \grave{a} κωκ \acute{h} , a point, it leads us to a verb AK Ω (acuo), because the

* Before the termination $\mu\alpha\iota$ of the perf. pass, the ν undergoes three changes:

1. Into μ in ἦσχυμμαι; in ἐξήραμμαι (ξηραίνω), Athen. 3. p. 80., and in σέσμμαι (σίνω), σεσιμμένος, Inscr. Chish. p. 130.

2. Generally into σ, as in πέφασμαι,

μεμίασμαι, μεμόλυσμαι, &c.

The ν is rejected and the vowel remains long, τετραχυμένος, Aristot. H. A.
 This takes place very rarely.

† See note on άγαγεῖν under "Αγω. ‡ From the aor. 2. act., as being a most necessary and consequently a most ancient tense, were taken very naturally new forms. Thus from $\epsilon \tilde{v} \rho o \nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau v \chi o \nu$, infin. $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho \epsilon \tilde{l} \nu$, $\tau v \chi \epsilon \tilde{l} \nu$ were formed $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{j} \sigma \omega$, $\tau v - \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, not from $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, $\tau v \chi \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, which were never in existence.

§ The perfect passive, as well as the other perfects, is intimately connected with the present; and as the terminations are similar in the infinitive and participle, this affinity can only be shown by adopting the accent of the present; thus $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\eta}\lambda a_{-\mu\alpha\iota}, \dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\eta}\lambda a_{\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma}$; $\dot{a}\rho\dot{\eta}\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota, \dot{a}\rho\eta\rho\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s, and many others.

 χ of the perf. act. before the μ is not changed into γ . For the α instead of η in the second syllable see below, note (*).

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

'Ακήδεσεν. See Κήδω.

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

'Ακροάομαι, I hear: Depon. midd. The fut. is ἀκροάσομαι, not -ήσομαι, an exception to the general rule. Of this verb the 2. pers. ἀκροᾶσαι, ἠκροᾶσο, for ἀκροᾶ, ἠκροῶ, was also in use among the Attics: the former occurs in Lex. Seguer. p. 77, 22., and the latter at p. 98. is quoted from Antiphanes. See Piers. ad Moer. p. 16. Lex. Seguer. p. 18, 10.

'Αλαλάζω, I shout: fut. - ξ ω, &c.

'Αλαλκείν. See.'Αλέξω.

'Αλαλύκτημαι. See 'Αλυκτέω.

'Aλάομαι, I wander: Depon. pass. [Imperf. ἢλώμην; aor. ἢλήθην, poet. ἀλήθην.—Passow.]

The Epic form ἀλάλημαι, ἀλάλησθαι, ἀλαλήμενος, with the meaning of a present, is supposed to be a form in μ ι, according to the analogy of ἄημαι, δίζημαι: but there are no grounds for such an idea; for the accent of the present in these forms is no proof, being found also in such undoubted perfects as ἀκήχεμαι, ἐλήλαμαι, and others (see note on ἀκήχεμαι under ᾿Ακαχίζω); and the meaning of the present is so similar to

(*) In forming the Attic reduplication the temp. augm. of the second syllable is sometimes neglected; for instance in ἀκα-χμένος, ἀλάλημαι, ἀλαλύκτημαι, ἀκά-χημαι, ἀραίρηκα, ἀραίρημαι.

† [No pure Attic writer has the fut. act. ακούσω, Schæf. Greg. p. 1063. It first

occurs three times in Lycophr., then in the LXX and the N. T., and more frequently in later writers, as Dion. Hal., Lucian Navig. 11. Jacobs' Anth. Poet. vol. i. p. l., vol. 3. pp. 552. 580. 1024. and particularly Schæf. Appar. Demosth. vol. 2. p. 232.—Passow.]

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

'Aλδαίνω*, I make large and strong. The present is found in the later Epic poets, as Nicand. Alex. 402. Homer has $\ddot{\eta}\lambda\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$, Od. σ , 70. ω , 768. where, particularly in the second passage, it appears to be completely an aorist. At II. ψ , 599. stands the intransitive $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\delta\dot{\eta}\sigma\kappa\omega\dagger$, to grow, increase. Other forms are not found in the older poets; Schneider in the Supplement to his Lexicon has collected those which occur in the later‡; among them is the intransitive $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\delta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ in Nicander, for which undoubtedly he had an older precedent: compare $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\alpha\dot{\iota}\nu\omega$. From this came the verbal adj. $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\tau\dot{\sigma}s$, whence in Homer $\ddot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\tau\sigma s$, insatiable, literally whom nothing fills and nourishes, Od. ρ , 228. σ , 113, 363.

'Αλείφω, I anoint: [fut. -ψω, aor. ἤλειψα; aor. pass. ἤλείφθην; aor. 2. conjunct. ἐξαλιφῆ, Plat. Phædr. p. 258, B. as restored by Bekker from the best manuscripts. Midd. ἀλειψάμην, ἀλείψασθαι, ἀλειψαμένος, Hom. The perf. ἤλοιφα, the Att. ἀλήλἴφα (Demosth. in Callipp. 29.), and the pass. ἀλήλιμμαι were in post-Homeric use.—Passow.]

In the Attic reduplication $\partial \lambda \epsilon i \phi \omega$, like $\partial \kappa n i \omega$, takes a short vowel in the third syllable, even shortening the vowel of the root: $\partial \lambda \epsilon i \phi \omega$, $\partial \lambda i \lambda i \omega$, $\partial \lambda i \lambda i \omega$, $\partial \lambda i \omega$, at whether this be a correct form, or a false reading for $\partial \lambda i \omega$, $\partial \lambda i \omega$, $\partial \lambda i \omega$, $\partial \lambda i \omega$, is uncertain.

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

See Schneid. on Xenoph. Anab. 1, 3, 6. From the aor. 1. act., formed according to the analogy of the future, come the Homeric ἀλεξήσειεν and ἀπαλεξήσειμι. There are no grounds in Pind. Ol. 13, 12. for a present ἀλεξεῖν. The pres. ἀλέξομαι, which sounds so like a future, and is

^{* [}Akin to ἄλω, ἄλδω, ἄλθω, ἄρδω, αρδω, αρδω,

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

^{‡ [&#}x27;Αναλδήσκοντες, Apollon. Rhod. 3, 1363. 'Αλδήσκονσαι, Eratosthenes, where Scaliger reads ἀλδίσκονσαι. 'Αλδίσκω, Suid. 'Αλδαίνονσι, Nicand. Al. 402. 'Εναλδήνασα, Tenait. 409. 'Αλδήσασκεν, from ἀλδέω, Orph. Lith. 364. 'Αλδύνηται, Quint. Sm. 9, 473. where Rhodomannus reads ἀλδαίνηται. 'Αλδυνομένους, Suid.—Schneid. Suppl.]

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

The Poets have in the active the aorist $\mathring{\eta}$ λαλκον, \mathring{u} λαλκε \mathring{v} , \mathring{u} λαλκ \mathring{u} ν*, with the reduplication \uparrow from ΑΛΚΩ, whence \mathring{u} λκτ $\mathring{\eta}$ ρ and \mathring{u} λκ \mathring{u} θε \mathring{u} ν. Hence (according to the note on \mathring{u} καχε \mathring{v} ν, \mathring{u} καχίζ \mathring{u} ν) came a new future \mathring{u} λαλκ $\mathring{\eta}$ σ \mathring{u} ν.

A present $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\omega$ appears to have been actually used by the epigrammatic poet Diodorus (Epig. 1. Anthol. 6, 245.), although it is only as a conjecture instead of the $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\sigma\iota$ of the manuscript. Still however the early existence of this theme would not even then be proved, as these later poets occasionally made a form from analogy. But this $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\omega$ bears the same relation to the forms which we have seen above from the root $\Lambda\Lambda K$ –, as $\partial\rho\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ does to $\partial\rho\gamma\iota\dot{a}$, $\partial\rho\gamma\dot{\eta}$: see also Buttm. Lexilog. p. 132. From the aorist of this verb $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\iota$ was formed the present in common use $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\xi\omega$, which then took again its own proper inflexion $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\xi\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$. In the same way the similar verb $\dot{a}\dot{\epsilon}\xi\omega$, $a\dot{\nu}\xi\omega$, arose from the root Λ E Γ – Λ Y Γ \rightarrow , which beside that has produced only the Latin verb.

'Aλέω ‡, I bruise or stamp to pieces, grind: fut. ἀλέσω, Att. ἀλῶ; imperf. ἤλουν; perf. act. Att. ἀλήλεκα; perf. pass. ἀλήλεσμαι, [altered by Bekker in Thucyd. 4, 26. to ἀλήλεμαι, 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 ἀλήθω, which however was still an ancient form. See Piers. ad Moer. p. 17. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 151.

'Aλέομαι or ἀλεύομαι, I avoid: Depon. midd. An active $d\lambda \epsilon \omega$ is doubtful. From this present we find $d\lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha \iota$ for $-o\hat{\nu}\mu \alpha \iota$, Theogn. 575. $d\lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, Simon. de Mul. 61. $d\lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \sigma$, $d\lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \iota \tau \sigma$, Hom. $d\lambda \epsilon \nu \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, Hes. ϵ , 533. $d\pi a\lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \epsilon \sigma$, ib. 758. The aorist is the aor. 1. without σ : $d\lambda \epsilon \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ and $d\lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, $d\lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \alpha \tau \sigma$, $d\lambda \epsilon \alpha \tau \sigma$, $d\lambda \epsilon \alpha \tau \sigma$, &c. The conjunctive therefore is as to form undecided between the pres. and aor. At Od. ξ , 400. $d\lambda \epsilon \hat{\nu} \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ is the conjunctive shortened according to the custom of

those very ancient poems, as from an indistinctness of tense: and as $\dot{a}\mu\dot{\nu}\nu\omega$ is a various reading for $\dot{a}\lambda\dot{a}\lambda\kappa\omega$ at II. ϕ , 138. 539., so may $\ddot{a}\mu\nu\nu$ have been the true reading in II. ψ , 185.

† See note on ηγαγον under "Αγω. And

Buttm. Lexilog. pp. 132. 548.

‡[Its root seems to be akin to ἔλω, ὁλαί, οὐλαί, mola, molere: Buttm. Lexilog. p. 259.

^{* &#}x27;Alakwa' is, as far as I know, always correctly written thus, and with the infin. $\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \lambda} \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\nu}$ will therefore prove $\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \lambda} \kappa o \nu$, $\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \lambda} \kappa o \nu$, to be undoubted a orists; although the only Homeric passage of this indicative (II. ψ , 185.) requires the imperfect. But then in Hes. 0, 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

the Epic poets*; and at ω, 29. the same form standing instead of the future may serve for the pres. indic. as well as the conjunctive.

In the Attic poetry occurs also an act. ἀλεύω with the regular aorist (ἥλευσα) ἀλεῦσαι. Its exact causative meaning, as deduced from that of ἀλεύομαι, is to snatch away, protect; and in this sense it is quoted from Sophocles in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 383, 4. (ἀλεύσω, φυλάξω). In Æschyl. Sept. 141. also nothing is wanting to ἄλευσον but to supply ἡμᾶs: while ib. 88. and Suppl. 544. have the accus. of the evil to be warded off; and at Prom. 567. with ἄλευε either sense is admissible.

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

'Αληναι, αλήμεναι. See Είλω.

"Aλθομαι, to heal, i. e. become healed: [there is no known instance of the pres. act. or pass.—Passow.] imperf. pass. $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\epsilon ro$, II. ϵ , 417.; fut. $d\lambda\theta\dot{\eta}\sigma\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, II. η , 405., but in this latter passage there are doubts both of the sense and reading: see Heyne. To this intransitive sense was added a causative one, I heal, i. e. I cure, which assumed different forms; $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\dot{\alpha}\kappa\omega$ or $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\dot{\alpha}\kappa\omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$ or $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\dot{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, whence the fut. $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\theta\dot{\alpha}\omega$, &c.; which forms are found in the Ionic prose of Hippocrates and others, but still need the help of the critic. See Foës. Œc. Hippocr.

'Αλίνδω. See Κυλίνδω.

'Aλίσκομαι, I am taken: imperf. ἡλισκόμην. Of this verb the active is not in use, but its place is supplied by aiρείν, of which again ἀλίσκομαι is used as the passive, and always in the same or a cognate sense. It forms its other tenses from 'AΛΟΩ (compare ἀμβλίσκω), and with the additional irregularity, that aorist and perfect have the passive sense in the active form \S : aor. ἡλων (Herodot. 3, 15. Xen. Anab. 4, 4, 21.), Att. ἐάλων ||, with a long; the other moods with a short, as opt. ἀλοίην (II. χ , 253.), and Ion. άλψην (Hom. sæpe), conj. ἀλώ, ψ̂c, &c., infin. ἀλώναι, part. άλούς;

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

^{† [}It is generally used with an accus. but also with infin. II. ζ, 167. ν, 356.— In Apoll. Rh. 3, 650. ἀψ ἀλεείνειν is intransit. to retire.—Schneid. and Passow.]

I [We find άλθίσκω twice in Hippocr.

^{7, 563.} D. 'Αλθάσσω, Aretæus p. 61. B. Συναλθάσσω, Hippocr. p. 758. 'Αλθέσσω, Aret. 3, 13. 'Αλθέζεται, Aret. p. 42. C. "Αλθέζεις, Aret. 2, 1. and a various reading in Hippocr. 758. E.—Schneider.]

[§] Thus the perfects ἔαγα, ἔρρωγα, I am broken, torn; in later writers πεπληγα, I am struck; in Hom. τετευχώς; and in the Lat. vapulo. See note p. 5.

^{||} See note under Γιγνώσκω.

Perf. εάλωκα with a short [the usual form in Thucyd. and Demosth.]; Ion. and Att. ηλωκα. The fut. is from the middle voice, αλώσομαι.—See 'Αναλίσκω.

The augment of ἐάλων deserves particular attention. It is not merely the syllabic augment before the vowel of the root, but, as this vowel is long in ἐάλων while it is short in ἀλώναι, &c., the length of the a must be looked upon as a parallel case to the ω in ξώρων. Besides, in ήλων the regular augment is as old as the other, and as early as Homer (Od. χ, 230.) and Herodotus (7, 175. ἥλωσαν); while ἐάλων is properly the Attic form. In the perfect this is reversed; jidwa is a strict Atticism, and ἐίιλωκα the common form. See Dawes Misc. p. 315. and Piers. ad Moer. p. 178. But this ἐάλωκα is distinguished from ἐάλων by the quantity of the a, the reason of which it is difficult to ascertain*. Compare εόρακα and note under 'Οράω.

Homer has once (Il. ϵ , 487.) the long α in a form which has not the augment, the part. ἀλόντε, which appears to be the original quantity: compare ἀναλίσκω.

'Αλιταίνω, to commit a fault, sin against: fut. αλιτήσω; aor. act. ήλιτον †, aor. mid. ἀλιτόμην. The act. and mid. have the same meaning. [Homer uses only the above two aorists.]

The Epic language has also a participle used like an adjective, αλιτή- $\mu \epsilon \nu os \ddagger$ in an act. sense, sinning, Od. δ , 807. Hes. α , 91 δ . This form may be considered as a shortened perf. (for ηλιτημένος) or a syncopated agrist (like $\beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon vos$): as regards its active sense we may compare it with the similar passive part. πεφυγμένος, ολόμενος.

* These, like many other irregular forms, had originally the digamma, and were therefore 'E-FAAΩN FE-FAAΩKA, 'E-FESSATO FE-FESTO. But when the digamma was changed to the aspirate, they took the augment according to the analogy of other aspirated verbs, consequently $\dot{\epsilon}$ - $\dot{a}\lambda\omega\nu$, whence $\ddot{\eta}\lambda\omega\nu$, as $\ddot{\eta}\rho\mu$ o- $\ddot{\zeta}o\nu$ was formed from $\dot{a}\rho\mu\dot{o}\zeta\omega$.

† See note on Αίσθάνομας. ‡ [Passow calls it a part. pres. from an obsolete verb ἀλίτημι, ἀλίτημαι.]

§ I hope to defend αλιτήμενον Εὐρυσθηα in this second passage against άλιτήμερον, which has been taken from the Scholium of Tzetzes and the Etym. Mag. v. ηλιτόμενος. See Hermannin Add. ad Greg. Cor. p. 879. The reading of the text has been always so generally preferred, that the emendation can be offered as nothing more than a various reading.

But considered accurately I cannot acknowledge it to be such. The utmost we can draw from the Schol. of Tzetzes is that some old grammarians thought there was meaning enough in the common reading allτήμενον to explain it as synonymous with ήλιτόμηνον, which Homer uses with reference to the same Eurystheus,) but not as an epithet,) so that άλιτόμηνος or άλιτήμενος might be each formed from μήν according to the difference of the rhythm. Let any one read now the gloss in the Etym. M. and he will see at once that the statement there given is the same, and that άλιτήμεροs is an error of transcription: for in the whole passage nothing is mentioned but the derivation from univ, whereas if the etymologist had really used the other word, he must have given his reasons for it.

'Αλίω. See Κυλίηδω. ΛΛΚ-, ἀλαλκεῖν. See 'Αλέξω.

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

"Αλλομαι, I leap. Usage seems balanced between the two aorists, ἡλάμην, ἄλασθαι (with a long), and ἡλόμην, ἁλέσθαι (with a short): but the forms ἥλατο, ἁλάμενος and ἁλέσθαι, ἄλοιτο, appear to have the preference*.

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

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

* See Fisch. ad Well. iii. a. p. 29. On the 2. pers. ηλω and ηλου see Erf. ad Œd. Tyr. 1310. where Hermann now reads the imperf., which is very harsh in that pasage.

* The Grammarians accounted for this lenis by the consonant following the λ ; 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 $\dot{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\hat{\nu}\nu$, $\dot{\eta}\mu\beta\rho\sigma\tau\sigma\nu$, $\dot{\alpha}\beta\rho\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, we see at once, without following the process throughout, that such changes had an influence on the aspirate; other changes of the same nature, though the reverse of the above (i. e. from the lenis to the aspirate), we may see in $\ddot{\alpha}\rho\omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\rho\mu\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, in $\ddot{\delta}\rho\omega$, $\dot{\delta}\rho\mu\dot{\alpha}\omega$, &c.: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 300. No one with common sense will suppose that a grammatical caprice can have produced this old and fixed tradition.

‡ While the orthography of $\tilde{a}\lambda\tau o$ has been handed down invariably the same, that of $\tilde{a}\lambda\eta\tau a\iota$ has been uncertain from

the oldest times, as is clear from the Scholia on the Homeric passages (Il. A, 192. ϕ , 536.) and the copies of the Gram-In this however it is to be observed, that those who wrote αληται derived the word, inverting the usual way, from $a\lambda \hat{\eta} \nu ai$; although they could not decide between the two spiritus; see Schol. on both the above passages :- but those who classed the word with $\ddot{a}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, did not change the aspirate; see Eustath. and Schol. Min. ad A, 192. Now as the grounds for the spiritus of alto, which were touched on in the last note, cannot (look at them in what light we will) be applicable to αληται, so neither is there anything throughout to direct us to ἄληται with the lenis; and analogy therefore requires us to write "hyrai, and to join it to the regular aor. 2., which had as good a title, through that altro, to be admitted into the Epic language, as ωρετο (to which belongs ὄρηται) has through ώρτο. Beside the above, Homer has also once the aor. 1. ἐσήλατο, Il. μ, 438.

Valck. ad Ammon. 1, 4. p. 21. s. Lex. Seguer. p. 379, compared with p. 16. p. 270, 27. and Thom. Mag. in voc. [Att. ἀλοάω; Poet. ἀλοιάω.—Passow.]

'ΑΛΟΩ. See 'Αλίσκομαι and 'Αναλίσκω.

'Αλυκτέω and (II. κ, 94.) ἀλαλύκτημαι, I am uneasy, full of anxiety. Beside Homer, Hippocrates, according to Erotian, used this present (compare Foes. Oec. Hipp. v. ἀλύζει); and ἀλυκταίνω (Etym. M.), ἀλυκτάζω (Herodot. 9, 70.) are analogous sister-forms. We abandon therefore all analogy when we attempt to make ἀλαλύκτημαι a present; while as perf. pass. it can still have the sense of the present increased in force; compare κεχάρημαι, τέτυγμαι, δεδακρυμένος; see also note on 'Ακαχμένος.—Quintus Sm. 14, 24. has also ἀλάλυκτο, which, if we may trust to a form of such a poet, is a nearer approach to the original theme. This verb must not however be classed with ἀλύσκω, ἀλύξω, but rather with ἀλύω and ἀλύσσω, which also mean a confusion and uneasiness of mind.

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

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

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

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

* [Homer uses the pres. and imperf., which thus supply the place of those tenses in ἀλύσκω.—Passow.]

† The only meaning of this verb is to be beside oneself—either with grief or joy; those who give it the sense of $d\lambda \hat{a}\sigma\theta a\iota$ are in error: in the two passages quoted by Schneider in his Lexicon (11. ω , 12. Apoll. Rh. 4, 1289.) as instances of this

meaning, there is a verb of such a sense (δινεύεσκε, ἐρπύζοντεs), but ἀλύειν refers only to distraction of mind.—On the doubtful aspirate, ἀλύειν, ἀλύειν, see Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 380. [Passow calls ἀλύειν the Attic form, but says that the later Atticists kept to the older form ἀλύειν, Locella Xen. Eph. p. 172.]

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

'Αλφάνω or ἀλφαίνω, I find, obtain. It forms its tenses from ἄλφω (see note on Λίσθάνομαι); thus aor. 2. ἦλφον, ἄλφοιμι, Hom. [Passow has both ἀλφαίνω and ἀλφάνω as presents, and cites in proof of the latter Eurip. Med. 301., the only passage of the Tragedians in which it is found; adding, on the authority of Elmsley, that it is more frequent in the Comedians. The Grámmarians have also ἀλφάζω, ἀλφαίω, ἀλφάω, ἀλφάω, ἄλφω, Dor. ἀλφάδδω.]

'Αμαρτάνω, I err: fut. άμαρτήσομαι; perf. ήμάρτηκα; aor. ήμαρτον, infin. άμαρτεῖν; [the fut. act. άμαρτήσω is found only in the Alexandrians; the aor. 1. ήμάρτησα only in later writers, Lobeck. Phryn. p. 732.—Passow.]

For $\eta\mu\alpha\rho\tau\sigma\nu$ the Epic language has often $\eta\mu\beta\rho\sigma\tau\sigma\nu$, $\delta\pi\eta\mu\beta\rho\sigma\tau\sigma\nu$, formed by transposition, by the change of a to o, and the necessary insertion of β . See Buttm. Lexilogus, p. 82. &c. On the change of the spiritus compare the note on $^{3}\Lambda\lambda\tau\sigma$.

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

The first α is long (Il. σ , 551. Hes. ϵ , 390.) and short (Il. γ , 359. Hes. ϵ , 763.), but the augment is always regular, $\eta \mu \omega \nu$, &c. [According to Passow the first α in Hom. is long in the act. and short in the midd., while in later writers, as in Theorr. 10, 7. 10, 16. 11, 73. it is common.]

'Αμβλίσκω, I have an abortion, miscarry: fut. (formed from the less frequent $\mathring{a}\mu\beta\lambda\acute{o}\omega$) $\mathring{a}\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega$; aor. 1. $\mathring{\eta}\mu\beta\lambda\omega\sigma\alpha$; perf. $\mathring{\eta}\mu\beta\lambda\omega\kappa\alpha$.

the female about to bring forth is the subject, as Plat. Theæt. p. 150. e. απελθύντες δε (metaphorically transferred to scholars) εξήμβλωσαν δια πονηράν συνουσίαν. In Æl. V. H. 13, 6, 3. βουλόμεναι άμβλωσαι, wishing to miscarry. In Plut. Lycurg. 3. οὐκ ἔφη δεῖν ἀμβλίσκουσαν αὐτὴν-κινδυνεύειν. But one who helps or injures may also be the subject, and then the production is generally the object expressed. In Plut. Arat. 32. metaphorically spoken of the fruits of the field, καρπούς ἀπαμβλίσκειν. In Æl. ap. Suid. v. έξήμβλωσεν: ή έλπὶς έξήμβλωτο αὐτη. In Aristoph. Nub. 137. έξήμβλωκας (ήμιν) φροντίδα, and immediately afterwards το έξημβλωμένον; again in Plat. Theæt. 149. d. αμβλίσκειν and αμβλίσκουσιν seem to have the midwives as their subject. And so in the passage of Euripides the phrase έξαμβλοῦν τὴν νηδύν is very intelligible, particularly as a poetical expression, without its following as a necessary consequence that έξαμβλοῦν γυναῖκα had been also made use of. However, in all the passages quoted above, and also in the common meaning to have an abortion, the verb may be considered as a causative, if we imagine to ourselves an immediative sense, to miscarry, whose subject shall not be the mother, but the child; and as such we actually find an aor. 2. (or by syncope) in Suid. v. "Ημβλω with a fragment of Ælian, έξήμβλω ή εννοια τώ arooio*; which again is strongly confirmed by Pollux, in whose collection of the terms relating to this subject (II, c. 2.), instead of the untenable ἀμβλῦναι, ἀμβλῶσαι, we must read from the manuscripts ἀμβλώναι, άμβλώσαι.

'A μ ei $\beta \omega$, I exchange.—MIDD. [The act. is seldom used by Homer, more frequently by the Attic writers.—Passow.]

' 'Αμπέχω and 'Αμπισχνοῦμαι. See under "Εχω.

' $\Lambda \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \kappa i \sigma \kappa \omega$, I commit α fault, err: fut. $d\mu \pi \lambda \alpha \kappa i \sigma \omega$; aor. 2. $\eta \mu - \pi \lambda \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu$, $d\mu \pi \lambda \alpha \kappa \epsilon i \nu \uparrow$. The Doric dialect has $d\mu \beta \lambda \alpha \kappa i \sigma \kappa \omega$, &c.‡

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

editor has corrupted the old reading to $\dot{a}\mu$ - $\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{e}\nu\tau\iota$. Gaisford has given the whole paragraph from his manuscripts with $\dot{a}\mu$ - $\beta\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{e}\nu\tau\iota$. (for so he reads it) three times; but in the first-quoted passage $\dot{a}\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{e}\tau$, the form $\dot{a}\mu\beta\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{e}\iota$ is also in Archilochus, 30. As to the other forms, $\dot{a}\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{e}\iota\nu$ and some that come from it, found in the Tragedians with the first syllable short, are now written in such passages $\dot{a}\pi\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{e}\iota\nu$ &c., in some ineasure from the representations of the old Grammarians. See Erf. ad Soph. CEd. T. 474. ed. min. Matth. ad Eurip. Iph. A. 124.

^{*} Under Έξήμβλωσεν we find, it is true, these same words with the form έξήμβλωτο; but beside that the pluperf. does not suit the context when completed as it is under "Ημβλω, even this very "Ημβλω speaks plainly in favour of the amended έξήμβλω.

[†] Verbs in έω sometimes have a present in ισκω, although their tenses are formed from the infin. of the aor. 2. in εἶν, as εὐρίσκω, ἀμπλακίσκω, ἀπαφίσκω, ἐπαυ-

⁻ρίσκομαι.

[†] The present in ισκω occurs in Theagenes ap. Stob. Serm. l. Schow. p. 22., where this

and pass.—MIDD.— Αμύναθον, άμυνάθειν, άμυναθοίμην, are formed from άμυνάθω, a lengthened form of άμύνω, like διωκάθειν, εἰργάθειν.

On these forms Elmsley (ad. Eurip. Med. 186.) was the first to observe that the pres. indic. in $-i\theta \epsilon i \nu$ never occurs; but he was hasty in adding that they are always aorists, and must therefore be accented in the infin. -είν. It is true that the examples quoted by him of ἀμυνάθειν have the momentary meaning of the agrist; but διωκάθειν, Plat. Euthyphr. p. 15. d. and ἐδιώκαθες, Gorg. p. 483. a. are quite as plainly in duration the pres. or imperfect. This particular formation belongs therefore to those cases in which the preterit was not clearly separated into imperfect and agrist, and which consequently in this relation take a direction according to the nature of the verb; as for instance the idea of διώκειν contains the duration in itself*.—More certain is it, that εσχεθον is always an agrist, and the same as εσχον; and the accentuation of the infinitive of this verb $\sigma_X \epsilon \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ is confirmed by the Homeric σχεθέειν. But I do not therefore think we are justified in writing σχεθών, σχεθόντες, Pind. Pyth. 6, 19. Soph. El. 744; nay πέφνων (see observations on this verb in its place) ought to check such an arbitrary proceeding, and teach us not to hazard a decision on these traditionary points. See Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 272. Herm. ad. Soph. El. 744.

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

'Αμφισβητέω, I am of a different opinion, dispute. [Herodot. 4, 14.: imperf. ημφισβήτουν; aor. ημφισβήτησα, Demosth.—Passow.]

As άμφισβητείν is compounded of άμφίς and βαίνω, ήμφισβήτουν,

in joining with the aor. 2. merely on account of the termination in $o\nu$.—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 $\pi\epsilon\lambda d\theta\omega$, the α of which belongs to the root, $\pi\epsilon\lambda d\theta\omega$, $\theta\epsilon\epsilon$, $-\theta\epsilon\epsilon$, in Eurip. Rhes. 557. Aristoph. Ran. 1265. Thesm. 58.

^{*} Elmsley quotes, as an authority of the old Grammarians in favour of the aorist, the single gloss of Photius, $\dot{\eta}\mu\dot{\nu}\nu\alpha\theta\nu$, $\ddot{\eta}\mu\nu$ - $\nu\alpha\nu$; 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 $\epsilon i\nu$, $\dot{\omega}\nu$ 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

-ησα, -ηκα are regular formations; but the custom generally observed in compounds with ἀμφί caused quite early a false separation in the word, whence ἀμφεσβήτουν, and with double augment ἢμφεσβήτουν. Whether ἀμφεσβήτουν actually occurs I know not, but ἡμφεσβήτουν has been uniformly restored to the text of Plato by Bekker from the best manuscripts, and in the Etym. Mag. p. 94, 37. it is quoted from Plato, though altered by Sylburg without authority. And further, in the passage quoted there from Andocides de Myster. p. 4, 38. ἡμφεσβήτουν 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 ἀμφεσβήτουν.

'Aναίνομαι, I refuse: [imperf. ήναινόμην, Poet. ἀναινόμην, and in later authors like Agathias frequently ἀνηνόμην.—Passow.] aor. ήνηνάμην, ἀνήνασθαι, conjunct. ἀνήνηται.

This is a verb in $\alpha i \nu \omega$ formed from the negation $\check{\alpha}\nu$ (see Buttm. Lexil. p. 118.); its aorist is therefore quite regular, like $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\nu\mu\eta\nu\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$. The other tenses are not in use; for in Il. ι , 510. Theorr. 25, 6., where $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\eta}-\nu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ is quoted as a perfect, it is the aor. conjunct.

'Aναλίσκω, I employ, expend, consume: imperf. ἀνήλισκον. The older form ἀναλόω is found in Thucyd. and the dramatic poets: imperf. without augm. ἀνάλουν, Thucyd. 8, 45. The other tenses are formed entirely according to the old form, as fut. ἀναλώσω, while the aor. and perf. have sometimes the augment, sometimes not; thus the Att. aor. is ἀνάλωσα, without augm. (Herm. Soph. Aj. 1028.), in the non-Attic writers sometimes ἀνήλωσα, sometimes ἡνάλωσα; in the same way the Att. perf. isἀνάλωκα, the non-Att. ἀνήλωκα and ἡνάλωκα, Valck. ad Phœn. 591*. Perf. pass. ἀνάλωμαι, aor. pass. ἀναλώθην and ἀνηλώθην. The pres. ἀναλόω is rare.

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

^{*} In Æschin. c. Timarch. p. 8. 9. ἀνάλωσε, ἀνηλωκώs, have a various reading, but one of no great authority.

[†] Notwithstanding this distinction, the similarity of meaning in ἀλίσκεσθαι sumi and ἀναλίσκειν consumere, and the relation of the aorists prove the actual iden-

tity of the root. The active form of $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\hat{\omega}\nu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}a\lambda\omega\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$, 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 $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\hat{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$ bears to the above is causative, according to the leading analogy which I have drawn

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 arak- was long the favourite. See Thom. Mag. with Hemsterh. note; Moeris. p. 25. Valck. ad Phæn. 591. Fischer ad Well. iii. p. 33 sqq. On the other side see Elmsl. and Herm. ad Souh. Ai. 1049. (1028.). In Isocrates Coray uniformly wrote, contrary to the preponderating authority of the manuscripts, dval-; and Bekker, following the Codex on which he places most reliance, has uniformly restored $d\nu\eta\lambda$. For $\dot{\eta}\nu\dot{\alpha}\lambda\omega\sigma\alpha$ in this semi-compound form there appears to be no authority whatever; but κατηνάλωσεν in Isocr. Euag. 22. (Bekker, 73), and κατηναλωμένα, Nicocl. 9. (Bekker, 37.), are established firmly by the same manuscript.

'Aνδάνω, I please: imperf. εάνδανον, Herodot. 9, 5., εήνδανον and ηνδανον in Homer; aor. εαδον, Herodot. 1, 151. 4, 145. 153.*, εναδον, Hom. and άδον, Poet.; infin. άδεῖν, &c., all with a short; fut. άδήσω, Herodot. 5, 39.; perf. ¿aða†. A passive voice does not occur; but in the Doric dialect is found a synonymous middle άδέσθαι in Fragm. Pythagor. p. 749. Gale. [We find also ἀνδάνεται, Archias Epig. 16.— This verb is mostly Ion. and Poet.—Passow.]

The Homeric aor. evalor is to be explained by the digamma E-FAΔON ε-άδον εαδον. But F might be doubled on account of the metre, EFFADON, and, as it could not therefore entirely disappear from the verse, it passed over into the cognate ν, εὐαδον, as in κανάξαις under "Ayvvuit.

The double augment εήνδανον follows the analogy of εώρων and εαλων, and therefore undoubtedly there were grounds for it in the old language, though hardly in the Homeric, in which the aor. was EFADON, EADON, ADON. 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 έάνδανε and ηνδανε in Herodotus. The pure Homeric forms, as soon as the digamma disappeared, were without doubt εάνδανεν, and, where ηνδανε now stands, ανδανε; while that of Herodotus was ηνδανον, according to the analogy of ωρων.

We have merely to add that this verb, which is used only in the dialects and poets, is properly the same as ήδω (compare λανθάνω, λήθω),

out in my Grammar, that is to say, to the analogy of δύω, ἔδυσα, δύσω,—ἔδυν, δέδυκα, δύσομαι, belongs, 'ΑΛΟΩ (I take), αναλόω, ανάλωσα, αναλώσω-έάλων, εάλωκα, άλώσομαι.

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

^{*} In these three passages incorrectly quoted as a persect by Fischer, 3. p. 21.
† On ἔαδε, Theoer. 27, 22. suspected as

^{\$} The idea of this form signifying well-pleased, is not to be entertained for a moment, as the above analogy proves. Had this been the case, we must have met with such expressions as acev ev, ev yap äĉev.

and distinguished from it by nothing more than a slight deviation of meaning and a difference of construction.

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

'Aνήνοθα, I press forward: a perfect with the sense of a present, the third person of which was also used as an aorist*. For its theme we must take $\Lambda N\Theta \Omega$ or $\Lambda NE\Theta \Omega$, a detailed account of which see in Buttm. Lexil. pp. 110. 133. &c.

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

· 'Ανοίγω. See Οίγω.

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

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

* Thus $\gamma \acute{e}\gamma \omega \nu a$, I call, 3. pers. $\gamma \acute{e}\gamma \omega \nu e(\nu)$, he calls, $Od. \zeta$, 294., whence a new form in $o\nu$ gives a 3. pers. $\grave{e}\gamma \acute{e}\gamma \omega \nu e(\nu)$, which, by dropping the augment, becomes again $\gamma \acute{e}\gamma \omega \nu e(\nu)$; see II. ξ , 460. ω , 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:

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

 $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\eta}\nu_0\theta\epsilon$ pres. Od. 0, 365.—imperf. II. β ,

† [Passow however has αντέω, Ion. for αντάω.]

'Aνύω, Att. ἀνύτω*, I complete: fut. ἀνύσω, &c. The pass. takes σ.—Midd.—[The a and vare always short.—Passow.]

A more restricted Atticism was ἀνύω with the aspirate, καθανύω. See Piers. ad Moer. v. ἥνυσα. Lex. Seguer. p. 14. Hesych. v. καθανύσας.

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

"Aνω, an older form of ἀνύω: used only in pres. and imperf. ἄνειν, Plat. Cratyl. p. 415. a. ἦνον, Od. γ, 496. ἄνοντος, Aristoph. Vesp. 369. ἄνομαι, I draw to a close, Il. κ, 251. Æschyl. Choeph. 788. (795.) Valck. Herodot. 7, 20. ἤνετο, Herodot. 8, 71.

This verb, with regard to quantity, is a solitary exception to the general rule, having its a uniformly long. Hence ἔργον ἄνοιτο, Od. σ, 473. must be left as an instance of Epic uncertainty: compare ἀμάω. But the opinion of Barnes is more probable, that the various reading ἄνῦτο is the true reading, as optat. of ἄνυμαι (see the preceding), like δαίνῦτο, Il. ω, 665. from δαίνυμαι: compare Od. π, 373. ἀνύσσεσθαι τάδε ἔργα.

"Ανωγα, 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, ἄνωγμεν, Hymn. Apoll. 528.— Pluperf. with the force of an imperf. (ἡνώγειν) ἡνώγεα, 3. pers. ἡνώγει.— To the perf. belong, according to the general analogy of perfects, other moods, as ἀνώγη, ἀνώγοις; infin. ἀνωγέμεν for ἀνωγέναι, and the imperat. ἄνωγε, Eurip. Or. 119. Callim. Fr. 440. But the more common imperat. is ἄνωχθι, formed from ἄνωγμεν as κέκραχθι from ἐκέκραγμεν; and again, by a similar formation, from ἀνώγετε (Od. ψ, 132.) and ἀνωγέτω (Od. β, 195.) came, by imitating the passive termination, ἄνωχθε (Hom.) and Eurip. and ἀνώχθω (Hom.) †.

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

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 $-\dot{v}\tau\tau\omega$, see Koen.et Schæf. ad Greg. Cor. in Att. 26., Hemst. ad Plut. 607., and the notes to Thom. Mag.

† See ἐγρήγορθε and note under Ἐγείρω.

^{* &#}x27;Ανύτω (like ἀρύω, ἀρύτω,) is the common form in the older Attics, so that for this dialect we may form ἀνύτω, ἀνύσω. But as ἀνύω, ἀνύσω, 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-

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

It were unnecessary to suppose a theme $\partial \nu \omega \gamma \epsilon \omega$, from which to form the 3. sing. imperf. $\partial \nu \omega \gamma \epsilon \iota$; for this belongs to $\partial \nu \omega \gamma \epsilon \iota$; but at II. η , 394. we read also the 3. pl. $\partial \nu \omega \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$. This form however certainly crept into the text after the digamma, which followed in $ei\pi\epsilon \hat{\iota}\nu$, had ceased to be perceived; whence Bentley proposed the simple alteration to $\partial \nu \omega \gamma \iota \nu \nu$.

A striking want of symmetry, and at the same time an uncertainty, but probably not attributable to the old poet, arises from the usage of the third person as it now exists in his writings. For we find not only as a pres. sometimes $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon(\nu)$ from $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\alpha$, sometimes $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon(\nu)$ from $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\alpha$, sometimes $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon(\nu)$ from $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon(\nu)$ from a theme in ω , but also as a preterit either $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon(\nu)$ from $\mathring{n}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, or $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\iota$ (II. β , 280. δ , 301.) for $\mathring{n}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\iota$ from $\mathring{n}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\alpha$. To reduce all this to uniformity and rule would be perhaps now impossible without some very arbitrary proceeding. At the same time there are strong grounds for suspecting $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\iota$ as a pres. to be not Homeric, as it stands (without any reason for it) in the same expression and the same part of the metre as $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, e. g. $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, II. ξ , 195. $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\iota$, χ , 142., and in every instance it can be changed for $\mathring{a}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, which has the oldest and surest analogy in its favour, and which in many cases is the reading of the manuscripts instead of the other, for instance in II. o, 180. σ , 176.†

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, $\ddot{a}\nu\omega\gamma\alpha$, -as, -e, like oida, -as, -e; the 1. plur. $\ddot{a}\nu\omega\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$ answers to $\ddot{\iota}d\mu\epsilon\nu$, and in the imperat. $\ddot{a}\nu\omega\chi\theta\iota$, $-\theta\epsilon$, $-\theta\omega$ answer to $\ddot{\iota}\sigma\theta\iota$, $\ddot{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon$, $\ddot{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega$, only changing the τ into θ in the latter. The pluperf. with the force of an imperf. is $(\dot{\eta}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu)$ $\dot{\eta}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\alpha$, 3. sing. $\dot{\eta}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\iota$, $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\iota$, answering to $\ddot{\eta}d\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\ddot{\eta}d\epsilon\iota$, $\ddot{\eta}d\epsilon\iota$. All these are original forms; the transitions to the pres. and imperf. $(\dot{a}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\iota)$; imperf. $\dot{\eta}\nu\omega\gamma\nu$, $\ddot{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\nu$, $\ddot{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, $\ddot{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\epsilon\nu$, &c.) are of later usage. "Ar $\omega\gamma\alpha$ is therefore without doubt in sense as well as form an

^{*} But whoever examines the whole context of that passage will perhaps agree with me in thinking it still more probable that $i \nu \dot{\omega} \gamma \epsilon \iota$, supported by the same digamma, was copied from v. 386. and used again here (v. 394.) where Priam's words are repeated from v. 375.

[†] There would then remain of the pres. in ω nothing in Homer but the above-mentioned $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\omega}\gamma\epsilon\tau\sigma\nu$, which again is very suspicious, as it is scarcely to be supposed that a writer who did not make use of $\ddot{\alpha}\nu\omega\gamma\alpha$ s should have used $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\omega}-\gamma\alpha\tau\sigma\nu$.

old perfect like $\partial \ell a$, although it may be impossible to disentangle it etymologically from the present, and discover from which sense of the present it eomes. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 135.

'Απαντάω. See 'Αντάω. 'Απανράω. See ΑΥΡ-.

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

'Απολαύω, I enjoy: [fut. ἀπολαύσω in Dion. Hal. and Lucian, but more generally] ἀπολαύσωμαι, Xen.; aor. 1. ἀπέλαυσα, and aor. 2. ἀπέλαυσν, Thucyd. and Xen.: but in later writers these aor. took, in addition to the syllabic, the temporal augment, thus ἀπήλαυσν, ἀπήλαυσα‡, Isocr. ad Demon. c. 3. Ælian. V. H. 12, 25. Alciphr. 3, 53. It is true that Herodian in Hermann, p. 315., disapproves of these latter aorists; but when we see the other forms which that writer objects to, it only shows that these were very old and in common use. [An aor. midd. ἀπελαυσάμην nowhere occurs. The perfects are formed regularly, and are in Attic usage. A simple λαύω is not found; and probably ἀπολαύω comes from the same root as λαμβάνω, λαβεῖν.—Passow.]

'Απούρας. See AYP-.

+ Nothing however is more probable

than that these forms expelled at some later æra the old and genuine $\alpha\pi\alpha\phi\eta\sigma\omega$, $\alpha\pi\alpha\phi\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$. Homer certainly had only the subst. $\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\eta$, which was formed by itself from $\Lambda\Phi\Omega$, $\alpha\phi\alpha\omega$ (see Buttin. Lexil. p. 117.), and from which again came the new verb $\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\alpha\nu$ used in prose.

1 See note under Boulouat.

^{*} As these are aor., not imperf., the correct accentuation of the part. is $\alpha\pi\alpha$ - $\phi\omega\nu$ (not $\alpha\pi\delta\phi\omega\nu$) as we find it in Hymn. Ven. 38. Eurip. 1on. 705.: and other passages ought to be corrected according to these. As to the reduplication see note on $\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\hat{\imath}\nu$ under " $\Lambda\gamma\omega$.

'Aπτω*, in both its senses, I set fire to and I fusten, is regular. From $\dot{a}\phi\dot{n}$ we see that its characteristic letter is ϕ . Its second meaning is the causative one of to hold firm, which is the proper sense of the middle $\ddot{a}\pi\tau o\mu a\iota$ (Il. θ , 67.), and from which came the common meaning, to touch.

Έάφθη, or ἐάφθη (for the aspirate is doubtful), which occurs twice in Homer, viz. II. ν , 543. ξ , 419., appears to belong to this verb; for if we compare at II. β , 15. η , 402. ϕ , 513. the perf. ἐφῆπται (necessity, evil, death) is fixed upon, we must then take for ἐπὶ—ἐάφθη in both passages the physical meaning of inflicta est, was struck upon. But there are objections to this sense; and a very strong one as regards the form is this, that the separate augment ϵa is found in those verbs only which had the digamma, of which there is nowhere any trace in ἄπτω, ἄπτομαι. This form requires therefore a further examination. [It is fully examined in Buttm. Lexil. p. 242—246.]

'Αράομαι, I pray, curse. The first a in the Epics is long, in the Attics short †.—Depon. midd.

There is one instance, Od. χ , 322., of an act. infin. $d\rho\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, which, as the context requires a past tense, like Od. δ , 378. and ξ , 134., must be an aorist. And the only way in which I can arrive at such a one is by supposing an old depon. pass. from the simple root $(\bar{a}\rho\rho\mu\alpha\iota)$, of which there remains nothing but this solitary instance of the aor. 2. pass. $d\rho\bar{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$ (with long vowel like $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{a}\gamma\eta\nu$) for $d\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma\partial\alpha\iota$; just as Homer uses elsewhere both the aor. pass. and aor. midd. of other deponents, of $ai\delta\dot{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ for instance.—' $A\rho\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma$ is a very different word: see it in its alphabetical place.

'Αραρίσκω, I fit. The simple theme $AP\Omega$ is one of the most fruitful of the Greek radical verbs: from it are derived immediately the following, —ἀρέσκω, ἀρτάω, ἀρτύω, ἀρύω, αἴρω, ἀρμόζω, ἄρνυμαι. The pres. ἄρω never occurs. Its meaning is both transit. and intransit. according to

which the tenses may be thus divided:

† The same holds good of the subst. $\alpha \rho \dot{\alpha}$. But in Homer a regular distinction is observed between $\dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\eta}$ with α long,

meaning a prayer or curse (as at II. o, 598. Od. ρ , 496.), and $\dot{\alpha}\rho\dot{\eta}$ with α short, in the sense of evil, destruction (as at II. μ , 334.) We must however remark that a third Homeric form apein, harsh words, threatening (II. ρ , 43 I.) has α 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.]

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

- 1. Transit.—Act. fut. ἀρῶ, Ion. ἄρσω; aor. 1. ἄρσα, Ion. ἄρσα, infin. ἄρσαι, part. ἄρσαs, Hom. More used than the aor. 1. is the aor. 2. ἤρᾶρον*, Ion. ἄραρον (¨˙), infin. ἀραρεῖν, part. ἀραρών, Hom. passim; and from this aor. 2., which in Hom. is twice intransit. also, comes the transit. pres. ἀραρίσκω (see note on ἀμπλακίσκω), which we see in the imperf. ἀράρισκεν, Od. ξ, 23.—Pass. perf. ἀρήρεμαι, to which may be joined both in formation and sense the new pres. ἀρέσκω; aor. 1. ἤρθην, of which Homer has only 3. plur. ἄρθεν for ἤρθησαν, Il. π, 211. Of the midd. we find the aor. 1. part. ἀρσάμενος, Hes. α, 320.
- 2. Intransit.—This sense, as arising from the continuity of action represented by the perfect, belongs to that tense almost exclusively; ἄραρα†, (), Ion. and Ep. ἄρηρα‡, part. ἀραρώs, Ion. and Ep. ἀρηοώς, fem. ἀραρνία, but in the Epics ἀραρνία &, with the second syllable short; pluperf. ἡράρειν (ā), Ion. and Ep. ἀρήρειν or ἡρήρειν. The perf. has generally the sense of a present, the pluperf. that of an imperfect. But beside the perfect we have also two instances of the aor. 2 with an intransit. meaning, viz. Od. δ, 777. ήραρεν ήμιν, was pleasing to us; and II. π , 214., where we find both the meanings of this form within a line of each other, 'Ως ὅτε τοῖχον ἀνὴρ ἀράρη-"Ως ἄραρον κόρυθες. In both passages we must not overlook the momentary sense of the aorist; in the former passage, "the proposal which was pleasing to us all," that is to say, recommended itself at the time of consultation: and in the latter it is a mere repetition of $\ddot{a}\rho\theta\epsilon\nu$ which is in the preceding line, and which would have been literally repeated but for the intentional repetition of ωs ἀράρη—ωs ἄραρον; consequently the sense is, "so the helmets fitted themselves to each other" (compare II. μ, 105. οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ άλλήλους ἄραρον); and the description then follows correctly in the imperf. ἀσπὶς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδεν, &c.

"Apμενοs, fitting, suited, is a syncopated aor. 2. midd., used as an adjective, exactly like the part. ἀρηρώs, Hom.—And in the same way as ἄρμενοs and ἄρθεν with a passive formation had an intransitive or reflective meaning, there was also a perfect ἀρήρεμαι, (like ἀκήχεμαι and ὀρώρεμαι,)

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

† The temporal augm. of the second syllable is sometimes omitted. In the poetical verb $\ddot{a}\rho\ddot{a}\rho a$ however, which, from the mere formation of the perf. 2. and without any regard to the augment, ought to have the η in its middle syllable, and is therefore written in Ionic poetry $\ddot{a}\rho\eta\rho a$, the a in the Attic form is only a consequence of the ρ preceding (compare the termination ρa of the 1. declension, the contractions like $\ddot{a}\rho\gamma\nu\rho\bar{a}$, the fut. in

 $-\rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega$), and the augment is therefore not so much omitted as invisible.

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

§ The lengthened vowel of the perf. 2. may be shortened again, of which we have examples in the Epic participles $\sigma \epsilon \sigma a \rho v \hat{\imath} a$, $\mu \epsilon \mu a \kappa v \hat{\imath} a$, $\tau \epsilon \theta a \lambda v \hat{\imath} a$, etc., where the \check{a} is restored in place of the η . In Hes. θ , 607. $\mathring{a}\rho \tilde{a}\rho v \hat{\imath} a \nu$ is undoubtedly false for $\mathring{a}\rho \eta \rho v \hat{\imath} a \nu$.

of which we find the part. $\mathring{a}\rho\eta\rho\acute{e}\mu\epsilon\nu os^*_{\uparrow}$ with the accent thrown back on the antepenult. according to the note on $\mathring{a}\kappa\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\mu a\iota$ under ' $\Lambda\kappa a\chi\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$. The same perf. as a midd. with transit. meaning occurs in Hes. ϵ , 429. $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma$ - $a\rho\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\tau a\iota$.†

For the aor. part. ἀρηράμενος see the last note.

The Greek verb, like the German fügen [to fit, and not unlike the English to fit and to be fitting], makes a metaphorical transition to the mind, with the meaning of to be pleasing. Thus Od. δ , 777. δ $\delta \eta$ kal $\pi \hat{a}\sigma \iota \nu$ $\dot{\epsilon}\nu \dot{\epsilon}$ $\phi \rho \epsilon \sigma \dot{\iota}\nu$ $\dot{\eta} \rho a \rho \epsilon \nu$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\iota}\nu$. Soph. El. 147. $\dot{\epsilon}\mu \dot{\epsilon}... \ddot{\iota}\rho a \rho \epsilon$ $\phi \rho \dot{\epsilon}\nu a s$. Il. a, 136. $\ddot{a}\rho \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ katà $\theta \nu \mu \dot{o}\nu$, where we must understand $\dot{\epsilon}\mu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \dot{\varphi}$ $\gamma \dot{\epsilon}\rho a$, and compare it with $\pi \dot{\omega} \mu a \sigma \iota \nu$ $\ddot{a}\rho \sigma \iota \nu$ $\ddot{a}\sigma a \nu \tau a s$ ($\tau o \dot{\nu} s$ $\dot{a}\mu \phi o \rho \dot{\epsilon} a s$) Od. β , 353. and $\ddot{\eta} \rho a \rho \epsilon \theta \nu \mu \dot{o}\nu$ $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \omega \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\eta}$, ϵ , 95. It is clear therefore that $\dot{a}\rho \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\dot{a}\rho \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$, which is used in the same sense, comes from this AP Ω with the inflexion $-\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$.

"Aρδω, I water: fut. ἄρσω, &c. It has no perf., and in the passive neither perf. nor aor. For its meaning see Buttm. Lexil. p. 157.

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

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

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

• This participle occurs three times in Apollon. Rh. 1, 787. 3, 833. 4, 677. where Brunck changed it into an aor. ἀρηράμενος, which was a reading of the first passage in some manuscripts. Now from ἄρηρα it may be allowable to derive a pres. ἀρήρομα; but for an aor. 1. formed again from this pres. or immediately from the perf. I know neither proof nor authority: for I do not reckon as such Quintus Sm., who has this ἀρηράμενος frequently, and read it so in Apollonius. In the first of the three passages quoted above the aor. 1. would be unnatural.

† The word however is suspicious in this passage. That is to say, its construction there depends on $e\bar{v}\tau$ dv, and it is therefore conjunct. for $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\rho\eta\rho\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.

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. (εὖτ' ἀν...ἀράργ) is admissible. In this case ἀρήρεται must therefore be the conjunct. of ἀρηράμην; 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 ἀράργ in the metre, a comparison of ἀράμενοs in Hes. Scut. 320. used likewise of fitting a piece of workmanship, will furnish us with ἄρσηται, ἄρσεται. Perhaps therefore the old reading was πρὸς ἄρ' ἄρσεται ἰστοβοῆτ. Some Codd. of Lanzi have προσαρήσεται.

doubtful origin: the derivation from ἀράω, ἀράωμαι is very uncertain, but its connection with ἀραιός undoubted.—Passow.]

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

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

'Αρμόττω, and άρμόζω, to fit: fut. άρμόσω, &c.—ΜΙDD.

Many verbs with $\sigma\sigma$ or $\tau\tau$ have for their characteristic letter a labial instead of a palatic, which in most of them can only be known by their taking in the inflexion a single σ instead of the ξ , γ , κ , χ of the other verbs in $\sigma\sigma\omega$. The principal verbs of this kind in prose are $\pi\lambda\dot{u}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\pi\dot{u}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\pi\tau\dot{u}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\xi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\omega$, $\xi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$,

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

' Αρνυμαι, I acquire, gain by my exertions, a lengthened form of αἴρω, as $\pi \tau άρνυμαι$ is of $\pi \tau αίρω$: it is a defective deponent, used only in the pres. and imperf., and takes its other tenses from αἴρομαι, fut. ἀροῦμαι: compare Il. ζ, 446. with σ , 121., and χ , 160. with ι , 124.

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

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

άνύω, · τσω — ήνυσμαι; - σπάω, - ἄσω ἔσπασμαι. † The text and many MSS, have ἀρόμ-

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

A form ἀρπάμενος (according to the analogy of οὐτάμενος, κτίμενος, &c.) is found in the later poets, as in Nonnus and the Anthologia (Cod. Vat. pp. 462.516.).

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

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

"A $\rho\chi\omega$, I am the first, take the lead, command. The midd. has the same meaning; but in the Attics (with the exception of Soph. El. 522.) that voice alone has the sense of to begin. The act. is common in Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus and Pindar.

'APΩ. See 'Αραρίσκω.

'Aσάσμαι, I feel disgust or dislike: generally a depon. pass. [The aor. 1. pass. ἀσηθηναι occurs in Herodot. 3, 41., the aor. 1. midd. ἄσασθαι φρένα in Theogn. 567.] The act. ἀσάω is more rare, Theogn. 593, Bekker. Galen. ap. Foes. in voc. 'Ασσάσμαι, Hippocr.

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

Aνδάω, I speak: fut. -ήσω, Att. -άσω. The tenses principally in use are the imperf. 3 pers. ηνδα as a sorist, and the aor. 1. ανδήσαι. Pindar (Ol. 2, 166.) uses ανδάομαι as a depon. midd., as does Soph. Aj. 772. Phil. 130. 852.

μεναι, many have also ἀρόμεναι, which was the only reading of the Scholiasts, who merely recommend its being read and written in the former way. This ἀρόμεναι is by syncope for ἀροέμεναι, and may be therefore classed with ἔδμεναι and εἰρύμεναι. But a great number of the MSS. have according to Lanzi ἀρώμεναι, and it was and still is a question for the critic in what way the oldest wri-

ting APOMENAI is to be read. Now surely the same criticism, which in Homer from καλέω, καλέσω wrote καλήμεναι, could not in Hesiod from ἀρόω, ἀρόσω write ἀρόμεναι or ἀρόμμεναι. The reading ἀρώμεναι, 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, αὐδάζασθαι, ηὐδάζατο in Ionic prose must be formed from a pres. αὐδάζομαι. The act. αὐδάζω, -άξω, occurs in Lycophr. 892.

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

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

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

- 1. ἀπαυράω, I take away. Of this verb we find only the imperf. (with the meaning of an aorist) ἀπηύρων, ἀπηύρως, ἀπηύρω, all three in Homer; and (from a theme AΥΡΩ) an aor. 1. midd. ἀπηύρωτο, Od. δ, 646., but with a various reading ἀπηύρω. Connected by meaning with the above forms are also the participles aor. 1. act. ἀπούρως, and midd. with a passive sense ἀπουράμενος, (Hes. a, 173.) by a change of vowel which never occurs elsewhere†.
- 2. ἐπαυρίσκομαι, I reap advantage or disadvantage from, enjoy; depon. midd.: fut. ἐπαυρήσομαι, Il. ζ, 353.; aor. act. ἐπηῦρου, Dor. ἐπαῦρου, Pind. P. 3, 65. [of this aor. Homer has only 3. pers. conjunct. ἐπαύρη, Il. λ, 391. ν, 649. and infin. ἐπαυρεῖν, ἐπαυρέμεν, Il. λ, 573. σ, 302. Od. ρ, 81.]; aor. midd. ἐπηυρόμην, Eurip. Hel. 476. [of this aor. Homer has only the 2. pers. conjunct. ἐπαύρηαι, ἐπαύρη, Il. ο, 17. Od. σ, 107. and 3. plur. ἐπαύρωνται, Il. a, 410.]; infin. ἐπαυρέσθαι, Eurip. Iph. T. 529. and in non-Attic writers ἐπαύρασθαι‡, Hippocr. Jusjur. 3. and elsewhere.

^{*} See both examined more at length in Buttm. Lexil. p. 144. &c.

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

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

[‡] See last paragraph under Αἰρέω.

The infin. pres. ἐπαυρίσκεσθαι (II. ν, 733.) occurs frequently in Hippocr. The pres. ἐπαύρομαι, which was supposed for some other purpose, (whence the accentuation ἐπαύρεσθαι,) does not occur; ἐπαύρωμαι is conjunct. aor. The pres. act. ἐπαυρίσκω is found only in Theogn. 115.: no pres. ἐπαυράω or ἐπαύρω exists. Hesiod, ε, 417. has ἐπαυρεῖ from ἐπαυρέω. 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 εὐρίσκω, which differs from it only in the diphthong, as εὖχομαι and αὐχέω.

Avω, I call out, sound aloud. This present occurs only as a dissyllable; but the other tenses (as if formed from $\mathring{a}\mathring{v}\omega$) are fut. $\mathring{a}\mathring{v}\sigma\omega$, aor. $\mathring{\eta}\mathring{v}\sigma\alpha$, infin. $\mathring{a}\mathring{v}\sigma\alpha$, with v long. From the subst. $\mathring{a}\mathring{v}\tau\mathring{\eta}$, a cry, comes in the Epic and Tragic poets a new pres. $\mathring{a}\mathring{v}\tau\acute{e}\omega$, also with long v.

Ανω, I kindle; Att. ανω; ανοι, Od. ε, 490. Ανηται, takes fire, Arat. 1035. (Diosc. 333.) Thence in prose

Έναύω, I kindle. Herodot. 7, 231. Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 22. The pass. probably takes the σ, whence ἔναυσμα.—ΜΙDD. Έναυσάμενος, Ælian.

This compound has, I believe, no augment, a point however not proved by the instance from Herodot. 7, 231. οὖτε οἱ πῦρ οὐδεὶς ἔνανε.

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

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

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

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

^{*} Verbs beginning with α, αν, οι, followed by a vowel, do not take the augment; as ἀτω, ἄημι, ἀηδίζομαι, αὐαίνω, οἰόω, οἰακίζω, οἰωνίζομαι: but the α if

short becomes long, as "αϊον, αὐαίνετο; οἰάκιζεν, &c.—By ἐπαφαυάνθην, (Aristoph. Ran. 1089.), we see that αὐαίνω in the Attic pronunciation had the aspirate.

Nub. 865. 1432. Av. 84., but sometimes $\mathring{a}\chi\theta\mathring{\eta}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$; aor. 1. $\mathring{\eta}\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ (Od. o, 457.), whence also the pass. fut. $\mathring{a}\chi\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\mathring{\eta}$ -σομαι: see Piers. ad Moer. p. 21.

ΑΧΩ, ἀχέω. See 'Ακαχίζω.

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

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

In the Etym. M. is quoted 3. pl. ἄεισι, and the explanation of its being Æolic for ἀεῖσι is proved by reference to Hes. θ, 875. Much the same is said by the Schol. Il. ε, 526., in Heyne vol. 5. p. 712. "Αλλαι ἄεισι was therefore an old-established reading there (see the various readings), and ἄεισι without doubt a genuine form.

2. I sleep: aor. ἄεσα, contr. ἆσα, Od. τ, 342. π, 367. [This verb is the root of αὔω, ἰαύω, ἀωτέω.—Passow.]

3. I satiate. From the pres. come the following infin. act. "āμεναι, (II. φ,70.) contr. from ἀέμεναι for ἄειν; 3. pres. pass. ἀται (Heysch.), and by resolution ἄἄται, Hes. α. 101., where it stands as a future*. Fut. ἄσω, aor. ἀσα, infin. ἀσαι; with the midd. ἄσεσθαι, ἄσασθαι; although the active form also occurs in the intransitive or middle sense, I am satiated, like the above-mentioned ἄμεναι and ἀσαι, II. ο, 317. ψ, 157,&c. Verbal adj. ἀτόs, and with a priv. ἄατοs, contr. ἀτοs, insatiable. On these forms see Buttm. Lexil. p. 2.

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

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

4. I hurt; aor. 1. ἀσα. See 'Aάω.

"Αωρτο. See Αἴρω.

he has enlarged on the probability of the $\tilde{a}\tau a\iota$ of Hesych, being taken from this passage.

^{*} There are sufficient grounds for this future, but some doubts about the resolution: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 142. where

Βάζω, I speak: fut. βάξω; and 3. sing. perf. pass. βέβακται, Od. θ , 408.

Βαίνω, I go: fut. βήσομαι, Dor. βασεῦμαι; perf. βέβηκα (whence the syncopated forms βεβάασι, βεβασι); infin. βεβάμεν, part. βεβαώς, βεβανῖα, contr. βεβώς, βεβωσα, βεβώς, which forms are rare except in the poets: Homer has the Epic βεβάασι, part. βεβάως, βεβανῖα, infin. βεβάμεν. The aor. 2. ἔβην* is like ἔστην, therefore ἔβημεν, &c., imperat. βῆθι, conjunct. βω, optat. βαίην, infin. βῆναι, part. βάς, βασα, βάν. [Homer has also βάτην (ἄ) for ἐβήτην; and in 3. plur. βάν and ἔβαν for ἔβησαν†. Aor. midd. ἐβήσετο, more rarely ἐβήσατο.] Some compounds have also a passive, e. g. παραβαίνω, παραβέβαμαι, παρεβάθην. Verbal adj. βατός.

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

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

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

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

The Epic forms ($\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta a a$) $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta a \dot{\omega} s$, $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta a \ddot{v} a$, and the 3. plur. $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \beta \dot{a} a \sigma \iota$ are formed from the perfect by omitting the κ , as in $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \kappa a \phi \eta \dot{\omega} s$, $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \iota \eta \dot{\omega} s$, $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \kappa a \phi \eta \dot{\omega} s$, $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \iota \eta \dot{\omega} s$; this must therefore have been a rule in the Ionic language, as it is not done on account

^{*} See note under Γιγνώσκω.

[†] For the short α in $\beta \acute{\alpha} \nu$ and $\mathring{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \nu$ see $\Delta \iota \delta \rho \acute{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$ toward the end and note.

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

In the aor. 2. Homer has some forms with a instead of η short, $\beta \acute{a}\tau \eta \nu$ for $\mathring{\epsilon}\beta \acute{n}\tau \eta \nu$, $\mathring{v}\pi \acute{\epsilon}\rho \beta a\sigma a\nu$ for $\mathring{v}\pi \acute{\epsilon}\rho \acute{\epsilon}\beta \eta \sigma a\nu$; with these we may compare many other words in which the Ionians changed the η into short a, as $\pi \acute{a}\rho \eta^*$ for $\pi \acute{\eta}\rho a$, $\mathring{a}\mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \check{a}\tau \acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\mathring{a}\mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \check{a}\sigma \acute{\epsilon}\eta$, for $-\eta \tau \acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $-\eta \sigma \acute{\epsilon}a$, and $\mu \epsilon \mu \check{a}\kappa v \mathring{\iota}a$ from $\mu \acute{\epsilon}-\mu \eta \kappa a$. On the other hand $\beta \acute{a}\tau \epsilon$ in Æschyl. Suppl. 206. in the iambics is one of the solitary instances of a Doricism† in the Tragic language. In Theocr. 15, 22. $\beta \acute{\sigma}\mu \epsilon s$ for $\beta \acute{\omega}\mu \epsilon \nu$ is an unusual Doricism. The 1. sing. aor. 2. conjunct. $\beta \acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and $\beta \acute{\epsilon}\iota\omega$ for $\beta \acute{\omega}$, and 3. pers. $\beta \acute{\eta}\eta$ for $\beta \acute{\eta}$, &c. are Ionic and Epic resolutions, like $\sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \omega$, $\sigma \tau \acute{\eta}\eta s$, $\sigma \tau \acute{\eta}\eta \tau \nu$, &c., $\theta \epsilon \iota \omega$, $\theta \epsilon \iota \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, &c., $\delta a\mu \epsilon \iota \omega$, &c.

Beside the fut. midd. the Epics have also the aor. midd. in the same sense, but varying in form, $\hat{\epsilon}\beta\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau o$ and $\hat{\epsilon}\beta\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau o^{\dagger}$, imper. $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon o$. 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\beta\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$, but for this I find no other authority in Homer than $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$, Od. o, 474.

See the form Béopai, Beiopai, 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 $\beta\iota\beta\acute{a}\zeta\omega$. The fut. act. and the aor. 1. are the only tenses which have this meaning; but in the compounds it appears to belong also to the aor. 1. midd., as $\imath\dot{\omega}$ $\grave{a}\imath a\beta\eta\sigma\acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\iota$, taking us into his vessel, Od. o, 475. Of other forms I know of only two instances, $\grave{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\eta\tau\sigma\nu$, Od. ψ , 52., and $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{a}\iota\nu\epsilon\iota$, Pind. Pyth. 8, 111: for $\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ $\pi\acute{o}\epsilon$ and such kind of expressions (see Seidler on Eurip. El. 94.) appear to me only a liberty taken with the syntax, in which the Greek poets occasionally indulged themselves, and no change of meaning in the verb $\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$. The Epic sister-form $\beta\acute{a}\sigma\kappa\omega$ has also both senses; $\beta\acute{a}\sigma\kappa^{\prime}\imath\theta\iota$, go; $\grave{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\alpha\sigma\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, to bring into, Il. β , 234.

The Epic language has also the form $\beta\iota\beta\acute{a}\omega$, $\betai\beta\eta\mu\iota$, which it uses in the sense of I stride, of which however we have only the pres. $\beta\iota\beta\acute{q}$ (Hymn. Merc. 225), and the part. $\beta\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\beta\iota\beta\acute{\omega}\sigma a$, (II. γ , 22. Od. λ ,

^{*} See Heraclid. ap. Eust. Il. α, 24. p. 22, 14. Od. μ, 89. p. 478, 12. Basil.

⁺ We always find for instance in the

Tragedians 'Αθάνα, ποδαγός, κυναγός, and sometimes ναός, the Doric gen. of ναῦς.

1 See ἐδύσετο toward the end of Δύω.

539.) βιβάς (II. η, 213). [To these Passow adds ἐβίβασκε, Ion. imperf. Hymn. Apoll. 133. Now if we take this as a present instead of Bairw. the whole verb corresponds exactly in formation with ιστημι, and both have the fut. and aor. 1. in the causative sense.

Bάλλω, I throw: fut. βαλώ, and sometimes (but not in the early writers) βαλλήσω, Aristoph. Vesp. 222. 1482. with the aor. 1. $\epsilon \beta \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma a$; the usual agrist is the agr. 2. έβαλον, midd. έβαλόμην; perf. βέβληκα, perf. pass. βέβλημαι*, Epic βεβόλημαι also; aor. 1. pass. ἐβλήθην.—ΜΙDD.

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

From a syncopated aor. $\dagger \tilde{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\nu$ come the Epic forms $\xi\nu\mu\beta\lambda\dot{\eta}\tau\eta\nu$ (Od. φ, 15.), ξυμβλήμεναι infin. for -ηναι, (II. φ. 578.); pass. εβλητο, &c., βλήσθαι, βλήμενος; conjunct. βλήεται for βλήηται, Od. ρ, 472.; optat. βλείμην, βλεῖο[†], &c.; and a future βλήσομαι, II. ν, 335.

All these forms, beginning with the perfect $\beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \kappa a$, arise from the metathesis of BAA to BAA§; nor is it any objection to this that the optat. has the diphthong ϵ_i , as we see the same change from the vowel of the root a in other cases, for instance in a precisely similar one under πίμπλημι and in χρή (χράω). Besides in the verb before us the old original form was BEA (by metath. BAE), as shown in the derivative βέλος, and more particularly in the verbal adjective βελέτης in εκατηβελέτης. Compare τέμνω τάμνω, τρέπω τράπω, and σκέλλω.

From the same old stem or root too, by that change of vowel which is the most usual, come the verbal substantive βόλος, and the common Epic perf. pass. βεβόλημαι.

Bάπτω, I dip: fut. βάψω; perf. pass. βέβαμμαι; aor. 2. pass. $\epsilon \beta \dot{a} \phi_{\eta \nu}$. The characteristic letter is ϕ .

* We know that in general there is no conjunct. or optat. of the perf. pass., partly from the difficulty of forming them, partly from their being seldom wanted, but that they are made up of the participle and a tense of eival. There are cases however where, for the sake of greater expression, of clearness, or of conciseness, such moods are formed. Thus διαβέ-βλησθε, Andocid. p. 22, 41. ἐκτέτμησθον, Plat. Rep. 7. p. 564. c.

έβλήμην, optat. βλημην or βλείμην; but the connection of these passive with the corresponding active aorists, as shown in a note near the end of Γιγνώσκω, and the prevailing form of the optative oßeinv, βαίην, γνοίην, are decisive in favour of Compare πλείμην under Πίμβλείο. πλημι.

§ As in θνήσκω, θανοῦμαι, ἔθανον, τέθνηκα (ΘΑΝ, ΘΝΑ): in θρώσκω, θοροῦμαι, ἔθορον (ΘΟΡ, ΘΡΟ): in βλώσκω, μολούμαι, εμολον, μεμβλωκα (ΜΟΛ,

 $M\Lambda 0).$

[†] See note under Γιγνώσκω. ‡ The various reading βλŷo arises from a twofold opinion of the old Grammarians;

Βάρυνω, I load, takes in the pass. the perf. of the otherwise non-Attic β αρέω, β ε β άρημαι, I am loaded, Plat. Symp. 203. b., for which Homer uses intransitively the act. β ε β αρηότα, β ε β αρηότεs*: see the article on Bαίνω, paragraph 6.

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

· ΒΑΩ, βίβημι. See Βαίνω.

Βέομαι, or βείομαι, 2 pers. βέη, an Epic future, I shall live, which there are quite as strong grounds for our explaining to be a real but irregular future, (like πίομαι or like κέω, κείω,) as there are for our calling it a conjunctive, for βέωμαι, used like a future. A more important question is, whether it belongs to an old verb ΒΕΙΩ, whence βίος and βιόω; or whether the passive of βαίνω took in more ancient usage the sense of I walk, i. e. live, in which case βείομαι will correspond with the active βείω for βῶ. This investigation will therefore prevent the necessity of altering, as Wolf has done, the traditionary form βιόμεσθα, (Hymn. Apoll. 528.) to βεόμεσθα.

Βιάζομαι, I force: depon. midd., from which however is not only formed with a passive meaning the aor. pass. εβιάσθην, 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. μ , 297. Alcœus ap. Anecd. Bekk. p. 86. For the passive use of $\beta\iota\dot{\alpha}\zeta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ see the passages of Thucyd. in Popp. Prolegg. 1. p. 184. and those of Xenoph. in Sturz. Lexicon. See also Hymn. Cer. 68. Soph. Ant. 66.

The Ionians have the form in -άομαι; e. g. in Herodot. $\beta\iota\bar{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\beta\iota\hat{\alpha}-\tau\alpha\iota$, $\beta\iota\dot{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$; imperat. $\beta\iota\hat{\omega}$; aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon}\beta\iota\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\sigma$; and also as pass. $\beta\iota\eta\theta\epsilon\dot{\iota}s$. Homer has $\beta\epsilon\beta\dot{\iota}\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ actively.

Βιβάω, βίβημι. See Βαίνω.

Βιβρώσκω, I eat. From this synonym of the verb ἐσθίω

* See Græv. ad Lucian. Solæc. 7. Tho. M. v. $\beta a \rho \acute{\nu} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, where the intrans. $\beta \epsilon \beta \acute{a} - \rho \eta \kappa a$ 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 $\beta \epsilon \beta \acute{a} \rho \eta \mu a \iota$ it

has been observed, and not without reason, that the words in that passage sound very poetical.

† There are many deponents of which the poets use an active form with the same meaning, as βιάζω for βιάζομαι, δωρέω for δωρέομαι, μηχανάω for μηχανάομαι,

was formed in the Attic and common language neither future nor agrist. In the active voice the only tense in use was the perfect, in the passive all the tenses, βέβρωκα, βέβρωμαι, έβρώθην*.

The future midd. βρώσομαι was used only by the later writers; see Lobeck. ad Phryn. p. 347. The future pass. βεβρώσομαι occurs in Od. β. 203. The Epic language had also a syncopated aor. † εβρων, Hymn. Apoll. 127. From the perf. part. βεβρωκώς was formed by syncope βεβρώς, βεβρώτος , Soph. Antig. 1010.

The Homeric form βεβρώθοις, Il. δ, 35. is not a perf. but comes from a poetic pres. $\beta \epsilon \beta \rho \omega \theta \omega$, I feed upon, devour, in which the stem or root BPOΩ is formed in $-\theta\omega$, like κνάω κνήθω, ἀλέω ἀλήθω, and the reduplication prefixed to increase the force of the word, as in respairs from

τράω, τιτράω and τετρεμαίνω from τρέω.

We find some forms from εβρωξα; viz. καταβρώξασαι, Apollon. Rh. 2, 271., καταβρώξειε, 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 Ω have simply the sense of eating up with mastication, and, where they are used metaphorically, of the consumption or waste of property. Hence Struven's emendation καταβρόξασαι, καταβρόζειε, in the Supplement to Schneider's Lexicon is very probable (see under BPOX-); particularly as Dionysius had undoubtedly in his mind the καταβρόξειεν of Od. δ, 222. For as all the Homeric forms with o are used to express the swallowing or gulping down of fluids, they were the more calculated for the above sense, as we see from the analogy of καταπιείν §.

Βιόω, 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 common use the fut. βιώσομαι; aor. 1. ἐβίωσα rare; aor. 2. εβίων , optat. βιώην (not-οίην), conjunct. βιώ, ώς, ώ, &c.,

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

[†] See note under Γιγνώσκω. Like πίπτω, perf. πέπτωκα, part. $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega \kappa \omega s$, by syncope $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega s$ and $\pi \epsilon$ πτεώς.

[§] There is one other instance, viz. κα-

τέβρωξεν in Schol. Pind. Ol. 1, 38., of the eating up the shoulder of Pelops. It is difficult to say whether this should be suffered to remain as the incorrect form of a faulty writer, or altered to κατέβουξεν, upon a supposition that it was copied from an older narrative of the || See note under Teyr workw.

infin. βιώναι, part. βιούς; perf. βεβίωκα, and perf. pass. in the expression βεβίωται μοι.

The pres: $\beta\iota\acute{o}\omega$, which is very common in Lucian (see Reitz. Ind.) and others, occurs but rarely in the older writers; we do meet with $\tau \acute{\omega}\nu$ $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\lambda\gamma\dot{\omega}s$ $\beta\iota\acute{o}\dot{\nu}\nu\tau\omega\nu$, Æschin. 1, 5. p. 1. $\zeta\eta\tau\dot{\omega}\nu$ $\beta\iota\acute{o}\dot{\nu}\nu$, Eurip. Fr. Archel. 30. From the time of Aristotle it is found more frequently. In Herodotus 2, 177. the MIDDLE has the sense of I subsist upon, victum habeo; and in Aristotle's Ethics 10, 10. p. 105. f. Duv. (10, 9. Wilkinson.) the more expressive meaning of I lead a certain kind of life.

[The fut. act. βιώσω is used by Diog. Laert.—Passow.]

Somewhat more singular is the very common use of the infin. aor. 2. βιῶναι (beside its own natural usage) for the infin. pres., i. e. for βιοῦν οτ ζῆν. Thus ἔτι γάρ νύ μοι αἶσα βιῶναι, Od. ξ, 359., ἀνάγκη ἐγένετο αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν κρίσιν τριάκοντα ἡμέρας βιῶναι, Xen. Mem. 4, 8, 2., πῶς πέφυκε; δεινῶς λέγειν, κακῶς βιῶναι, Æschin. Ctes. p. 97, 33. And this usage may perhaps extend to the other moods; as the optat. in Plat. Gorg. p. 513. extr. σκεπτέον τίν' ὰν τρόπον τοῦτον ὃν μέλλει χρόνον βιῶναι ὡς ἄριστα βιῷη.

I find but one instance of the aor. 1. in the pure Attic times, viz. in Xen. Œc. 4, 18. εἰ ἐβίωσεν, if he had lived. But in the participle this tense (βιώσας, Hippoer. Coac. vol. 1. p. 559.) appears to have taken the place of the cases of βιούς (-όντος, &c.) which never occur: thus we find βιούς, Plat. Phæd. p. 95. e. and οἱ ὁσίως βιώσαντες, p. 113. d. In the older language the aor. 1. had probably, according to the analogy of ἔστησα, ἔβησα, &c., the causative sense of I make to live, preserve life, and, to express that meaning, a present βιώσκω, αιστίσης to the analogy of μεθύσκω, πιπίσκω. This supposition is confirmed by the pres. βιώσκεσθαι, to be brought to life, revive, Aristot. Meteor. 1. c. 14.; and the aor. 1. (though in the middle voice like ἑβήσατο, ἐστήσατο) does actually occur in this sense at Od. θ, 468, σὸ γάρ μ' ἑβιώσαο, thou hast preserved my life.

Βιόμεσθα, Hymn. Apoll. 528. Wolf has altered to β εόμεσθα. See under Βέομαι.

The compound of this verb with ἀνά has only the aor. ἀνεβίων, ἀναβιῶναι to express the intransitive sense of *I revive*; the causative meaning, *I resuscitate*, is expressed by the aor. 1. midd. ἀνεβιωσάμην, Plat. Phæd. p. 89. b. Hence the pres. ἀναβιώσκομαι, being both passive and middle, has both senses; as passive, *I am brought to live again*, *I*

revive, ἀναβιώσκεσθαι, -οιτο, ibid 72. c. d.; as middle, I bring to life again, resuscitate, οί... ἀναβιωσκόμενοι ἄν, Crito p. 48. c.

The active voice in this causative sense, ἀναβιώσκω, is found in Schol.

Eurip. Alcest. init.*, and ἀνεβιωσα in Palæph. 41.

Apollon. Rh. 1, 685. has $\beta \vec{\omega} \sigma \epsilon_i \sigma \theta \epsilon$ for $\beta_i \vec{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, an absorption of the iota which takes place also in $\sigma \omega \pi \bar{q} \nu$ for $\sigma_i \omega \pi \bar{q} \nu$, and perhaps in $\pi \epsilon \pi \omega \kappa \alpha$ also.

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Perhaps from Pherecydes, who is mentioned there, and from whom the story is quoted in Schol. Pind. p. 3, 96. with the expression $\dot{\alpha}\nu a\beta to \bar{\nu}\nu \dot{\epsilon}\pi o i\epsilon t$.

† See following note under $\beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$. † All verbs beginning with $\gamma\nu$, and some with $\gamma\lambda$, $\beta\lambda$, take in the perfect, instead of the reduplication, the syllabic augment ϵ . 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 those beginning with $\gamma\lambda$, $\gamma\lambda\dot{\nu}\phi\omega$ is doubtful; for we have έξεγλυμμένος, Plat. Rep. 10, p. 616. d. $\Delta\iota\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\lambda\upsilon\pi\tau\alpha\iota$, Athen. 3. p. 93. c. $\Delta\iota\alpha\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\lambda\upsilon\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ os, Ælian. V. H. 3, 45.

§ Some verbs, whose radical vowel is ε, do not change their vowel in forming the aor. 2- pass: thus from φλέγω, βλέπω, λέγω we find ἐφλέγην, and the participles βλεπείς, συλλεγείς; compare also λέπω, πλέκω, ψέγω.

instance of the present with $\sigma\sigma$, probably because it was originally a pure Attic word. See Buttm. Lexil. pp. 84, 189.

ΒΛ-. See Βάλλω.

Βλώσκω, I go. This verb comes by metathesis from the root MOΛ–(see Βάλλω with note, and Buttm. Lexil. pp. 84, 189.), whence the fut. μ ολοῦμαι; aor. ἔμολον, μ ολεῖν, μ ολών; perf. μ έμβλωκα. Of these tenses Homer uses the aor. and perf., the Tragedians the future, Æschyl. Prom. 694. Soph. Œd. C. 1742.

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

Boáω, I cry out : Attic fut. βοήσομαι.

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

BOΛ-. See Βάλλω and Βούλομαι.

Βόσκω, I feed (in its active sense): fut. βοσκήσω[†], according to which the other tenses are formed.—Μ_{ΙDD}. I feed (in its intransit. sense).

Βούλομαι, I wish: depon. pass.; with fut. midd. βουλήσομαι (see note under Βόσκω); perf. pass. βεβούλημαι; aor. 1. έβουλήθην, also Att. ήβουλήθην † .

* We find also in Aristoph. Pac. 1154. $\beta \dot{\omega} \sigma a \tau o$; and in the Etym. M. $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \tau a \iota$ is quoted from a satirical piece of Sophocles. \uparrow Of all the changes which take place in forming the different presents of verbs, the easiest is that of ω into $\dot{\epsilon} \omega$, as $\dot{\rho} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \omega$ and $\dot{\rho} \iota \pi \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, $\kappa \dot{\nu} \dot{\omega}$ and $\kappa \nu \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, $\gamma a \mu \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ from TAM Ω . Hence as often as the regular inflexion of a verb presented any difficulty, sounded badly, or caused obscurity, it was inflected as if the present had been in $\dot{\epsilon} \omega$. $\dot{\tau}$ In the three verbs $\beta o \dot{\nu} \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\delta} \dot{\nu} \tau a \mu \alpha \iota$, and $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\lambda} \omega$, the Attics very com-

monly increase the syllabic augm. of the

Homer has also a perf. βέβουλα in the compound προβέβουλα, I prefer: see note under "Αγνυμι. On the form βόλομαι, βόλεσθαι, which occurs twice in Homer, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 196.

BO-. See Boάω.

Βράζω, more commonly β ράσσω, -ττω, I boil (in its intrans. sense), I ferment, I throw up (as the sea does), I winnow: fut. β ράσω; aor. 1. έ β ρασα. The passive has again frequently the intrans. sense.

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

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

Βρέμω and βρέμομαι, fremo, I roar (as the sea or thunder does), I resound. Used only in pres. and imperf.

Βρέχω, I wet: fut. βρέξω, &c. Pass. I am wet, βρεχό-μενοι πρὸς τὸν ὀμφαλόν, Xenoph. It has the aor. 1. ἐβρέχθην, and the aor. 2. ἐβράχην.

Pindar has the perf. pass. βεβρεγμένος, Ol. 6, 92.—The doubtful

* [I compile from that untranslated

Lexicon the following:

Intrans.—to boil up, foam, ferment; τοῦ πότου λαμπρῶς βράζοντος, Heliod. p. 193. where Jacobs conjectures βρυάζοντος. Οἶνος βράζων, fermenting, Alex. Aphrod. Probl. p. 282. Βράζων νόος, α turbulent spirit. It also expresses the roaring of the bear, Pollux 5, 58. Its compound is used for the rushing forth of fire, πολλή πυρὸς ἐξέβρασς ζάλη, Apollod. 1, 6.

Trans.—to throw up with violence (as boiling water or a tempestuous sea does), εὐτε βράσσηται πάμφυρτος άφυσγετός, Oppian. Hal. 1, 779. ΄Οστέα βέβρασται παρ΄ ήόνι, Antip. Thess. Epig. 61. Έβρασεν ές ήἴόνα, Laur. Tull. Epig. 2. Τὰ μὲν ἔβρασεν ήλιθα νηδὺς πνεύματα, Nicand. Al. 25. Τὰ δ΄ ἀθρόα νειόθε βράσσαις, ib. 137. In the same sense is used

the compound έξεβράσσοντο, of vessels cast on shore, Herodot. 7, 188. Again ἐαυτον ἐξέβρασε, Ælian. H. A. 6, 15. Also, to throw up and shake corn in order to winnow it, Ruhnk. Tim. p. 64. Μόσχος θηλης χύσιν βράττει, sucks by pushing and shaking the teat, Meand. Al. 359. Lycophr. 461. And in the passive, βρασσόμενος ὑπὸ γέλωτος, shaking with laughter, Lucian 5, p. 213. Anecd. Bekk. 1, 66. The passive voice has also the intrans. sense in θάλασσα πνεύματι βρασσομένη, Leonid. Tar. 57. Apoll. Rhod. 2, 323. Πόθοισι βρασσόμενος, Greg. Naz. Carm. 20, 4. But the compound avaβράττω has an active sense, to boil up, κρέα, Aristoph. Batr. 510. Pac. 1197. Ach. 1005. 'Ανάβρασον ὑποκαίων, Dioscor.; and so has the other compound o φάρυγξ αίματος θρόμβους ἐκβράσσεται, Hippocr. 531, 20.—ED.]

perf. $\beta \epsilon \beta \rho \rho \chi \alpha$ or $\beta \epsilon \beta \rho \tilde{\nu} \chi \alpha$ see under $B \rho \nu \chi \alpha \rho \mu \alpha \iota$; as also the root BPOX-, below.

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

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

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

BPO-. See Βιβρώσκω.

BPOX-: a stem or root from which we find only some forms of the aor. 1. act. and aor. 2. pass. in the Epics with the meaning of to suck in, to swallow up, καταβρόζειεν, ἀναβρόζειεν, ἀναβροχέν (swallowed up again), Od. δ, 222. μ, 240. λ, 586. See Βιβρώσκω; and ἀναβέβροχα under Βρυχάομαι. These forms are also treated of more at length in Buttm. Lexil. p. 200, &c.

Βρύκω and Βρύχω* are generally distinguished by the former meaning to bite, feed on, the latter to gnash the teeth; but the distinction is not sufficiently certain: see Buttm. on Soph. Phil. 745. and compare $\dot{\rho}\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\omega$ and $\dot{\rho}\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\chi\omega$. Of these two verbs no other tenses are found† except that Hesychius has $\beta\rho\tilde{\nu}\dot{\xi}\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\delta}\alpha\kappa\hat{\epsilon}i\nu$. [In Buttm. Lexil. p. 203. will be found a detailed account of these verbs as well as Schneider's articles (translated from his Lexicon) on $\beta\rho\dot{\nu}\kappa\omega$, $\beta\rho\dot{\nu}\chi\omega$, $\dot{d}\nu\alpha\beta\rho\dot{\nu}\chi\omega$, $\beta\rho\nu\chi\dot{\alpha}o\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\dot{\omega}\rho\dot{\nu}\omega$, $\dot{\omega}\rho\dot{\nu}o\mu\alpha\iota$.]

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

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

A very difficult form occurs in II. ρ , 54. älis dia $\beta \epsilon \beta \rho \nu \chi \epsilon \nu$ ü $\delta \omega \rho$. The short ν in this perf. is contrary to the general analogy of the perfect 2, in which all the vowels except ρ are long. This form also is

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

^{+ [}Yet I find in Passow's Lexicon, under Βρύκω, ἀλὶ βρυχθείε, Phil. Thes. Epig.

^{77.} Βρῦκον στόμα, Nicand. and aor. 2. ἔβρῦχε, Epigr. Adesp. 418.—under Βρύχω the perf. βέβρῦχε, βεβρῦχώς, pluperf. ἐβεβρῦχε. In addition to which the aor. 1. ἔβρυξε, Eryci. Epig. 2. βρύζας, Diodor. 16.—Ευ.]

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

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

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

Βυνέω, I stop up, makes fut. βύσω, aor. 1. ἔβυσα with v long; but the passive takes the σ.

The pres. βύω was not used by the Attics. In Aristot. H. A. 9, 37, 3. Schneider's Codd. have βυνοῦσιν, and in Aristoph. Pac. 645. the general reading of the text ἐβύουν is now from the best sources corrected to ἐβύνουν. Herodot. 2, 96. has διαβύνεται, and 4, 71. διαβυνέονται. Compare κῦνέω, and δύνω, ἐνδῦνέουσι, under Δύω.

Γ.

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

The fut. γαμήσω and aor. 1. ἐγάμησα belong to the later writers. The older future (from ΓΑΜΩ) was γαμέσω*, fut. midd. γαμέσομαι, whence γαμέσσεται, II. ι, 394., which however has in that passage the causative meaning of to give a woman in marriage, in which sense Menander used also the aor. 1. ἐγάμησα: see Schol. Ven. ad II. ι, 394. Lobeck. ad Phryn. p. 742. Meineke Menand. Fr. 303. p. 274. Buttm. in Friedem. and Seeb. Misc. Crit. 2, 4. p. 712. Compare also Reisig De τν Partic. p. 127. The γαμεθεῖσα of Theocr. 8, 91., for the aor. 1. part. pass. γαμηθεῖσα, is grounded on the old future γαμέσω.

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

^{*} See note under $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, I bind. [But ever this form occurs there are reasons for Passow gives it as his opinion that wher-suspecting it to be spurious.]

obsolete verb γανύω, which occurs only in the perf. pass. γεγανυμένος.— Passow.] consequently it does not follow the general analogy of verbs in rupe*.

ΓA-. See ΓEN-.

 $\Gamma \epsilon_{\gamma \omega \nu \alpha}$, a perf. 2. with the meaning of a present, I call aloud: infin. γεγωνέμεν (for -έναι); part. γεγωνώς; conjunct. γεγώνω (Soph. Œd. C. 213.); imperat. γέγωνε, used by the Tragedians. The 3. sing. perf. 2. γέγωνε is in Homer both pres. and aor. (see 'Ανήνοθα and note.) The other tenses are inflected as from a pres. in $-\epsilon \omega$, formed from the above perf. 2., as the infin. pres. $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu \epsilon i \nu$ (Il. μ , 337. Eurip. Hippol. 586.) and the imperf. έγεγώνευν (Od. 1, 47. &c.). Hence then the 3. sing. έγεγώνει is to be classed with these, although it may with the same sense be the pluperf. also. The fut. γεγωνήσω is used by Euripides; the aor. γεγωνήσαι by Æschyl. Prom. 989., and the verbal adj. γεγωνητέον by Pind. Ol. 2, 10. Even Xen. Ven. 6, 24. has the imperat. γεγωνείτω. And lastly was formed a pres. yeywriokw, used by the Tragedians and also by Thucyd. 7, 76.

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

The regular aor. 1. is έγέλασα, Poet. έγέλασσα: but as the Dorics form all verbs in -ζω with a fut. in -ξω, we have the Dor. fut. γελάξω and the Dor. aor. έγέλαξα.

The regular contr. part. is γελών, plur. γελώντες, but in some contracted verbs the w is resolved into wo: which takes place only where a syllable long by position follows the ω , or it has the ι subscript, in which latter case ω is resolved into ωοι; e.g. ήβώοντες, ήβώοιμι, for ήβωντες, ήβωμι (from -άοντες, -άοιμι), and for γελώντες may stand according to the metre γελόωντες or γελώοντες, Od. σ, 40. 110 t.

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

† See Buttm. Lexil. p. 202. note. ‡ At Od. v, 347. 390. we find however another form, γελοίων for ἐγέλων, and the part. γελοίωντες, although in both passages the text is uncertain, from their being various readings without the di-phthong. In itself it is very conceivable that, as the resolution of ow is by far the most usual, and the most common mode of lengthening a syllable was by changing it into οι, like άλοιάω, ήγνοίησεν, so γελόων became γελοίων whenever the verse required it (Eust. adv. 347.). But in that case we must read γελοίωντες at Od. σ, 110. also, where there is no such various reading. We are led to view the word however in another light by the meaning of $\gamma \epsilon \lambda o i \dot{\eta} - \sigma a \sigma a$ at Hymn. Ven. 49. where the context points not to mere laughing, but rather requires laughing and joking, (yeTEN-. 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. γέγονα 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. γείνομαι has the proper and simple sense of to be born; its present, which belongs to the Epic poets only, is used in both meanings, to be born (II.κ, 71.), and to beget (Od. v, 202. where we have γείνεαι the 2. sing. conj. aor. 1. midd. for γείνηαι). The aor. 1. midd. ἐγεινάμην, infin. γείνασθαι, is transitive, to beget, bring forth, and belongs to both prose

and poetry.

2. γίγνομαι, old and Attic; in the common language γίνομαι, with ι long; fut. γενήσομαι; aor. ἐγενόμην; perf. γεγένημαι, or in the active form perf. 2. γέγονα*. All these forms are without exception intransitive, not only in their proper meaning to be born, but also in the general sense to become, fieri, and in which they are most commonly used. To these we may add the meaning of to be, as ἐγενόμην and γέγονα serve at the same time for preterites of the verb εἰμί†. Not unfrequently however the perf. γέγονα may be also taken as a present, I am; yet so that the meaning always comprehends the more exact idea of I have been, I have been born‡. Compare πέφυκα.

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

* For an account of the meaning of this form see note under "Αγνυμι.

† Instances of this use of γέγονα are, οι πάντες βασιλείς γεγόνασι, who have all been kings, Plat. Alcib. I. 41. c. p. 124. εἰ ἄρα τις γέγονεν ἐραστής...οὐκ, ἡράσθη, ib. 55. a. p. 131.

ηράσθη, ib. 55. a. p. 131.

‡ For instance, in Plat. Phæd. p. 76. c. άφ' οῦ ἄνθρωποι γεγόναμεν, since we are men, i.e. have been born men. Hence ἐξήκοντα ἔτη γέγονα, I am sixty years old, i.e. have been born sixty years.

With these we may join the verb $\gamma \in \nu \nu \acute{a}\omega$, which takes entirely the causative meaning to beget, as well as its more general sense to produce; while the above-mentioned aor. $\mathring{e}\gamma e \nu \acute{a}\mu \eta \nu$ is used only with the strict and simple idea of begetting and birth, and for that sense is the higher and better expression.

From the root ΓΕΝ- arise in strictness of analogy no other presents than γείνομαι, like τείνω from ΤΕΝ-, and γίγνομαι, like μένω, μίμνω. The form γίνομαι might indeed, as ει and ι were in very ancient times almost the same, be reckoned identical with γείνομαι; but the analogy of γινώσκω shows that it arose in the course of pronunciation from γίγνομαι. That grammatical decision appears therefore to have been correct, according to which the old Epic poets admitted those two forms only, and used γείνομαι, on account of the established usage of γείνασθαι, in the sense of being born, γίγνομαι in that of to become. With regard to Attic usage, the Atticists decide between γίγνομαι γιγνώσκω, or γίνομαι* γινώσκω, in favour of the former orthography; see Valck: ad Phæn. 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 γίγνεσθαι was a depon. pass., therefore ἐγενήθην was used for ἐγενόμην; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 108. and Archyt. ap. Gal. p. 674. (γεναθήμεν); and thence it came into the common language of the later writers. But the future γενηθήσεσθαι (occurring twice in Plat. Parmen. p. 141. e.) presents difficulties of another kind to see Heind.

Callimachus (in Cer. 58.) uses γείνατο in the exact sense of ἐγένετο, facta est. With this I join the particip. γενάμενος, 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 γένατο, and the same kind of formation as εἰλάμην, εὕρατο, &c.

The aor. ἔγεντο, γέντο†, by syncope for ἐγένετο, is used by Hesiod, Pindar and other poets. Theognis, 640. has ἐπέγεντο.

For γέγονα we find a poetical form (γέγαα) plur. γέγαμεν—γεγίασιν;

δέγομαι-έδεδέγμην, έδέδεξο, &c., δε-

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

[†] These passive aor. are formed from the simple present of the verb; and when that pres. is the one in common use, they are distinguished from the imperf. and the moods of the pres. merely by this syncope. Hence they are exactly like the perfect

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 $\mu\alpha_i$; and they belong only to the oldest period of the language. e.g.—

infin. γεγάμεν (for -άναι); part. Ep. γεγαώς, γεγαώτος* (for -αότος), γεγαΰία, Att. γεγώς, -ώσα, -ώς. See βέβαα, &c. under Βαίνω.

With these are united three other forms: 1.) γεγά $\bar{\alpha}$ τε, Batrach. 143. Hom. Epigr. ult. for γεγά $\bar{\alpha}$ τε, on account of the metre, perhaps formed according to a false analogy from γεγά $\bar{\alpha}$ σι: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 142.—2.) ἐκγεγάονται, they will be born, Hymn. Ven. 198., a future which bears the same relation to γέγαα as τ εθνήξομαι does to τ έθνηκα, is used like the latter as a simple but express future, and formed without the σ like π ίομαι, ἔξομαι, and the Epic futures in -ὑω for -ὑσω, viz. ἐρύονσι Il. λ, 454., τ ανύονσι Od. φ, 174. &c.—3.) Dor. infin. γεγάκειν (for -ἐναι), Pind. Ol. 6, 83., which supposes the existence of the more complete perfect γέγηκα (as βέβηκα, βέβαα) of which Hesychius quotes the conjunct. γεγάκω.

Γέντο, he took, an old verb in Homer, of which we find only this one form. It appears to be a dialect of $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\tau_0$, as $\kappa\epsilon\nu\tau_0$ for $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau_0$ is quoted from Alcman by Eust. ad II. ι , 756, 32. Rom. (658, 29. Bas.) The γ instead of the aspirate is preserved in many glosses of Hesychius and others.

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

In Theorit. 14, 51. we meet with a singular form $\gamma \epsilon \dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, which unless forced can only be called a perfect without the reduplication: and as there are few or no undisputed instances of the reduplication (i. e. the real syllabic reduplication) being omitted in the pure times of the language, this form arose most probably from the faulty language of common life; as the similar one $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\tau o$, 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.

 $\Gamma_{\eta}\theta\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, I am glad, fut. $\gamma_{\eta}\theta\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$, &c. The perf. $\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\gamma_{\eta}\theta\alpha$ is the same as the present, only in more common use, and that not merely in Homer (who always has the former, never the latter,) but in prose also (Plato).

δέχθαι.—aorist syncop. (ἐδέγμην) ἔδεξο, ἔδεκτο, infin. δέχθαι, imperat. δέξο.

μίγνυμι, ΜΙΓΩ—(ἐμίγμην) μίκτο. λέγομαι—ἐλέγμην, λέζο, λέκτο, λέχθαι.

πάλλω—(ἐπάλμην) πάλτο. ὅρνυμι, ΟΡΩ—ὤρμην, ὧρτο, infinit. ὄρθαι, particip. ὄρμενος, imperat. ὄρσο: and some others, as ἔγεντο, εὖκτο, ἀλτο, ἐλέλικτο, ἵκμενος, ἄρμενος. * The Epics allowed themselves the li-

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

There is no authority for a present $\gamma \dot{\eta} \theta \omega^*$; consequently none for $\gamma i \theta \epsilon i$, a various reading of $\gamma \eta \theta \epsilon \hat{i}$ at II. ξ , 140.; on the other hand we have ἐγήθεον in Hom.. γαθεῦσι in Theocr. We see the same in ριγέω ἔρριγα, δουπέω δέδουπα, of which no pres. in -ω is in use. Yet Eustathius quotes γηθόμενος, which is found also in the later Epics† who probably had some older precedent for it: this however proves nothing in favour of the active form having been used; compare ἀχέω ἄχομαι, ἐρέω ἔρομαι, κυρέω κύρομαι.

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

This infin.either comes from an aor. 2. or is formed by syncope similarly to διδράσκω, έδραν, δράναι; therefore έγήραν, -as, -a, &c. γηράναι, &c. In the older language this was undoubtedly the only aorist; hence also in the Epics the part. γηράς (II. ρ, 197.), γηράντεσσιν (Hes. ε. 188.): and certainly the 3. pers. έγήρα (II. ρ, 197.), and κατεγήρα (Herodot. 6, 72.), are not imperf. but this same agrist; for in both passages the sense requires, to make it complete, that "he did grow old in it:" whilst in Herodot. 2, 146. κατεγήρασαν may quite as well be the 3. plur. of έγήραν. The long a || in έγήρα and γηραναι answers to that in έδραν, and corresponds as in all \ such agrists with the vowel of the perfect. A particip. in eis, évros, consequently as coming from a sister-form in $\epsilon\omega$, is quoted in the Etym. M. from the later Ionic poetry of Xenophanes. Compare the note on Πίμπρημι.

The aor. 1. ἐγίρασα occurs in Æsehyl. Suppl. 901. in a causative sense, to make a person grow old; while the infin. ynpágai is used in Xen. Mem. 3, 12, 8. as intransitive. According to Passow there are doubts of the reading in Æsehylus; but even supposing it to be true, there are many instances of the aor. 1. having a causative sense, while

^{* [}Passow has the form γήθω as a pres. not in use, from which he deduces the perf. γέγηθα.]

[†] The earliest writer in which it occurs is Quintus Smyrn.—Passow.]

[!] In Simonid. 1. (Gnom. Brunck.) the active form γηρασσέμεν occurs, in which the double σ at all events is false: but it is possible that the true reading there was γηρασκέμεν: Οὔτε γὰρ ἐλπίδ' ἔχει γηρασκέμεν, ούτε θανείσθαι.

See note under l'iyvworw.

It is true that the only historical evidences in favour of this quantity are the circumflex on $\gamma \eta \rho \hat{a} \nu a \iota$ in correct editions (see Oud. ad Tho. M. in v.), and the α in both the iambic verses quoted by Pierson ad Moer. in v. falling in the place where a long syllable is admissible: but the above analogy makes it certain.

[¶] Thus βέβηκα εβην, εκτάκα εκτάν ἔκτα, δέδρακα ἔδραν: φθάνω is the only exception, which see.

the pres. was intransitive, and vice versa: for instance μεθύω, I am drunk: πλήθω, I am full; aor. ἐμέθυσα, I have intoxicated, ἔπλησα, I have filled; thus also ναίω and ενασσα, κύω and εκνσα; and instances of the opposite kind we have in τρέφω, I nourish, ετραφον, I am well fed, fat; στυγέω, εστυξα; άραρίσκω, ήρσα; ύρνυμι, ώρσα, &c .- With regard to the reading of the infin. γηράσαι in Xen. Mem. [both Moeris and Tho. M. prefer γηράναι, and] certainly nothing was easier than the change of this latter word to the common form, as in Herodot. 7, 114. γήρασαν might have been easily corrupted to the present reading γηράσασαν. See a similar case in the aor. of διδράσκω.

Γίγνομαι, γίνομαι. See ΓΕΝ-.

Γιγνώσκω, old and Attic, in the common language γινώσκω (compare γίγνομαι); I know: fut. γνώσομαι; aor. ἔγνων (plur. ἔγνωμεν), imperat. γνώθι, γνώτω, &c.; optat. γνοίην, infin. γνωναι (Epic γνωμεναι); part. γνούς*; perf. έγνωκα; perf. pass. έγνωσμαι; aor. 1. pass. έγνωσθην, infin. γνωσθήναι, part. γνωσθείς. Verbal adj. γνωστός, old form γνωτός, γνωστέος.

The w in eyvwv corresponding with the vowel of the perfect (according to the preceding note) continues through the agrist with the exception of the optat. and participle. Indeed yvoinv is become the established reading even in Homer, where however we find ἀλώην (see 'Αλίσκομαι). Hence συγγνώη in the old Atticism Æschyl. Suppl: 230. deserves our attention. In the later Attics this is again found: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 347.—The 3. plur. Eyrwv for Eyrwoav is (if the reading be correct) an exception: for when the syllable $-\sigma a \nu$ is abbreviated to ν , the vowel preceding is always shortened; thus βάν for εβησαν is short, έδραν for έδρασαν (see Διδράσκω), έδυν for έδυσαν. In Pind. Pyth. 9, 137. Isthm. 2, 35. ἔγνων stands without any various reading; but as

διδράσκω, δέδρακα-έδραν, έδραμεν,

δραναι, δραίην, δράς. κτείνω, ἔκτὰκα—ἔκτὰν, ἔκτἄμεν, κτάναι, κταίην, κτάς.

γιγνώσκω, έγνωκα-έγνων, &c. Other instances equally or even more complete may be seen under ἀλίσκομαι, βιβρώσκω, βιόω, δύω, πέτομαι, σκέλλω, $\tau\lambda$ ηναι, $\phi\theta$ άνω and ϕ νω; while single forms of this agrist will be found under βάλλω, γηράσκω, κλάω, οὐτάω, πλέω, $\pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$; and some imperatives, as $\beta \hat{\eta} \theta \iota$, δράθι, γνωθι, δύθι; plur. βήτε, δύτε, &c.

^{*} Many verbs have a syncopated aorist which must be either compared with the aor. 2. or reckoned as such. The 1st pers. of this aor. always ends in v, and the vowel preceding it is (with the single exception of φθάνω) the same as that of the perfect; thus it corresponds exactly with the aor. 2. of verbs in \mu in all its moods and its participle: thus-

σβέννυμι, ΣΒΕΩ, ἔσβηκα—ἔσβην, ἔσβημεν, σβηναι, σβείην. βαίνω, ΒΛΩ, βέβηκα—ἔβην, ἔβημεν,

βηναι, βαίην, βάs.

the syllable is long in both cases by position, we cannot in either of these instances attain perfect certainty from the metre. [Passow however, in his Lexicon, quotes at once $\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma ro\nu$ as from Pindar, without stating whether on any authority.] In Æschyl. Pers. 18. $\tilde{\epsilon}\beta a\nu$ is by its position in the anapæstic metre long. See Lachm. de Chor. Syst. p. 28.—The occurrence of the passive aor. opt. $\sigma \nu \gamma \gamma \nu o \tilde{\iota} \tau o^*$, and of the active aor. $\sigma \nu \gamma \gamma \nu \phi \eta$, both in the same passage of Æschylus (230. 231.), and in the same active sense, is very singular.

The compound ἀναγιγνώσκω has, beside its common meanings, the sense of to persuade, particularly in the Ionic writers (see Hemst. ad Tho. M. in v. and Koen. Greg. p. 503.); and in this alone, as being a causative meaning, do we find the aor. 1. ἀνέγνωσα, Herodot. 1, 68.

87. and in many other passages of this author †.

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

In this verb, as in $\phi\rho\dot{\nu}\gamma\omega$ $\phi\rho\dot{\nu}\sigma\omega$ (Theocr.), in $\delta\rho\dot{\epsilon}\pi\omega$ $\delta\rho\dot{\epsilon}\pi\tau\omega$ (Mosch.) &c., the former, which is the more simple present, is the more usual, while the latter, which is the more forcible one, was indeed formed but not in general use.

Γοάω and γοάομαι, I bewail. Epic infin. γοήμεναι, for γοῶν, Il. ξ, 50.; aor. ἔγοον, Il. ζ, 500. [which Passow calls an imperf.]

Γράφω, I write.—ΜΙDD. The aor. 2. pass. ἐγράφην is formed, not regularly from the aor. 2. act., but from the imperf. ἔγραφον, as ἐτρίβην (with ι short) from ἔτριβον, φρῦγῆναι from ἔφρῦγων; in all which the rule of the aor. 2. is preserved, that the long vowel becomes short.

Beside the perf. γέγραφα there was also in use γεγράφηκα (see Archim. De Spiral. Procem. extr.) which, when occurring in the common language of the time, is censured by the Grammarians: see Phot. v.

stance, $\epsilon \beta \lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ optat. $\beta \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \mu \eta \nu$ —from $\epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \nu$ ($\xi \nu \mu \beta \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau \eta \nu$): see $B \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$.

έκτάμην, κτάσθαι, κτάμενος—from ἔκταν: see Κτείνω.

See also obtápevos, and $\kappa\lambda\bar{\nu}\theta\iota$ with the old particip. $\kappa\lambda\bar{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu$ os.

† 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 Hippoor.—See Steph. Rec. Voc. Herod. in v. and Fæs. &c. Hippoor. in v.

^{*} With the syncopated act aor. described in the last note may be classed a passive aor. in $\mu\eta\nu$, σ o, τ o, &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 indéed serve as passive to the above-mentioned active aorists, for in-

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

Γρηγορέω. See Έγείρω. ΓΩΝ-. See Γέγωνα.

Δ .

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

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

2. δαίννμι, I receive at my table, give to eat. Midd. δαίννμι, I eat at table as a guest, feast on (δαίτα, κρέα, &c.), forms according to the analogy of all verbs in νυμι its tenses from δαίω, which however in the pres. never has this meaning. Therefore fut. act. δαίσω, aor. 1. ἔδαισα (Herodot. 1, 162.), fut. midd. δαίσομαι, aor. 1. ἐδαισάμην, &c. As to whether we may add ἐδαίσθην also see note on $\Delta αίζω$.—The Ionics, without any contraction, omit the σ in the second pers. sing.; thus imperf. δαίννο‡, imperat. μάρναο, φάο, θέο, &c. [Callimachus has δαινύω, - - - -.—Passow.]

3. $\delta a i \omega$, I burn, set fire to §. Midd. I burn, am on fire. [Of the act. the pres. and imperf. only are in use.—Passow.] Of the midd. we find the pres. and imperf., the aor. 2. $\dot{\epsilon} \delta a \delta \mu \eta \nu$, whence 3. sing. conjunct. $\delta \dot{a} \eta r a \iota$, Hom. The perf. and pluperf. $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \eta a \parallel$, $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\eta} \epsilon \iota \nu$, Poet.

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

† The verbal termination of $\alpha i\omega$ for $\dot{\alpha}\omega$ in the Epic language is not, like $ei\omega$ for $\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, a mere help to the metre; for $\dot{\alpha}\omega$ is seldom used without the contraction, and the α might be long of itself: but $\alpha i\omega$, like $\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ and $\dot{\alpha}\nu\nu\nu\mu$, is a mode of strengthening in the pres. the α which is short in the inflexion: beside the above-mentioned

see μαίομαι, άγαίομαι, λιλαίομαι, κεραίω, κεδαίω, σκεδάννυμι, and in prose κναίω, ψαίω.

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

§ The intrans. sense, to blaze, has been given to the active voice from a misinterpretation of 11. ϵ , 4. and 7. Compare II. σ , 206. 227.

|| See note under "Ayvous.

δεδήειν, belong to the intrans. meaning of the middle, with the sense of the pres. and imperf. The future, which is nowhere found, appears, according to the analogy of καίω, to have been δαύσω, whence δεδαυμένοs, burnt, in Simonid. ap. Etym. M. v. δαύω, and (by a very good emendation) in Callim. Epig. 53. (28.)

4. ΔΛ-, with the ideas of to teach and learn. To the former belongs the aor. 2. act., of which έδα ε occurs in Theor. 24, 27. Apollon. 4. 989., and the same form with the reduplication δέδαε is found occasionally in the Odyssey*. The perf. has the sense of to learn, of which Homer has only the particip. δεδαώς (one who has learnt), other writers have δεδάαστι. To this we may add the aor. pass. ἐδάην (I was taught, I learned); from which comes, according to the note under ᾿Λκαχίζω, a new formation δαήσομαι, δεδάηκα or δεδάημαι (I have learnt). Another Homeric form δεδάασθαι, to try and learn, inquire into, examine, (Od. π, 316.) can only be a pres. in -άομαι formed from δέδαα (just as from γέγαα comes γεγάονται, only that this occurs as a future); excepting which we find no other trace of the present of this merely poetical verb; though it is the stem from which branches the common verb διδάσκω, having its own proper inflexion: see below.

The Epic future $\delta \hat{\eta} \omega$ ($\delta \hat{\eta} \epsilon \iota s$, $\delta \hat{\eta} \rho \iota \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \hat{\eta} \epsilon \iota \epsilon$) belongs to this stem or root $\Delta \Lambda \Omega$, I learn, consequently has the meaning I shall learn, find out, and comes undoubtedly from the future $\delta a \epsilon \omega$ by contraction of the two first vowels, as the similar Epic future $\kappa \epsilon \iota \omega$ or $\kappa \epsilon \omega$ is formed from $\kappa \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \omega \delta$: see $K \epsilon \hat{\iota} \mu a \iota$.

· Δαίζω, I divide, cut in two, kill: fut. δαίξω, &c.

In Eurip. Heracl. 914. stands $\delta \epsilon i r \hat{q} \phi \lambda \sigma \gamma i \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \delta \alpha i \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$, whilst everywhere besides, even in the Tragedians, we find $\delta a i \chi \theta \epsilon i s$, $\delta a t \xi a s$, &c. Elmsley reads, to answer with the verse in the antistrophe, $\delta a i \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$, thinking to form it from $\delta a i \omega$, I burn, but which appears to me contrary to the above analogy. Nor are there any grounds for forming $\delta a i \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$ from $\delta a t \zeta \omega$, as there was nothing to hinder the use of $\delta a i \chi \theta \epsilon i s$, like $\delta \epsilon \delta a i \gamma \mu \epsilon i v s$ in Pind. Pyth. 8, 125. (see Hermann and Boeckh on that passage.). If then we read $\delta a i \sigma \theta \epsilon i s$, I can place it only under $\delta a i \nu \nu \mu a i$; and I see no reason why the language of Lyric poetry might not have formed from the transitive sense of this middle voice, to eat, consume, an aor. passive, was consumed.

[•] This last is generally but erroneously given to δέδαα with the other meaning. That it was the old aor. is shown by the gloss in Hesych. Δέδαον εδειξαν, έδίδαξαν.

[†] See for this formation βέβαα, &c. onder Βαίνω.

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

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

Δαίρω. Sec Δέρω.

 Δ'' άκνω, I bite: from Δ HK Ω come the fut. δήξομαι, perf. δέδηχα, &c.; aor. ἔδακον*, infin. δακεῖν. [In the passive the perf. δέδηγμαι is the tense most in use.—Passow.]

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

Δαμάζω, δαμάω, δαμνάω. See Δέμω.

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

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

We find also in the shape of an aor. pass. $\kappa ara \delta a\rho \theta \acute{e} \nu \tau a$, Aristoph. Plut. 300., and $\kappa ara \delta a\rho \theta \acute{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ (which however depends entirely on the accent) Thesm. 794. Again $\kappa ar\acute{e} \delta \rho a\theta \epsilon \nu$ for $-\eta \sigma a\nu$, Apollon. Rh. 2, 1229. We may suppose these forms (as Bekker does in his criticism on Wolf's Homer) to have taken a passive shape merely from mistaking the θ . But as they occur principally in the compound with $\kappa ar\acute{a}\dagger$, the aor. of which certainly has in itself something of a passive nature, as in German ich habe geschlafen, and ich bin eingeschlafen, in English I have been asleep, and I was fallen asleep; I would rather suppose this to be the true reason: and $\kappa are \delta \acute{a}\rho \theta \eta \nu$ will then be the perfectly regular form of the aor. 2. pass.; and thus the traditionary reading $\kappa ara \delta \rho a\theta \acute{\omega}$ (Od. ϵ . 471.) appears to me unobjectionable, i. e. I believe it to have been the reading in the time of the Attics‡.

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

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

^{*} In forming a new present ν is sometimes inserted before the termination; as δάκνω, aor. ἔδακον; compare κάμνω, τάμνω.

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

[‡] 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.

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

 $\Delta a \tau \acute{\epsilon} o \mu a \iota$, depon., used only in pres. and imperf., while the other tenses are taken from $\Delta a \acute{\iota} \omega$, No. 1., which see. Hesiod ϵ , 795. has the aor. 1. infin. of this verb without the σ , δατέμσθαι, like ἀλέασθαι, ἀλεύ-ασθαι from ἀλέομαι.

 $\Delta \epsilon a \tau a \iota$, it appears, occurs only once, Od. ζ , 242. $\delta \epsilon a \tau o$. But to this verb belongs also the aor. with its vowel changed $\delta o a \sigma a \tau o$, conj. $\delta o a \sigma \sigma e \tau a \iota$ (for $-\eta \tau a \iota$). In that passage of the Odyssey the common reading was $\delta o a \tau o$, but the unanimous consent of Grammarians and manuscripts has now restored $\delta \epsilon a \tau o$. Both forms however indisputably belong to each other, as $\epsilon - o$ is a common change of vowel. Apollonius uses the 3. optat. act. $\delta o a \sigma a \tau o$ personally, and writes also $\delta o a \epsilon e \sigma a \tau o$ as he, with the majority of the Grammarians, derived the Homeric verb from $\delta o a \eta$, $\delta o a \tau o a \tau o conjecture$, reflect. But in the Homeric passages either there is no doubt, or, if there is one, it lies in the former part of the sentence; and $\delta \epsilon a \tau a \iota$, $\delta o a \sigma \sigma a \tau o$, answer exactly to the verb $\epsilon \delta o \epsilon \iota$. See a full account of these forms in Buttm. Lexil. p. 212, &c.

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

. In Homer we have δειδίσσομαι frequently, and in a transitive sense; but once it occurs intransitively, to be afraid, Il. β, 190. The verb comes from δείσαι, δέδια, δείδια. Another form is δεδίσκομαι (see Piers. ad Moer. p. 119.), which must not however be confounded with the Homeric δειδίσκομαι, δεδίσκομαι, οn which see the note to Δείκνυμι.

· Δεῖ. See Δέω.

Δείδω. See Δείσαι.

Δείκνυμι, and δεικνύω, I show: fut. δείξω; aor. 1. έδειξα.

The Ionians spoke all the forms which came from the simple root with ϵ only; as, $\delta \epsilon \xi \omega$, $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \alpha$, $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \alpha$, Herodot. 3, 88., $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \delta \epsilon \alpha$ id. 7, 154.* That is to say, all these forms preserve their original length by position, like $\mu \epsilon \zeta \omega \nu$, $\kappa \rho \epsilon \delta \sigma \omega \nu$. Compare also $\pi \epsilon i \kappa \omega$.

The midd. δείκνυμαι has in the Epics (Il. ι, 196. Hymn. Ap. 11.) the additional meaning of to salute, welcome, drink to †. Consequently to it

Compare Kœn. Greg. Cor. in Ion. 36. Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. in δείκν. and ἀποδείκν.

† [In this sense Homer uses only the perf. and plupers.—Passow.]

^{*} Though many passages still have δείξαι, at least among the various readings, and even taken from good manuscripts, this ought not to militate against the correctness of restoring δέξαι universally.

belongs the perf. $\delta \epsilon i \delta \epsilon \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$, which has the same meaning, and is used as a present: 3. plur. $\delta \epsilon \iota \delta \epsilon \chi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota$, 3. sing. pluperf. (as imperf.) $\delta \epsilon \iota \delta \epsilon \kappa \tau \iota$. 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 $\delta \epsilon \iota \delta \sigma \alpha \iota^*$.

Δειπνέω, -ήσω, &c. On the Att. perf. δέδειπνα, infin. δεδειπνάναι, see 'Αριστάω.

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

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

^{*} That is to say, many bring the form δείδεκτο under δέχομαι, 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 δείκνυμαι, which occurs in a similar sense, nor from its sister-form δεικαμᾶσθαι; and to these again belong the synonymous presents δειδίσκομαι, δεδίσκομαι; whence also A pollonius 1, 558. might say δειδίσκοτο πατρί in the common sense of εδείκνυε. The original idea is indisputably the stretching out and offering of the hand, the cup, &c., with which that of pointing with the finger, or showing, corresponds very well.

[†] The form $\partial \epsilon \partial i \nu \partial a$ deserves our attention, which the Antiatticist p. 90, 1. quotes from the Comic writer Eubulus, and which Bekker from evident traces in the manuscripts has restored to the text of Plat. Phædr. p. 254. extr. But the form of the optative $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \epsilon i \eta$, which that critic 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 $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota o i \eta$, like $\pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon \nu \gamma o i \eta$, $\epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \nu \partial o i \eta$, $\epsilon \delta \eta \delta \delta \kappa o i \eta$, $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \partial o i \eta$. But the syntax of the common reading, $\epsilon i \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \delta i \epsilon$ (imperf.)... $\theta \nu o i \delta \nu \dots$ appears to me admissible.

syllable in the exsura of the old hexameter long (e. g. II. λ , 10. ξ , 387.); and the δ of its stem or root is scarcely ever* preceded by a short syllable, it is clear that there must have been something peculiar in the old pronunciation of this verb to have produced such a general coincidence: and Dawes with great probability suspects this to have been the digamma after the δ (dw), to supply the place of which the δ was afterwards doubled. See Dawes Misc. Crit. pp. 165. 168. and Buttm. Lexil. pp. 355. 375.

The Epics pronounced (with the diphthong) δείδοικα, δείδια, έδείδιμεν, the reason of which was, as in δείδεκτο under δείκνυμι, that the diphthong was in the stem or root. Now as the fem. particip. of δείδια could not be admitted into an hexameter, Apollonius Rh. (3, 753.) has, and undoubtedly not without a precedent from some older poet, deidviat. 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. δείδιε used as imperf. see 'Aνήνοθα and note. Δεδοίκω is a Doric pres. formed from the perf. in Theorr. 15, 58., like ἐστήκω in the Ionic epigram of Posidippus ap. Athen. 10. p. 417, e.

· Δέδοικα is formed from the theme ΔΕΙΩ, with the change of vowel usual in the perf. 2.; and $\delta\epsilon\delta\iota\alpha$ is shortened from it, as $\pi\epsilon\phi\tilde{\nu}\alpha\sigma\iota$ is from πέφυκα, ίδμεν from olda. But that theme also was still in existence in

* The only exceptions to an immense number of instances are unobeioare. Od. β, 66. 'ἄδειής, Il. η, 117. δεδίασιν, Il. ω, 663., the last of which, as being taken

from ω , is of no weight.

† And thus it includes δείσαι, according to the statement here given of it. But when we consider the peculiarity of this verb, as noticed above, according to which the δ in its stem or root was originally equivalent to dw, it follows that in Homer's pronunciation the first syllable of both δέδοικα and δέδια must have been also long by position. After the disappearance of the digamma the syllable δει discharged the same office in these forms as the double δ did in $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon$. This is the most accurate and detailed account which I can give of these perfects.

† 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 δεδιντα, the sound of which could have been no objection to those who used πεφυνία. The form dedia ouv in Il. w, 663. has been al-

ready touched on in the last note but one. § In the epigram of Antagoras, Cod. Vat. p. 379. n. 147. (in Brunck. Simonid. 62.) we ought undoubtedly to read δείδιτε instead of deidere. Compare the various readings δειδίμεν, δειδέμεν, Od. ι, 274. As the verse can in every instance dispense with the form δείδω, the poets appear to have been swayed in their preference of that or δείδια by merely metrical reasons. Compare Il. κ. 39. with φ, 536.—On δείδω we have only further to observe that in many Lexicons [Schneider's and l'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 δείδια. And it is equally clear from the above-mentioned δειδυία, (as a substitute for which δείδουσα must have been at once apparent,) and from $\delta \epsilon \delta (\alpha \sigma i \nu)$ in so old a poet as the author of II. ω , must at all events have been, and who would therefore certainly have used Scidovoi, that this present was unknown to those old writers further than in its first person.

the Epic language in this its shortened form, whence Homer has more than once the imperf. $\delta i \epsilon$ ($\dot{\epsilon} \delta i \epsilon$), e.g. Il. λ , 556. ρ , 666.*

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

In Æschyl. Pers. 697. 698. (in both which verses the present reading is δέομαι, a theme formed without any authority,) the old editions and the majority of the manuscripts have δείομαι, contrary to the metre. But three manuscripts, according to Hermann, give δίομαι: 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 δίομαι, which with δέδια has in its favour the analogy of κήδομαι κέκηδα, ελπομαι εολπα, and the like.

ΔΕΚ-. See Δείκνυμι and Δέχομαι.

Δέμω, I build, and midd. δέμομαι: aor. 1. έδειμα; midd. έδειμάμην; perf. 1. δέδμηκα; perf. 2. δέδομα, perf. pass. δέδμημαι.

The pres. and imperf. are rare even in the poets. The pres. is found only in the part. δέμοντα, Hymn. Merc. 188.; the imperf. δέμον in Od. ψ , 192.; but the aor. act. and midd. occur in the Ionic writers, and later in common prose. The perf. pass. is used by Herodot. 7, 200. The form $\delta \epsilon i \mu o \mu \epsilon v$, Il. η , 337. is the conjunct. acr. 1. act. shortened

from δείμωμεν.

Of the sister-form & δομέω we find principally the aor. and perf., but their usage is also limited; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 587. sqq. The common language used οἰκοδομέω, e.g. ψκοδόμησε τεῖχος, and the like.

* Nay the theme exists unshortened, but in a poem which can hardly be quoted with such a view as this, in Orph. de Lapid. 335. δειέμεν, where however Hermann has adopted (I see no reason why) Tyrwhitt's correction δειδέμεν. See the preceding note.

† The pretended verb δίημι, said to have the same meaning as διαίνω, to water, and which is so described in Schneider's Lexicon, is erroneous. All the forms of that kind belong to διίημι: see Riemer's . Lex. and Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 27. [Passow places the different forms διείς, διέμενος, &c. under δίημι, which he says is con-

tracted from διίημι.]

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

§ Many dissyllable barytone verbs, which have e in the syllable of the stem or root, make sister-forms by changing the ϵ to o, and taking the termination έω; as, φέρω φορέω, τρέμω τρομέω, φέβομαι φοβέομαι, &c.

The same stem or radical word $\Delta \epsilon \mu \omega$ has also the meaning of to tame in the following forms; perf. $\delta \epsilon \delta \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$; perf. pass. $\delta \epsilon \delta \mu \eta \mu \omega$; aor. 1. pass. $\delta \epsilon \delta \mu \eta \theta \nu \nu$; part. $\delta \mu \eta \theta \epsilon i s$; aor. 2. $\delta \delta \mu \eta \nu^*$, part. $\delta \alpha \mu \epsilon i s$. Beside these was formed the present in the following manner: 1. $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ and $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$. 2. by the insertion of the syllable $\nu \alpha$, $\delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \eta \mu$ and $\delta \alpha \mu \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega^*$. Of these $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ has become the usual form in prose as well as verse, and is inflected regularly through all its tenses like the derivative verbs in $\dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$: $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, as a present, is the Epic sister-form of $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ (like $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \dot{\alpha} \omega$ for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$), II. α , 61.; but its forms are at the same time the Ionic and Attic future of $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$; e. g. $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \alpha \eta \partial \alpha \iota$, II. χ , 271. $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\omega} \omega \sigma \iota \nu$, II. ζ , 368. ζ . MIDD. $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega \partial \alpha \iota$, $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \partial \alpha \iota$, Eurip. Hom. &c. $\delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \sigma \sigma \partial \alpha \iota$, Hom. Hes.

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

There are no grounds for a pres. act. δέρκω. The perf. δέδορκα has in Pindar (Ol. 1, 153, &c.) a pass. or intrans. meaning also, φέγγος, φάος δέδορκε, is seen, shines.

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

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

† Like περνάω πέρνημι from περάω; and with the change of ε into ι, κιρνάω κίρνημι from κεράω (κεράννυμι), πίλνημι, πίτνημι and σκίδνημι from $\pi \epsilon \lambda \acute{a}\omega$, IIETAΩ, ΣΚΕΔΑΩ. These derivatives occur mostly in the dialects and poets.

§ The aor. 1. also did however exist; see δαρθείs in Lex. Seguer. 2. p. 89, 5.

^{*} Beside these two synonymous aorists there has been quoted a syncop. aor. $\delta \delta \mu \eta \tau \sigma$; the only authority for which is Antim. Fragm. 19. ap. Pausan. 8. p. 651.; where however the reading $\gamma' \delta \delta \mu \eta \theta'$ is false. The manuscripts have $\delta' \delta \delta \mu \eta \theta'$ contrary to the context. But Schellenberg saw that the true reading is, "Os $\rho \alpha \tau \sigma \tau'$ 'Adragay $\tau \rho \tau \tau \rho \tau \tau \sigma \tau \phi \delta \delta \delta \mu \eta \theta'$ in avakti.

[‡] Thus we have as futures $\tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \epsilon_i$, II. θ , 415. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon}$, Plat. Protag. p. 311. b. $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon}$, Xen. Symp. 1, 15. $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \epsilon$, Demosth. Lept. 5. $\kappa o \rho \acute{\epsilon} \epsilon i s$, II. ν , 831: These futures in $\acute{\epsilon} \omega - \omega$, and $\acute{\alpha} \omega - \omega$, with a similarly sounding present, are not very numerous. Compare $\acute{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \acute{\nu} \nu \omega$ and $\pi \epsilon \rho \acute{\alpha} \omega$.

 $\Delta\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$, I wet, is inflected regularly. The Epic $\delta\epsilon\dot{\nu}o\mu\alpha\iota$ see under $\Delta\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, I am wanting.

Δέχομαι, Ionic (but not Epic) δέκομαι, I receive; depon. midd.: fut. δέξομαι, also δεδέξομαι, II.; aor. 1. ἐδεξάμην.— Pass. perf. δέδεγμαι; pluperf. ἐδεδέγμην; aor. ἐδέχθην, part. δεχθείς, (in a pass. sense) taken.

The perf. δέδεγμαι has in the Epics another peculiar sense of a present, I wait, e. g. δεδεγμένος εἰσόκεν ἔλθης, Il. κ, 62. Also, I receive, particularly of one who stands to receive an attack, or waits for game; e. g. δεδεγμένος ἐν προδοκῆσιν, Il. δ, 107. Imperat. δέδεξο, Il. ε, 228. υ, 377., to which belongs with a similar active sense the fut. δεδέξομαι, Il. ε, 238. But δείδεγμαι, I welcome, similar as that idea may seem to be to the above meaning, belongs to δείκνυμι, as we have shown under that verb.

The syncop.aor. (ἐδέγμην) ἔδεκτο, δέχθαι, imperat. δέξο, has been mentioned before in a note under the root FEN-. According to the analogy there laid down it has the sense of an aorist, and therefore means received, exactly synonymous with ἐδεξάμην; compare Il. o, 88. with a, It happens however that the 1. sing. έδέγμην does not occur in this meaning but only with that of an imperf., I was waiting for, expecting, (e.g. Od. ι, 513.) and in the same way the particip. δέγμενος, ποτιδέ- $\gamma \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, has only the sense of waiting, expecting (e.g. Il. ι , 191. η , 415.), that is to say, the sense of the perf. δέδεγμαι as given in the last paragraph; in which therefore these forms differ from the analogy of the syncopated forms laid down in the above-mentioned note under I'EN-. But since at II. μ, 147. δέχαται, which is not an historical form, is used in speaking of the waiting for an attack, consequently in the exact meaning of δεδέχαται, it is clear that the perf. δέδεγμαι in this its peculiar sense (as a present), which sense the present δέχομαι never has, was able to throw off the reduplication,-a rare occurrence, of which we find but two or three instances, and those in the later writers*; we must therefore lay down for δέχομαι in the old Epic writers a twofold usage: viz.-

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

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

From the form δέκομαι would come (see the second note under Δέμω†)

might be formed δοκέομαι, from which would come regularly δεδοκημένος.

^{*} See Γεύω.

† That is to say according to the

[†] That is to say, according to the analogy laid down in that note from δέκομαι

also the Epic perf. δεδοκημένος, II. o, 730. Hes. a, 214. in the sense of the above-mentioned δεδεγμένος. We find in Apollon. Lex. δεδοκημένος έκδεχόμενος, έπιτηρών: which is therefore to be distinguished from the Attic δεδόκημαι under δοκέω.

Δέω, I bind: fut. δήσω; aor. 1. ἔδησα; perf. δέδεκα*; perf. pass. δέδεμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐδέθην.—Μιdd. The fut. 3. (or paulo-post fut.) δεδήσομαι generally supplies in Attic writers the place of the non-Attic fut. 1. pass. δεθήσομαι, which however is occasionally found, e.g. Demosth. c. Timocr. 126. 131. 190.—Dissyllable contracted verbs do not in general take the contraction, except in ει: thus we have τρεῖ, πνεῖν, but τρέομεν, πνέουσι, &c.: δέω, I find, is however an exception; for we find τὸ δοῦν, τῷ δοῦντι, Plat. Cratyl. (ὁ) ἀναδῶν, Aristoph. Plut. 589. διαδοῦμαι, &c.; in which respect it differs from δέω, I am in want of, which makes τὸ δέον, δέομαι, and even sometimes δέεται.

On the above-mentioned usage of the future see Moeris and Thom. Mag. in v. We will only remark that it is not to be considered as an aberration of the pronunciation from δ to θ , for the future 3. is used in some other verbs in the same way: see particularly $\Pi \iota \pi \rho \acute{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$.

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

Δέω, I am in want of, I fail: fut. δεήσω; aor. ἐδέησα, for which Homer has once δῆσεν, II. σ, 100. This verb is generally impersonal; δεῖ, it is wanting, it is necessary, (il faut), conjunct. δέη (contr. δῆ), optat. δέοι, infin. δεῖν, part. δέον, Att. δεῖν; imperf. ἔδει; fut. δεήσει; aor. 1. ἐδέησε. Pass. δέομαι (as depon. I am in want of), δέη or δέει, δεῖται, &c.; fut. midd. δεήσομαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐδεήθην, This voice is never impersonal.

This verb, like αἰνέω, αἰρέω, ποθέω, and many others, inflects some of its tenses regularly with η, e. g. its future and

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

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

The conjunctive of the impersonal is frequently found in verse as a monosyllable, because according to some $\delta \epsilon \eta$ though written as two syllables was pronounced as one. See Meineke on Menand. Fr. Inc. 28. and 39., and a fragment of Philetærus ap. Athen. 10. p. 416. f. But there is an old precept, well deserving attention, according to which $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ 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 $\partial \epsilon \hat{\imath} r$, to be in want of, and $\partial \sigma \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$; that is to say for $\partial \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ (which is otherwise never contracted) $\partial \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, and for $\partial \sigma \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, the same in sound as their infinitives, and which they

* Compare the preceding verb, particularly toward the end of the first paragraph. † Δέεσθαι, Mem. 1, 6, 10. Anab. 7, 7, 31.; δέεται, Anab. 7, 4, 8.; δέεται and προσδέεται three times in Mem. 3, 6, 13. 14.; ἐδέετο, Hell. 6, 1, 18. In some of these passages no manuscript can be quoted against this reading, in others very few; notwithstanding which, the common form has been of late introduced by the editors into all; while in another passage (Mem. 4, 8, 11.) this was done long ago, although the old editions and four manuscripts have προσδέεται. Eight passages in a single author, while not one is quoted from any of the older writers, are sufficient to warrant our attributing with certainty to this author at least, an Ionicism, of which the existence is very probable at that æra of the Atticism and in that particular verb; while we can see no reason for this form, which was unknown to the other Attics, having been foisted into this one writer by copyists or grammarians. In addition to this we have the gloss of the Antiatticist in Bekker p. 94. 'Εδέετο άντὶ τοῦ ἐδεῖτο, which merely proves the great probability of what was most probable before. The only usage of later writers and Grammarians (see Schæfer ad Greg. p. 431.) at a time when certainly

every one pronounced $\delta \hat{e} \hat{\iota} \sigma \theta a \iota$, 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 $\pi \lambda \hat{e} \hat{\iota} \nu$, 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.

Dobree (on Aristoph. Plut. 216.) rejects much too disdainfully this precept given in the Hort. Adon. 187. b., for the truth of which I certainly cannot answer, but which is undoubtedly taken from one of the older Atticists: for this writer quotes (exactly as Phrynichus often does, e. g. pp. 70. 84. 120. 250. Lob.) the ρήτορες, that is to say the later ones, as using the common form. If now we compare εηλόει δηλοῖ, we have an analogy for δέη δεῖ. The passages quoted by Reisig from Aristophanes Plut. 216. Ran. 265., where the reading in many, and those the best manuscripts, is κἀν ἔεῖ, "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 κείμαι, as μή διάκειμαι does not arise from contraction. even call Attic forms. See Greg. Cor. in Att. 72. with the notes. Apollon. de Adv. p. 542, 33., and the Exc. Paris. at the end of Schæfer's Gregorius, p. 678. Phavor. vv. $\delta\epsilon \tilde{\imath}\nu$ and $\pi\lambda\epsilon \tilde{\imath}\nu$. But there are no instances quite free from doubt; which warrants our suspecting that the existence of these forms arose entirely from the syntax of the sentences being mistaken, and that the forms are really infinitives standing elliptically or used as substantives*.

Homer has this verb with the stem or root ΔEY - instead of ΔE -, very frequently as a passive $\delta \epsilon \dot{\nu} o \mu a \iota$, $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \epsilon \tau o$, $\delta \epsilon \dot{\nu} \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu a \iota$, and once as active $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, Od. ι , 540., both voices in the sense of to be wanting; so that the poet, in speaking of a momentary event, appears to have used the aor. act. instead of the common prose form $\delta \epsilon \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \nu a \iota$. In the midst of this great unanimity of meaning in the root ΔEY -, we find two passages which are very striking: 1. II. ι , 337. which has the impersonal $\delta \epsilon \hat{\iota}$, whereas in all the other passages $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$ is used in a similar sense: 2. Od. σ , 100. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \bar{\iota} o \delta' \dot{\epsilon} \partial \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ in the sense of the above-mentioned $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} - \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, where the common form $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ 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 πλείν for πλέον, have not the two forms in question: beside which, some of the manuscripts, even that of Gregory, mention only $\pi\lambda\hat{\epsilon\hat{\imath}\nu}$, and have not the addition of δείν άντὶ τοῦ δέον: while δοκείν depends entirely on the most uncertain authorities, Phavorinus and the above-mentioned Exc. Paris. Hence it is highly probable that some of the very late Grammarians were the first to make use of the well-known case of the comparative \(\pi \lambda \illin \illin \pi \) for \(\pi \lambda \illin \pi \), in order to understand δείν and δοκείν in certain phrases as participles. Whence under the word $\Delta\epsilon \hat{\imath}\nu$ in the Etym. M. we find after that explanation the following, η ἀπὸ τοῦ δέειν, δείν. The gloss itself may be compared with those on Δεῖν ψήθην and Δεῖν in Hesychius. And how suitable the article is to the infinitive τὸ δεῖν, τὸ δέον, in the latter Lexico-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 δεῖ, while δεῖν as well as δέον 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 δοκείν, I have no doubt that it depends entirely on a comparison of the expression έμοι δοκείν with έκείνω δοκούν; but this comparison is most uncertain; for the meaning of the latter is, "since it seems good and pleasing to him," that of the former "as it appears to me," which in Herodotus is evidently an infinitive, ¿µoì δοκέειν (see Herm. ad Vig. not. 204.). We have now therefore to consider the contraction as stripped of all analogy; for to the taction is stripped of an analogy; for $\pi\lambda\epsilon i\nu$, if that be the only instance, is sufficiently explained as shortened from $\pi\lambda\epsilon i\nu$, which in a phrase of daily occurrence like $\pi\lambda\epsilon i\nu$ $\hat{\eta}$ $\mu\dot{\nu}\rho\iota\nu\iota$ is very conceivable. But in $\pi\lambda\epsilon i\nu$ the pure sound of the stem or root is $\epsilon\iota$, which in δέον or δοκέον is unheard of even in the Ionic dialect. Further, the name Kheiσθένης, which the Grammarians introduce also in the comparison, is compounded not of Kheo- but of Kheei-, from khéos, as ὁρείνομος from ὄρυς; and, not to omit anything bearing on the question, the name Νείλεως is not from Νεόλεως, but a dialect from the old name Nyhevs, the head of the family of that old colonist.

† If criticism were not bound to consider as sacred whatsoever the old rha-

ΔΗΚ-. See Δάκνω.
 Δήω. See ΔΑ- 4.

Διαιτάω, I arbitrate: pass. with fut. midd. I live in a certain way, lead a certain kind of life. The only irregularity in the formation of this verb is in the augment, as it makes sometimes ἐδιαίτησα, sometimes διήτησα, and has even the double augment κατεδιήτησα. Compare the following.

Διακονέω, (and διακονέομαι depon. midd.) I serve. Like the preceding verb its irregularity consists in the augment: thus εδιακόνησα and διηκόνησα, δεδιακόνηκα and δεδιηκόνηκα.

On the derivation of this word, which is indisputably not compounded of διά, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 231.

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

It comes from $\Delta A\Omega$, and is exactly like ἀλύσκω, which may be compared with it. In the poets we meet with another future διδασκήσω, e. g. in Hes. ϵ , 64. Hymn. Cer. 144.

. Δίδημι. See Δέω, I bind.

Διδράσκω, I run away, generally occurs in composition with ἀπό, ἐξ, or διά: fut. δράσομαι; perf. δέδρακα; all with a long; hence Ion. διδρήσκω, δρήσομαι, &c.—Aor. 2. ἔδραν, -āc, -ā, -āμεν, -āτε, ἔδρασαν and ἔδραν; conjunct. δρω, -ậc, -ậ, &c.; optat. δραίην; imperat. δράθι; infin. δράναι; part. δράς, δράντος (not δραντος); Ion. ἔδρην, -ῆναι, &c.: but δραίην, δράς retain the a, according to the analogy of ἔστην.

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 $\chi\rho\dot{\eta}$, and the other to $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\dot{\nu}$ $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$. If however the Homeric formation $\delta\epsilon\dot{\nu}\eta\sigma\omega$ 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 ϵv , as in $\epsilon\dot{\nu}a\delta\epsilon\nu$; while in others it was en-

tirely omitted, as in $\delta\epsilon\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\alpha\delta\epsilon\nu$. Hence also we may find it easier to explain how $\delta\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, &c. remained longer than others in a state of resolution; and to bring $\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota$ within the same analogy we may adduce the formation $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha$. But the steps by which we advance here are not so sure as in $\epsilon\ddot{\nu}\alpha\delta\epsilon\nu$ and $\kappa\alpha\dot{\nu}\dot{\alpha}\dot{\alpha}s$: we will therefore content ourselves with merely pointing out the probability.

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

The aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\rho\tilde{a}\sigma\alpha$, which is the regular aorist of $\delta\rho\tilde{u}\omega$, I do, was also that of $\delta\iota\tilde{c}\rho\tilde{u}\sigma\kappa\omega$ in the common dialect, and after the time of Aristotle in the written language; here and there it is found also in some copies of the earlier authors.

Δίδωμι, I give: fut. δώσω; aor. 1. ἔδωκας; perf. δέδωκα; aor. 2. ἔδων; perf. pass. δέδομαι; aor. midd. ἐδόμην.

Homer has in the pres. 2. and 3. sing. διδοῖς, διδοῖ, as formed from διδόω, Il. ι, 164. 519., which forms occur also in Herodot. and Hippocr. But δίδοισθα, or rather διδοῖσθα, is found only in Homer, e. g. Il. τ, 270. The following forms are also Homeric only; the imperat. pres. δίδωθι (Od. γ, 380.), the infin. pres. διδοῦναι (Il. ω, 425.), the fut. διδώσειν, δι-

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

† Thus it is easy to conceive that $\dot{\alpha}\pi_0$ - $\delta\rho\dot{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ s and $-\dot{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha$, wherever they are now met with in 'Attic writers, are corruptions of $\dot{\alpha}\pi_0\delta\rho\dot{\alpha}$ s and $-\hat{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$. See Bekker on Andoc. Myst. 125. Lys. c. Andoc. 28. and compare $\Gamma\eta\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$.

† Thus the Dorics and Epics use έθεν, έσται, έδον, έδυν, for έθεσαν, έστησαν,

&c. The same takes place in other anomalous agrists, as $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, $\beta\hat{\alpha}\nu$, for $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, Hom.

§ This irregular aorist in $-\kappa \alpha$ is principally used in the sing, in good writers: in the plur., particularly in 1 and 2 pers., the Attics generally preferred the aor. 2. There are neither moods nor participles of the form in $-\kappa \alpha$, except the participle of the middle, which however with its indicative belongs to the Ion. and Dor. dialects. Except this indic, and particip, the other moods of the middle are never met with. In Attic prose we find, of the middle, the aor. 2. only.

εώσομεν (Od. ν, 358. ω, 314.), and the aor. 2. δόσκον for ἔδων (Hom.).*
—The imperat. pres. δίδω, as from δίδωμι, is an unusual Doricism for δίδων, in Pind. Ol. 1, 136. The infin. pres. διδων† (Theocr. 29, 9.) is also Doric. Instead of ἐδίδωσαν, the Dorics and Epics used ἔδιδων, δίδων, Ηymn. Cer. 328, 437. On the unusual accentuation of the conjunct. pass. δίδωναι and the opt. pass. ἀπόδωντο, which look like Atticisms, (Fischer quotes some instances from Ionic writers,) see the second paragraph under $\Delta \dot{\nu}_{l} \nu_{l} \mu_{l} \nu_{l}$.

The form $\delta \delta \theta \iota$, and $\theta \ell \tau \iota$ from $\tau \iota \theta \eta \mu \iota$, 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 $\delta \hat{\varphi}$, as $i \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota$ is for $i \sigma \tau \hat{\eta}$. As the conjunctive arises from contraction, it is again resolved by the Ionics; thus for $\delta \iota \delta \omega$, $\delta \omega$, $\delta \omega s$, &c. they use $\delta \iota \delta \omega \omega$, $\delta \omega \omega$, $\delta \omega \eta s$, $\delta \omega \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta \omega \eta \tau \epsilon$, &c.: and in this resolved form the Epics shorten the vowel, thus $\delta \omega \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\delta \omega \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, &c.

 $\Delta i \zeta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, I seek, an Ionic depon. midd. according to the formation in $\mu \iota$, but retaining the η in the passive: thus $\delta i \zeta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, $\delta \delta i \zeta \eta \tau \sigma$, $\delta \delta i \zeta \eta \sigma \sigma$, $\delta \delta i \zeta \sigma \sigma$, Herodot.; $\delta \delta i \zeta \eta \alpha \iota$, Od. λ , 100.; $\hat{\eta} \nu \delta i \zeta \eta$, Callim. Epig. 11. The shortened forms $\delta \delta i \zeta \sigma \alpha \iota$ (Theocr. 25, 37.) and $\delta \delta i \zeta \sigma \sigma$ (in an hexameter in Etym. M. v. $\delta \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \alpha i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$) are perfectly regular. But the forms of the proper theme in $-\epsilon \mu \alpha \iota$; are also frequently found. In Herodotus however those in $-\epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$, $-\epsilon \tau \sigma$, $-\epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, are now, according to the manuscripts, universally changed into those with η : and in Callim. Epig. 17., where hitherto has stood $\delta \delta i \zeta \sigma \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, Jacobs has adopted from the Vatican manuscript (vii, 459.) $\delta \delta i \zeta \eta \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, so that the other formation in general, at least in the older writers, may be doubted $\delta \iota$. Fut. $\delta \delta i \zeta \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$, Od. π , 239.; aor. 1. $\delta \delta \delta i \zeta \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \gamma \nu \delta \nu$, Heraclit. ap. Plut. adv. Colot. 20. p. 1118.

The verb $\delta i \zeta \omega$, which occurs in II. π , 713. and in an oracle in Herodot. 1,65. with the meaning of to doubt, is supposed to be the same stem or family as $\delta i \zeta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$. Compare 'E $\xi \epsilon \delta \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$ preserved in Suidas from some lost writer.

Δικεῖν, infin. to ἔδικον, I threw; a defective poet, a orist [found in the lyric and tragic poets, with no other tenses except the aor. 1. ἔδιζε in Simmias Br. Anal. 1, 208. In Lycophr. 531. is πήδημα λαιψηρὸν δικών.]

^{*} On this iterative see $\delta \dot{\upsilon} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ toward the end of $\Delta \dot{\upsilon} \omega$.

[†] See Mus. Ant. Stud.1. p. 242. sqq.

[‡] In Brunck's Anal. 3, 216. is διζομένη. § In Apollon. 1, 1208. the reading δίζετο κρηναίηs has been preferred perhaps a little too hastily, on account of the rare

occurrence of δίζομαι. But ἐδίζετο in Moschus 2, 28. stands undisputed, as it does in the following fragment, perhaps of Callimachus, in Suid. v. ἄγκος; ποσσίδ ἀνελθεῖν Ἄγκος ἐς ὑψικάρηνον ἐδίζετο: not to mention (see Ind. Gesn.) the Orphic poems.

Διστάζω, I doubt, (like βaστάζω and νυστάζω,) seems to partake of the two formations of verbs in -ζω; its future is διστάσω, and though I know of no examples of the formation in -ξω, -γμαι, &c., yet the verbal substantive is δισταγμός, and still we find δίστασις.

 $\Delta\iota\psi\acute{a}\omega$, I thirst; fut. $\delta\iota\psi\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$; infin. $\delta\iota\psi\acute{\eta}\nu$, never $\delta\iota\psi\acute{a}\nu$. $\Delta\iota\omega$. See $\Delta\epsilon\iota\acute{c}\sigma\iota\iota$.

Διώκω, I pursue, has the fut. διώξω in Xen. Cyr. 6, 3, 13. Anab. 1, 4, 8. and Demosth. p. 989.; but the general Attic fut. is διώξομαι, Aristoph. Equ. 368. Elmsl. Ach. 278. Plat. Theæt. p. 168. a. On ἐδιώκαθον, διωκάθειν, from διωκάθω, see ἀμύνω and note.

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

 Δ οκέω, I seem, appear; also I think: it forms its tenses from Δ OK Ω , as fut. δόξω, aor. 1. ἔδοξα; but takes its perf. from the passive δέδογμαι, I have seemed.

The regular formation δοκήσω, aor. 1. ἐδόκησα, belongs to the poets. Thus δεδόκημαι in Pind. Nem. 5, 36. Eurip. Med. 761. Aristoph. Vesp. 726. (also Herodot. 7, 16, 3.) must be distinguished from the Epic δεδοκημένος under Δέχομαι.

For a full account of the supposed neut. part. δοκεῖν for δοκοῦν, see

 $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, I am in want of, with note.

 $\Delta ov\pi \epsilon \omega$, I sound heavily, I fall: fut. δονπήσω; perf. δέδονπα; aor. 1. έδούπησα and (Il. λ , 45.) έγδούπησα from a stem or root ΓΔΟΥΠ-, which appears to bear the same relation to δονπέω as κτυπέω does to $\tau \dot{v}\pi \tau \omega^*$.

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

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

and hence that $\delta o \nu \pi \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$ came to signify the falling of such a body, $\tau \dot{\nu} \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ the beating it.

^{*} I suppose for instance that $\gamma\delta\sigma\sigma\pi$ and $\kappa\tau\sigma\pi$ - are essentially the same onomatopoeia for the sound proceeding from a
heavy body, whether striking or struck;

Δράω, I do, is inflected regularly with a long; hence the perf. δέδρακα is common to this verb and to διδράσκω.

Beside δέδραμαι we find δέδρασμαι; see Thucyd. 3, 54. Hence the verbal adj. δραστός, δραστέος.

[Δρώοιμι is an Epic form produced from the optat. pres. act. $\delta \rho \tilde{\varphi} \mu \iota$, (Od. o, 317.), and the only instance in Homer of this verb in its simple form: it was most frequent in the Doric dialect, in which it was used like the Attic $\pi \rho \acute{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega$, Aristot. Poet. 3, 6.—Passow.]

Δρέπω, I pluck, is inflected regularly; thus fut. δρέψω, &c. The midd. is frequent: [αἷμα δρέψασθαι is an unusual expression in Æschyl. Sept. 720. Verbal adj. δρεπτός.—Passow.]

In Pind. Pyth. 4, 234. $\delta\rho\alpha\pi\omega\nu$ is the particip. of the aor. 2., and perhaps the only part of that tense to be met with: but such solitary forms are not unusual in this aorist. $\Delta\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\omega$ is less common than $\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\omega$; we find it in Moschus 2, 69. The middle $\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ is of more frequent occurrence; $\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\tau\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu$, Aual. 1, p. 241. No. 81. Compare $\Gamma\lambda\dot{\nu}\phi\omega$.

Δρύπτω, I tear the flesh, scratch, is inflected regularly: fut. δρύψω; perf. δέδρυφα; perf. pass. δέδρυμμαι; aor. 1. midd. δρυψάμενος, Od. β, 153.

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

Δύναμαι, I can, forms the pres. and imperf. like ισταμαι; depon. with fut. midd. δυνήσομαι; aor. 1. pass. εδυνήθην, ηδυνήθην, or εδυνάσθην, which last form (more Ionic than the others) never takes the augment; aor. 1. midd. εδυνησάμην, Hom.; perf. δεδύνημαι. Verbal adj. δυνατός, possible.

. In the passive of all verbs in μ , there are instances in the common language of a formation in the conjunctive and optative moods, by which they assimilate, sometimes in sound but always in accent, to the common conjugation. Instances in $\tau i\theta \epsilon \mu a \iota$, $\tau i\theta \epsilon \mu a$

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

[†] On the double augment see Βούλομαι and note.

their respective verbs: in the present case we have as proparoxytons, the optat. $\delta \dot{\nu} r a \iota \tau o$ and the conjunct. $\delta \dot{\nu} r \omega \mu a \iota$, (Ion.) $\delta \dot{\nu} r \eta a \iota$, $\delta \dot{\nu} r \eta \tau a \iota^*$, which have undoubtedly been introduced into Homer from the common language.

The shortening of the 2. pers. sing. -ασαι by the Attics into -α does not apply to this verb, which took rather the Ionic form δύνη† (Ion. δύνεαι) and was used thus by the Tragedians (Eurip. Hec. 253. Androm. 238. Soph. Phil. 798. ed. Buttm. with the notes). In prose δύνασαι only was in use. But in the imperf. the Attics preferred even in prose the form ἐδύνω, ἡδύνω, to that in -ασο. Moeris, p. 182. Xen. Anab. 7, 5, 5.

Of the three forms of the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \delta v r \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta v$ is the only one in Homer: it is preferred by Herodotus (see Wessel. on 7, 105.), and is frequent in Xenophon. The Attics prefer the double augment $\dot{\eta} \delta v r \dot{\eta} \theta \eta v$; the former occurs also in Herodot. 1, 10. But in Thucyd. and Xenoph. the simple augment is the more common. Homer generally uses the aor. midd. $\delta v r \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \tau o$.

Δύω. 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 ἴστημι and φύω, and the analogies laid down in sect. 113. of my Grammar‡. The pres. act. δύω, καταδύω, &c. has the causative meaning to envelope in, to sink anything, and retains it in the fut. and aor. 1. act. δύσω, ἔδυσα. Pass. ἐδύθην with ν short §. The Midd. δύομαι, δύσομαι, ἐδυσάμην 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

^{*} Notwithstanding $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ as a proparoxyton is the only form in use, according to which we find $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu \eta \alpha \iota$ (11. ζ , 229.) accented in the same way, yet the Ionians admit the resolution and write $\delta \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \omega \mu \alpha \iota$; e.g. in Herodot. 4, 97. Compare $\dot{\epsilon} E \pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$.

 $[\]uparrow$ [Yet Passow says that $\hat{\epsilon}\acute{\nu}\nu\eta$ is in good writers conjunctive only, though it does occur in Eurip. Hec. 257., and that the Att. and Dor. is $\hat{\epsilon}\acute{\nu}\nu\eta$, Schæf. Soph. Phil. 798.]

^{‡ [}That is, of Buttmann's large detailed Grammar (Ausführliche Sprachlehre), of which this Catalogue forms part of the second volume. The section referred to, consisting of twelve pages, is of course too long to be inserted here, and to make extracts or an abridgement would be most unsatisfactory.—ED.]

[§] Like $\epsilon\lambda\dot{\nu}\theta\eta\nu$, $\epsilon\dot{r}\dot{\nu}\theta\eta\nu$, and the perf. pass. $\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$, although from $\lambda\dot{\nu}\omega$, $\delta\dot{\nu}\omega$, $\theta\dot{\nu}\omega$, fut. $-\dot{\nu}\sigma\omega$, &c., all with v long. See $\Delta\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, I bind, with note; also $T\dot{\epsilon}(\nu\omega)$.

(a garment). All these meanings belonging to the immediate sense join with the middle voice the active perf. δέδυκα and the aor. 2. ἔδῦν*. In addition to the above comes a new active form δύνω, which properly speaking is synonymous with the middle δύομαι, as ἔδυν is with the midd. ἐδυσάμην; 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\delta}\tilde{v}v$, like $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\tilde{v}v$, retains the v long through all its persons (ἔδυμεν, &c.); but the 3. plur. ἔδυν, shortened by the Epic and Doric writers for εδυσαν, has the v short according to the regular analogy. See έδραν, &c. under Διδράσκω with note. Of the conjunctive and optative moods we must however make particular mention. To form a conjunct, according to the analogy of $\xi \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, $\sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$, is not possible, but it may follow that of the resolved form στέω or στείω, στήης: and thus we find a conj. δύω, δύης, δύη from έδυν, not only in Homer, (e.g. II. ρ, 186. ι, 604. λ, 194.) but even in Attic prose, ἐπειδαν ὁ ήλιος δύη, Plato Cratyl. 64. p. 413. b.; which forms therefore must not be derived from the present δύω, nor must we attribute to this latter an immediate sense. Of the optat. $\delta \dot{\nu} \eta \nu$ ($\bar{\nu}$ for $\nu \iota$) I can produce but one example, viz. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \bar{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu \uparrow$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \nu i \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ (like $\sigma \tau \alpha i \eta \nu - \sigma \tau \alpha i \mu \epsilon \nu$) in II. π , 99. But according to Bekker's observation, the construction in Od. 1, 377. σ, 348. υ, 286. requires the optative, and consequently in those passages instead of δύη we must write δύη.

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

The Epic sister-forms of the aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\nu} \sigma \epsilon \tau v^{\ddagger}$, imperat. $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \sigma \epsilon o$, (like $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau o$, imperat. $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon o$,) are some among many instances of the aor. 1. taking the termination of the aor. 2., or, which is the same thing, the aor. 2. taking the characteristic σ of the aor. 1., of which the most complete instance is the well-known aor. $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma o \nu$, $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu$, &c.

For an account of this agrist see note under Γιγνώσκω.

[†] See Buttm. Lexil. p. 425. and note. ‡ Amidst the uncertainty which prevails in Homer's text between ἐδύσατο and -ετο, it is very probable that the form in -ατο crept into it from common analogy, and

that the true reading in the Epic poets is always $\dot{\epsilon}\beta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau o$, $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau o$. At the same time it is possible that usage might have attached a distinct meaning to each form, and that Homer might have said in every instance $\delta\acute{\psi}\sigma\epsilon\tau o$ $\ddot{\eta}\acute{e}\lambda\iota\sigma$, $\delta\acute{\psi}\sigma\epsilon\tau o$ $\ddot{\eta}\acute{e}\lambda\iota\sigma$, &c., but $\delta\acute{\psi}\sigma\sigma\tau o$ $\tau\acute{e}\acute{\chi}\epsilon\alpha$, $\chi\iota\tau\ddot{\omega}\nu\alpha$, &c., but $\delta\acute{\psi}\sigma\sigma\tau o$ $\tau\acute{e}\acute{\chi}\epsilon\alpha$, $\chi\iota\tau\ddot{\omega}\nu\alpha$, &c.

See Buttm. Lexil. p. 226. note. The Epic participle $\delta \nu \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \delta$, used in the sense of a present in Od. a, 24. Hes. ϵ , 382., is certainly not a future; and as it does not describe one in particular, but the general setting of some of the heavenly bodies, it may be explained as coming from the common expression $\delta \nu \sigma \epsilon \tau \sigma \delta^{*} \dot{\eta} \epsilon \lambda \iota \sigma s$.

Later writers form from δύνω an aor. 1., at least in the participle, ηλίου δύναντος, μετὰ ήλιον δύναντα, Æl. V. H. 4, 1, 1. Paus. 2, 11. Herodotus inflects the form δύνω, as he does many other barytones*, as if it were a pres. in $-\epsilon\omega$; thus 3, 98, ἐνδυνέουσι, they put on.

E.

'Εάφθη. See "Απτω.

'Eáω, I permit, &c.: fut. ἐάσω; but in the augment it changes the ϵ not into η , but into $\epsilon\iota\dagger$, e. g. imperf. είων; aor. 1. είασα, &c.

The Ionics leave out the augment; thus imperf. ἔων for εἴων, [ἔασα for εἴασα, Hom. who has also a pres. εἰάω, εἰῶ, Il. δ, 55. The fut. midd. ἐάσομαι is used in a passive sense, Thucyd. 1, 142.—Passow.]

Έγγυάω, I give as a pledge; Midd. I pledge myself. This verb is inflected regularly, but is uncertain in its augment: thus we have in general use the imperf. ηγγύων, and the aor. 1. ηγγύησα, yet the perf. is equally common as ἐγγεγύηκα; and again we find without any augment at all ἐγγυήσατο, ἐγγυηκώς ‡, &c.

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

Lucian. Lexic. v. ἐνεγγυῶν. Budæus explains this to be merely the augment; which is singular, as analogy would require ἐνεγύησω. Others place it as without the augment under ἐνεγγυῶν. I consider it to be an anomaly in the augmentation; and that daily pronunciation, deceived by ear and sense, strayed from ἐνεγύησω into the double compound ἐνεγγύησω.

^{*} Thus we find συμβαλλεόμενος, ὑπερβαλλέειν, ἐρρίπτεον, πιεζεύμενος, Herodot.

[†] The following verbs do the same: $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\pi\omega$ and $\hat{\epsilon}\rho\pi\dot{\nu}\zeta\omega$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\kappa\omega$, $\hat{\epsilon}\theta\dot{\nu}\zeta\omega$, $\hat{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\nu}\sigma\omega$, $\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\nu}\omega$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\omega$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, $\hat{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\dot{\alpha}\zeta\rho\mu\alpha\iota$.

[‡] See Reisk. Ind. in Isæum. It is remarkable too that the aor. 1. ἐνεγγύησα, ἐνεγγυησάμην occurs frequently: see Budæus p. 76. 77. Stephan. Thesaur. and

This agrist has been mistaken by the Grammarians, at least the later ones, who, as we see in Thom. Mag., supposed a present ἔγρομαι. Such a one however is never met with, and the remaining forms are in every instance plainly acrists, e. g. έγρετο δ' έξ υπνου, Il. β, 41. καν έγρη μεσημβρινός, οὐδείς σ' ἀποκλείσει, Aristoph. Vesp. 774. In the same way the infin. also expresses universally the moment of waking: and hence it was a very easy step to substitute the accentuation of ἐγρέσθαι. and ascribe ἔγρεσθαι to the above-mentioned mistake of the Grammarians. But in a form which has always remained in the common language, and of which the infin. for instance occurs frequently (Od. v, 124. Apollon. Rh. 4, 1352. Lucian Dial. Mar. 14, 2.), more than usual circumspection is necessary. In a similar case under ἀγείρω, where άγέροντο, άγερέσθαι occurred only in the old Epic language, and the latter but once, grammatical decision was necessary, and the perfectly regular agrist 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 εζεσθαι under "Ιζω. Compare also Πέφνων.

The perf. 2. έγρήγορα,

whose anomalous reduplication was probably caused by the sound of $\eta \gamma \rho \delta \mu \eta \nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, belongs, like that a crist, to the immediate meaning, and expresses the being in a certain state or situation, I am watching*. The pluperf. $\tilde{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \delta - \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ has the force of an imperfect.

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

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

^{*} See note under "Ayvout.

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

although we find just before as a present, έγρήγορεν. † In the same way from ἀνώγετε, ἀνω-

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

"Εδω. See Έσθίω.

Έδουμαι. See "Ιζω.

Εζομαι. See "Ιζω.
 'Εθέλω and θέλω, I wish, am willing: fut. ἐθελήσω and θελήσω; but aor. 1. ἦθέλησα; imperf. ἤθελον; and perf. ἢθέληκα in good prose writers; τεθέληκα is an Alexandrine perf.; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 332.

'Εθίζω, I accustom, is regularly inflected; e. g. fut. ἐθίσω, Att. -ἴω, Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 53.; but it takes ει for its augment, like ἐάω, which see with its note. Compare also the following.

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

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

* These forms do indeed appear in their external relations like a series of anomalies; but I think I can point out a general regularity running through the whole. The transition of $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\delta\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon$ to the passive form $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\dot{\eta}\gamma\rho\rho\theta\epsilon$ was justified by the neuter meaning of $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\dot{\eta}\gamma\rho\rho\alpha$, which suited

the perf. pass. quite as well as the perf. active, just as in $d\nu \acute{e}\phi\gamma a$ and $d\nu \acute{e}\phi\gamma \mu a\iota$ but this passive might, according to the analogy of $\ddot{a}\omega\rho ro$ ($\dot{\eta}o\rho ro$), retain the o; and thus $\dot{e}\gamma\rho\dot{\eta}\gamma\rho\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, $-o\rho\theta\epsilon$, $-\dot{o}\rho\theta\alpha\iota$ are regular. That the active form $\dot{e}\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\rho\rho\theta\epsilon$, might have been only an appearance, but devoid of truth. As from $\dot{d}\gamma\epsilon\dot{\rho}\omega$ came $\dot{d}\gamma\epsilon-\dot{\rho}\theta\omega$, so from $\dot{e}\gamma\epsilon\dot{\rho}\omega$ might come $\dot{e}\gamma\epsilon\dot{\rho}\epsilon\theta\omega$, so from $\dot{e}\gamma\epsilon\dot{\rho}\omega$ might come $\dot{e}\gamma\epsilon\dot{\rho}\epsilon\theta\omega$, of which latter theme the regular perf. 2. would be $\dot{e}\gamma\dot{\rho}\dot{\eta}\gamma$ o $\rho\,\theta\,\alpha$.

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

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

- 1. to see: the only tense which retains this meaning is the aor. 2. $\epsilon i \delta \sigma \nu$, and Epic without the augment $i \delta \sigma \nu$; infin. $i \delta \epsilon i \nu$, Ep. $i \delta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$; conjunct. $i \delta \omega$, Epic $i \delta \omega \mu \iota$; part. $i \delta \omega \nu$: all these forms are Homeric. The aor. 2. midd. has the same meaning, $\epsilon i \delta \delta \mu \eta \nu$, in Hom., more frequently without the augment $i \delta \delta \mu \eta \nu$; infin. $i \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$; conjunct. $i \delta \omega \mu a \iota$; imperat. $i \delta \sigma \hat{\nu}$. See also $i \delta \rho \delta \omega$.
- 2. to know: oidat, I know, to which we may add the part. $\epsilon i\partial \omega s$; infin. $\epsilon i\partial \epsilon \nu a\iota$, Ep. $i\partial \mu \epsilon \nu a\iota$ and $i\partial \mu \epsilon \nu$; imperat. $i\sigma \theta\iota$; conjunct. $\epsilon i\partial \omega s$; Ep. $i\partial \epsilon \omega s$ also; optat. $\epsilon i\partial \epsilon i\eta \nu$; pluperf. $\tilde{\eta}\partial \epsilon \iota \nu$; fut. $\epsilon i\sigma \iota \mu a\iota$, but less frequently and mostly Epic $\epsilon i\partial i \mu s\omega$. The aor. and perf. are supplied from $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$.

Of the regular persons of οἶδα, the 2. sing. and the three persons of the plur. οἴδαμεν, οἴδατε, οἴδασι, occur but seldom, and, with regard to Attic usage, are disapproved of by the Atticists, while their places are supplied

^{*} See note on ἀγήοχα under Αγω, and Buttm. Lexil. p. 136. &c.

[†] Those who attributed to εἴδω as a present the two meanings of to see and to know were guilty of an inaccuracy: εἴδω meant I see, I see into it; the perf. οἴδα, I have seen into it, and consequently I know.

[‡] Properly the perf. 2. of $\epsilon \tilde{n} \delta \omega$ with the augment thrown aside (like $\epsilon i \kappa \omega$, $\tilde{\epsilon} o t \kappa \alpha$,) but always used as a present, and consequently its pluperf. has the force of an imperfect. For the very remarkable analogy between the formation of this perf. and $\tilde{\epsilon} o t \kappa \alpha$ see last note but one under $\tilde{E} i \kappa \omega$.

by syncopated forms: we will therefore first give the pure Attic usage of this verb in $oi\delta a$ and its pluperf. $\mathring{\eta}\delta\epsilon\iota\nu$.

ATTIC USAGE.

Pres. S. oida	D.		Ρ. ἵσμεν			
οἶσθα		ΐστον ,		ίστε '		
olde(v)	ἴστον		ἴσασι(ν).			
Imperat.	Conj.	Optat.	Infin.	Part.		
ίσθι, ίστω, &c.	είδω	είδείην	είδέναι	είδώς, -υῖα, -ός.		
T 0 NO	A 4 4 NO					

IMPERF. S. ηδειν. Att. ηδη,

ηδεις, more generally ήδεισθα; Att. ήδης, more gen. ήδησθα, ήδει; Att. ήδειν and ήδη,

Fur. είσομαι, less frequently είδησω†.

Αοπ. (είδησα), είδησαι‡.

Verbal adj. (neut.) ἰστέον.

In both the Ion. and Dor. dialect we find the regular οίδαs, Od. α, 337.; in the Att. sometimes οἰσθαs, Cratin. AB. 3. p. 1295. Piers. Moer. p. 283. Br. Aristoph. Fr. 143. Meineke Menandr. p. 122. The Ion. and Dor. use ἴδμεν for ἴσμεν §; and the Epics for εἰδέναι have ἴδμεναι and ἴδμεν as shortened from εἰδέμεναι. They have the same shortening of the radical vowel in the conjunct. ἰδέω (II. ξ, 235. where however others read εἰδέω as a dissyllable) for εἰδῶ, and in the fem. part. ἰδνῖα for εἰδνῖα. We find also εἴδετε, 2. pl. conjunct. for εἴδητε, Od. ι, 17., εἴδομεν for εἰδῶμεν, Il. α, 363. For ἥδειν the Epics have a lengthened form, by which the separation of the augment from the radical syllable is made more distinct (compare ἤειν under Εἴμι, I go), and of which we find 2. pers. ἠείδειs, ἠείδηs; 3. pers. ἠείδει, ἠείδη, Il. χ, 280. Od. ι, 206. Apoll. Rh. 2, 822., and Herodotus (1, 45.) has with the termination short ἤειδε for ἤδει||. To these we must add a form as quoted in this verb only,

5. εἰδήσεις; more frequently in the Ionic dialect.

† Hippocr. De Dec. Orn. 3. De Vict. Acut. 46. Aristot. Eth. 8, 3. Theophr. Procem. extr.

§ The Ion. ἴδμεν did not come from ἴσμεν; general analogy requires just the converse: ἴδμεν and the infin. ἴδμεναι belong evidently to εἴδω, and not to ἴσημι. See last note but one under εἴκω, ἔοικα.

|| This shortened termination is certainly remarkable in a dialect which in other cases adds vowels without reason or ana-

^{*} On these syncopated forms of the dual and plural see Piers. ad Moer. p. 174.
† Isocr. ad Demonic. 4. συνειδήσεις;

ηκείν for ηδεσαν, Apollon. Rh. 2, 65. and lengthened to ηείδειν, ib. 4, 1700. On the other hand Homer has (II. σ , 405. Od. δ , 772.) the 3. pl. " $\sigma \alpha \nu$, in sound the same as the 3. plur. imperf. of $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \mu$; and it is to be explained in the same way, for it bears the same relation to the syncopated form ησαν for ηδεσαν, as " $\sigma \alpha \nu$ from $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \mu$ " does to η $\hat{\iota} \sigma \alpha \nu$. Lastly Homer uses both futures, less frequently however $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \delta \eta \sigma \omega$, Il. α , 546. The Epic infin. $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \delta \eta \sigma \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, Od. ζ , 257.

In order to distinguish correctly where forms of this verb belong to the one or the other meaning, we must observe that many ideas which really relate to internal knowledge, but which we express by the sense of seeing, are given by the Greeks to the verb εἰδέναι. So in particular, ώs είδης, τν' είδητε, in many combinations, where there is danger of our being influenced by custom to alter it to "tons, "tonre, e.g. in Demosth. Mid. 23. (p. 539. Rsk.) "I will lay it before you, τν' είδητε, ότι καὶ τούτων την μεγίστην δφείλων δουναι δίκην φανήσεται:" and again at 24. (p. 541. init.): see other examples in Sturz. Lex. Xenoph. under είδειν 6. To the above we may add also the verbal adj. ἰστέον, which is never uséd properly of seeing, though there are cases where we cannot translate it otherwise; see Heind. ad Plat. Theæt. 141. In the same way the Homeric conjunct. είδομεν, which always stands for είδωμεν. (as at Il. v, 327. Od. ζ , 257. where we should say "that we may see... let us see...)" would be more accurately translated by know; nor can there be any doubt that the only passage where εἰδήσω according to the context might express the physical idea of seeing, Od. 4, 257., belongs, like all the other cases, to εἰδέναι; "Thou wilt there know the most illustrious of the Phæacians." The later poets were the first, from misunderstanding perhaps the Homeric language, to use είδω in the exact sense of to see; eiloues, as a present, Theorr. 2, 25., or they formed from the agrist ideiv a new future, apá y' idnow auráv, ib. 3, 37.

But there is one part of the verb which really belongs to $\epsilon i \delta \omega$, video, viz. the Epic middle $\epsilon i \delta o \mu a \iota$, $\epsilon i \sigma a \mu \eta \nu$, used exactly as the Latin verbs appareo and videor, as at II. 0, 555. a, 228. μ , 103.; and by a particular deviation it is joined with a dative in the sense of to be like to, $\epsilon i \delta o \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$ 'Aκάμαντι, II. ϵ , 462. $\epsilon i \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma v \ell \iota$ Πριάμοιο, β , 791.

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

logy. It is easy enough to conjecture that Herodot. wrote ἡείδεε: but the various reading ἤδεε, from which this must

ἔλιπον,λιπεῖν: and (after the total disappearance of the digamma) by contraction εἶδον. This ει is therefore different from that in the pres. εἴδω, where it was added to strengthen the radical syllable ἰδ- as in λείπω from λιπ-. Hence in the Epic language the aor. εἶσάμην occurs with that augment ἐεισάμην. But Homer has also the particip. ἐεισάμενος, II. β, 22., and Pindar (Nem. 10, 28.) ἐειδόμενος, for which it is necessary to suppose a theme ἐείδω, as such an ε is found in many verbs which had the digamma according to the analogy of ἐθέλω*.

Είκάζω, I conjecture, is regular, except in sometimes taking the augment, contrary to the analogy of verbs in ει: thus εἴκασα, εἴκασμαι, Att. ἤκασα, ἤκασμαι. See Moer. 182. and compare Ruhnk. ad Tim. v. εἰκάζων. In Plato it is found thus augmented in good manuscripts. See the following.

Eίκω, I yield, is regular, and like other verbs in ει does not take the augment: thus imperf. εἶκον; aor. 1. εἶξα, where the place of the augment is supplied by the accent. The same is still visible in many compounds; thus ἄπειργε can only be the imperat. of ἀπείργω, the imperfect is ἀπείργε. But wherever in the written text of Homer the augment can be known only by the accent, it necessarily depended on the Grammarians whether to express it or not: and some of these appear to have been induced by an Ionic analogy to omit it entirely, writing ἕζε, ἔφιζε, ὑπόεικον; which last is the present reading of Il. π, 305. in Wolf's Homer, though he reads in every instance ἕζεν and ἐφῖζε. See Etym. M. v. καθῆστο.

Homer has the fut. midd. II. a, 294. Od. μ, 117.; for at II. δ, 62. ὑποείξομεν is the shortened conjunctive: in others we find the fut. act. as in Herodot. 7, 160. Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 45. Demosth. de Rhod. 197. ult. On εἴκαθον see ἀμύναθον under ᾿Αμύνω.

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

^{*} Thus $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\delta o\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\pi o\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omega$, † In the three perfects $\check{\epsilon}o\kappa\alpha$, $\check{\epsilon}o\lambda\pi\alpha$, $\dot{\epsilon}i\sigma\kappa\omega$.

and in Homer (II. ν, 102.) once, 3. pl. ἐοίκεσαν; perf. infin. ἐοικέναι, part. ἐοικώς, -υῖα, -ός, beside which Homer has once εἰοικυῖαι, II. σ, 418. The Attics preferred a sisterform of this part. εἰκώς, (like ἔοιδα, ἐοιδώς, εἰδώς,) particularly in its neuter εἰκός, although ἐοικός still remained always a good form. Homer has once εἰκώς, Il. φ, 254. and very frequently the fem. εἰκυῖα: the Ionics, but not Homer, always use οἶκα, οἰκώς, οἰκός. Fut. εἴξω (Aristoph. Nub. 1001.).

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

The Homeric $\epsilon i \kappa \epsilon$ (Il. σ , 520.) is imperf., and the only instance of the

pres. or imperf. of είκω.

Of the syncopated forms of this perfect we find $\epsilon_{0i\gamma\mu\nu\nu}$ for $\epsilon_{0i\kappa\alpha\mu\nu\nu}$ in Soph. and Eurip., $\epsilon_{i\kappa\tau\rho\nu}$ 3. dual for $\epsilon_{0i\kappa\alpha\tau\rho\nu}$, Od. δ , 27., and $\epsilon_{i\kappa\tau\eta\nu}$ 3. dual pluperf. for $\epsilon_{\omega\kappa\epsilon i\tau\eta\nu}$, II. a, 104. This perfect made a further transition (without however changing its meaning) to the passive form†, of which Homer has only the pluperf. $\eta_{i\kappa\tau\rho}$, and without the augm. $\epsilon_{i\kappa\tau\rho}$, II. ψ , 107.‡. The perf. $\epsilon_{i\gamma\mu\alpha\iota}$ is found in composition in the post-Homeric poets, but with an irregular augment: thus $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\eta_{i\kappa\tau\alpha\iota}$ Eurip. Alc. 1066., $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\eta_{i\kappa\tau\alpha\iota}$ Hesych.§.

radical vowel ε, and the ε at the beginning is the syllabic augment instead of the reduplication, like ἕαγα and some others; thus εἰκω ἔοικα, ἔργω ἔορκα, like δέρκω δέδορκα. Again in the three pluperfects ἐο- would by the temp. augm. be ἡο-, which again by Attic and Ionic analogy would become ἐω-, as χράομαι, lon. χρέωμαι, νηόs, Att. νεώs, and many others.

* [Whether the perf. eika 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 έγρήγορα

— ἐγρηγόρθαι.

In order to understand clearly the augment of the pluperf. in these forms εψκει and ἥϊκτο, we must recollect that

this is not the way of writing them which existed in Homer's time. Eikw is one of those verbs which had originally the digamma; the perfect therefore with the reduplication was FE-FOIKA, consequently έψκει was in his language FEFOIKEI, and είκτο, ήίκτο were FEFIKTO, EFEFIKTO; which forms, if substituted for the others, suit the verse in every instance, by merely throwing aside occasionally a separable ν , as in Il. ψ , 107.

§ These forms appear to have arisen out of the old Epic η ikto by analogies imperfectly understood. For if it were wished to form at once from eike, without going through the perfect ε oika, a perf. pass. η γ μ a, in order to resolve it into η i γ μ au, the leading analogy which

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

To this stem or root belong also ἴσκω, ἐΐσκω, which see in their places.

Εἰλύω, I envelope: fut. εἰλῦ'σω; perf. pass. εἴλῦμαι; aor. 1. part. εἰλυσθείς, Hom. Post-Hom. εἴλῦσα, Com. ap. Athen. 7. p. 293. d.

regulates such cases would be destroyed without sufficient reason. Whilst a language still exists in its vigour and purity, it is easy and not uncommon for an old analogy to be inaccurately understood: but to spin out new analogies on mere theory could have been only done by the

later grammarian-poets.

* If we compare the different forms arising out of the two perfects cocka and οἴδα, we shall find a very close analogy between them. From εἴκω, εἴδω, came ἔοικα, ἔοιδα; of the former a shortened form oika is found in the Ionic dialect, of the latter oida was in common use: the one has a part. εἰκώς, the other εἰδώς. Of coika the pluperf. (with the augm. after the analogy of ἐορτάζω, ἐωρτάζον) was ἐψκειν; but there existed also the regular pluperf, with merely the or shortened, as is clear from the 3. pluperf. pass. ήϊκτο, (without the augm. ἔικτο,) which must come from a perf. eiyuai, pluperf. ήτγμην. In the same way from εοιδα came the pluperf. (ἡτδειν) ήδειν. syncope from ἔοικα were formed ἔοιγμεν and $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{t}\kappa\tau\eta\nu$; from $\dot{\sigma}\dot{t}\delta\alpha$ —($\dot{\sigma}\dot{t}\delta$ - $\sigma\theta\alpha$) $\dot{\sigma}\dot{t}\sigma\theta\alpha$, ίδμεν, ίσμεν, ίστε; and in the pluperf. from ήδειν-ήσμεν, ήστε, ήσαν. this $\eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ (for $\eta \delta - \sigma \alpha \nu$) comes therefore the Homeric ισαν (for ιδ. σαν) by the mere omission of the augment: so that it is not necessary to suppose for this single word that Homer was acquainted with ionue,

of which there is no other instance. And lastly,

+ The great difference between the terminations of the principal and of the historic tenses 2 is this, that by the augment e and the consequent throwing back of the accent toward the beginning of the word, the terminations of the latter were shortened; e.g. τύπτ-οντι (Dor. for -ουσι) έτυπτ-ον; and consequently from the historic ending $\sigma a \nu$ we may conclude that there was in the principal tenses the ending -σαντι (-σασι). In this remark I agree exactly with that acute philologist Landvoigt of Merseburg, who has thus resolved to my complete satisfaction a difficulty mentioned in my Grammar, in a note on the 3. plur. pres. indic. of the verbs in µ1; namely, that in the most ancient mode of inflection the 3. plur. of the pres. and imperf. ended thus, τιθέ-σαντι, ἐτίθε-σαν. The σ in the former dropped out, leaving τιθέαντι τιθέασι, which were shortened to τιθεῖσι τιθέντι.

^{* [}Buttmann in his Grammar divides the tenses of the verb into principal, viz. pres. perf. and fut., and historic, viz. imperf. and aor.—Ed.]

Eilíopai, I drag myself along, crawl along, Soph. The pass. èlvo $\theta \hat{\eta} v ai$, used in Homer with the single ϵ , is distinct from the above, and means, 1.) to compress or draw oneself up together, Il. ω , 510. Od. i, 433. 2,) to be thrust or pushed, Il. ψ , 393. The old Homeric language seems to have made a distinction between the forms beginning with ϵi and those with ϵi , using the former in the sense of to envelope, cover up, the latter in that of to compress and to push; but later poets confounded both forms and meanings. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 272.

Είλω, είλλω or είλλω, ίλλω, and είλεω or είλεω, I press together, shut in, envelope, roll up: all the remaining forms, which occur in the common language, come exclusively from the form in έω; as, είλήσω, είλημαι, είληθείς.

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

In Homer, beside the pres. and imperf. $\epsilon i \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ and the part. pass. $\epsilon i \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma_s$, the rest of the formation comes from the simple stem or root $E\Lambda$ -; as, the 3. pl. aor. 1. $\epsilon \lambda \sigma a \nu$, the infin. $\epsilon \lambda \sigma a \iota$, and (according to the analogy mentioned above in $\epsilon \epsilon \iota \sigma a \nu \sigma_s$) $\epsilon \epsilon \lambda \sigma a \iota$; also the part. $\epsilon \lambda \sigma a \sigma_s$ with the meaning of to $\epsilon \iota \sigma a \nu \sigma_s$ which, and on the relation which this verb bears to $\epsilon \lambda a \nu \sigma_s$, $\epsilon \iota \sigma_s$ as each 44. in Buttm. Lexil. Perf. pass. $\epsilon \iota \sigma_s$

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

The imperf. ἐόλει in Pind. Pyth. 4, 414. (according to Bœckh's undisputed emendation) and the pluperf. pass. ἐόλητο in Apollon. 3,

^{*} See the conclusion of Εἴδω.

^{. †} Some of the Grammarians, principally the more modern, class these forms by themselves under a theme AAHMI, which

they join partly with ἀλέομαι partly with ἀλέος, conferti, &c.: but genuine grammatical tradition agrees with our statement. See Buttm. Lexilogus.

471. are sister-forms of είλει and εέλτο with the meaning of to press upon, disturb, which bear the same relation to ΕΛΩ, είλω, as τρομέω does to τρέμω, ἐκτόνηκα to κτείνω, and other similar forms*.

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

Είμαρται. See Μείρομαι.

Εἰμί, I am, a defective verb in μ_i , from a radical form ΕΩ. Beside the pres. and an imperf. $\hat{\eta}_{\nu}$, it has only a fut. ἔσομαι, Poet. ἔσσομαι; the other tenses are supplied by $\gamma i \gamma \nu o \mu a i$; verbal adj. ἐστέον. From the middle comes the 2. sing. imperat. ἔσο, Epic and also Dor. ἔσσο; and the 1. sing. imperf. $\mathring{\eta}_{\mu}\eta\nu$, rejected indeed by the Atticists, but found occasionally in the older writers, and more frequently in the later†. Its other persons are never met with in any of the better authors. The most surprising is είατο for $\mathring{\eta}_{\nu}\tau_0$, Od. ν , 106., where however others read είατο.

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

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

Optat. ἔοιμι: conj. ἔω: part. ἐών.

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

^{*} These two forms (ἐόλει, &c.) together with Bœckh's derivation of them are examined fully in Buttm. Lexil. p. 63.

[†] This is a point which still requires critical examination: see Piers. ad Moer. p. 172. Fisch. 2. p. 502. Lobeck ad

Phryn. p. 152. Schæf. ad Long. p. 423. † Compare Herm. De Legg. quibusd. subtil. Serm. Hom. 1. p. 16. Matth. Gr.

Gramm. p. 415. Schæf. Hes. Op. 538. 567. p. 238. Gnom. Gr.

abridged forms $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\epsilon i \tau \epsilon$, 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: $\epsilon i \tau \epsilon$ occurs in Od. ϕ , 195., and the dual $\epsilon i \tau \eta \nu$ is found, according to Bekker, in several passages of Plato.

The 3. sing. of the imperat. $\tilde{\eta}\tau\omega$ for $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\omega$ 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\omega$. The 3. plur. has also an unusual sister-form (corresponding with the gen. plur. particip.) $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omega\nu$, Plat. Leg. 9. p. 879. b. Ionic and Dor. $\hat{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omega\nu$, $\hat{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omega$.

In the infin. we find in the old Ionic ἔμεν, ἔμεναι, ἔμμεναι, ἔμμεναι, ξιμεναι, ξιμεναι, ξιμεναι, ξιμεναι, the last is the most common in Homer. The Dorics use ἡμεν or ἡμες, both which are at the same time 1. pl. imperf.—also εἶμεν, εἶμες, differing

from 1. pl. pres. indic. only in the accent.

The imperfect has numerous sister-forms: e.g. from the radical form E\Omega the 1. sing. $\xi o \nu$ for $\eta \nu$, Il. ψ , 643., but none of the other persons: $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\sigma\nu$, $-\epsilon$ s, $-\epsilon$, in Hom. is a mere imperf. as Il. η , 158, but in Herodot. a real iterative like the other forms in -σκον: and lastly the true Ionic form according to the formation in μι, ἔα, ἔαs, and 2. plur. ἔατε; or lengthened $\tilde{\eta}\alpha$, 3. sing. $\tilde{\eta}\epsilon\nu^*$, II. μ , 371.: $\tilde{\epsilon}\eta\nu$ occurs as 1. sing. in II. λ , 762. only, where it is most probably false for $\tilde{\epsilon}o\nu$; but as 3, sing. it is more common, and found in Ionic prose; Homer has also sometimes $\tilde{\eta}\eta\nu$, and in 2. sing. $\tilde{\epsilon}\eta\sigma\theta\alpha$ for $\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha$: the 3. plur. $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu$ for $\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu$ occurs both in the older and later Ionic, as well as in the Doric dialect. In Hes. e, 825. and θ , 321. $\eta \nu$ also appears to stand for $\eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, but it is there rather a peculiarity of syntax†. From the Ionic ἔα arose the old Attic 1. sing. $\vec{\eta}$ for $\vec{\eta}\nu$, which with regard to the extent of its usage requires still further critical examination :. For the 3. sing. $\eta \nu$ the Dorics have by a particular anomaly ηs. Poetical fut. ἔσσομαι for ἔσομαι, &c.; and from the Dor. ἐσοῦμαι comes ἐσσεῖται, Il. β, 393. ν, 317.

All the persons of the pres. indic. are enclitical except the 2. sing. ϵ 7, which always retains the accent; perhaps also ϵ 7, used enclitically

by Wolf in Od. δ, 611.

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

* This form has always the ν , whether before a vowel or consonant.

[†] As far as this is supposed to depend on prose authorities, it arises from entire misunderstanding: see Sturz. Lex. Xen. 2. p. 47. Herodot. 5, 12. where the nom. which follows it is not a plural but two singulars.

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

(The dual follows the analogy of the 2. plur.)	<i>йева</i> ν.	йесте or fire,	P. ἥειμεν οτ ἦμεν,	ที่ยะ or ที่ยะ»,	ἤεις οτ ἤεισθα‡,	Imperf. S. ηeev , Ion. $\etaa, Att. \etaa,$		P. ίμεν, ίτε, ἵασι(ν).	D. ἴτον, ἴτον,	Pres. S. cimi, els, (generally ci,) clou(v), idi, itw,	INDICAT.
							ιόντων .	ire, irwaar, or loinv, &c.	ίτον, ίτων,	ίθι, ἴτω,	IMPERAT.
								ιοίην, &c.	or	τοιμι, &c. τω, &c. ιέναι.	OPTAT. CONJ. INFIN
										ĭω, &c.	CONJ.
											INFIN.
						verbs).	the part. aor. 2. in other	on the last syllable like	(always with the accent	ίων, ἰοῦσα, ἰόν	PART.

ĭημι) makes the imperat. ἴεσο §, &c. Verbal adj. irós, iréos, or irηrós, irηréos ||. The Midd. (with the meaning of to hasten) is likewise used in pres. and imperf. ieµu, iéµnv, and (like ieµu from

dual, a circumstance which otherwise occurs only in the passive formation. Compare in Εἰμί—ἔστων, and Elmsley on Markland's Iphig. Τ. Homer has also είσθα, II. κ, 450.
 Instead of ἔτωσαν Æschyl. Eumen. 32. has ἔτων, the same as the

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

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

ίτητέον. Perhaps the only instance of ίτός is έξιτόν έστι, Hes. 0, 732. || The longer form is merely a lengthening of the shorter one by a repetition of the reduplication, like ἔτυμος, ἐτήτυμος. In the sim-For ithtos see the compounds (cigithtos, arekithtos) in the lexicons. ple verb the above verbals cannot well occur except in the neuter, iréov,

[The middle voice of this verb is entirely rejected by some modern critics, as Elmsl. Soph. Œd. T. 1242. and L. Dindorf, Eurip. Supp. 699... who instead of it write ἴεμαι, ἵενται, &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 epyopai which are not much in use.

Homer has an infin. "uev, and sometimes "uevai, for lévai: but elvaifor léval is doubtful, as προσείναι in Hes. ε, 351. may come from εἰμί I amt. The 3. sing. opt. ein for iou occurs in Il. w, 139. Od. \(\xi, 496. \) The conj. eiw for iw is quoted from the Doric writer Sophron in the Etym. M. p. 121, 29. and 423, 23. Homer has contracted the Ionic imperf. ηια, 3. sing. ηιεν, ηιε, to ηε, II., and in 1. plur. to ηομεν, Od.: beside which we find the 3. plur. nov in the Od., the 3. sing. iev, ie, the 3. dual "την, and the 3. plur. "iσαν, which, though imperfects, have also the force of aorists. Lastly we find in the Epic poets a fut. midd. elooμαι; and from the aor. midd. εἰσάμην a 3. sing. εἴσατο, ἐείσατο, and a 3. dual ἐεισάσθην, Il. o, 415. 544.‡. A peculiar form, the 3. plur. pres. lot for lage, is found in Theogn. 716.

· Είπειν, to say, an aorist: indic. είπον; imperat. είπέδ, compound $\pi \rho \acute{o} \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon$, &c. Beside these the forms of the aor. 1. εἶπα were also in use; in the Attic language the most common were $\epsilon i\pi ac$, $\epsilon' i\pi a\tau \epsilon$, $\epsilon i\pi a\tau \omega$, but these were constantly exchanged for the forms with the ϵ , so that after all the speaker appears to have been generally guided by his ear. The most unusual are the 1. sing. $\epsilon i\pi a \parallel$, which is rather

* See these exceptions in Herm. de Æschyl. Danaïd. p. 8.

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

I I deduce διαειμένος (Apollon. Rhod. 2, 372.) rather from elui, leuai, than from δάημι. A perfect είμαι from that verb is not more surprising than εἴσατο, κατα-είσατο, according to which it is formed.

§ On the accentuation of this imperat. see the second note under Ερχομαι. It is used also for εἴπετε, like ἄγε, particularly by Aristoph. see Elmsl. Ach. 328. Reisig Conj. p. 35. Demosth. Phil. 1. p. 43, 7.

Coherson. p. 108, 13. \parallel Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 8. $\circ \tilde{v}\tau'$ $\epsilon \tilde{\iota}\pi a$ $\circ \tilde{v}\tau'$ $\epsilon \tilde{\tau} o i \eta \sigma a$: the use of the aor. 1. is here evidently intentional. "Edetza $\kappa a \tilde{\iota} - \epsilon \tilde{\iota}\pi a$, Demosth. c. Euerg. p. 1151. Bekk. and Philem. Inc. 51. a. Eurip. Cycl. 101.

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

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

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

With this aorist εἰπεῖν usage has joined, so as to form but one verb, the Ion. fut. ἐρέω, Att. ἐρῶ, from the pres. εἴρω, which in the sense of I say is Epic; also the perf. εἴρηκα, perf. pass. εἴρημαι; and lastly the aor. pass. ἐρρήθην, pronounced also ἐρράθην, but probably by those only who were not Attics. Verbal adj. ρητός, ρητέος. The fut. 3. (paulo-post fut.) εἰρήσομαι, from εἴρημαι, is used as a simple fut. pass. instead of ρηθήσομαι, which is found but seldom in Attic writers (Isocr. Philipp. init.).

The pres. είρω occurs in Od. λ, 137.: and thence undoubtedly comes

^{*} In Plat. Soph. p. 240. d. $\epsilon i\pi \alpha \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ has been restored from the best manuscripts. So has also $\epsilon i\pi \alpha \iota \epsilon \nu$ in Demosth. c. Nicostr. p. 1254. This opt. is more frequent in Aristotle. There is also an instance of $\epsilon i\pi \epsilon \iota \epsilon$.

[†] See Buttm. Lexil. p. 131. The occurrence of enouge (e. g. in Nicand.Ther. 738.) shows only the usage of a late grammarian-poet.

[†] This form is found written in various ways in the manuscript copies of the older writers: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 447. Bekker ad Æschin. 2, 34. 124. But the best manuscripts have it not unfrequently in its regular shape; see Plat. Gorg. 36. Theæt. 65.

[§] This fut. appears to have been used only in its participle. Thuc. 8, 66. Plat. Phædr. 9.

the fut. $\epsilon\rho\hat{\omega}$. But the aor. pass. $\epsilon\hat{\rho}\hat{\rho}\hat{\eta}\theta\eta\nu$ points to a theme PEO, to which we may refer the perf. $\epsilon\hat{i}\rho\eta\kappa\alpha$ also, on account of the syllable $\epsilon\iota$ which stands instead of the reduplication*. The Ionians and the common prose language had also $\epsilon\hat{i}\rho\hat{\eta}\theta\eta\nu$ or $\epsilon\hat{i}\rho\hat{\epsilon}\theta\eta\nu$ (see Schweigh. Lex. Herod. in $\hat{\rho}\hat{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$), in the same way as from $\epsilon\hat{i}\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\iota\epsilon\hat{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$ crept into the non-Attic aorists $\epsilon\hat{i}\lambda\hat{\eta}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, $\delta\iota\epsilon\iota\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\chi\theta\eta\nu\uparrow$.

By some $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$ also is considered a present, but in the Epic writers it is always either a future, or, if a present, it is used with the sense of to ask, instead of $\epsilon \rho \omega \mu a \iota$, which see ‡. Yet Hesiod (θ , 38.) has a verb $\epsilon \iota \rho \omega$ produced to $\epsilon \omega$, in which $\epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon \upsilon \sigma a \iota$ is the fixed traditionary reading, though the metre would admit $\epsilon \iota \rho \rho \upsilon \sigma a \iota$ quite as well.

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

The expression with κακῶs, to speak ill of, was treated in this respect as a compound, for instead of εἶπέ με κακῶs, the present was ἀγορεύει με κακῶs.

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

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

* This syllable & 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

εἴληφα from ΛΗΒΩ. See Λαμβάνω. εἴληχα from ΛΗΧΩ. See Λαγχάνω. εἴλοχα, εἴλεγμαι from λέγω.

είμαρται from μείρομαι.

† We may indeed, as many do, form $\epsilon i\rho \eta \kappa \alpha$ from $\epsilon i\rho \omega$, or even from the fut. $\dot{\epsilon}\rho \dot{\epsilon}\omega$, as a new theme by means of the augm. $\epsilon\iota$; but by the method which I have followed above, the perf. pass., the aor. pass. and the verbals $\dot{\rho}\bar{\eta}\mu\alpha$, $\dot{\rho}\eta\tau\dot{\phi}s$, all agree together; and the grand analogy of the language is in favour of this plan.

‡ Struve has pointed out two passages in Hippocrates, viz. δ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ $\delta \nu$... $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, I say, in Præcept. p. 64., and $\dot{\eta} \rho \epsilon o \nu$, they said, Epidem. 2. p. 691. If the syntax and reading of these passages are to be depended on (which I cannot take upon myself to assert positively) the two forms belong to the analogy of other Ionic presents sprung from the future, as $\mu \alpha \chi \dot{\epsilon} o - \mu \alpha t$; and $\dot{\eta} \rho \epsilon o \nu$ is then a proof that the augm. ϵt cannot be used in the way noticed in the preceding note.

noticed in the preceding note. § Not that ἀπηγόρευσα, ἀντέλεξα, could not be used, but the compounds of

είπον were far more common.

The circumflex over $\epsilon\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu^*$ 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 $\epsilon\nu\iota\psi$ the σ is dropped, as in the fut. of $\delta\iota\delta\dot{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$ and $\dot{\iota}a\lambda\dot{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$. From this future was formed again another present $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\iota}\pi\tau\omega$ in Pind. Pyth. 4, 358., which however must be distinguished from the Homeric $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\dot{\iota}\pi\tau\omega$, to revile, which see hereafter.

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

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

^{*} See Od. γ, 93. Eurip. Suppl. 435. In Hes. θ, 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.

see Beck on Apoll. 1, 1333. and 3, 917.

† The same editors have given to Apollonius 2, 1165. from some manuscripts the non-Homeric form ἐνέψω.

[!] The above observation is grounded on

the lemmata of Villoison are to be depended on) $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon$. I would not therefore recommend the adoption of this form with a view to strengthen the last syllable of the hexameter.

Εἴργω, I shut out, εἴργνυμι, I shut in, are distinguished from each other in their tenses merely by the breathing; thus, εἴρξω, εἶρξα: εἴρξω, εἶρξα. This verb, according to the analogy of verbs beginning with $\epsilon\iota$, does not take the augment, which is supplied by the accent: see Εἴκω, I yield. For εἴργαθον see ᾿Αμύνω, ἀμύναθον.

The Ionic form of this verb is ἔργω, ἔρξα, &c.*; which in the oldest language, as we shall see below, had the digamma, and consequently corresponded exactly with the same stem or root under ρέζω. The distinction of out or in is not marked in Homer by the absence or presence of the aspirate, because in that early stage of the language the word had instead of the aspirate the digamma, the loss of which was supplied in the dialects by the one or other of the breathings; in the Epic language, according to general tradition, by the lenis; consequently the sense of Od. ξ, 411. was to shut in, τας μεν (the swine) αρα ερξαν κατὰ ήθεα. Originally therefore the meaning of the verb was undefined; it meant nothing more than to separate, shut off, and the context showed whether it was in or out. But in the Ionic dialect of Herodotus the distinction is observed, e. g. 3, 136. τους Πέρσας έρξε ώς κατασκόπους ἐόντας, and no doubt from old tradition: whence the same writer has ἐρκτή for the Att. εἰρκτή, a prison. In the Attic and in the common language it was also a standing rule: see Eust. ad Od. a, 27. (p. 14, 25. Bas.), and the directions of an old grammarian in Hermann (at the end of De Em. Gr. Gr.) p. 337.†. Nor is ἀπείργειν (with the exception of $\ddot{a}\phi \epsilon \rho \kappa \tau \sigma s$ in the last note) ever found with a ϕ ; on the contrary, the compound with κατά, the most usual in the sense of to

* It is singular to find this form in Thucyd. 5, 11. where περιέρξαντες is the reading of all the known manuscripts except one which has ει; for in all the other passages of this writer we find the diphthong. We may however compare with it ἄφερρτος in Æschyl. Choeph. 444.

† This is also proved in various instances by the manuscripts: compare for example the passages in Sturz. Lex. Xenoph. and Brunck's Index to Aristophanes, as well as Andoc. 4. p. 31, 27. 32, 36. There are however manuscripts which have είργω without exception (see

Bekker on Thuc. 1, 35.): the reason of which was, that other grammarians ascribed $\epsilon^i \rho \gamma \omega$ without distinction to the Attics, but $\epsilon^i \rho \gamma \omega$ to the $\kappa o \iota \nu o \bar{\imath} s$ (see Etym. M. 377, 48.), as is indeed the case in many other words. And certainly $\check{\alpha} \phi \epsilon \rho - \kappa \tau o s$, shut out, quoted in the last note from Æschylus, leads to the same conclusion. If now we suppose (as was said before, and is certainly the more probable) that originally there was no distinction, but that one established itself by degrees, yet without ever becoming universal, all that can occur is satisfactorily explained.

shut in, is almost always written with the θ ; while in Thucyd. 1, 76., where $\kappa a r \epsilon i \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ has the general sense of to constrain, keep down by force, the τ stands without a various reading. Further, that the sense of shutting in is expressed by the pres. $\epsilon i \rho \gamma \nu \nu \mu \iota$, is evident from the grammarian above mentioned, who observes that " $\epsilon i \rho \gamma \omega$ in the present is not used;" for $\epsilon i \rho \gamma \omega$ is a very common present.

As to the digamma, the same conclusion results from the Epic augment in ἔεργον, ἐέργνυ, and again from the Epic sister-form (with its superfluous ϵ in the present) $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega$, in the same language, from which is contracted the common $\epsilon i\rho\gamma\omega^*$. The digamma is therefore very easily to be discerned in Od. & 411. Tas $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \ \tilde{a} | \rho \alpha \ \tilde{\epsilon} \rho | \xi \alpha s...,$ and in the Epic compound ἀπυέργει. The Homeric perf. pass. ἔεργμαι, 3. plur. pluperf. ἐέρχατο 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. k, 241. it is preceded by a consonant, in Il. ϵ , 89. by a shortened diphthong. These two passages belong however to the numerous instances where the digamma has disappeared from our Homer. The forms ξρχαται, ξρχατο, are much more striking, particularly in Od. 1, 221. k, 283., where they begin the verse, and where consequently a slight emendation is not to be thought of. Here then the syllable of reduplication has quite disappeared, which in cases of the true syllabic augment (as if τεύγαται were put for τετεύγαται) is never the case. Hence in the history of the digamma, and its gradual disappearance, this verb would be a remarkable feature. The form έρχαται supposes the theme έργω to have the common lenis, and is therefore a regular perfect, but without the temp. augm.: and this too contrary to Epic usage, but as it occurs in a syllable long by position it is free from suspiciont.

Είρύω. See Έρύω. Είρω. See Είπεῖν.

Εἴρω, I string in a row: aor. 1. εἶρα (Herodot. 3, 87. ἐξείραs, exserens) and ἔρσα (Hippocr. de Morb. 2, 33. διέρσαs). Perf. pass. in the Epic poets ἔερμαι, ἐερμένοs; in Herodot. 4, 190. ἐρμένοs. In the former the digamma is not obliterated, for in the only two passages where the pluperf. ἔερτο, and the perf. ἐερμένον occur, (Od. o, 460. σ, 296.) it is pre-

it not before the first ε; compare Il. β, 825. ἐντὸς ἐέργει. Bentley's emendation of this passage is therefore, certainly correct, μ' ἐέργουσι.

† The augment is occasionally omitted in syllables naturally long, as εντυε, ελκε, ελπετο, ἄογε, ἄπτετο.

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

ceded by the separable ν . In Herodotus on the contrary we find the common form, but with the temp. augm. omitted, as is always the case in the Ionic dialect. Suidas quotes from some writer $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\rho\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nuos~\pi\dot{\epsilon}\delta\alpha\iota s$, consequently with the augm. $\epsilon\iota$; although it may be taken for the unchanged diphthong of the present, as in the verbal subst. $\epsilon i\rho\mu\delta s$, on the aspirate of which see Buttm. Lexil. p. 300. For $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\delta}\epsilon\rho\sigma\epsilon$ see "E $\rho\sigma\alpha\iota$.

Εἴσα. See ἙΩ, 2.
'Εἰσκω. See Ἰσκω.
Εἴωθα. See ἴΕθω.
'ΕΛ-. See Αἰρέω.
'ΕΛ-. See Εἴλω.

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

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

In Od. η , 86. is a 3. plur. pluperf. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}a\tau o$, for which Wolf writes $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\eta\rho\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\partial\tau o$, the reading of the old editions. This latter has however by far the fewest manuscripts in its favour, and it seems to me clear that the true reading must be some form of $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda a\dot{\nu}\nu\omega$, as the expression is much the same as we find in v. 113. in Il. σ , 564. and Od. ζ , 9. But the reading $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\dot{a}\dot{\epsilon}a\tau o$ is likewise found in very few manuscripts, while by far the majority has $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}a\tau o$, and some $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\dot{\epsilon}a\tau o$. This last has been adopted by Alter; and when we consider that it is the regular Ionic form, according to the analogy of $\pi\epsilon\pi\tau\dot{\epsilon}a\tau a$ for $-a\nu\tau a\iota$, 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 έληλάμενος, συνεληλάμενοι, Arat. 176., like ἀκηχέμενος (II. σ, 29.), ἀκαχήμενος, and ἀλαλήμενος. See Herodian in Etym. M. v. ἀκαχήμενος and Thom. Mag. v. ἐληλάμενος. In Apollon. 2, 231. the modern editors have altered this accent, because it was not supported by a scholium, like the passage in Aratus. See note under ἀκαχίζω.

Έλδομαι and ἐέλδομαι*, I desire; a defective depon. used only in pres. and imperf. It is found once in a passive sense, Il. π , 494.

Both forms are exclusively poetical.

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

'Ελελίζω, I turn round, tremble: fut. ἐλελίζω; aor. 1. ἐλέλιζα, aor. 1. pass. ἐλελίχθην, midd. ἐλελιξάμενος, &c. 'Ελέλικτο (Il. λ, 39.) is a syncopated aorist. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 287.

ΕΛΕΥΘ-, ΕΛΘ-. See "Ερχομαι.

'Ελίσσω, -ττω, I wind: augm. ει†; perf. pass. εἴλιγμαι and ἐλήλιγμαι. In this last perf. three things are to be observed: 1.) that the simple augm. εἴλιγμαι was also in use: 2.) that the augm. ει does not take place with the reduplication: 3.) that the syllable of reduplication does not admit of the aspirate‡.

"Ελκω, I draw: fut. ἕλξω; aor. 1. εἶλξα. It borrows also from a theme ἙΛΚΥΩ, which is not used in the pres. or imperf., and even in the fut. ἕλξω is preferred: see Piers. ad Moer. p. 134. But in the aor. εἴλκὕσα, ἐλκύσαι is far more common than εἶλξα, and in the passive εἵλκυσμαι, εἰλκύσθην are the only forms in use.—ΜΙDD.

The regular imperf. εἶλκον is never found in Hom. nor in Ionic prose, but always ἕλκον, ἕλκετο. The particular inflexion ελκήσω, ἥλκησα (with η as augment), ελκηθείs, has in Homer the stronger meaning of to

drag along.

"Ελπω, I encourage to hope: Od. β , 91. γ , 380. But it is generally used in the midd. ἔλπομαι, I hope; perf. ἔολπα with the force of the pres.; pluperf. ἐώλπειν with the force of an imperfect: see ἔοικα and note under Εἴκω; also the second note under "Αγνυμι, and a note in Buttm. Lexil. p. 202. The Epic forms are ἐέλπομαι and ἐελπόμην: see "Ελδομαι and note.

* Like ἐέλπομαι, ἐέργω, ἐειδόμενος, ἐἐσκω, 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 Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 30.

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

Έλύω. See Εἰλύω.

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

[Æschylus has the fut. midd. ἐμοῦμαι in the sense of to vomit, while Xenoph. (Anab. 4, 8, 20.) has the imperf. act. in the same intrans. sense.]

Έμνήμυκε. See Ἡμύω.

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

Έναύω. See Αύω.

ENEΓK-, ENEIK-. See Φέρω.

Ένέπω. See Εἰπεῖν.

Ένήνοθα, a perf. with the force of a present, found in the Epic writers in composition only, and in the third person; used at the same time as a corist: thus $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\nu\dot{\eta}\nu o\theta\epsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\dot{\eta}\nu o\theta\epsilon$, it lies or it lay thereon. As a theme we must suppose ENΘΩ, ENEΘΩ: see this more fully explained in Buttm. Lexil. p. 110. &c.

Ένθεῖν, ηνθον. See "Ερχομαι.

'Ενίπτω, I reproach, has in Homer two forms of the aor. 2., viz. 1.) ἐνένιπτον, for which two false readings ἐνένιπτον and (II. ψ , 473.) ἐνένισπον have crept into the printed text of Homer, as I have shown in Buttm. Lexil. p. 123. &c. This form is the reduplicated aor. 2. with the radical vowel long, which we know from the subst. ἐνῖπή was long in the root also. 2.) the 3. sing. ἢνίπᾶπε, formed by a peculiar reduplication in the middle of the word, like ἢρύκακον, infin. ἐρυκακέειν from ἐρύκω.

Homer has another sister-form $\epsilon \nu i \sigma \sigma \omega$, which bears the same relation to $\epsilon \nu i \pi \tau \omega$ as $\pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega$ to $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega$. 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; they must therefore be distinguished from $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \pi \omega$, $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega$, and the Pindaric $\epsilon \nu i \pi \tau \omega$ (see under $\epsilon \nu \epsilon \omega$); while the long ϵ above mentioned makes it most probable that they belong to a particular family of verbs, of which a more accurate examination will be found in Buttm. Lexil. p. 123. &c.

"Εννῦμι, or ἐννῦω, I put on, clothe, forms its tenses from a theme ΈΩ; thus fut. ἔσω, Ep. ἔσσω; aor. 1. ἔσσα, infin. ἔσαι; fut. midd. ἔσομαι; aor. 1. midd. ἐσσάμην; perf. pass. εἶμαι, εἶσαι, εἶται, &c., whence 3. pl. pluperf. εῖατο (Il. σ , 596.), comp. ἐπιεῖμαι, ἐπιειμένοs. From the pass.

ἔσμαι, ἔσμην, (which never occurs in its simple form in the first person,) come the 2. and 3. sing. of the pluperf. ἔσσο, ἔστο, and the compound ημφίεσμαι, &c. The forms with the syllabic augment (which takes the aspirate), ἐέσσατο (Il. κ, 23., Od. ξ, 519.) and ἕεστο (Il. μ, 464.), are Epic only.

The Ionics have another form $\epsilon \tilde{i}\nu\nu\mu\iota$; for $\epsilon \pi\epsilon i\nu\nu\sigma\theta a\iota$ in Herodotus proves that the $\epsilon\iota$ in the Homeric $\epsilon \tilde{i}\nu\nu\nu\nu$ (II. ψ , 135.) is not the augment. The temp. augm. is found neither in the imperf. nor the aorist: the perf. only has the augment $\epsilon\iota$. 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 ἔννυμι is never used in prose, but principally the compound ἀμφιέννυμι, which makes its fut. ἀμφιέσω, Att. ἀμφιώ; fut. midd. ἀμφιέσομαι; and takes the augment in the preposition, ἢμφίεσα, infin. ἀμφιέσαι, pass. ἢμφίεσμαι, ἢμφίεσαι, ἡμφίεσται, &c. infin. ἢμφιέσθαι. Nor do the other compounds generally reject the vowel of the preposition before the ε, as ἐπιέσασθαι.

Έόλει, ἐόλημαι. See under Είλω.

Έορτάζω, I celebrate, solemnize: fut. ἐορτάσω; it takes the augm. in the second syllable ἐώρταζον, according to the analogy of ἔοικα, ἐψκεψ. See Είλω and note.

'Επαίω, Herodot. 3, 29. See 'Αίω. 'Επαυρεῖν, &c. See ΑΥΡ-.

'Επείγω, I press; pass. I hasten. For proof that this verb is no compound, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 118.

Έπίσταμαι, I understand, depon. pass. with fut. midd.; imperf. ηπιστάμην: fut. ἐπιστήσομαι; aor. ηπιστήθην; verbal adj. ἐπιστητός. In the optat. the accent sometimes follows the regular conjugation of barytone verbs, e. g. ἴσταιο, ἵσταιτο, ἵσταισθε, ἵσταιντο; but the conj. is always ἰστώμαι, συνιστήται, &c.*. See Δύναμαι with note, and Ἱστημι.

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

Instead of the 2. sing. ἐπίστασαι the Attic poets have ἐπίστα (Æsch. Eum. 86.578.), the Ionics ἐπίστη (Theogn. 1043. or 1085. Bekk. 1081.)

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

Gaisf. Sce Buttm. on Soph. Phil. 798. The usual form in the imperf. is $\eta\pi i\sigma\tau\omega$ and in the imperat. $\epsilon\pi i\sigma\tau\omega$, e. g. Xen. Mem. 3, 4, 9. Cyr. 3, 2, 16. See Moer. 163. 182. Homer has the imperf. without the augm. $\epsilon\pi i\sigma\tau\alpha\tau$. The pres. and imperf. are conjugated like $i\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$.

ΈΠΩ, ένέπω. See Εἰπεῖν.

"Επω, I am employed or busy about anything: imperf. εἶπον, Poet. without augm. ἔπον; fut, ἔψω; aor. ἔσπον, infin. σπεῖν, part. σπών; compound ἐπέσπον, ἐπισπεῖν, μετασπών. The augment is ει, as περιεῖπεν, Xen. Mem. 2, 9, 5. This verb in its simple form is found only in Il. ζ, 321.*, but its compounds are used both in verse and in prose, περιέπω, διέπω, &c.

These agrists seldom occur except in poetry: though Ionic prose has frequently $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon$, Herod. 1, 73., $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$ ib. 115., and the passive of the same compound $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\phi\theta\hat{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$, 5, 1. 6, 15., and $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\dot{\epsilon}\psi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ for $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\phi\theta\hat{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, 2, 115. 7, 119.

Midd. ἕπομαι, I follow: imperf. εἰπόμην, and Poet. without augm. ἐπόμην; fut. ἔψομαι, infin. ἔψεσθαι. The aorist has this peculiarity that the augment is aspirated, ἐσπόμην, comp. ἐφεσπόμην (ἔσπου Plat. Polit. p. 280. b., ἐφέσπετο Eurip. Hipp. 1307.)†, and as a proof that it is merely the augm. it disappears in the other moods: infin. σπέσθαι, imperat. σποῦ, ἐπίσπου Plat. Theæt. p. 169. a., ἐπίσπεσθε Plat. Crit. p. 107. b. &c. The Ion. imperat. 2. pers. is σπέο, Ερ. σπεῖο, Il. κ, 285.

If $\epsilon\sigma\pi\rho\nu$ $\sigma\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\sigma\chi\rho\nu$ $\sigma\chi\epsilon\bar{\imath}\nu$ be compared with $\epsilon\pi\lambda\epsilon$ $\epsilon\pi\lambda\epsilon\tau\rho$ and $\epsilon\pi\tau\rho\mu\nu$ $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, we see at once that the former arise from the same syncope as the latter. That is to say, the aspirate in $\epsilon\pi\omega$ and $\epsilon\chi\Omega$ ($\epsilon\xi\omega$) passed (as it does in so many other words) into a ϵ , which immediately attached itself to the consonants following, therefore $\epsilon\tau\sigma\nu$, $\epsilon\tau\sigma\nu$. This statement does not however militate against the insertion of a $\epsilon\tau$ according to another analogy in the root $\epsilon\tau$, and thus $\epsilon\tau$ and $\epsilon\tau$, $\epsilon\tau$ are $\epsilon\tau$ and $\epsilon\tau$ and $\epsilon\tau$ are $\epsilon\tau$ and $\epsilon\tau$ are $\epsilon\tau$ and $\epsilon\tau$ are $\epsilon\tau$ and $\epsilon\tau$

^{* [}Yet Homer has frequently περὶ τεύχε' επουσιν, e. g. in II. 0, 555. ἀμφ' 'Οδυσῆα επου, II. λ, 483. and many other similar expressions, which Buttmann, it would seem, considered as compounds.—Ed.]

[†] A singular form is $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\nu\tau\sigma$ in Pind. Pyth. 4, 237. which can hardly be joined with the Pindaric forms in the note following.

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

Έράω, I love, is used only in the pres. and imperf.; having a regular passive ἐρῶμαι, ἐρᾶσθαι, ἐρῶμενος. But the sisterform ἔραμαι, like ἴσταμαι, is a deponent synonymous with the active, and in the pres. solely poetical. The aor. pass. however, ἡρᾶσθην, fut. ἐρασθήσυμαι, with an active sense, is used in prose; part. ἐρασθεία.

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

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

Έργάζομαι, I labour, work, depon. midd.: fut. ἐργάσομαι;

* 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 έσπέσθαι &c. have crept into Homer's poems by false readings, because in every instance the verse would admit δὲ σπομένοιο, ἄμα σπέσθαι &c., and that the later Epics, in whose verse this is not always the case, imitated the false reading. This view of the subject is much strength. ened by the circumstance of the compounds being invariably written in Homer ἐπισπέσθαι, μετασπόμενος &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. Isth. 4, 40.) as they are in the Alexandrine poets,

there seems to be no doubt of a twofold ancient usage: at the same time it seems hardly possible that such a distinction as that between simple and compound could have existed in Homer's language. Bekker's supposition therefore, if confined to Homer, has great probability.

† That is to say, the depon. $\mathring{e}\rho a\sigma \theta e$ is no more capable of resolution than $"\sigma \tau a\sigma \theta e$, $\mathring{\delta} \mathring{v} \nu a\sigma \theta e$ &c.; and $\mathring{e}\rho \mathring{u}\sigma \theta e$ can be only passive. The reading must therefore necessarily be $"e\eta s \tau \sigma \pi \rho \acute{v} \nu \gamma' \ \grave{e}\rho \acute{a}\sigma \sigma \sigma \theta e$. [Passow however seems to think it may be defended by supposing a theme $\mathring{e}\rho \mathring{a}-\sigma \mu a$; from which will come $\mathring{e}\rho \mathring{a}\tau a \iota$, Sappho Fr. 59. Theocr. 2, 149.]

‡ Isocr. Phil. p. 110 b. as restored by Bekker. Aristot. de Gen. Animal. 3, 1. extr.

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

"Εργω. See Είργω.

'ΕΡΓΩ and έρδω. See 'Ρέζω.

'Ερεείνω. See Ερομαι.

Έρ $\epsilon\theta\omega$, I excite, irritate, is used only in pres. and imperf., but we find in Mosch. 3, 85. the aor. with augm. $\eta\rho\epsilon\theta\sigma\nu$. Its derivative $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\theta\iota\zeta\omega$ is more used.

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

Έρείκω, I tear, break: imperf. ἤρεικον; aor. 1. ἤρειξα. Midd. I tear my clothes in pieces. Pass. I am torn or broken; perf. ἐρήριγμαι, Hippocr.

To the intransitive sense of the pass. (e.g. II. ν, 441.) belongs the Epic aor. 2. act. ἤρικον, II. ρ, 295.* Compare the last paragraph of Γηράω. Ἐρείπω, I overthrow: fut. ἐρείψω; aor. 2. ἤρίπον; aor. 1. pass. ἤρείφθην; perf. 2. with Att. reduplication ἐρήρῖπα; perf. pass. ἐρήριμ-

^{*} As this agr. 2. occurs in no other passage, it is not to be wondered at if later poets used it transitively: thus Euphor. Fr. 40. and Alex. Ætol. in Piers. ad Moer. p.

^{194.} whose admirable emendation of the whole fragment was not understood by his neglecting in this verse to change καλόν into κακόν; διὰ μὲν κακὸν ἤρικεν οὖσον.

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

In this verb as in the last the passive makes a transition to the intransitive meaning to fall over, fall down, and this, as being the immediate sense, belongs to the aor. 2. act. $\eta\rho\iota\pi\sigma\nu$, and the perf. $\epsilon\rho\eta\rho\iota\pi\alpha$ (see note under $T\epsilon\nu\chi\omega$), which however occur only in the poets*. In Pind. Ol. 2, 76. Boeckh has shown from the manuscripts and from Apollou. Synt. p. 277. that the part. aor. 2. pass. $\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\epsilon\nu\tau\iota$, not $\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\delta\nu\tau\iota$, is the true reading.

The Epic middle ἀνηρειψάμην belongs unquestionably to this verb, although in this compound its sense is somewhat different: Homer has frequently ἀνηρείψαντο, they have torn away, carried off, Il. v, 234. Od. ε, 727. &c. and Hesiod θ, 990. has ἀνερειψαμένη, having carried off.

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

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

Έρεύγω. See Έρυγγάνω.

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

* Of this agrist $\tilde{\eta}\rho\iota\pi\sigma\nu$, which is frequent in the poets, we find one instance of a transitive meaning in the latest editions of Herodot. 9, 70. But the old reading $\tilde{\eta}\rho\epsilon\iota\pi\sigma\nu$ ought not to have been changed, even though the new reading had been favoured by manuscripts. A fixed line of distinction between imperf. and agr. is not possible in these older remains of antiquity. If Herodotus had intended to use the agr., we cannot but suppose that he would have said $\tilde{\eta}\rho\epsilon\iota\psi\alpha\nu$, as he has $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\dot{\iota}\psi\alpha\iota$ at 1, 164.

† There are no grounds for the theme $\dot{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\rho\epsilon i\pi\tau\omega$ in the lexicons; nor must we be misled by the usage of this word in some later writers $(\dot{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho\epsilon(\dot{\psi}\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\pi\dot{\nu}\nu\nu))$

you have undertaken, Orph. Arg. 292.). In the old Epic usage there is nothing to lead us decidedly from $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon(\pi\omega)$. Whatever in the word $\dot{\alpha}\eta\eta\rho\epsilon\psi\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ seems opposed to the sense of $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon(\pi\omega)$ lies merely in the preposition $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}$ and the midd. voice. The idea of a $\dot{\rho}\iota\dot{\pi}\dot{\eta}$ is in $\dot{\rho}(\pi\tau\omega)$, in $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon(\pi\omega)$, and in $\dot{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho\epsilon\iota\dot{\psi}\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$. What is torn away, falls to the ground; hence the simple $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon(\pi\omega)$ and $\ddot{\eta}\rho\iota\dot{\pi}\nu$ contain in themselves this collateral meaning: if we add to this $\dot{\rho}\iota\dot{\pi}\dot{\eta}$ or tearing the sense of $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}$ in composition and the middle voice, we have $\dot{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho\epsilon\iota\dot{\nu}\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$, 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 Αἰσθάνομαι. On the other hand in the later form ἐρυθραίνω' -αίνω is a derivative termination from ἐρυθρώς, as λευκαίνω is from λευκός with the regular flexion λευκάναι &c. And the Alexandrine poets treated ἐρυθαίνω in the same way, e. g. ἐρύθηνε, Apollon. Rh. 1, 791. Compare κερδαίνω.

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

'Ερέχθω, I torment, torture; used only in pres. and imperf.

'Ερέω. See Είπεῖν and Ερομαι.

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

"EPOMAI, I ask: fut. ἐρήσομαι; aor. ἠρόμην, imper. ἐροῦ (not ἔρου), Ep. ἔρειο, opt. ἐροίμην, conj. ἔρωμαι, infin. ἐρέσθαι (not ἔρεσθαι), part. ἐρόμενος. [This aor. is in common Attic use in all its moods, and the fut. is occasionally found in the best writers, Plat. Lys. p. 207. c. 211. d. Apol. p. 29. e. Xen. Hell. 4, 5, 6. but of the infin. pres. ἔρεσθαι 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 ἐρωτάω.—Passow.] Ionic prose has on the other hand a present εἴρομαι, of which the imperf. εἰρόμην with its other moods εἴρωμαι, εἴρεσθαι, &c. are, like the above, used as aorists: fut. εἰρήσομαι.

† This way of writing it Wolf has very

properly rejected: and thence we must conclude that the Greeks expressed this lengthening of the vowel, not by merely making it long (as from $\tilde{e}\rho\iota s$ $\tilde{e}\rho\iota\tilde{o}os$), but by the accent or ictus. This however does not appear to me grounded on sufficient analogy: and it is therefore worth remarking, that the old Grammarians, according to the Scholium in Heyne, had another reading $\dot{e}\rho\iota\tilde{\chi}\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. Compare the double way of writing $\dot{\alpha}\dot{t}\delta\eta\lambda os$ and $\dot{\alpha}\dot{t}\dot{\zeta}\eta\lambda os$ in Buttm. Lexil, p. 53. &c.

^{*} I know not whether this perf. occurs in any other passage beside the fragment of Hesiodap. 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, Αὐτὸς γὰρ πάντων βασιλεύε καὶ κοίρανός ἐστιν, 'Αθανάτων τέ οἱ οὕτις ἐρήρισται κράτος ἄλλος.

We often meet with the accentuation ἔρεσθαι, which is considered as a present; but as we nowhere find an indicative ξρομαι, ξρεται, &c., this is not conceivable. Now as the manuscripts frequently give us the aoristic accentuation ἐρέσθαι, ἐπερέσθαι, there is no doubt that this alone is the true way of writing it, and that the other arose from the grammatical custom of supposing a pres. ἔρομαι. Compare ἡγρόμην in έγείρω*. This supposition was very much supported by the actual existence of the Ionic pres. eloqual, which was considered to be a mere Ion. production of the common ἔρομαι. But if we examine carefully all that is quoted on the subject and the analogy of the language, there can be no doubt of the Ion. είρομαι being the true theme, and ἐρέσθαι the regular aor. from it (compare ἀγερέσθαι), which thus takes its natural augment ήρόμην. Now when we explain the Ion. είρετο &c. to be an imperf., it is not to be denied that we look to its exterior only, as with regard to the meaning there is no room for the exercise of any grammatical acuteness; because, as we see in the syntax, all these verbs belonging to the conversational narrative of the language stand very commonly in the imperfect, as έκέλευε, ήρώτα, έννεπε, and thence also εφη. In Homer too we find εἰρομαι, εἰρεσθαι, είρωμαι &c. frequently enough; but sometimes we also meet with έρώμεθα, εροιτο, ερειο (for έρεο), ερεσθαι. Of the accentuation έρεσθαι 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 e and those with et to be in the Epic language the same, and therefore leave the accentuation of ἔρεσθαι untouched. Again at II. a, 513. ϕ , 508. we must remain in doubt between the reading of είρετο and ήρετο; the best manuscripts are in favour of the former. Of this old verb therefore common prose has retained only the historic tense, which by the quantity of the stem and by the accent was pronounced as an aor. 2., whilst the present could be dispensed with on account of έρωταν.

Later writers, mistaking the addition meaning of $\epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, have used $\epsilon \rho \eta \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, Paus. 4, 12.† The fut. in the Ion. form $\epsilon i \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ was liable to be confounded with the passive fut. $\epsilon i \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ under $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$; whence perhaps $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ was preferred.

The Ionic insertion of the ϵ in $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \sigma$ &c. is found in Homer, and in $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon \delta \mu \epsilon \tau \sigma$, Herodot. 3, 64., where those manuscripts

^{*} That the Greek Grammarians supposed $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$ to be falsely accented is clear from the Etym. M.v. $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\rho\omega$ and $\Lambda\iota\tau\tilde{\tau}\epsilon\sigma\theta a\iota$, however faulty these articles may be in other respects.

[†] In that passage however Bekker proposes instead of έρησαμένοις δε έχρησεν to read χρησαμένοις.

which give $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma$ are not deserving of attention. The Epic language had also in this formation the active $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$, Il. η , 128. Od. ϕ , 31. λ , 229. which must not be confounded with the future $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$ from $\epsilon \iota \rho \omega$, $\epsilon \iota \pi \sigma \nu$: $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$ is 1. plur. conj. pres. for $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, Il. α , 62. A lengthened present in the same language is $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu \omega$. Compare $\epsilon \iota \nu \omega$.

"Ερπω, I creep along, go along: fut. "ρψω, &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.]

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

"Ερσαι is an old aorist, of which we find in Hom. the compound ἀπό-ερσε, ἀποέρση, ἀποέρσειε with the sense of to wash away, sweep away. Il. ζ , 348. ϕ , 283. 329. The present for this may be either ἔρρω with a causative meaning, or ΕΡΔΩ; see Buttm. Lexil. p. 156. &c.

Έρυγγάνω, I eruct: fut. ἐρεύξομαι*; aor. ήρυγον.

The more simple theme $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu \gamma \omega$ does not occur in an active form; on the contrary Homer, Herodotus, and the non-Attic writers of a later period have $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu \gamma \omega \mu \omega \iota$, from which the latter formed $\eta \rho \epsilon \nu \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$. Homer has, like the Attics, $\eta \rho \nu \gamma \sigma \nu$. The meaning of this verb has modifications which may be seen in the Lexicons, in which however sufficient attention is not paid to the difference of the forms. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 63. 64.

Έρυθαίτω. See Έρεύθω.

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

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

'Ερύω and εἰρύω, I draw, a verb used only by the Ionics and Epics, has v short in the inflexion. 'Ερύω has the fut. ἐρύσω, Ερ. ἐρύσσω, but also ἐρύω, Il. λ , 454.; perf. pass. εἴρυμαι. The Poet. and Ion. εἰρύω forms εἰρύσω, &c. The Midd. passes over to the meaning of to save; see Buttm.

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

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 ϵ , viz. $\dot{\rho}\dot{\nu}o\mu\alpha\iota^*$. This verb is also used in Attic prose, and has in Attic poetry the ν always long in the inflexion, $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\bar{\nu}\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$. But in the Epic poets it is short even there, as $\dot{\rho}\dot{\nu}\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$, Il. o, 29.; hence, when the metre requires it long, this form also ought to be written by them with $\sigma\sigma$: but the printed text has generally $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}_{\rho}\dot{\nu}\dot{\nu}\sigma\alpha\tau o$, $\dot{\rho}\dot{\nu}\sigma\alpha\tau o$, even where the syllable is required to be long \dagger .

In the passive form of this verb it is sometimes difficult, particularly amidst the difference of meanings, to distinguish the tenses correctly. The perf. pass. has necessarily by virtue of the reduplication, even if it be formed from $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\nu}\omega$, the syllable ϵ_i as augment. To this tense belong, with some degree of certainty according to the sense, the forms $\dot{\epsilon}i\rho\nu\nu\tau\alpha_i$ or $\dot{\epsilon}i\rho\dot{\nu}\alpha\tau\alpha_i$, pluperf. $\dot{\epsilon}i\rho\nu\nu\tau\sigma_i$, $\dot{\epsilon}i\rho\dot{\nu}\alpha\tau\sigma_i$, Il. ξ , 75. σ , 69. σ , 654. of the ships which have been or were drawn up on land. In the passage of Od. χ , 90. it may be doubted whether $\dot{\epsilon}i\rho\dot{\nu}\tau\sigma_i$ be pluperf. or syncop. aorist \dot{z} . In either case there is this certain result, at least for the Epic language, that as the radical syllable of the syncop. aor. always corresponds with that of the perf. pass., the 1. sing. of this last tense was not formed with the σ , but with the ν long ξ .

In the sense of to save, watch over, we frequently find ξρυσθαι, ξρυτο,

* 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 6 was added after-

wards as in θέλω, έθέλω.

† Because ρῦσασθαι with υ long was usual in the Attic and common language, this quantity was supposed to be the ground of the Epic usage also, and ρὐσά- $\mu\eta\nu$ to be an Epic shortening of the syllable. Again in ἐρύσασθαι the earlier editors made a distinction between epvσασθαι, ἐρύσσασθαι, to draw, and ἐρῦσασθαι to save. See Buttm. Lexil. The justice of the conclusions which I have drawn both there and here is evident; and there is but one alternative, either to suppose with me a radical shortness through all the meanings, and to write the lengthened syllable in all instances with oo, or to explain ρυσάμην to be a corruption (see Spitzner's Prosody, p. 68.), a mode of proceeding which the moderate critic will never wish to encourage. That the difference of quantity might have in time produced a difference of meaning is certain; and Attic usage shows it to have done so: but that it was not so at an earlier period

is proved by the verbals $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$, $\hat{\epsilon}\rho\tilde{\nu}\sigma\dot{\epsilon}$ - $\pi\tau o\lambda \epsilon s$, &c. having the meaning of to protect, while $\dot{\rho}\bar{\nu}\tau\dot{\eta}\rho$, $\dot{\rho}\bar{\nu}\mu\dot{\phi}s$, &c. have the meaning of to draw. That the Epic language belongs to that period is in itself probable; the above-mentioned $\dot{\rho}\check{\nu}\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$

gives it critical certainty.

‡ The passage runs thus, 'Αμφίνομος δ' 'Οδυσῆος ἐείσατο κυδαλίμοιο 'Αντίος ἀξάς, εξρυτο δὲ φάσγανον ὁξὺ, Εἴ πώς οἱ εἴξειε θυράων. Here εἴρυτο appears to stand in exactly the same situation as at Od. χ, 79. εἰρὐσσατο φάσγανον ὁξὺ. But we may understand the times of the action thus, "he rushed on Ulysses with the sword which he had draum," and then εἴρυτο is the pluperf. of the same middle of which εἰρὑσσατο is the aorist. If the poet had wished to use the aor., he might have said εἰρὑσσατο δὲ ξίφος ὀξὑ, as indeed he has done at δ, 530. If this argument be not conclusive, it will at least show that this is a solitary instance of the syncop. aor. εἴρυτο as a middle with transitive sense for εἰρὑσσατο, whereas all other instances of those syncop. aorists have a completely passive meaning.

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

είρυτο, &c. with ν 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 είρυτο, ἔρυτο, 2. pers. ἔρυσο are plainly imperf., Il. ω , 499. δ , 138. ν , 555. χ , 507. in all which instances the sense is thou didst protect, he protected, exactly corresponding with the undoubted imperf. in Il. ζ, 403. οἷος γαρ έρύετο "Ιλιον" Εκτωρ. In the same way εἴρυντο, ρύατο are used of protecting bolts, walls, guards, Il. μ, 454. σ, 515. Od. ρ, 201.: and a similar meaning of duration is always found in the infin. είρυσθαι, έρυσθαι, ρύσθαι, e.g. Od. γ, 268. ι, 194. Il. o, 141. It is clear therefore that all these forms belong to the syncope of the pres. and imperf.—εἰρύετο εἴρυτο, ἐρύεσθαι ἔρυσθαι. Nay, the indicative itself is used, not only by Apollon. 2, 1208. ἔρῦται, he watches over, but by Homer also, in as much as the 3. plur. εἰρύαται in the passages of Il. a, 239. Od. π, 463. stands in the sense of to watch over, observe, and consequently as it cannot in accordance with the above-quoted passages be explained from the meaning of the perfect, it can be only a present.

There remain some passages in which the sense of the aor. appears to suit better than that of the imperf., as $\xi\rho\nu\tau\sigma$, II. ϵ , 23. and 538. $\xi\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\nu\tau\sigma$ (lyric), Soph. Œd. 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 $\gamma \acute{e}\nu o\mu a\iota$ and in Buttm. Lexil. p. 305. that in the Epic language the future of $\acute{e}\rho \acute{\nu}\omega$ becomes $\acute{e}\rho \acute{\nu}\omega$ again*. We must consider in the same light the middle $\acute{e}\rho \acute{\nu}e\sigma\theta a\iota$, Il. ξ , 422. ι , 248. ν , 195.; for Homer when speaking of a hope or intention to do some certain thing, never puts the verb following in the present, but always in the fut. or aor.; as we may see by comparing Il. σ , 174. χ , 351. where in a similar combination and meaning we find as in other cases the aor. $\acute{e}\rho \acute{\nu}\sigma a\sigma\theta a\iota$.

There are still two other Hesiodic forms to be mentioned: 1.) ε, 816. infin. εἰρύμεναι with ν short, for ἐρύειν, to draw; therefore exactly analogous to the formation in μι, like δεικνύμεναι for δεικνύναι. 2.) θ,

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

* Some similar futures of verbs in $-\epsilon \omega$ and $-\epsilon \omega$ will be found in the last note

under $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \omega$, with which these Epic futures in $-\dot{\nu}\omega$ correspond exactly; thus $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \omega$, fut. $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \omega \omega$, and dropping the σ , $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \omega \omega - \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\nu} \omega \sigma \omega$, Il. λ , 454. $\tau a \nu \dot{\nu} \alpha \nu \sigma$, Od. ϕ , 174. Compare also $\sigma \dot{\omega} \omega$ under $\Sigma \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \omega$.

304. $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\nu\tau\sigma$ likewise with ν short, and with a passive sense, was watched, guarded.

"Ερχομαι, I go, borrows from ΕΛΕΥΘΩ its fut. ἐλεύσομαι, its aor. Ep. ἤλυθον, Att. ἦλθον* (from which all the other moods are formed, imperat. ἐλθέ†, inf. ἐλθεῖν, part. ἐλθών), its perf. ἐλήλὕθα; and verbal adj. ἐλευστέος (μετελευστέος).

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

The Dor. ηνθον, ένθειν for ηλθον, έλθειν is analogous to βέντιστος,

φίντατος for βέλτιστος, φίλτατος.

It has been mentioned under εἶμι, I go, that in usage it is connected with this verb. That is to say, instead of the collateral moods of the pres. of ἔρχομαι those of εἶμι are generally used; instead of the imperf. ἢρχόμην the imperf. ἢειν or ἦα; and instead of the fut. ἐλεύσομαι the indicat. pres. εἶμι: 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. ἔρχομαι, imper. ἴθι, conj. ἴω, opt. ἴοιμι, infin. ἰέναι, part. ἰών. Imperf. ἤειν or ἦα; perf. and pluperf. ἐλήλυθα, ἐληλύθειν; aor. ἦλθον, ἐλθέ, &c.; fut. εἶμι, of which the other moods will be found under that verb.

nothing more than the proper sound of this perfect, which without the Attic reduplication would be $\tilde{\eta}\lambda\omega\theta\alpha$, the ov being the analogous change from the ϵv which we see in $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\dot{\nu}\sigma\rho\mu\alpha$. The supposed perfect $\tilde{\eta}\lambda\nu\theta\alpha$ would therefore be contrary to analogy, and there can be no reason for introducing it into Hes. θ , 660. where the aor. is quite as good: the reading therefore of the old editions and of Gaisford's two manuscripts (Barocc. Medic.) should be restored to the text, $\dot{\eta}\lambda\dot{\nu}\theta\rho\mu\epsilon\nu$.

^{*} This distinction of $\eta \lambda \nu \theta o \nu$ and $\eta \lambda \theta o \nu$ into Ep. and Att, is not quite accurate, as Homer has both forms; so has Pindar; but afterwards the latter became the one in general use.

[†] The 2. sing. imperat. act. of five verbs is an exception to the general analogy of accentuation; thus, $\epsilon i\pi\dot{\epsilon}$, $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\dot{\epsilon}$, $\epsilon\dot{\nu}\rho\dot{\epsilon}$ in the common, and $\lambda\alpha\beta\dot{\epsilon}$, $i\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ in the Attic language.

[‡] In this word the first production only is pure Epic, as in έμνημυκε. The ov is

It is evident that the forms of $\epsilon l \mu \iota$ were preferred on account of their slightness (particularly in their numerous compounds) to the corresponding heavy-sounding forms of $\epsilon \rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon l \nu$, in addition to which there was the ambiguity of $l \rho \chi \epsilon \mu \nu$. Still however the latter were never entirely obsolete, but always introduced where they contributed to the perspicuity or fullness of the sentence. Thus we find $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \iota \eta \rho \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma$, Aristoph. Thesm. 504. $l \rho \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma$, Arat. 102, 118. $l \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$, Soph. Ed. C. 1206. &c. See Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 210., Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 37. 38.

To this mixture of forms we must add, in adapting it to the custom of other languages, a mixture of the meanings go and come. The forms of $\hat{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\imath}\nu$ have a decided preference for the meaning come, so that $\hat{\eta}\lambda\theta\hat{\epsilon}\nu$ for instance very seldom occurs in the sense of going, going away*; and those of $\hat{\epsilon}\hat{\imath}\mu$ are as seldom found in the sense of come†. But $\hat{\epsilon}\rho\chi\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\hat{\iota}$ 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‡.

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

* Instances of this meaning are the following; μη ελθης, do not go (away), Soph. Phil. 1182. εἰ ελθοι τις, Xen. Anab. 7, 8, 9. although this may be interpreted as a coming to the distant place: συμβουλεύει ελθόντι εἰς Δελφούς ἀνακοινῶσαι, 3, 1, 5. that is ἰέναι εἰς Δ., καὶ ἐλθόντα ἀνακοινῶσαι.

† They principally occur only where the immediate context expresses a coming, as $\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\rho\nu$ ($\tau\epsilon$, or oùr $\tilde{\eta}\tau\epsilon$ els $\tau\hat{\eta}\nu\delta\epsilon$ $\tau\hat{\eta}\nu$ $\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\nu$, Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 6. or in an antithesis as $l\acute{o}\nu\tau\epsilon$ s $\kappa\vec{\alpha}$ $l\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omega}\rho\tau\epsilon$ s.

† 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is both, as the particular relation come is announced by the context. The Aorist $\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\sigma\nu$, as expressing the moment when the action is com-

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; elou means he will go, and for he will come, the Greek language has recourse to the verb ήκω, I come, (i. e. I am arrived, I am there); therefore "¿ξει, he will come. In the compounds these distinctions generally disappear, because the point or place of arrival is expressed by the preposition; προσέρχεσθαι in all its tenses gives the idea of coming to us; its contrary απέρχεσθαι never has that sense: απηλθον expresses a point of time quite as well as $\tilde{\eta}\lambda\theta\sigma\nu$, but it is always the moment of departure, consequently never a coming or arrival. What I have said may suffice to give a general idea of this subject; particulars and exceptions will be seen by individual observation.

ring in Herodot. 6, 112., but found also, and with the augm. $\eta \sigma \theta \eta \mu \acute{e} \nu \sigma s$, in Eurip. Hel. 1555. We meet with $\eta \sigma \theta \eta \tau \sigma$ also in the sense of was clad in, had on, in Ælian. V. H. 12, 32. 13, 1. For some other instances from the later writers see Stephan. Thesaur.

Έσθίω, I eat, has from the old έδω a fut. έδομαι or έδοῦμαι and less frequently έδέσω; perf. 2. έδήδοκα; perf. pass. έδήδεσμαι; aor. pass. ήδέσθην; verbal adj. έδεστός, έδεστέον, Plat. Crito p. 47. b. Aor. act. ἔφαγον, infin. φαγεῖν.

The poets had also a shorter form $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \omega$; whence $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \sigma \sigma_i$, II. ω , 415. $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \omega \nu$, 476. which was used on account of the metre even by Attic poets; see the passages quoted from some Comic writers in Athen. 7. p. 277. f., 13. p. 596. b., 14. p. 645. a. The radical form $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \omega$ was also frequently used by the Epics and even by Hippocrates De Vet. Med. 9. $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \pi i \nu \omega \nu$. The infin. of this verb is by the Epics syncopated $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha i$; and from an old perf. act. $\tilde{\epsilon} \tilde{\epsilon} \delta \eta \delta \alpha$ they have the particip. $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta i \delta \omega s$; they use also an imperf. $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \sigma \kappa \sigma \nu$. The perf. 2. (with its change of vowel ϵ to 0) was $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta i \eta \delta \sigma \kappa \alpha$, which change was by the Epics transferred to the perf. pass., consequently instead of the usual $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta i \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha i$ they have $\tilde{\epsilon} \delta i \eta \delta \sigma \sigma \alpha i$, Od. χ , 56. See Buttm. Lexil. pp. 137–140.

From ΦΑΓΩ, which is not in use, the LXX frequently formed a fut. φάγομαι, 2. pers. φάγεσαι, analogous to ἔδομαι*.

"Εσπετε, εσπον, εσπόμην. See Είπειν and "Επω.

Έστιάω, I receive as a guest, entertain at my table. The augm. is ει. [Pass. with fut. midd. (Plato de Repub. 1. p. 345. c.), I am a guest, feast upon (anything, τινί), Lycophr. 1411. Casaub. Athen. 7. 1.—Passow.]

Ευαδε. See 'Ανδάνω.

Εύδω, καθεύδω, I sleep: fut. εύδήσω, καθευδήσω; imperf. with augm. εύδον, καθεύδον, but also ηύδον, καθηύδον, and ἐκάθευδον. Generally the compound is more used in prose than the simple.

The forms with ηv are more properly Attic; $\eta \delta \delta \epsilon v$, Plat. Symp. p.

^{*} We can scarcely reckon as belonging to the Greek language solitary forms from the root $\Phi A \Gamma$ — which are occasionally found in the later writers, as $\phi \dot{\alpha} \gamma o \nu \sigma \dot{\nu}$ in

the paraphrast of Dionys. de Aucupio (Schneid. Oppian. p. 179.) and φαγέσις in the false Phocylides 145.

203. b. καθηῦδον, p. 217. e. 219. c.: καθεῦδον is found in Aristoph. Eccl. 479. Av. 495.: ἐκάθευδον is used by Xenoph. and most good writers.

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

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

Εὔχομαι, I pray, depon. midd.: fut. εὕξομαι; aor. 1. πυξάμην. The augment follows the general analogy of verbs beginning with ευ; compare εὐρίσκω.

The 3. sing. syncop. aor. εὖκτο for ἠύξατο occurs in an Epic fragment in Schol. Soph. Œd. C. 1375. The pluperf. ἠύγμην is in Soph. Tr. 610.

Eνω, I singe, roast: fut. ενσω, Ion. ενω†; aor. 1. ενσα, Hom. In prose generally ἀφενω, ἀφενσα, and ἡφευμένος, Æschyl. ap. Athen. 9. p. 375. e.

In the dialects we find also $\dot{a}\phi u\dot{\nu}\omega$. In Aristophanes the reading is uncertain, but the better authorities are in favour of $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\dot{\nu}\epsilon\iota\nu$. So we have $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\dot{\nu}\sigma a$ in Simon. Fr. 136. and $\dot{a}\phi\epsilon\dot{\nu}\sigma a\iota s$ in Nicand. ap. Athen. 2. p. 61. a. The pronunciation with the lenis $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\nu}\omega$ and $a\dot{\nu}\omega$ is known from single forms and derivations, among which are $\dot{a}\pi\epsilon u\dot{\eta}\kappa a\sigma\iota\nu$ (Hesych.) in the sense of I dry up, $a\dot{\nu}a\dot{\iota}\nu\omega$, I dry, &c. But the forms which belong here must not be confounded with $a\dot{\nu}\omega$, I kindle (see that verb), as the radical idea is essentially different.

Έχθω, I hate, used only in pres. and by the poets; hence $\mathring{a}\pi\epsilon\chi\theta\mathring{a}\nu\rho\mu a\iota$, I am hateful; fut. $\mathring{a}\pi\epsilon\chi\theta\mathring{n}\sigma\rho\mu a\iota$. The aor. $\mathring{n}\chi\theta\acute{o}-$

Fr. 296. Soph. Aj. 459. Phil. 510. Eurip. Med. 118. Androm. 212. but the pass. ἔχθομαι is more common.—Passow.]

^{*} For the accentuation of this imperat. see the second note under $E\rho\chi o\mu\alpha\iota$. + See the last note under $E\rho\nu\iota\omega$.

^{‡ [}The active voice is found in Æschyl.

μην is Poet., but $\mathring{a}\pi\eta\chi\theta\acute{\rho}\mu\eta\nu$ is more generally used. Perf. $\mathring{a}\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\theta\eta\mu\alpha$, I am hated. We find also a perf. $\mathring{\eta}\chi\theta\eta\mu\alpha$, part. $\mathring{\eta}\chi\theta\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ ος 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 ἀπεχθάνομαι, a present, answering to the active, ἔχθομαι, ἀπέχθομαι, of which ήχθόμην, ἀπηχθόμην would be im-Now the true relation of which we are in search must be grounded on the usage of the older writers. And first then $\alpha \pi \eta \chi \theta \delta \mu \eta r$, when standing in immediate connexion with the present, cannot be an imperfect; it can only be an aorist. Thus in Od. ξ, 366. οἶδα ὅτ' ἤχθετο πασι θεοίσιν, "that he has been hated," consequently "is hated:" the same of ἀπήχθετο, Il. ι, 300.: again, θαυμάζω ὅτι, εἰ μέν τινι ὑμῶν ἀπηχθόμην, μέμνητε.... εἰ δέ τω ἐπεκούρησα, &c. Xen. Anab. 5, 8, 25. In the same way the conj. is plainly an agrist in Il. δ, 53. Τας διαπέρσαι, όταν τοι ἀπέγθωνται περὶ κηρί, "destroy them, as soon as they have become hateful to thee." Compare also the following passages in Plato's Apologia: and first the present, p. 24. "I tell you everything without concealment, καίτοι οίδα σχεδον ότι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀπεχθάνομαι, that I make myself hateful to you by these very things." Again p. 21., Socrates relates his going round to those who appeared to be wise, and his endeayouring to convince one of them that he was not so, and then he adds, έντεῦθεν οὖν τούτω τε ἀπηχθόμην καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν παρόντων; and immediately afterwards καὶ ἐνταῦθα κάκείνω καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς ἀπηχθόμην. μετα ταυτ' οθν ήδη έφεξης ηα, αισθανόμενος μεν... ότι άπηχθανόμην, where the relative meaning of the imperfect and agrists is most evident. In Demosth. Olynth. 3, p. 34. "I say it not, "ν' ἀπέχθωμαί τισιν ὑμῶν," it evidently refers to the immediate consequences of the sentence; and just afterwards in a general sense, "for I am not so silly, ώστε ἀπεχθάνεσθαι βούλεσθαι μηδέν ὡφελεῖν νομίζων." But the passages where $\eta_{\chi}\theta\epsilon\tau_0$, $\alpha\pi\eta_{\chi}\theta\epsilon\tau_0$ have been translated as imperfects, was hated, may very well be understood, like other aorists, in the sense of the pluperf. had made himself hateful, had been hated, as Il. y, 454. Eurip. Hipp. 1402. Compare particularly Il. 4, 200. Notwithstanding this however we see the infin. $\dot{a}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\chi\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, not only in every instance as a proparoxytone, but we find expressly in Lex. Seg. 6, p. 423. 25. the gloss 'Απέχθεσθαι' λέγουσι δέ ποτε καὶ ἀπεχθάνεσθαι. Nor do I feel sufficient confidence to recommend the agristic accentuation for II. ϕ , 83. Eurip. Med. 290. Thucyd. 1, 136. Plat. Rep. 1, p. 343. e. Lys. c. Andoc. p. 108, 2.; not so much because the sense is indecisive in favour of aorist or present (it generally is so in the infinitive), but because I am waiting for manuscript examples of this accentuation*. Notwithstanding what has been said we need not be surprised at finding the indic. pres. $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\chi\theta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ in Eurip. Hipp. 1260.; (compare $\alpha i\sigma\theta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$) for it is ascertained to be a false reading for $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\alpha}\chi\theta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$: and the usage of Theocritus ($\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\chi\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, 7. 45.) is not of sufficient authority.

"Εχω†, I have, hold: fut. ἔξω with the aspirate; imperf. εἶχον‡; aor. (as from ΣΧΩ) ἔσχον, imperat. σχές (comp. παράσχες), optat. σχοίην, conj. σχῶ, σχῆς, &c., (comp. παράσχω, παράσχης &c.), infin. σχεῖν, part. σχών. Pass. and midd. ἔχομαι; imperf. εἰχόμην; fut. midd. ἔξομαι; aor. midd. ἐσχόμην§ (παράσχου, παρασχέσθαι). From the aor. σχεῖν comes a new fut. act. σχήσω ||, and fut. midd. σχήσομαι, whence perf. act. ἔσχηκα, perf. pass. ἔσχημαι, aor. pass. ἐσχέθην, verbal adj. ἑκτός and σχετός.

From the aor. $\epsilon \sigma \chi \sigma \nu$ comes also a new pres. $\epsilon \sigma \chi \omega$, 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 $\epsilon \chi \epsilon \omega$), require force and elevation. The aor. $\epsilon \sigma \chi \sigma \nu$ 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 $\epsilon \chi \omega$ has generally one of these more definite senses, whence also the aor. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \sigma \chi \sigma \nu$ &c. is found much more commonly in these than any other meanings.

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

the augm. exor.—Passow.]

§ [This aor. sometimes loses the augm. in Hom. in its 3. sing. $\sigma\chi\acute{e}\tau$ 0, II. η , 248. ϕ , 345. We find also its imperat. $\sigma\chi\acute{o}\tilde{v}$, infin. $\sigma\chi\acute{e}\sigma\theta\alpha$ 1, part. $\sigma\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu$ 0s.—Passow.] || [We find a rare form of the 2. sing.

|| [We find a rare form of the 2. sing. fut. σχήσεισθα, Francke Hymn. Cer. 366. like ἔχεισθα mentioned above.—Passow.]

^{*} Bekker has never yet found it in any manuscript. The quotation of the abovementioned verse of Eurip. in Plutarch with $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\hat{\alpha}\sigma\theta a\iota$, contains a trace of it; see Elmsley, who has written it $\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\hat{\sigma}\sigma a\iota$.

† [Theornis has for the 2. sing. $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon_{ij}\theta a\iota$.

^{† [}Theognis has for the 2. sing. εχεισθα, 1316. like σχήσεισθα below.—Passow.] ‡ [Homer has the imperf. also without

be seized, held, Od., ἔσχοντο Herodot. 1, 31., κατέσχετο Od. γ, 284. Eurip. Hipp. 27., κατασχόμενος Pind. Pyth. 1, 16. Plat. Phædr. p. 244. συσχόμενος Plat. Theæt. p. 165. b.

The way in which $\epsilon\sigma\chi\rho\nu$ comes from $\epsilon\chi\omega$ may be seen by comparing it with $\epsilon\sigma\pi\rho\nu$ from $\epsilon\pi\omega$. In $\epsilon\sigma\chi\omega$ the ϵ supplies the place of a reduplication, as we see fully exemplified in $\mu\ell\mu\nu\omega$, $\gamma\ell\gamma\nu\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ &c., where $\mu\nu$, $\gamma\nu$ are the syncopated stem of those verbs as $\sigma\chi$ is of the one before us. This ϵ would have the aspirate, as in $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$; but here again, as in $\epsilon\chi\omega$ itself, it passed on account of the χ into the lenis, a change more frequent in the older times of the language: compare $\epsilon\sigma\theta\eta$ s from $\epsilon\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$, $\epsilon\sigma\tau\rho$, $\epsilon\nu$ vestis; ϵ ϵ 0 ϵ 0 ϵ 0 and ϵ 0 ϵ 0 ϵ 0 and ϵ 0 ϵ 0 ϵ 0. Att. ϵ 0 ϵ 0 ϵ 0 ϵ 0.

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

The language of poetry has from a theme $\Sigma X E \Theta \Omega$ the forms $\xi \sigma \chi \epsilon \theta \sigma v$, $\sigma \chi \epsilon \theta \epsilon \nu \nu$, on which see $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\nu} r \omega$.

On είχεε, Herodot. 1, 118. for είχε, see εψεε under εψω, and compare ἐώθεε under ἔθω.—From the part. perf. συνοχωκότε, Il. β, 218. we may conclude that there was an old Epic part. ὄχωκα, of which the following seems to be a satisfactory explanation. The simple perfect of $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$, with the usual change of vowel, would be $\tilde{v}\chi\alpha$ (compare the subst. $\partial_{\chi} \dot{\eta}$); which reduplicated becomes, according to the common analogy, ὅκωχα. But since of two aspirates the second may be changed, it is very possible that this became ὄχωκα, particularly as such a change made the derivation from $\xi_{\chi\omega}$ more sensible to the ear. And it is clear from the Hesychian gloss συνοκώχοτε, either that the old Grammarians explained the Homeric form in this way, or that both stood side by side as old various readings. That a reduplicated form of this kind did exist is certain at all events by the subst. ὀκωχή, as all similar verbal substantives (ὀπωπή, ὀδωδή, ἐδωδή, ἀγωγή, ἀκωκή) are connected with really reduplicated forms of their respective verbs. Compare also the exactly similar formation of o'ixwka under o'ixw.

In the passage of II. μ , 340. the reading $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a i \gamma \hat{a} \rho \hat{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\omega} \chi a \tau o$ (i. e. $\pi \hat{\nu} \lambda a i$) with the explanation "were shut" has very much in its favour, both from the sense and construction as well as from the antithesis at θ , 58. $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a i \delta$ $\hat{\omega} i \gamma \nu \nu \nu \tau o \pi \hat{\nu} \lambda a i$. If with Wolf we adopt it, the only way of analogous explanation is this: 'O $\chi \epsilon \hat{\nu} s$, a bolt, has its meaning from the verb $\hat{\epsilon} \chi \omega$; and the supposition that $\hat{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\epsilon} \chi \omega \tau \hat{a} s \pi \hat{\nu} \lambda \hat{a} s$ meant to hold together, shut, is grounded on analogy, like $\hat{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \hat{a} \hat{\omega} \tau a$, $\tau \hat{\eta} \nu \gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma a \nu \hat{c}$. But as we have shown above that $\hat{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \chi a$ was the perf. act., so is $\hat{\omega} \gamma \mu a \iota$ formed as correctly as $\hat{\eta} \gamma \mu a \iota$ with $\hat{a} \gamma \hat{\eta} o \chi a$, and with

the change of vowel continuing into the passive like $\delta\omega\rho\tau o$. According to this $\epsilon\pi\omega\chi a\tau o$ is the Ion. 3. plur. of the pluperf. pass. from $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\chi\omega^*$.

The following compounds of $\xi \chi \omega$ have other peculiarities:

άνεχω. When ἀνεχεσθαι in the midd. has the sense of to bear, its imperf. and aor. have a double augm., ἢνειχόμην, ἢνεοχόμην (ἀνασχέσθαι).

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

άμπ έχω, I envelope: imperf. άμπεῖχον; fut. άμφέξω; aor. ἤμπισχον, άμπισχεῖν. ΜΙDD. άμπέχομαι or άμπισχ νοῦμαι, Ihave round me, have on me; fut. άμφέξομαι; aor. ἤμπισχόμην.

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

A present $\grave{a}\mu\pi\imath \acute{o}\chi\omega$ has also been adopted, which considered in itself, like $"o\chi\omega$ and $\~e\chi\omega$, is not only admissible, but actually does occur (see Elmsl. ad Eurip. Med. 277.). Still however $\~\eta\mu\pi\imath o\chi o\nu$, which appears so frequently in the common language, is not the imperfect of it, as $\~a\mu\pi\imath o\chi e\~a\nu$ alone would suffice to inform us. But instead of this another pres. $\~a\mu\pi\imath o\chi e\~a\omega$ has been supposed, and supported not only by the gloss $\~a\mu\pi\imath o\chi o\'au\mu e\nu o\nu$ in Hesychius, but also by the similar various reading in Aristoph. Av. 1090. That a form $\iau\chi e\~a\omega$, $\~au\mu\pi\imath o\chi e\~a\omega$ should have existed in the Attic dialect, and that $\~au\mu\pi i o\chi\omega$ and $\~au\mu\pi\imath o\chi o\~au\mu a\imath$ should have become completely confounded together, is most improbable. But in the passage of Aristophanes there is an old reading $\~au\mu\pi\imath o\chi vo\~au\alpha \imath$: it is therefore evident that $\~au\mu\pi\imath o\chi o\~au\mu a\imath$, from a mere misunderstanding of the aor. $\~au\mu\pi\imath o\chi e\~au\nu$, crept not only into some of the manuscripts of Aristophanes, but into Hesychius also, where the gloss $\~au\mu\pi\imath o\chi e\~a\nu\nu$ occurs just

^{*} The reading ἐπψχατο, from a supposed pres. ἐποίγνυμι, is quite untenable; for as the simple οἰγνύναι means to open, this compound of it cannot mean to

shut. Derived from οἴχομαι it might be in itself defensible, but in the passage in question it gives no idea recommended by its combining easily with the context.

before*. Now that $\mathring{\eta}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\sigma\nu$, $\mathring{\alpha}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$, is really an aorist, we learn from the passages of Aristoph. and the following glosses of Hesych. $\mathring{A}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\mathring{\epsilon}\alpha\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$. $\mathring{A}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\mathring{\epsilon}\alpha\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$. $\mathring{A}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\mathring{\epsilon}\alpha\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$. $\mathring{A}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$, $\mathring{\epsilon}\nu\hat{\epsilon}\alpha\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\nu$. $\mathring{A}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\nu$, $\mathring{\epsilon}\nu\hat{\epsilon}\alpha\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\nu$. $\mathring{\epsilon}\nu$ is clear that this form is not resolvable into $\mathring{\eta}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\nu$, $\mathring{\epsilon}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\nu$, but into $\mathring{\eta}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\nu$, $\mathring{\epsilon}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\imath\nu$; because instead of $\mathring{\epsilon}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\nu$ the augm. passed over to the preposition, $\mathring{\eta}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\hat{\epsilon}\nu$.

ύπισχνέομαι, I promise, Ion. (Hom. and Herod.) ὑπίσχομαι: fut. ὑποσχήσομαι; aor. ὑπεσχόμην, imperat. ὑπόσχου†; perf. ὑπέσχημαι.

Έψω, I cook: fut. ἐψήσω, &c. Verbal adj. ἐφθός, or ἐψητός, ἐψητέος. A remarkable form of the aor. is συνήψας in the comic writer Timocles ap. Athen. 9. p. 407. e.

We find in Herodotus (1, 48. 1, 118. 8, 26.) a resolution of $\epsilon\epsilon$ for ϵ in the 3. sing. imperfect of three verbs, $\epsilon\psi\epsilon\epsilon$, $\epsilon\nu\epsilon(\chi\epsilon\epsilon)$, $\omega\phi\lambda\epsilon\epsilon$, from $\epsilon\psi\omega$, $\epsilon\nu\epsilon(\chi\omega)$ and $\omega\phi\lambda\nu$, which reciprocally confirm each other. Some suppose a pres. $\epsilon\psi\epsilon\omega$ from which they may be formed, but except in $\epsilon\psi\eta\sigma\omega$, $\delta\phi\lambda\eta\sigma\omega$, there are no traces whatever of such a theme, unless we imagine something in $\epsilon\psi\epsilon\nu$, Hippocr. de Steril. 17. which to me seems to mean nothing of the kind; and in an aor. 2. (as we shall see $\omega\phi\lambda\nu$ is) a form in $\epsilon\nu$ would be quite remote from all analogy. Compare the perf. $\epsilon\omega\theta\epsilon\epsilon$ under $\epsilon\omega$.

The formation of the verbal adj. $\epsilon\phi\theta\delta s$ dates from a time when the double letters ξ and ψ were not yet introduced into the Attic writing; consequently the root of $\epsilon\psi\omega$ was then $E\Phi\Sigma$: when to this root the termination τos was added, the σ necessarily dropped out, as three consonants could not stand together, leaving $\epsilon\phi-\tau\delta s$, which by a change of the second consonant to make the root somewhat more visible, became $\epsilon\phi\theta\delta s$.

'ΕΩ, 'ΕΩ, 'ΙΩ. The first 'ΕΩ has three leading senses, which form so many verbs: 1. I send; 2. I seat; 3. I clothe. The second 'ΕΩ is the

† An imperat. pass. ὑποσχέθητι has been hitherto the reading in Plat. Phædr. p. 235. d., but there are only weak grounds for it in the manuscripts. See Bekker.

^{*} The critic must not be misled by finding the reading $\dot{\alpha}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\circ\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\circ\nu$ 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 $\dot{\alpha}\mu\pi\iota\sigma\chi\nu\circ\bar{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$, 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.

[‡] 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 $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ in Herodot. 1, 153. where $\tau \epsilon$ is injurious to the context, is a corruption of $\epsilon \pi \epsilon i \chi \epsilon \epsilon$.

root of $\epsilon i\mu i$, I am. The third, $I\Omega$ is the root of $\epsilon i\mu i$, I go. As these two last will be found in their alphabetical places, we have here to treat only of the three derivates of $E\Omega$.

1. ἵημι, I send, throw.

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

ACTIVE.

Pres. ἵημι, ἵης, ἵησι,—3. pl. (ἰέᾶσι) ἰᾶσι or ἰεῖσι. Imper. ἵει. Opt. ἰείην. Conj. ἰω̂. Infin. ἰέναι†. Part. ἰείς.

Imperf. $i\eta\nu$ and (from IEQ) $io\nu\nu$. Comp. $i\phi io\nu\nu$ or $i\phi io\nu\nu$; 3. pl. $i\phi ie\sigma a\nu$.

Fut. ήσω.

Perf. $\epsilon \tilde{l} \kappa a_{+}^{+}$ (like $\tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \kappa a$). Pluperf. $\epsilon \tilde{l} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$.

Aor. 1. ήκα, Ion. εηκα.

Aor. 2. ην, &c. (not used in sing. but its place supplied by aor. 1.), pl. εμεν, ετε, εσαν, generally with augm. εξμεν, εξτε, εξσαν (καθείμεν, ἀνεῖτε, ἀφεῖσαν §). Imper. ε΄s. Opt. εἵην; pl. εἴμεν, εἶτε, εἶεν for εἵημεν, &c. Conj. ω΄. Infin. εξναι. Part. εἵs. The compounds follow the simple, e. g. ἀφεῖναι, ἀφω, ἄφες, &c. Opt. pl. ἀνεῖμεν for ἀνείημεν, &c.

Pass. and Midd. (compare Τίθημι.)

Pres. ἵεμαι.

Perf. εἷμαι (as μεθεῖμαι, μεθεῖσθαι, μεθείσθω), &c. Διαειμένος, Apoll. Rh. 2, 372. belongs to the middle of εἶμι, ἵεμαι.

Aor. 1. pass. εθην, generally with the augm. εθην (ἀφείθην, part. ἀφεθείς, &c.; ἠφείθη, Plut. Sylla 28.).

* It may however be shortened in Att. poetry; see Lex. Seg. 6. p. 471, 10. Dobr. ad Aristoph. Plut. 75.

† [Instead of ἱέναι Homer has ἱέμεναι, Hesiod ἱέμεν: and in the imperf. Homer has ἵεν 3. plur. for ἵεσαν, Il. μ, 33.—

Passow.]

‡ For ἔωκα, ἀφέωκα, and the pass. ἀφέωνται in N. T. see the note on ἀγήοχα under ἄγω. I will mention here a trace of the same form in Herodot. 2, 165.
where the text has ἀνέονται ἐς τὸ μά-

χίμον, but the sense requires a perfect ἀνεῖνται, they are given to, devoted to, vacant. What therefore was a mere conjecture of Stephanus, ἀνέωνται, now deserves our highest consideration, as the valuable Florentine Codex of Schweighæuser actually has this reading.

§ In these forms of the aor. 2. act. and those of the aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\hat{\epsilon}\nu\tau\sigma$, &c. the accent is not thrown back to the beginning of the word because the $\epsilon\epsilon$ arises from the

augment.

Aor. 1. midd. ἡκάμην, which in the indicative is used even in prose*; the other moods do not occur.

Aor. 2. midd. ἔμην, generally with the augm. εἴμην, εἶσο, εἶτο (ἀφεῖτο, ἐφεῖντο) †. Imper. οὖ (ἀφοῦ, προοῦ, πρόεσθε, &c.). Opt. εἴμην, εἶο, εἶτο, &c. Conj. ὧμαι. Infin. ἕσθαι (προέσθαι). Part. ἕμενος (ἀφέμενος).

Verbal adj. ἐτός, ἐτέος (ἄφετος, &c.).

Instances of the imperf. sing. in $-\eta\nu$ are rare, and those which do occur are suspicious; in the 2. and 3. sing. we generally find $ie\iota s$, $ie\iota$ (contracted like $ie\iota i\theta e\iota s$), and in the 1. sing. was formed, at least in the Ion. and Att. dialect, an anomalous form in $-e\iota \nu$, as $\pi\rho\sigma ie\iota \nu$, Od. ι , 88. κ , 100. μ , 9. (Wolf's ed.); $i\eta\phi ie\iota\nu$, Plat. Euthyd. p. 293. a. Libanius 1, p. 793.; $i\nu ie\iota\nu$, Lucian. Catapl. 4.

On the Attic conj. and optat., which imitate the regular conjugation of the barytone verbs in accent if not in form, as $\pi\rho\delta\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, $\pi\rho\delta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, $\delta\iota\tau\sigma$, $\pi\rho\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon$, &c., see the second paragraph of $\Delta\delta\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$. We find in the active voice of this verb corresponding forms, but only in the present, e. g. $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\iota\tau\epsilon$, Plat. Apol. p. 29. d.; $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\eta$, Xen. Cyr. 8, 1, 2. (6.); but the genuineness of these two is doubtful. The other dialectic forms of both moods correspond exactly with those of $\tau\dot{\epsilon}\theta\eta\mu\iota$, as $\dot{\alpha}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, $\dot{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ for conj. $\dot{\alpha}\phi\omega$; $\dot{\eta}\sigma\iota$ for 3. sing. conj. $\dot{\eta}$, &c.

From the ι of the pres. iέναι arose a new theme, ἸΩ, of which we find many forms, but always in the Ion. dialect, as ἀνίει for ἀνίησι, Herodot. 3, 109. ξύνιον frequently for ξυνίεσαν, Il. α, 273. ξύνιε, imperat. Theogn. 1240. Bekk. μετίετο or ἐμετίετο for μεθίετο, Herodot. 1, 12. and the augm. perf. μεμετιμένος frequently used for μεθειμένος: see also 3. pres. μετίει in Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. There are many other such forms which vary only in the accent, and consequently are not to be depended on §.

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

+ Xenoph. Hier. 7, 11. Eurip. Suppl.

† Yet we find in the Attics instances of the regular form, as $\pi \alpha \rho \iota \bar{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ Plat. Phæd. p. 90., $\dot{\alpha} \phi \iota \bar{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ Xen. Hell. 2, 4, 10. (16.), $\dot{\alpha} \phi \iota \epsilon \bar{\iota} \epsilon \nu$ ib. 6, 4, 2. and 3., still with the various reading $\alpha \phi (\iota \iota \epsilon \nu)$ in both passages.

§ For instance $\dot{\alpha}\nu\iota\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ is from IE Ω , but $\dot{\alpha}\nu\iota\epsilon\iota$ pres. of I Ω . Compare II. α , 326. with 336., β , 752. with γ , 118. where

προίει is sometimes pres. sometimes imperfect. See Brunck on Sophoel. Cd. T. 628. and Heyne on Il. ζ, 523. The imperat. ξύνιε in Theognis becomes suspicious when compared with the Homeric ξυνίει, Od. a, 271. and elsewhere; while the 3. plur. ξύνιον is rendered doubtful by the various reading ξύνιεν for ξυνίεσαν (see Heyne on Il. a, 273.). We have quoted these points to show the great uncertainty of the readings, not to recommend an uniformity, which is impossible if we pay any regard to manuscripts.

^{*} Examples may be found in Fisch. ad Well. 2. p. 484. where we must restore προήκασθε.

cording to meaning can only belong here, and which have this peculiarity, that they take ϵ instead of η in the future, and have the regular formation of the aor. 1. in σa instead of κa , as $\mathring{a} \nu \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \epsilon \iota$, $\mathring{a} \nu \acute{\epsilon} \sigma a \iota \iota \iota$, 11.

2. είσα, I seated, placed; ήμαι, I sit.

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

Aor. εἶσα, αs, εν, &c. Imper. εἶσον. Infin. ἔσαι, ἔσσαι (ἐφέσσαι).
Part. ἔσαι, εἴσαι.—Μιdd. εἰσάμην. Imper. ἔσαι, ἔσσαι (ἔφεσσαι).
Part. ἐσάμενος (ἐφεσσάμενος, Od. π, 442.), εἰσάμενος:

some of which are liable to be confounded with similar forms of εννυμι. Fut. midd. εσομαι, εσομαι (ἐφέσσομαι).

Perf. pass. yuar, &c. which see below.

Of these forms $\epsilon i\sigma \dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$ only occurs in Attic prose in the sense of to lay the foundation of, found, erect; the others belong to the dialects and to poetry, particularly to the Epic. The defective parts of this verb are supplied by $i\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\omega$ (which is complete in all its moods and tenses), and by $\kappa a\theta i\zeta\omega$, a word of still more general occurrence. The indisputable connection of this verb with $i\zeta\omega$ and $i\xi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ has induced many grammarians to place the above forms under $i\xi\omega$, the pres. act. of which however is nowhere found. But in that case the augm. $\epsilon\iota$, which does not occur in $i\xi\epsilon\eta\eta\nu$, would form in Attic prose a deviation for which there are no grounds. Now as $i\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ seems to presuppose a radical form $i\epsilon\eta\iota$ it is more natural to leave all the above forms in this their simplest formation, distinguish them from $i\xi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, (which we shall see presently to be a word in very limited use), and class this latter as a form belonging to $i\xi\omega$, $i\xi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ *.

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

at II. ϕ , 506. But a much more evident comparison is furnished by Od. π , 443. $\epsilon\mu\dot{\epsilon}...$ Οδυσσεύς Πολλάκι γούνασινοίσιν $\epsilon\phi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$. The meaning of $\epsilon\dot{\phi}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon$ - $\sigma\theta\alpha$ therefore in the above passage of the Iliad is "he will never seat," consequently it must not be separated from $\epsilon\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha$, $\epsilon\sigma\alpha$.

^{*} It might appear as if the fut. ἐφέσσεσθαι (II. ι, 455.) could not be separated from ἔζεσθαι, as the curse of Amyntor Μήποτε γούνασιν οἶσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλον νίὸν Ἑξ ἐμέθεν γεγαῶτα is understood by all commentators thus, "that a son born of me may never sit on his knees," and in this sense we find ἐφέζετο

εἰσάμενος not only in Herodot. 1, 66. but also in Plut. Thes. c. 17. and many other passages. In Thucyd. 3, 58. ἐσσάμενος is scarcely genuine, and the various reading ἐσάμενος is undoubtedly the true reading. Lastly we find in Od. ξ, 295. ἐέσσατο with the syllabic augment*, like ἔειπε, ἐείλεον, ἐελμένος, ἐερμένος, &c.

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

ζεσθε and καθήσεσθε.

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

Pres. ήμαι +, ήσαι, ήσται, &c. 3. pl. ήνται.

Imperf. $\vec{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$, $\hat{\eta}\sigma\sigma$, $\hat{\eta}\sigma\tau\sigma$, &c. 3. pl. $\hat{\eta}\nu\tau\sigma$. Imperat. $\hat{\eta}\sigma\sigma$, $\hat{\eta}\sigma\theta\omega$, &c. Infin. $\hat{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha$. Part. $\hat{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s.

In prose however the compound $\kappa \acute{a}\theta \eta \mu a\iota$ with the same meaning is much more used, which takes no σ in the 3. sing. except when in the imperf. it has no augm., as—

κάθημαι, 3. sing. κάθηται.

έκαθήμην or καθήμην, 3. sing. έκάθητο or καθήστο.

Imper. κάθησο. Opt. καθοίμην, 3. sing. κάθοιτο‡. Conj. κάθωμαι, -η, -ηται. Infin. καθῆσθαι §. Part. καθήμενος.

The defective tenses are supplied by ἔζεσθαι or ἵζεσθαι with their compound.

Instead of the 2. sing. in $-\sigma \alpha \iota$ and $-\sigma \sigma$ we find also the shortened forms of the compounds, viz. pres. $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \iota$ and imperat. $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \sigma \sigma \nu$ for $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \sigma \sigma \rho$, which however are not so good Attic as the others.

Instead of $\tilde{\eta}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, $\tilde{\eta}\nu\tau\sigma$, the Ion. have $\tilde{\epsilon}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, $\tilde{\epsilon}a\tau\sigma$ (the ending of the Ion. perf. pass.), and the Epics $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}a\tau\sigma$. In the compound the Ion. use, according to their general analogy, $\kappa\dot{\alpha}\tau\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, $\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{\epsilon}\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$, for $\kappa\alpha\theta$ -.

The same form ημαι is also the true perf. of είσα, as used in the sense of τερνμαι of inanimate objects, e.g. Herodot. 9, 57., Callim. Fr. 122.: these passages, with the Ion. 3. pl. εΐαται, Lucian. De Dea Syr. 31. prove decidedly that the reading of Od. ν, 106. is εΐατο with the

* This writing ἐἐσσατο, with the lenis, to distinguish it from ἐἐσσατο the aor. of ἔννυμι, is an arbitrary proceeding of the Grammarians, and scarcely correct, as the syllab. augm. takes the aspirate before aspirated vowels, as in ἑώρων, ἕηκα.

† 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 μι, like δίζημαι: the former appears to me the

more probable. Compare Κείμαι.

† 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 $\kappa \acute{a}\theta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, $\kappa \alpha \theta \mathring{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, but compare the same appearance with the observations made on it under $Ke \mathring{\iota} \mu \alpha \iota$.

aspirate, not (as it is sometimes written) $\epsilon i \alpha \tau o$ the midd. of $\epsilon i \mu i$. See also " $I \zeta \omega$.

3. εννυμι, to put on, which see in its place.

'Εωμεν or ἔωμεν. See 'Aω, 3.

7.

Ζάω, I live, is contracted in η , like διψάω, πεινάω, χράω; it is used by old writers principally in the pres. and imperf., as β ιόω is in the remaining tenses: thus pres. $\zeta \hat{\omega}$, $\zeta \hat{\eta} c$, $\zeta \hat{\eta}$; imperat. $\zeta \hat{\eta}$ (Herm. Soph. Ant. 1154.), or $\zeta \hat{\eta} \theta \iota$; opt. $\zeta \psi \eta \nu$; infin. $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$. Imperf. $\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \omega \nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \eta c$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \zeta \eta$, &c.

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

Beside the pres. and imperf. there was in common use among the older writers a future, as ζήσειν (Aristoph. Plut. 263.), ζήσουσι (Plat. Rep. 5.

* It is singular that Pierson (ad Mocr. p. 148.) was so far misled by Herodian's authority as to reject contemptuously the very intelligible opinion of the grammarian in the Etym. M. p. 413, 8. (to which we may add Ib. p. 410, 49. &c. and Tho. M. v. $\tilde{c}\zeta\omega\nu$), and to defend $\tilde{c}\zeta\eta\nu$, 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 $\tilde{c}\zeta\omega\nu$, which sounds so differently from $\tilde{c}\zeta\eta$, nay the contrary is the more probable. See Fischer, 1. p. 125. In Demosth. Timocr. 702, 2. we certainly find $\tilde{c}\zeta\eta\nu$ without any known various

reading. All things considered I very much doubt whether Herodian ever gave it as his opinion that $\tilde{\epsilon}\zeta\eta\nu$ was used for $\tilde{\epsilon}\zeta\omega\nu$. 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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\zeta\eta\nu$, which belongs to $\tilde{\epsilon}\zeta\eta s$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\zeta\eta$, 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 seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth (ZHOI) are said, by a play on the letters, to bid us enjoy life.

p. 465. d.), $\zeta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ (ib. 9. p. 591. c.), and $\zeta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ (which is the common form in use among the later writers) in Dem. c. Aristog. I. p. 794, 19. In these last we find also the aor. I. $\ddot{\epsilon} \zeta \eta \sigma a$ and the perf. $\ddot{\epsilon} \zeta \eta \kappa a$.

The Ion. and Dor. formed this verb with the vowel ω , and that not merely as a lengthening of the theme in $\zeta \dot{\omega} \omega$, $\zeta \dot{\omega} o \nu \tau \epsilon s$, $\xi \zeta \omega o \nu$, but throughout the persons, thus $\zeta \dot{\omega} \epsilon \iota s$, $\zeta \dot{\omega} \epsilon \iota \nu$, $\zeta \dot{\omega} \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, $\zeta \dot{\omega} o \iota \sigma \iota \nu$, and also shortened to $\zeta \dot{\omega} \epsilon \iota \nu$, see Simonid. Gaisford. 231, 17. Herodot. 7, 46. Theodorid. Epig. 8, 7. Hence also a future tense, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \zeta \omega \sigma \epsilon$, which is now restored from the manuscripts to the text of Herodot. 1, 120.*.

Zέω, I seeth, boil, retains the ε in the inflexion. From the examples given by Stephens it appears that ζέω, generally speaking at least, has an intransitive, and ζέννυμι a transitive sense; the other tenses have both meanings in common. The pass. takes σ, e.g. ἀπεζεσμένος, ἀποζεσθείς.

Ζεύγνυμι, *I join*: fut. ζεύξω, &c.; aor. 2. pass. ἐζύγην. Ζώννυμι, *I gird*: fut. ζώσω, &c.; perf. pass. ἔζωσμαι.— ΜΙDD. ζώννυμαι, &c.

According to Suidas (v. $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \omega \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$) the older Attics had no σ in the perfect. This he proves by the authority of Thucyd. 1, 6. διεζωμένοι, where however all the Codd. have διεζωσμένοι. Compare Σώζω.

Zώω. See Zάω.

H.

Ἡβάω, I am in the bloom and vigour of manhood, pubeo; ἡβάσκω, I am coming to manhood, pubesco. The aor. ἡβησα, 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 $\acute{a}\omega$ has the sense of to become, $\grave{a}v\eta\beta\hat{a}v$ to become young again.

When the ω is followed by a syllable naturally long it is lengthened by the Epics to ω_0 , and when it has the ι subscript it becomes $\omega_0\iota$; thus $\eta\beta\dot{\omega}_0\nu\tau\epsilon$ for $\eta\beta\dot{\omega}_0\nu\tau\epsilon$ for $\eta\beta\dot{\omega}_0\nu\tau\epsilon$.

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

ἐπεζάρει for ἐπεβάρει, ζέρεθρον for βέρεθρον, it seems to point out to me a radical identity in the verbs $\zeta \bar{p} \nu$ and βιωναι, which accounts for their being so mixed up together in usage.

^{*} This formation may be supposed to arise from the mere lengthening of $\zeta \acute{\omega} \omega$, $\zeta \acute{\omega} \omega$; but when I compare $\beta \acute{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \partial e$ (see $B \iota \acute{\omega} \omega$) and $\beta \acute{e} \circ \mu \alpha \iota$ with $\zeta \acute{\omega} \epsilon \iota \nu$ and $\zeta \acute{g} \nu$, and the well-known forms

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

The Ion. and Dor. use, principally in the sense of to consider in a certain light, the perf. $\eta \gamma \eta \mu a\iota$ instead of the pres.; it is common for instance in Herodotus, see Schweigh. Lex. Herod. v. $\eta \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a\iota$; Fragm. Pythag. Gale p. 711. ($\mathring{a}\gamma \eta \nu \tau a\iota$); whence it came into the language of poetry, e.g. $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \gamma$ $\mathring{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma a\iota$ $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \delta \acute{\epsilon}$; Eurip. Phw. 553. In prose it does not appear frequent until the later writers*. In the sense of to precede $\mathring{a}\gamma \eta \mu a\iota$ is found in Pind. Pyth. 4, 442. In a passive sense $\tau \grave{a}$ $\mathring{a}\gamma \eta \mu \acute{\epsilon} \iota a$ is the same as $\tau \grave{a}$ revolutation, that which is usual, Orac. ap. Demosth. adv. Macart. p. 1072, 25. In two of the passages of Herodot. there is a remarkable various reading $\mathring{a}\gamma \eta \mu a\iota$ (see Schweigh. ib. v. $\mathring{a}\gamma \acute{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a\iota$); and it is very possible that this form had the Ion. short a for η with a different breathing.

"Hδω, I delight: but little used in the active. Pass. I am delighted: fut. ἡσθήσομαι; aor. 1. ἥσθην. Compare 'Ανδάνω.

Homer has once the midd. $\eta \sigma \alpha \tau \sigma$ for $\eta \sigma \theta \eta$, Od. ι , 353.

'Hθέω, I strain, filter: fut. in general use $\mathring{\eta}\theta\mathring{\eta}\sigma\omega$, &c. But Galen quotes from Hippocrates $\mathring{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varepsilon$ from HΘΩ.

"Ηκω, I come, am arrived (see Ἰκνέομαι), has (in the older writers) only the present, the imperfect $\hat{\eta}$ κον, and the future $\hat{\eta}$ ξω.

The form $\delta\iota\hat{\eta}\xi a$ belongs to $\delta\iota\hat{a}\tau\tau\omega$; but later writers have also from $\eta\kappa\omega$ not only the aor. 1. $\eta\xi a$ but a perf. $\eta\kappa a$. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 743. 744.

Ήμαι. See ΈΩ, 2.

'Ημί, η̈́ν. See Φημί.

ἸΗμύω, I sink: fut. ἢμύσω, &c. The regular perf. of this verb was ἤμυκα; to this was prefixed the reduplic. with the shortened ϵ in order to preserve the relation between the first and second syllable: but on account of the verse the first syllable was to be again made long, for

^{*} Schneider's remark in his Lexicon must be taken in this limited sense. See the word in Lucian Piscat. 14. Paus. 10, 6, 32. Some older examples would be desirable. I find it also in Hipp. Min. p.

^{374.} d. $(\eta \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha i \text{ for } \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \hat{i})$, and in Clitophon 407. c. $(\eta \gamma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon)$. Better examples perhaps may be found in Plat. Tim. p. 19. e. Legg. 8. p. 837. c.

which purpose μν was taken instead of μμ, as in the instances of ἀπάλαμνος from παλαμή, νώνυμνος for νώνυμος; thus was formed an Epic perf. ἐμνήμυκα, and its comp. ὑπεμνήμυκα, Il. χ, 491.

'Ησσάομαι, ἡττάομαι, I am inferior, am overcome, used in the pure language only in the passive form. Fut. ἡσσηθήσομαι, occasionally ἡττήσομαι, Lys. c. Ergocl. 9., pro Polycr. 32. Verbal adj. ἡττητέον.

The Ion. formed from -όω a pass. ἐσσέομαι, ἐσσοῦμαι, ἐσσοῦην, &c. Herodot. The later writers thought they might also form an active (to overcome), which Diodorus has occasionally (see Schæfer on Aristoph. Plut. p. 525.). The only passage in which it occurs in any of the older writers (Isæus 11, 31. p. 86, 3.) has been corrected by the Breslau manuscript from τὸν μὲν ἡττῆν, τὸν δὲ νικᾶσθαι to ἡττᾶσθαι... νικῆν*.

θ.

Θάλλω, I germinate: fut. θ αλῶ, also θ αλλήσομαι; perf. 2. τ έθηλα, Dor. τ έθ $\bar{\alpha}$ λα.

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

ΘΑΝ-. See Θνήσκω.

Θάπτω, I bury: fut. θάψω; perf. τέτἄφα; aor. 2. pass. ἐτάφην (but Herodotus has the aor. 1. ἐθάφθην); perf. pass. τεθάμμαι, τεθάφθαι. The root of this verb was therefore

 and it would have been a most unnatural mode of speaking to have brought in the verb $\dot{\eta}\tau\tau\hat{q}\nu$, even if it had been in use. The neuter ideas "to get the better, to win," are here contrasted with "to be worsted, to lose," and it was therefore necessary to say $\tau \dot{o}\nu \ \mu \dot{e}\nu \ \dot{\eta}\tau\tau\hat{a}\sigma\theta a\nu$, $\tau \dot{o}\nu \ \dot{c}\dot{e}\nu \nu \mu \dot{c}\nu$, exactly as had been said a little before $\dot{a}\nu \ \dot{\eta} = \tau \dot{e}\rho a \ \nu \kappa \dot{c} \ \mu e\tau \dot{e}\nu \kappa \dot{a}\nu$ is taken in a judicial sense and stands absolutely, not having the opponent following it in the accusative case, as when it means to conquer any one in battle.

 $\Theta A\Phi$, as we see one or both of the aspirated letters in all the above forms. See below $\Theta A\Phi$.

Thus we have $\tau \epsilon \theta \acute{a} \phi \theta \omega$ in Lucian Dial. Mar. 9, 1. $\tau \epsilon \theta \acute{a} \phi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ in Herodot. 6, 103. Compare $T_{\theta} \acute{\epsilon} \phi \omega$, with note.

 Θ AΦ-. Perf. used as a pres. $\tau \epsilon \theta \eta \pi a$, I am astonished, where the second aspirated letter of the root is changed into the tenuis; on the contrary in the aor. $\epsilon \tau a \phi o \nu$ the first undergoes that change*. Compare $\Theta \alpha \pi \tau \omega$.

 Θ AΩ, 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. $\theta \hat{\eta} \sigma a_i$, and that only from Hesychius. Of the latter Hom. has the infin. pres. $\theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a_i \uparrow$ with the collateral meaning of to milk (Od. \hat{c} , 89.), and the aor. 1. midd. $\hat{c}\theta \hat{\eta} \sigma a \tau o$, he sucked (II. ω , 58.). [So $\hat{c}\theta \hat{\eta} \sigma a o$, Callim. Jov. 48. and $\theta \eta \sigma \hat{a} \mu e v o s$, Hymn. Cer. 236. But in Hymn. Apoll. 123. $\theta \hat{\eta} \sigma a \tau o$ has the causative sense she gave suck to.—Passow.]

See another θάομαι in the following Θεάομαι.

Θεάομαι, I look at attentively, consider. Depon. Midd.

The following different formations from this stem or root have been preserved in the dialects:

1.) θάομαι in the following Doric forms; θα'μεθα‡, Sophron ap. Apollon. de Pron. p. 359. a. Imperat. θάεο, Nossidis Epigr. 8., Anytes Epigr. 10. θᾶσθε, the Megarean in Aristoph. Ach. 770. Fut. and aor. θασύμεναι, Theorr. 15, 23. θάσασθαι, 2, 72. θᾶσαι (imperat.) 1, 149. And the Epic θησαίατο, Od. σ, 191.

2.) θαέομαι Doric, Pind. Pyth. 8, 64. θηέομαι Ion. whence ἐθηεῖτο, ἐθηεῦντο, θηεύμενοι, aor. ἐθηήσατο &c. Hom. Herodot.

3.) θεάσμαι Attic and common dialect.

Of these three formations the first and second have in Homer always the sense of being astonished and admiring. The simple $\theta \dot{\alpha}$ - $o\mu \alpha \iota$ appears to be the oldest, whence $\theta \alpha \bar{\nu} \mu \alpha$; and the second merely the common lengthening of it, $\theta \alpha$ - $\epsilon o\mu \alpha \iota$, Ion. $\theta \eta$ - $\epsilon o\mu \alpha \iota$. From the oldest form arose the simple verbal subst., properly $\theta \dot{\alpha} \alpha$, but soon changed into $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \alpha$, like $\mu \nu \dot{\alpha} \alpha$ into $\mu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \alpha$; and hence first came the form $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \mu \alpha \iota$, which

† This verb is contracted in η instead of α . See $Z\acute{a}\omega$.

^{*} A perfect $\tau \epsilon \theta a \phi a$ with a causative meaning, I astonish, in Schweighæuser's Athen. 6. p. 258. c. is suspected, because the manuscript has (contrary to the metre it is true) $\tau \epsilon \theta a \omega \phi$. Now the aor. p. $\epsilon \theta a \mu \beta \eta$ in Hesych. supposes a theme $\theta a \mu \mu \beta \omega$; perhaps therefore it ought to be, $\dot{\eta}$ ro $\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\eta}$ for $\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\eta}$ ro $\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\eta}$ for $\dot{\eta}$ $\dot{\eta}$

[‡] This is more of an Æolic than a Doric contraction: here the o is swallowed up by the a preceding it, which consequently becomes long; thus the part $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{a} \nu$ for $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{a} \nu \nu$, $\phi \nu \sigma \hat{a} \nu \tau \tau \epsilon$ for $\phi \nu \sigma \hat{a} \nu \tau \tau \epsilon$, $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{a} \tau \sigma$ for $\gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{a} \tau \sigma \sigma$.

does not occur in Homer. In Herodotus we find indeed both forms, e. g. $\theta\eta\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\theta\epsilon\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (Ion. for $\theta\epsilon\dot{u}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$), but this uncertainty would seem to arise more from traditionary corruptions of the text. He has also constantly recurring as various readings $\dot{\epsilon}\theta\eta\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\tau\sigma$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\theta\eta\dot{\eta}\tau\sigma$, of which the latter is perhaps according to the analogy of some verbs in $\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ contracted by the Epics in η instead of α , as $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\eta}\alpha\iota$ 2. sing. pres. and $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\eta}\tau\sigma$ 3. sing. imperf. of $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\dot{\epsilon}\tau\eta\nu$ dual of $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$: verbal adj. $\theta\alpha\eta\tau\dot{\epsilon}s$, $\theta\eta\eta\tau\dot{\epsilon}s$, $\theta\epsilon\alpha\tau\dot{\epsilon}s$. Compare $Z\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ and $\Theta A\Omega$.

Θείνω, I beat. This pres. is constantly used by the Epic poets and tragedians in both the act. and pass. voice. Beside this the Attic poets have a form θένειν, θένων, imper. θένε, conj. θένω, frequent for instance in Aristophanes, and consequently belonging to the common language of the time. But there is no instance of a pres. indic.; for in Acharn. 564. the manuscripts give, and the context requires, the fut. $\theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon is$. Hence our latest critics have shown that those forms are agrists, (excepting occasionally that the fut. θενώ, θενών ought to be restored,) and therefore that the infin: and part. must undoubtedly be accented $\theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, $\theta \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega} \nu^*$. All those passages certainly express a momentary beating, θείνειν on the contrary (e. g. θείνεται, Æschyl. Pers. 301. ἔθεινον, ib. 416. ἔθεινε, Eurip. Herc. 949. θεινόμενος, Hom.) continued blows, or the proper imperfect. Of the indic. of this aor. έθενον no instance has yet been found. The Epic language has the aor. 1. equiva, part. velvas, Il. v, 481. Hence we can point to έθεινε as evidently an imperf. at II. π , 339., and as an aor. at ϕ , 491. The perfects and the aor. pass. are wanting.

Θέλω. See 'Εθέλω.

Θέρομαι, I warm myself: used in prose in the present and imperfect only.

Homer has, beside the above, a fut. $\theta \epsilon \rho \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ and an aor. pass. $(\epsilon \theta \epsilon \rho \eta \nu)$ conj. $\theta \epsilon \rho \epsilon \omega$. The act. $\theta \epsilon \rho \omega$, I warm, stands in the lexicons without any good authority.

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

Θέσσασθαι, to beseech; a defective aor. of which we find only θέσσαντο (Pind. N. 5, 18.), and part. θεσσάμενος, Hes. Fr. 23.: see Schæf. Schol. Par. Apollon. Rh. 1, 824. The verbal adj. would be θεστός, from which come ἀπόθεστος and πολύθεστος, Hom.

^{*} Blomfield on Æschyl. Sept. 378. (he has made some mistakes) and Elmsley on Eurip. Heracl. 272. We must not be

surprised at the ϵ in an aor. 2. any more than in $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\mu\nu\nu$: it was necessary on account of $\tilde{\epsilon}\theta\nu\nu\nu$.

Θέω, I run: fut. midd. θεύσομαι* Hom., or θευσούμαι Dor. The other tenses are defective. Compare Τρέχω.

For the imperf. $\tilde{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon o\nu$ Hom. has $\theta \dot{\epsilon}\epsilon \sigma \kappa o\nu$. We find also an act. fut. $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\nu} \sigma \omega$ in Lycophr. 119. There are some forms from $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, the root of $\tau i\theta \eta \mu \iota$, which we must take care not to confound with those of $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ I run: e.g. $\pi \rho o\theta \dot{\epsilon} o\nu \sigma \iota$ (II. a, 291.), the Ion. optat. $\theta \dot{\epsilon} o\nu \tau \sigma$ for the aor. 2. midd. $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\iota} \tau \sigma$, and $\pi \sigma \tau \dot{\iota} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \iota$ for $\pi \sigma \tau \dot{\iota} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma$, Theorr. 14, 45.

Θηέομαι. See Θεάομαι.

Θηλέω. See Θάλλω.

ӨНП-. See ӨАФ-.

Θησθαι. See ΘΑΩ.

Θιγγάνω, I touch: fut. θίξομαι ; nor. 2. ἔθἴγον. See note under Αἰσθάνομαι.

Beside $\theta_i \gamma \gamma \acute{a} \nu \omega$ a pres. $\theta_i \gamma \omega$ is generally adopted, of which $\xi \theta_i \gamma \rho \nu$ would be at the same time imperf. and aor., and $\theta_i \gamma \epsilon_i \nu$ would be different from $\theta_i \gamma \epsilon_i \nu$ (compare $\kappa \lambda \acute{\nu} \omega$). But there are not sufficient proofs of the indic. $\theta_i \gamma \omega$ or of $\xi \theta_i \gamma \rho i \gamma$ as a decided imperfect. The accentuation of $\theta_i \gamma \varepsilon_i \nu$, and $\theta_i \gamma \omega \nu$ $\theta_i \gamma \acute{\omega} \nu$, is indeed generally confounded in the manuscripts; but when for instance we read in Hesychius $\theta_i \gamma \epsilon_i \nu$ $\psi a \nu \sigma \alpha_i$, $a \psi \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha_i$, $a \pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha_i$, we see how little dependence is to be placed on these accents. If we were to accent in every passage of our text $\theta_i \gamma \epsilon_i \nu$, $\theta_i \gamma \acute{\omega} \nu$, as a orists, we should not find the sense disturbed in any one instance.

. Θλάω, I contuse, bruise, crush: fut. θ λάσω, &c. It has a short in the inflexion, and in the pass. takes the σ.

The part. perf. pass. is $\tau \epsilon \theta \lambda \alpha \gamma \mu \acute{e} ros$, Theorr. 22, 45.; as in the Doric dialect all verbs ending in $\zeta \omega$ and some in $\acute{a}\omega$, which have α short in

* Six verbs in έω take ευ in the fut. or in some derivative, viz. θέω, νέω, πλέω, πνέω, ρέω, χέω; thus πλεύσομαι, επνευσα, χεῦμα, &c. And two in αίω take αυ, viz. καίω, κλαίω (Att. κάω, κλάω), fut. καύσω, κλαύσομαι.

† In Eurip. Heracl. 652, the reading of the text was $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\theta$ (zers, but it is now amended from the manuscripts to -et. [Passow has a fut. act. θ (zw, but without example or remark, further than that θ is more general.]

‡ Schneider in his Lexicon quotes έθιγεν from Apollon. Rh. 4, 1013. as an imperf. and θίγων from Æschyl. Prom. 855. as a present: but the immediate context does not agree with this statement. If we look at the passages, we shall see a plain difference between these aorists and the sense of $\mu\epsilon\iota\lambda i\sigma\sigma\epsilon\tau$ in the former and $\epsilon\pi\alpha\phi\bar{\omega}\nu$ in the latter, which express a duration of the thought; nay in the passage of Æschylus we shall find them contrasted, ' $E\pi\alpha\phi\bar{\omega}\nu$ d $\tau\alpha\rho\beta\epsilon$ î $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho$ $\kappa\alpha$ i $\theta\iota\gamma\dot{\omega}\nu$ $\mu\delta$ - $\nu o\nu$. [There are a few other instances in the Tragedians, but none to be depended on; e. g. in Soph. Phil. 9. the Ald. ed. has $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\theta\iota\gamma\epsilon$ i ν . compare also Æschyl. Agam. 1049. Soph. Aj. 1410. Elmsl. and Herm. Œd. C. 470. Schæf. Eurip. Or. p. 12. Greg. Cor. p. 990. Monk Eurip. Alc. 1136. Elmsl. Eurip. Bacch. 304. Wunderl. Obs. Critt. p. 151.—Passow.]

the inflexion, change to the other formation with the ξ; as κομίζω, Dor. fut. κομίζω γελάω, ἐγέλασα, Dor. ἐγέλαζα, &c.

 $\Theta \lambda i \beta \omega$, I press, squeeze: fut. $\theta \lambda i \psi \omega$; aor. 2. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \lambda i - \beta \eta \nu$ (like $\tau \rho i \beta \omega$).

In Homer we find the fut. midd. $\theta \lambda i \psi \epsilon \tau a \iota$, Od. ρ , 221. The pass. part. pres. $\theta \lambda \iota \beta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ is in Dioscor. Epig. 37., and the part. perf. pass. $\tau \epsilon \theta \lambda \iota \mu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta$ in Leon. Tar. Epig. 70.

Θνήσκω, I die: fut. θανοῦμαι; aor. 2. ἔθανον; perf. τέθνηκα: compare βέβληκα and note under Βάλλω. Of this perf. the following syncopated forms are in common use: τέθνἄμεν, τέθνᾶτε, τεθνασι, and 3. plur. pluperf. ἐτέθνασαν; imp. τέθναθι, opt. τεθναίην, infin. τεθνάναι, part. τεθνεώς, gen. -ῶτος, fem. τεθνεώσα, neut. τεθνεώς, but in Herodot. 1, 112. τεθνεός, which is perhaps preferable. From τέθνηκα arose also an Attic fut. τεθνήξω or τεθνήξομαι (like ἐστήξω or ἐστήξομαι), the latter of which is not to be considered in the light of a passive, but as a fut. midd. with an active sense. Verbal adj. θνητός.

That the a in the infin. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{a}\nu a\iota$ was short in the common language is evident from Aristoph. Ran. 1012: but we find in Æschyl. Agam. 550. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{a}\nu a\iota$ which was perhaps a contraction of $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{a}\dot{\nu}a\iota$. The Epics have also $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{a}\mu\epsilon\nu$, and Homer $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{a}\mu\epsilon\nu a\iota$. The Ion. and Hom. language has a perf. part. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}s$, $-\hat{\omega}\tau\sigma s$, (comp. $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\dot{\omega}s$ under $\beta\alpha\dot{\iota}\nu\omega$, and $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\dot{\omega}s$ under " $1\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$,) for which Homer has sometimes $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma s$, and once $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}\tau\iota$, as a trisyllable, Od. τ , 331. For $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma s$ there is also a frequent various reading $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma s$, and for $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma s$ sometimes $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma s$. To preserve Homeric uniformity Heyne wrote all the above with $\epsilon\iota$, whilst Wolf for the same purpose preferred η : of the two the latter seems to have made the better choice; but after maturely examining every part of the question, I think there are the strongest grounds both internal and external for the following as the Epic usage; $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}s$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\eta\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma$ s and $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\iota\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma s$.

In usage this verb is so mixed up with its compound $\partial \pi \sigma \partial \nu i / \sigma \kappa \omega$, that the simple forms $\partial \partial \nu i / \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\partial \partial \nu i / \sigma \kappa \omega$, the the simple forms $\partial \partial \nu i / \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\partial \partial \nu i / \sigma \kappa \omega$ are entirely poetical, while on the contrary the perf. $\partial \partial \nu i / \sigma \omega$ with its derivative forms scarcely ever occurs compounded with $\partial \partial \sigma i$. Moreover of the perfect we find hardly any but syncopated forms: the part. $\partial \partial \nu i / \sigma \omega i$ is indeed interchanged

with $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon \omega s$, yet so that of the latter the masculine only occurs in prose. The usage of prose is therefore the following:

θνήσκω and ἀποθνήσκω ἀπέθανον, ἀποθανεῖν, &c.; ἀποθανοῦμαι τέθνηκα, ἐτεθνήκειν τέθναμεν, τεθνάναι, &c.; τεθνηκώς and τεθνεώς, τεθνηκοῖα, τεθνηκός.

The part. θανών, οἱ θανόντες, is however common in prose as an adj. in the sense of dead.

The infin. perf. τεθνάναι is used generally in its natural meaning: but not unfrequently it stands also for the aor. θανεῖν, e.g. in Plat. Crito (at the beginning), ἢ τὸ πλοῖον ἀφῖκται οὖ δεῖ ἀφικομένου τεθνάναι με; and such is its meaning in the familiar hyperbolical expression πολλάκις, μυριάκις τεθνάναι: whence it is clear that in some other passages we must not force it to mean to be dead, as Plat. Crito 14. εἰ δέοι τεθνάναι σε. A wish to add force to the expression introduced the perfect, as a form of a more decided and more certain sound, in the place of the present.

The same was the case with the fut. $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\omega$ or $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, 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 $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ($\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\xi\epsilon\iota$) "he will be dead immediately" is a parallel case to such perfects as that mentioned above. But like the common fut. 3. of the passive (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 $\kappa a \tau a'$ is likewise synonymous with the simple verb, but occurs only in the poets: and the forms of the aor. are never found but with the syncope, as $\kappa a \tau \theta a \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, $\kappa a \tau \theta a \nu a' \nu a'$, &c.: hence in the Attic poets, who do not willingly omit the augment, the indic. $(\kappa a \tau \theta a \nu \epsilon)$ seldom occurs (Æsch. Agam. 1553.), while the other moods are frequent in Euripides and others.

Θορέω, θόρνυμαι. See Θρώσκω. Θράσσω. See Ταράσσω.

Θραύω, I break in pieces. The passive takes σ. The old perf. pass. τέθραυμαι has been restored by Bekker to Plat. Legg. 6. p. 757. e. (425, 7.).

τεθνήζεται, where we always contrast to live with to die, whereas the true contrast is between to live and to be dead.

^{*} An unwillingness to recognize the idea of a perfect in τεθνήξομαι arises partly from the custom of our language, particularly from such expressions as βιώσεται ἢ

Θρύπτω, I break in pieces: fut. θρύψω; aor. 2. pass. ἐτρύφην. Compare Θάπτω and Τρέφω with note.

[This verb seems to have been scarcely used in its simple form and literal meaning by any good writers; but in a metaphorical sense it is very common, particularly in the passive, as μαλακία θρύπτεσθαι, Xenoph.—Passow.]

Θρώσκω, I leap: fut. θοροῦμαι, Ion. θορέομαι; aor. 2. ἔθορον, conj. θορῶ, infin. θορεῖν. See βέβληκα and note under Βάλλω.

The pres. $\theta o \rho \epsilon \omega$, which is in all the lexicons, is scarcely to be found even in the later writers; and where we do find it, $\dot{\alpha}\pi o \theta o \rho o \hat{\nu}\tau \epsilon s$ is a false reading for $\dot{\alpha}\pi o \theta o \rho o \dot{\nu}\tau \epsilon s$ or something similar: see Stephan. Thesaurus*. That $\theta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$ and $\theta o \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ are connected in usage was allowed by the old Grammarians: see Eustath. ad II. β , 702. p. 246, 47. Basil. $\dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\nu} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{\nu} \dot{\tau} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\lambda} \dot{\lambda} \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\tau} \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\tau} o \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau a$. Compare also Herodot. 6, 134., where the aorists $\dot{\nu} \dot{\tau} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \theta o \rho \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\nu}$, $\dot{\nu} \dot{\tau} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \theta o \rho \dot{\nu} \dot{\tau} \dot{\alpha}$ are used of leaping over a wall, and then follows the present: $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa o \nu \tau a \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon}$ (by leaping down) $\dot{\tau} \dot{\nu} \nu \mu \eta \rho \dot{\nu} \nu \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$.

Among the forms of this verb we may with safety class the perf. $\tau \in \theta \circ \rho \alpha$; as it would not be easy to find an emendation more certain than this of Canter in a verse of Antimachus in Poll. 2, 4. 178. ' Ωs e te $\delta \delta v \circ s \tau \in \theta \circ \rho \circ t \circ s$ of $\delta v \circ t \circ t \circ t \circ t \circ s$ instead of $\delta v \circ t \circ t \circ t \circ t \circ t \circ t$." instead of $\delta v \circ t \circ t$.

cated..." instead of θουρίης... έξ.

In the collateral sense of copulating (see $\theta\rho\omega'\sigma\kappa\omega$ and $\theta\rho\rho\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ in Hesych.) the depon. $\theta'\delta\rho\nu\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ is more common.

ΘΥΦ-. See Τύφω.

Θύω, I sacrifice: fut. $\theta \bar{\nu}' \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon} \theta \bar{\nu} \sigma \alpha$; perf. $\tau \epsilon \theta \tilde{\nu} \kappa \alpha \uparrow$, Chærobosc. p. 1286., Draco pp. 45, 26. and 87, 25.; aor. 1. pass. $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau \bar{\nu}' \theta \eta \nu$, part. $\tau \nu \theta \epsilon i c$.—MIDD.

θύω, and a sister-form θύνω, have also the sense of I rage; and with this meaning we find a syncop. part. aor. midd. θύμενοs in Pratinas ap. Athen. 14, p. 617. d. according to the reading as now corrected.

I

'Iάομαι, I heal, depon. midd.: fut. ίάσομαι, Ion. and Ep.

^{*} Even in Quint. Sm. 1, 542. $\theta o \rho e \hat{i}$ should be amended to the far more suitable poetical aor. $\theta \acute{o} \rho e \nu$.

[†] On this perf. compare $\Delta \epsilon \omega$ with note, and $\Delta \dot{\nu} \omega$ with second note.

ίήσομαι; aor. 1. ἰασάμην. Pass. I am healed, used only in pres. imperf. and aor. 1. ἰάθην, Ion. ἰήθην, Hippocr. De Arte 20. In the older writers from Homer's time the ι and a are long through all the moods and tenses: in the later authors, particularly in the Anthologia, ι became common.

'Ιδρώω, I sweat; fut. ἰδρώσω, &c. This verb, like its contrary ριγόω, is contracted irregularly in ω and ω, instead of ov and oι; thus ἰδρῶσα, Il. δ, 27., ἰδρώην, ἰδρῶσι, ἰδρῶντες, Hippocr. This however seems to hold good of the Ionic dialect only, as in Xen. Hell. 4, 5, 7. the best editions now read ἰδροῦντι, not ἰδρῶντι.

Ίδρύω, I place, build: fut. ίδρύσω, &c.—ΜΙDD.

The aor. 1. pass. $i\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\theta\eta\nu$, regular with ν long, is recommended as exclusively the Attic form; on the other hand $i\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\nu\theta\eta\nu^*$ (which supposes a theme in $-\dot{\nu}\nu\omega$, which occurs in Homer, and came into use again in a later period,) is rejected by the Atticists: see Thom. M. in voc. It is found however, and sometimes even without a various reading, in the best writers. See Lobeck ad Phryn. in voc. p. 37. note. Oudend. ad Thom. M. Fisch. 3. p. 108.

"Ιζω, more generally $\kappa a\theta i \zeta \omega$, 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.† (Hom. and Herodot. 8, 52. 71.); but of $\kappa a\theta i \zeta \omega$ we find a fut. $\kappa a\theta i \hat{\omega}$, an aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta i \kappa a$, and perf. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta i \kappa a$. The Middle has the sense of to sit, and its future is generally $\kappa a\theta i \zeta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu a \iota$.

With regard to the accentuation of this verb, we know that the vowels ι and ν when short can be augmented only by being made long, as ι $\kappa \epsilon - \tau \epsilon \nu \omega$, aor. ι ι $\kappa \epsilon + \tau \epsilon \nu \omega$, aor. ι ι $\kappa \epsilon + \tau \epsilon \nu \omega$, but where they are already long by position, the augment can be marked only by the difference of pronunciation and accent; thus in ι ι ι ι ι the imperat. pres. is ι ι ι ι ι the imperation of transcription this rule is very frequently broken in the manuscripts, and consequently in the text of all writers. The older

^{*} Instances occur where there is no ν in the pres. of a verb, and yet it is found in the aor. 1. pass., as $i\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\nu\theta\eta\nu$, $\dot{\alpha}\mu\pi\nu\dot{\nu}\nu$ - $\theta\eta$ under ' $i\delta\rho\dot{\nu}\omega$ and $\Pi\nu\dot{\epsilon}\omega$. In such cases it is not necessary to suppose an actual theme in $-\dot{\nu}\nu\omega$. Compare $i\theta\dot{\nu}\nu$ - $\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$ for $i\theta\dot{\nu}\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$. See also $T\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$.

^{† [}Passow has also a fut. ἰζήσω, Att. ἱω̄; and in the compound he has fut. κα-θιζήσω, Dor. καθίζω, Att. καθιω̄; aor. 1. ἐκάθῖσα, also καθῖσα, Thuc. 6, 66. 7, 82. Aristoph. Ran. 911. The Epic part. κα-θίσσαs is used by Homer.]

Attics augmented καθίζω in the middle also, καθίζε, καθίσεν*. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 122. Dindorf. ad Aristoph. Ran. 921. Bekk. Thueyd. 6, 66, 7, 82, with the various readings.

The later writers, from the time of Aristotle, have also a pres. iζάνω, καθιζάνω.

With this verb is intimately connected the verb εζεσθαι, καθέζεσθαι, which never occurs in the older writers except in the agrist εζόμην, εκαθεζόμην, I sat, I have sat down, καθεζόμενος, &c., and of which the fut. 2. is καθεδούμαι † (like μαγούμαι and πιούμαι). The defective tenses are supplied by είσα, ίζω, and ίδρύω, with the comp. καθείσα, &c.

The general supposition is, that there are two synonymous verbal forms ϊζεσθαι and εζεσθαι. In that case εζόμην must be an imperf. as well as ίζόμην; whereas we can prove, not from the Homeric language, which is in this respect uncertain, but from Attic prose, that it is invariably a pure agrist. Plat. Meno. 26. p. 89. καὶ δὴ καὶ νῦν εἰς καλὸν ἡμῖν παρεκαθέζετο, ώ μεταδώμεν της ζητήσεως: in this construction the imperf. is not to be thought of, and the sense runs plainly thus, "he sat himself down by us," &c. Again in Xen. Anab. 5, 8, 14. (6.) καὶ αὐτός ποτε καθεζόμενος συχνὸν χρόνον κατέμαθον ἀναστὰς μόγις, not "while I was scating myself," nor "while I was sitting," but "after having sat a considerable time," &c. And in confirmation of this comes the strong inductive conclusion, which every one will draw for himself, that έζετο in the poets, and ἐκαθέζετο in all writers, are regularly used in the narrative of the momentary action of sitting down, as is also καθέζωμαι, &c.: those passages, therefore, where the context does not necessarily show this, must be understood in the same sense. And thus the few instances where the pres. καθέζομαι is found become very suspicious!.

† [Diogen. Laert. has also a fut. καθε-

δήσομαι.--Passow.]

τὸ καθέζεσθαι,—we must undoubtedly read here also καθίζομαι and καθίζεσθαι: for it is clear that the point in discussion is the difference between the midd. and act. voices, in the same way as καταδουλοῦσθαι and καταδουλοῦν are spoken of just afterwards. But in the direction given by Thom. M. (p. 489.) λέγεουν καθέζομαι, έκαθεζόμην, &c., καθέζομαι is evidently an interpolation, for among the preceding forms which are rejected there is no present: and in Lucian Philopseud. 27. the reading καθέζεται is uncertain. In Eurip. Heracl. 33. Ίκέται καθεζόμεσθα the augment is in the synalcepha, and the context requires either we are sitting (καθήμεθα)

^{* [}Wolf always accents the imperf. κάθιζον, not καθίζον, and his is indisputably the more correct way if we suppose the original form to be ἐκάθιζον: but Buttmann does not allow this to hold good in all cases .- Passow.]

[‡] În Lucian Solæc. 11. τό γε μήν καθέζεσθαι τοῦ καθίζειν διενήνοχεν. Here is a various reading καθίζεσθαι. Now when we find further on, τὸ δὲ καθίζω τοῦ καθέζομαι ἄρά σοι δοκεῖ μικρώ τινι διαφέρειν; είπερ το μέν έτερον δρώμεν (we do that to another), τὸ καθίζειν λέγω, τὸ δὲ μόνους ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς,

We can now then join together as the usage of common prose all the forms of this family of verbs which belong to the meanings to sit and to seat, together with $\epsilon i \sigma a$ and $i \mu a \iota$, whose immediate connection with ϊζω and ἔζεσθαι is shown in the note below: thus, καθίζω, I seat, place, έκάθισα, καθιώ. ΜΙDD. καθίζομαι, I seat myself, sit, fut. καθεδούμαι and καθιζήσομαι, aor. ἐκαθεζόμην. In the more remote meaning of the middle voice, I seat or place (for myself), cause to be placed, are used είσάμην and καθεισάμην, whence έγκαθείσατο, Eurip. Hipp. 31.: perf. κάθημαι, properly I have seated myself, whence pres. I sit. Nor must we forget to mention with the above the usage of καθίζω, 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 κρεμάννυμι.

The meaning of I seat or place myself may also be understood passively; and so arose (ἔσθην) ἐκαθέσθην, καθεσθήσομαι, forms which are frequent in the later writers but banished from the pure language*.

On the Homeric ἐφέσσεσθαι see note on είσα 2. under ΕΩ.

"In μ i, I send. See under ' $E\Omega$ 1.

'Ιθύω, I go straight on: fut. ἰθύσω; aor. 1. ἴθῦσα, &c., to which be-

or we seated ourselves, consequently ἐκα-θεζόμεθα. Again in Phæn. 73. and Helen. 1587. καθέζετ' is ἐκαθέζετο. Whether in a later period a usage was formed from this, according to which καθέζομαι, as a present, was the same as κάθημαι, 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, καθέζονται; 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 $\kappa \alpha \theta i$ - $\zeta o \nu \tau \alpha i$ is of no assistance, the context requiring κάθηνται. However the language of this dialogue, in which we find ης for ησθα, περιέστακας (see ιστημι) p. 570. d., and διψά 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 ¿δουμαι, εδος and sedeo. Now as $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\delta\mu\eta\nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\delta\mu\eta\nu$ come from $\ddot{\epsilon}\pi\omega$ and $\dot{\epsilon}X\Omega$, so $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\delta\dot{\delta}\mu\eta\nu$ comes from 'EΔQ: and here even better than in è- $\sigma\pi\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ we can see the augment which in the common language had become equally fixed throughout all the moods, eodowai, ἔζωμαι, ἐζόμενος. Το the above we may add the pres. ἴσδω, ἵζω, exactly like ἴσχω to εσχον. In καθίζω, καθέζετο this origin naturally enough ceased to be heard any longer, and thenwere formed ἐκάθισα, καθιώ: καθέζετο received a new augment at the beginning: and as to the aoristic accentuation of the infin., there is still less reason for insisting on it in the case of καθέζεσθαι than in that of other agrists, which we have seen mistaken in a similar manner. But it is now clear also that είσα and ημαι, whose connection with έζεσθαι we acknowledged (see p. 117.), and yet separated them from it on practical grounds, do not come from 'EΩ, but from this same ΈΔΩ; that is to say ημαι was softened down from houar, of which latter there are still remains in horal and in είσα, είσάμην, both formed with that oldest of augments et, which being misunderstood in this case also was carried on to some forms to which it did not belong.

* See Lobeck. ad Phryn. p. 269. reading προσκαθιζήσει there proposed for Æschin. c. Ctes. p. 77, 33. has been now adopted by Bekker from evident traces in the Codd. The conj. έσθω in Soph. Œd. C. 195. was indeed still more impro-

bable: see Brunck and Reisig.

longs also in Homer and others ἐπιθύω, with the ι long. But ἰθύνω is Ionic and Epic for εὐθύνω, I direct or guide straight forward: aor. 1. ἴθυνα; also in the midd. ἰθύνετο in the act. sense, Od. χ , 8.

Ίκνέομαι, more generally άφικνέομαι, I come, depon. midd.: fut. ίξομαι; aor. ἰκόμην; perf. ἶγμαι, άφῖγμαι, άφῖχθαι.

The Ion. 3. plur. perf. pass. $\delta\pi i\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha i$ in Herodotus is remarkable as the only known instance of the *tenuis* in the stem being retained. But $\bar{i}\kappa\tau o$ in Hes. θ , 481. is a syncopated agrist: and to this belongs also $\bar{i}\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu os$ for $i\kappa\delta\mu\epsilon\nu os$ in Soph. Phil. 494.: see note in Buttm. edit.

The Epic language has the pres. and imperf. of the active, $\tilde{\iota}_{\kappa\omega}$, $\tilde{\iota}_{\kappa\sigma\nu}$, with the aor. $\tilde{\iota}_{\xi\sigma\nu}$; on which last, as a mixture of the aor. 1. and 2. see $\tilde{\epsilon}\delta\dot{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\tau\sigma$, p. 73., and $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\sigma\epsilon$ under $\Phi\hat{\epsilon}\rho\omega$.

In the pres. ἴκω the ι is long throughout, while in the aor. ἰκόμην it is, according to the root, short, but becomes long by the augment; consequently in ἰκόμην, ἀφῖκόμην it is long; in ἰκέσθαι, ἴκωμαι, &c. short: and accordingly in the Epic language the indicative ἰκόμην, from the augment being moveable, is both long and short. The form ἰκνοῦμαι (Eurip. Or. 670. 679. &c.) has the ι short. Another poetical present is ἰκάνω, with ι short and α long.

The pres. ἰκνοῦμαι occurs in its simple form in particular senses only; in Hom. to go through, travel from one place to another, Od. ι, 128. ω, 338.: in the Attics, to go to as a suppliant (ἰκέτης), implore, and to be suitable to. The true pres. as to meaning is in the Epic language ἵκω and ἰκάνω, in the Tragic principally ἰκάνω, in prose ἀφικνοῦμαι. The aor. ἱξον is solely Epic; but ἰκόμην and ἵξομαι are common to all the poets.

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

ging it to $\epsilon \iota$, as in $\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega \pi \iota \theta \epsilon \bar{\iota} \nu$, passed over into $\bar{\iota}$ or η ; making therefore ' $\bar{\iota} \kappa \omega$ or $\ddot{\eta} \kappa \omega$ instead of $\epsilon \ddot{\iota} \kappa \omega$.

[•] That is to say, that in this verb the short syllable of the stem or root, as seen in the acrist $(i\kappa\epsilon\hat{\imath}\nu)$ $i\kappa\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, instead of being strengthened in the present by chan-

Ίλάσκομαι, I appease, midd.: fut. ιλάσομαι (Ep. ιλάσσομαι, Dor. ιλάξομαι); aor. 1. ιλασάμην with a short.

The Epics have also ἰλάομαι, (Il. β, 550.) and ἵλαμαι (Hom. Hymn. 20. Orph. Arg. 942.); while Æschylus has ἰλέομαι, Suppl. 123. 134. The ι of the radical syllable is long, but it is also shortened by the Epics.

In the old language the active voice had the sense of to be gracious, kind, whence the Epics took an imperat. $\tilde{\iota}\lambda\eta\theta\iota$ (Od. γ , 380. π , 184. $\tilde{\iota}\lambda\tilde{a}\theta\iota$, Theorr. 15, 143.) from $\tilde{\iota}\lambda\eta\mu\iota$, and a conj. and opt. from $\tilde{\iota}\lambda\eta\kappa\omega^*$.

'Ιμάσσω†, I whip: fut. iμάσω ($\check{\alpha}$); aor. 1. $\check{\iota}$ μασα. On the formation of this fut. see 'Αρμόττω.

'Ιμάω, I draw up (a rope or water): fut. ἰμήσω, &c. The Att. infin. pres. is ἰμῆν: compare ζάω, θάω.—ΜΙDD.

'Ιμείρω and ἰμείρομαι, I desire, wish for. The aor. opt. midd. is ἰμείραιτο (II. ξ , 163.), and the aor. 1. pass. ἰμέρθη (Herodot. 7, 44.). The ι is always long.

"Ιπταμαι. See Πέτομαι.

"Ισημι, I know. [Of this verb we find only the Dor. pres. ἴσᾶμι in Pind. and Theocr., the 2. sing. ἴσης, 3. sing. ἴσᾶτι, and 1. plur. ἴσᾶ-μεν, Pind. N. 7, 21., and the part. ἴσας, Pind. P. 3, 52. The forms which only appear to belong to this verb, such as ἴσμεν, ἴĉμεν, ἴσασι, ἵσθι, ἴσαν, will be found under Εἴδω.—Passow.]

"Ισκω. "Ισκεν, he spoke, is a defective imperf. (Od. χ , 31.), differing essentially from ισκω or είσκω, I make or think like (which occurs only

† The characteristic σσ of this verb may

be doubted, for $i\mu\acute{a}\sigma\sigma\omega$ (II. 0, 17.) may be the conj. aor., as it is in Hesychius; nor do I know other authority for the pres. than $i\mu a\sigma\sigma\acute{\mu}e\nu o\iota$ in Archiæ Epig. 22. which was perhaps first made from the passage of Homer.

^{*} We must compare these imperatives with $\sigma\tau\eta\theta\iota$, έ $\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha$, &c., and suppose that the pres. and aor. 1. took the causative sense to make gracious; of which ἰλάομαι, ἰλασάμην, would then be the middle, I make gracious to me, appease.

in the pres. and imperf., Il. λ , 798. ϵ , 181. Od. δ , 279. ν , 313.), and arising from the insertion of the σ in IK— the root of ϵ iκ ω , like λ άσκ ω from λ ακ ϵ i ν , τ ιτ $\dot{\nu}$ σκ ω from τ ϵ ύ χ ω , &c. With respect to $\dot{\epsilon}$ -ίσκ ω see note on Έλδομαι, $\dot{\epsilon}$ έλδομαι.

Ἰστημι: imperf. ἴστην; fut. στήσω; aor. 1. ἔστησα; perf. ἕστηκα; pluperf. ἐστήκειν, Att. εἰστήκειν. The aor. 2. indic. ἔστην is seldom used before the time of Polybius; its other moods are found in Homer. Pass. ἴστάμαι; imperf. ἰστάμην; fut. σταθήσομαι; aor. 1. ἐστάθην (ἄ); perf. ἔσταμαι; pluperf. ἐστάμην. Fut. midd. στήσομαι; aor. 1. ἐστησάμην; fut. 3. (paulo-post) ἐστήξω old Att., and ἐστήξομαι later, Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 597., like τεθνήξω, τεθνήξομαι, from θνήσκω. Verbal adj. στάτός, στατέος.

The 2. and 3. sing. of the indic. pres. in $-\hat{q}s$ and $-\hat{q}$ are found only in the later writers. The 3. plur. ἰστᾶσι is the Attic form, ἰστέασι the Ionic, ἰστάντι the Doric. In the optat. is an abridged form of the dual and plural by dropping the η , and in the 3. plur. changing $-\eta \sigma a \nu$ into $-\epsilon \nu$, thus returning to the regular optat. of the barytone verbs; as dual, ίσταῖτον, ίσταίτην, plur. ίσταίμεν, ίσταῖτε, ίσταῖεν: the same is found in the optat. of the aor. 2. as σταῖτε for σταίητε; 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 Epie 3. sing. "στασκε (Od. τ, 574.) with a sister-form in -ων, -as, -a, peculiar to the Ionic dialect and the later writers: Homer has also an aor. 2. στάσκον. In the aor. 2. imperat. instead of στηθι we have in the compounds παράστα, ἀπόστα*, as from a theme ΣΤΑΩ. In the infin. pres. are iστάμεν, iστάμεναι, with a short, for iστάναι, but in the aor. 2. the long vowel remains, as στημέν, στήμεναι, Od. ε, 414. Il. ρ, 167. In the middle the fut. and aor. 1. are Homeric; the latter is also in common use: but an aor. 2. ἐστάμην is nowhere found in any of its moods or tenses. In the passive the Ion. 3. plur. is ἰστέαται for ἴσταντι.

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

^{*} The length of the α is sufficiently evident from two passages in Menand. ap. Suid. v. $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\omega}\sigma\tau\alpha$. We see in Lex. Seguer.

p. 81. that some Atticists considered this form inferior to the other.

Epics vary to suit the metre, using $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \omega$, $\sigma \tau i \eta \eta$, $\sigma \tau i \eta \eta \tau \sigma v$, &c., and $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \omega \mu \epsilon v$ for $\sigma \tau i \omega \mu \epsilon v$, $\sigma \tau i \mu \epsilon \tau \sigma v$ for $\sigma \tau i \eta \tau \sigma v$: but it is very difficult indeed to distinguish some of the above forms from those of the optative. In the conjunct. and optat. of the passive voice of all verbs in $\mu \epsilon$ 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 δύναμαι): thus we find in all writers τσταιο, τσταιτο, τσταισθε, τσταιντο; but in the conjunct. always $i \sigma \tau \omega \mu \alpha \iota$, $\sigma \nu \nu \iota \sigma \tau \eta \tau \alpha \iota$, &c. See $\Delta \nu \nu \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\Delta \nu \iota$

The tenses of this verb, like those of δύω, φύω, 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. ἴστημι, ἴστην; fut. στήσω; aor. l. ἔστησα: whence therefore the whole of the passive voice has the sense of to be placed; and a middle (ἴσταμαι, στήσομαι, ἐστησάμην), answering to the above tenses of the active, has the meaning of to place for oneself, cause to be placed or erected.

But the middle has also the pure reflective meaning of to place oneself, which however was felt more as an intransitive, or as the inchoative belonging to the sense of to stand, like the Latin consistere, to stop. Considered in this light the relation between $i\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ and $i\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\iota\iota$ 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 $T\epsilon\nu\chi\omega$), we have the meaning of the

aor. 2. ἔστην, constiti as aorist, I placed myself, stopped; perf. ἔστηκα, properly constiti as perfect, I have placed myself, stopped, and thence I stand;

so that this perf. in Greek supplies the place of the Latin stare, to stand, and the pluperf. ἐστήκειν or εἰστήκειν the imperf. of the same*.

To suit this present meaning of the perfect was formed

^{*} In the later and corrupted state of the language a pres. was formed from έστηκα, viz. στήκω, whence στήκετε, 1 Cor. 16,

and στήκοντες, Alex. Aphrod. Probl.
 49. And again another pres. ἐστήκω,
 Posidippi Epigr. 15.

also a proper future $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\xi\omega$ or $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\xi\sigma\mu\alpha$, I shall stand, which, though a passive form, is not to be regarded as properly such (for in meaning it corresponds with the active), but as a fut. midd. with an active sense, like $\theta\alpha\nu\sigma\dot{\nu}\mu\alpha$, $\lambda\dot{\eta}$ - $\psi\sigma\mu\alpha$, &c.

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

Of all the syncopated forms of this perfect the infin. ἐστάναι* is most used, and ἐστηκέναι perhaps not at all. Of the others are found principally ἕσταμεν, -ατε†, -ασιν' ἔστασαν' ἐστώς, -ωσα, gen. -ωτος.

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

Instead of the regular perf. part. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}s$, $-\upsilon\hat{a}$, $-\upsilon s$, gen. $-\upsilon\tau\sigma s$, is used a syncopated form $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}s$, $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}\sigma\alpha$, $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}s$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}s$ (of the last we shall speak hereafter), gen. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma s$. There is also an Ionic form $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\dot{\omega}s$, $-\omega\sigma\alpha$, $-\dot{\omega}s$, gen. $-\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma s$, like $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}s$, &c. (see under $\theta\nu\dot{\eta}\sigma\kappa\omega$); and Homer has frequently a gen. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\dot{\sigma}\tau\sigma s$, an accus. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\dot{\sigma}\tau a$, and a nom. plur. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\dot{\sigma}\tau s$, as from $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\dot{\omega}s$; while another form $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\dot{\omega}s$, from $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}s$ by dropping the κ (like $\tau\epsilon\tau\lambda\eta\dot{\omega}s$ and others; see under $\theta\alpha\dot{\omega}s$), is found in Hes. θ , 5.19., and a gen. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\dot{\omega}\tau s$, with a fem. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\dot{\omega}\tau s$ in Apollon. Rhod. Again, like $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\omega s$ for $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}s$, we have a singular form in Hom. $\ddot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\tau\epsilon$

^{*} For which Homer has ἐστάμεν and ἐστάμεναι.

⁺ For which Homer has also εστητε, 11. δ, 243. 246.

[‡] In Andoc. 2, 8. καθέστατε is pluperf., and at 1, 112. παρέσταμεν according to Bekker is the same. [Homer has ἕστάτον as dual of both perf. and pluperf.; and έστάτην, plur. ἔστἄμεν, ἔστᾶτε, ἔστᾶσαν as pluperfects.—Passow.]

[§] We may gather from different parts of Buttmann's Grammar the following for-

mation: the regular part, was $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\dot{\omega}s$, whence by dropping the κ came $\epsilon\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\omega s$: the Ionics changed the η into short a (see under $Bai\nu\omega$), whence $\epsilon\dot{\sigma}\tau\dot{a}\omega s$; while again in $\epsilon\dot{\sigma}\tau\dot{\eta}\omega s$ the length of the η passed on into the following vowel, making $\epsilon\dot{\sigma}\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega\dot{s}$, though the origin of this change was not visible in the nom. as it is in the gen. $\epsilon\dot{\sigma}\tau\dot{\eta}\dot{\nu}\sigma\dot{s}$ $\epsilon\dot{\sigma}\tau\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\tau\dot{s}$, like $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{\eta}\rho\rho\sigmas$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega\dot{\tau}\sigma\dot{s}$.

^{||} This reading, according to the correct criticism of the grammarian in the scho-

for ἐστήκατε or ἔστατε, Il. δ, 243. 246. We find also for the syncopated 3. plur. ἐστᾶσι the Ion. resolved form ἐστέασι in Herodot. 1, 200.3,62.; and without doubt the 2.pl. ἐστέατε, προεστέατε, in Herodot. 5, 49. is genuine, notwithstanding the various reading προέστατε has crept in from the common language.

If we follow analogy the neut. part. of ἐστώs, contracted from ἐσταόs, 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 ἐστόs. Hence it is very probable that in this case the language of the Attics followed apparent analogy, and formed from ἐστώs the neuter ἐστόs. Still the gen. and other cases are ἐστώτοs, &c.*

There is also a perf. for the transitive meaning $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha$, I have placed, which belongs however to a later $\alpha\tau\alpha$. The older Attics used instead of the perfect, whether in a transitive or intransitive sense, (for there is no proper form to express I have stood,) either the aorists or a circumlocution, turning the perf. act. for instance into the perf. passive, and instead of ϵv $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \chi as$ saying ϵv $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau ai$ σoi , because $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \chi a$ was 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. μ , 55. and 56. where it has the two meanings in two succeeding verses. In the description there given of the ditch round the Grecian camp we read, $\kappa\rho\eta\mu\nu\delta$ 0... Εστασαν ἀμφοτέρωθεν, ὅπερθεν δὲ σκολόπεσσιν 'Οξέσιν ἡρήρει, τοὺs εστασαν υἶες 'Αχαιῶν. Here the first is beyond a doubt ἔστασαν: for there is no other form to express the imperf. they stood or were standing. It seemed therefore most natural to write the same in the second instance also, and to suppose that the old language used the perfect in both senses: and the context is much in favour of this, "which the Greeks had placed." But there are other instances of $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ in a transitive sense, as Il. β , 525. Od. γ , 182. σ , 306., in all which it is evidently an aorist; whereas the pluperf. (which necessarily is and remains $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$, if we deduce it in a transitive sense from the perfect have placed) cannot stand in these

lium, has been admitted by Wolf into the text instead of ἔστητε, 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 & or os, as does Hermann in Soph. CEd. T. 632. Compare Dind. Aristoph. Equ. 567. The other

reading is defended in Alb. Hesych. 1, p. 503.

† In Polyb. 10, 20. stands ἐφεστάκες, according to which therefore, if we find in the same writer ἐφέστηκε in a transitive sense, it must be altered. See Fisch. 2. p. 368. 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. σ , 306, without the greatest violence. But if $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ be an aorist, it must be a shortened form of $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$: and this opinion of Aristarchus, which Wolf has followed in his last edition, appears to me undoubted, particularly when I compare it with a similar case in Hesiod, $\epsilon\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\epsilon$ for $\epsilon\pi\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon^*$ (see $\Pi(\mu\pi\rho\eta\mu\mu)$).

Έπίσταμαι see in its alphabetical place.

"Ισχω. See "Εχω. ΙΩ. See Εΐμι.

K.

ΚΛΔ-, κέκασμαι, κέκαδμαι. See Καίνυμαι. Κεκαδεῖν, -ήσειν. See Κήδω and Χάζω.

Κάθαίρω, I cleanse: fut. κάθαρω; aor. 1. ἐκάθηρα (later ἐκαθαρα also), infin. καθαραι, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 25.—Μισσ. This verb is no compound; see Buttm. Lexil. p. 119.

Καθέζομαι. See "Ιζω.
 Καθεύδω. Se Εΰδω.
 Κάθημαι. See Ἡμαι.
 Καθίζω. See Ἦχω.

Καίνυμαι, I am distinguished, excel: defective depon. without fut. or aor., and occurring only in pres. and imperf. There is however a synonymous perf. κέκασμαι, Dor. κέκαδμαι; pluperf. ἐκεκάσμην. That these forms are correctly classed under one verb both sense and construction plainly show. For as in Od. γ, 282. we read ἐκαίνυτο φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων Νῆα κυβερνῆσαι, so at β, 158. we find ὀμηλικίην ἐκέκαστο "Ορνιθας γνῶναι: and as at θ, 219. Οἶος δή με Φιλοκτήτης ἀπεκαίνυτο τόξφ, so at II. ξ, 124. δς ἡλικίην ἐκέκαστο "Εγχεϊ. But κέκασμαι occurs also without an accusative; therefore, as a necessary result of the above comparison, it stands absolutely in the sense of to excel or be distinguished in anything, as κεκάσθαι ἰπποσύνη, μύθοισι, ἀλκῆ κακοῖσι δόλοισι κεκασμένε, &c. For these expressions a present κάζω has been supposed with the meaning of to equip, adorn; but the above comparison shows that καίνυμαι might have been used in that absolute sense quite as well

point only from Buttmann: he reads with him the 3. plur. aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\nu$ for $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta$ - $\sigma\alpha\nu$ in II. β , 525. Od. γ , 182. and σ , 306., but he also reads it in both lines 55 and 56 of II. μ ., whereas Buttmann reads in the former of the two the pluperf. $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ with the force of an imperfect.]

^{*} An opposite case is found in Callim. L. P. 83. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\theta\eta$ with α long; if it is not a false reading for $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\alpha}\kappa\eta$ ($\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\dot{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota$); 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 Il. μ , 55, 56. Passow differs in one

as $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \sigma \mu a \iota$, and no doubt would have been if it had occurred more frequently. It is found however only three times, and in its simple form but once through the whole of Homer. We must therefore join $\kappa a \iota \nu \nu \mu a \iota$ with $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \sigma \mu a \iota$, to which and to the Doric $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \delta \mu a \iota$ it bears exactly the same relation as $\dot{\rho} a \iota \nu \omega^*$ does to $\dot{\rho} \dot{a} \sigma \sigma a \iota e$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \dot{a} \delta a \tau a \iota$. But compared with each other as pres. and perf. they are like our expressions I distinguish myself and I am distinguished: and the radical idea is undoubtedly that of shining, $glittering \uparrow$, as in the Pindaric passage $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\epsilon} - \dot{\rho} a \nu \iota \iota$ $\dot{\rho} a \dot{\delta} \iota \mu \rho \nu$ $\dot{\kappa} \kappa a \dot{\delta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma s$; for the shoulder was not adorned with ivory, but composed of it, of which therefore the poet could say, it shone with ivory, or in Latin candebat. To this verb, as to so many others in the middle voice, was joined the accusative of the person, or $\mu e \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau o \dot{\imath} s$, $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau o \dot{\imath} s$, together with the dative of the thing; and sometimes (as in Od. τ , 82. $\dot{\delta}$, 725. Il. ω , 546. $\dot{\tau}$) this dative stood alone.

Kaiνω, I kill: fut. κανω; aor. 2. ἔκανον, infin. κανεῖν. The perf. is wanting. In the passive the pres. and imperf. only are in use.

This verb is a sister-form of $\kappa\tau\epsilon'\ell\nu\omega$, $\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon'\ell\nu$, to which it bears the same relation as $\pi\tau\delta\lambda\iota s$ to $\pi\delta\lambda\iota s$, or $\chi\theta\alpha\mu\alpha\lambda\delta s$ to $\chi\alpha\mu\alpha$. [It is very common both in the Poets and Tragedians and found also in the best Attic writers.—Passow.]

Καίω, I burn (transit.), Att. κάω with a long and without contraction: imperf. ἔκαιον, Att. ἔκᾱον; fut. καύσω (compare Θέω); aor. I. pass. ἐκαύθην. Verbal adj. καυτός, καυστός, καυστός, καυστός.

In the passive voice the aor. 1. is the only tense in use by the Attics; see Thom. M. v. $\kappa a \tau \epsilon \kappa a \acute{\nu} \theta \eta$. Beside Homer and Herodotus none but the later writers have the aor. 2. pass. $\epsilon \kappa \acute{a} \eta \nu$ (\check{a}).

The Epics have also an aor. 1. act. (without σ in the termination) $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \eta \alpha \S$; many forms of which fluctuate between η and $\epsilon \iota$, while a third

* For the terminations -νω and -νυμι are essentially the same; as in τίνω τίν-νυμι, κτείνω κτίννυμι.

† [Passow supposes it to be probably from καίνω, κτείνω, consequently from a radical form KENΩ in the sense of to

overpower, conquer.]

† The above account does not agree with the usage of Eurip. in Elect. 616., where the walls of the town Φρουραϊς κέκασται δεξιαϊς τε δορυφόρων. Here κέκασται evidently means are farnished, equipped,

a deviation in every respect from the usage of Homer, of which it is a partial imitation. § Some verbs form their aor. 1. in α

§ Some verbs form their aor. 1. in α instead of σa . In the common language there are only three, $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\alpha$ (Ep. $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\nu\alpha$) from $\chi \epsilon \omega$, $\epsilon \tilde{\iota}\pi\alpha$ from $\epsilon \tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon \tilde{\iota}\nu$, $\tilde{\eta}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha$ from $\epsilon \epsilon \omega$. The poets have also $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\eta\alpha$ from $\epsilon a \tilde{\iota}\omega$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu\alpha$ from $\epsilon \epsilon \omega$. As these aorists go over into the middle voice also $(\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon \epsilon \mu\eta\nu, \tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon \nu a\tau_0, \&c.)$, the Epic forms $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ may be considered as belonging to the same.

with ε has been retained by the Tragedians only, e. g. κέαντες Æschyl. Agam. 858., ἐκκέαντες 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 ἔκηα, ἔκηε, and the optat. 3. sing. κήαι, plur. κήαιεν, have no various reading with the $\epsilon \iota$, as all the others have: e.g. infin. aor. κείαι and κηαι, Od. o, 97: imperat. κείον and κηον, Od. φ, 176: conj. κείομεν and κήομεν, Il. η, 333. and 337: indic. midd. 3. plur. κείαντο and κήαντο, Il. ι, 88., and the same in the participles κείαντες, Od. ι, 231. r, 26., κειάμενος, Il. ι, 234. Od. π, 2. ψ, 51. If we compare with this the exactly similar appearance in the Epic conjunctives of the form in $\mu\iota$,—those for instance from $\xi\sigma\tau\eta\nu$, $\xi\beta\eta\nu^*$,—it is evident that when the η before the other vowel had been shortened in the old language into ϵ , it was again lengthened by the Epics into $\epsilon \iota$, like βείω, στείομεν, &c. in the two verbs above mentioned. Now as in some of these forms the various reading does not appear, while in others it is supported by the greatest authority of the manuscripts (see Heyne on the passages of the Iliad quoted above), I have no doubt of the reading κείαντο, κείομεν, κείαι, &c. in all those passages being the genuine one, i. e. having the oldest tradition in its favour †. Compare a similar case of the text fluctuating between τεθνειώτος and τεθνηώτος.

Some have also supposed a present $\kappa \in \omega$ and $\kappa \eta \omega$, on account of $\kappa \alpha$ - $\tau \alpha \kappa \epsilon \iota \ell \mu \epsilon \nu$ (var. reading $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \eta \ell \mu \epsilon \nu$), II. η , 408. and $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \eta \sigma \nu$, Od. ι , 553. To place this $\kappa \dot{\eta} \omega$ as an Ionicism by the side of the Attic $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \omega$ cannot be satisfactory, as $\kappa \alpha \dot{\iota} \omega$ is the Ionicism like $\kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\iota} \omega$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\iota} \alpha$; nor is it easy to perceive what grounds there are for those forms, when we have $\kappa \alpha \iota \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$, II. ξ , 397. and $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \nu$, Od. χ , 336. As therefore in the one passage $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \eta \sigma \nu$ has been already expelled from the text by the reading of the manuscripts $\tilde{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \nu$, so in the other $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha \iota \dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$ is undoubtedly the old reading, and the corruption was produced by confounding it with the forms of the aorist.

That the iota subscript with which $\kappa \acute{a}\omega$ and $\check{\epsilon}\kappa \eta a$ are written in many editions, new as well as old, rests entirely on a false opinion, is evident without further investigation. See Piers. ad Moer. p. 231.

Καλέω, *I call*: fut. καλέσω, fut. midd. καλέσομαι (Ep. and Poet. καλέσσω, καλέσσομαι, Attic καλώ[†], καλούμαι);

See Aristoph. Fr. 1133. and compare Piers. ad Moer. p. 321.

[•] As στείω for στέω, στήγε for στέγε; again στείομεν for στέωμεν, στήετον for στήπτον, δες... See Βρίνω and "Ιστην...

στήητον, &c. See Βαίνω and "Ιστημι.
† The form with ει is found once in Sophocl. El. 759. κείαντες with the various reading κήαντες, the alteration of which to κέαντες I cannot approve of.

[‡] The fut. $\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$, or, as the Attics spoke it, $\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{\omega}$, is indisputably the fut. of the simple stem or root $KA\Lambda\Omega$, and the common pres. $\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ arose out of that fut. as the Ionic pres. $\mu\alpha\chi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$ came from

aor. 1. ἐκάλεσα (Poet. καλέσσα); midd. ἐκαλεσάμην (Poet. καλεσσάμην); perf. κέκληκα; perf. pass. κέκλημαι (I am called, named), opt. κεκλήμην, κέκληο, &c.; aor. 1. pass. ἐκλήθην; fut. pass. κληθήσομαι; fut. 3. (paulo-post) κεκλήσομαι, I shall be called, named. Ion. and Hom. imperf. καλέεσκον.

From this verb came also by metathesis an Ionic sister-form $\kappa \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$, used by Homer in pres. and imperf. only; see note under $K \hat{\epsilon} \lambda o \mu a \iota$. On $\mathring{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \hat{\epsilon} o$ or $\mathring{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \hat{\epsilon} o$ see $K \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega$. This verb is the old Latin calo, calare.

Κάμνω, I am weary: fut. κάμοῦμαι; aor. 2. ἔκάμον*, infin. καμεῖν; aor. 2. midd. ἐκαμόμην; perf. by metathesis κέκμηκα: on which see βέβληκα under Βάλλω, and κέκληκα under Καλέω, with the note underneath.

Sophocles (Trach. 1215.) has the 2. sing. fut. καμεῖ. In the Epic part. perf. the κ is dropped as in κεκαφηώς, τ ετληώς and others; thus κεκμηώς, gen. -ότος and -ῶτος†, as in Hom. κεκμηῶτι, -ῶτα, and in accus. plur. -ότας: see under Βαίνω and "Ιστημι; also γεγαώς under Γείνομαι. The Epics have also very frequently the aor. 2. act. and midd. with the reduplication, which then remains in all the moods; thus λέλαθον, λελαθών; κέκλυθι, πεπύθοιτο, &c., and in the verb before us Homer has the conj. κεκάμω, κεκάμησι, κεκάμωσι.

Κάμπτω, I bend: fut. κάμψω, &c. In the perf. pass. when the 1. pers. has $\mu\mu$, one is naturally dropped, as κέκαμμαι, κέκαμψαι, &c.

Καταπροίξεσθαι Ion. (Archil. ap. Etym. M. v. προίκτης), καταπροίζεσθαι Att. (Aristoph. frequently); a defective verb found only in the fut.;,

μαχέσομαι-οῦμαι. From ΚΑΛΩ was formed κέκληκα by metathesis like τέτμηκα from τέμνω, κέκμηκα from κάμνω: see also βέβληκα under βάλλω. Instances of this fut. may be seen in καλεῖ, Xen. Symp. 1, 15. καλεῖσθε, Demosth. Lept. 5. παρακαλοῦντας, Xen. Hell. 6, 3, 2. See this formation also under Λέμω. Of the fut. καλέσω the only instances which we find in the older writers are in Æschin. c. Timarch. p. 10. and Lycurg. c. Leocr. p. 150. ἐπικαλέσεται. In Aristoph. Plut. 963. Brunck has mistaken the aorist for the future.

* See ἔδακον under Δάκνω, ἔταμον under Τέμνω.

† I cannot think there are any grounds for $\kappa\kappa\mu\eta\tilde{\omega}\tau\alpha$ s in Thucyd. 3, 59. however supported it may be by the manuscripts against the various reading $\kappa\kappa\kappa\mu\eta\kappa\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha$ s. It can hardly have been introduced by the antiquated meaning (the dead) or by the solemn tone of the oration, as $\kappa\kappa\mu\eta\kappa\acute{\omega}\tau$ s is used even by Euripides in the same sense.

‡ Thus οὐ καταπροίξεσθαι ἔφη, Herodot. 3, 36. καταπροίξεται, ib. 3, 156. Archil. Fr. 23. Aristoph. Nub. 1240. Vesp. 1396. καπροίξονται, Herodot. 5, 105. Aristoph. Vesp. 1366. Thesm. 566. Equ. 435.

and in such expressions as oi καταπροίξει, 'thou shalt not have done it for nothing' (i. e. not without being punished for it). A deviation to the aor. καταπροίξασθαι is very possible, but it occurs only in Themist. Or. 14. init.* In the Etym. M. we find also a verb $\pi \rho$ οίσσομαι, I beg, quoted from Archilochus, from which comes $\pi \rho$ οίκτης in Homer: but the etymological connection of the two is not clear.

Καυάξαις. See" Αγνυμι.

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

KAΦ-; whence perf. part. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \tilde{\alpha} \phi \eta \omega s$, -όros, breathing short and with difficulty, Il. ϵ , 698. Od. ϵ , 468. Of this root or stem we find no other trace except that Hesychius has $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \eta \phi \epsilon$, $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon$: probably with the sense of expirare. [This perf. seems to be formed from an obsolete theme $\kappa \alpha \phi \epsilon \omega$, akin to $\kappa \alpha \pi \tau \omega$ and $\kappa \alpha \pi \dot{\nu} \omega$.—Passow.]

Κεῖμαι, I lie, belongs to the stem or root ΚΕΙΩ or ΚΕΩ, and has only a pres., imperf. and fut. Pres. κεῖμαι, κεῖσαι ‡, κεῖται, &c., 3. plur. κεῖνται: imperat. κεῖσο, κείσθω, &c.; optat. κεοίμην; conj. κέωμαι §, κέη, &c.; infin. κεῖσθαι; part. κείμενοs. Imperf. ἐκείμην, ἔκεισο, ἔκειτο, &c. Fut. κείσομαι. Comp. κατάκειμαι, κατάκεισαι, &c.: but the infin. retains the accent on the syllable of the stem or root, κατακεῖσθαι. So also ἐπίκειμαι, &c.

The forms of the optative and conjunctive as well as the accent of the compound infinitive might possibly recommend KEO as the radical form of $\kappa\epsilon\hat{\imath}\mu\alpha\iota$: but the whole formation of the verb, together with the derivatives $\kappaoi\tau\eta$, $\kappao\iota\mu\hat{\imath}\nu$, makes it far more probable that the $\epsilon\iota$ is the radical syllable and the forms with the ϵ shortened from it. $K\epsilon\hat{\imath}\mu\alpha\iota$ itself might certainly be considered as a syncopated form (like $\delta\hat{\imath}\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\hat{\imath}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$), by virtue of which it would agree with the formation in $\mu\iota$; but it is better to take it altogether as an old perfect (I have laid my-

* Brunck thought indeed that he had found in the Argument of the Antigone of Sophocles an aor. pass. $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \rho o \iota \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha \epsilon$ in a different form and meaning; but it is a mere error of transcription for $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \rho \eta \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha \epsilon$.

† That is to say, $\pi \rho o(\xi)$ had the general sense of a gift, as originally dos had in Latin; thence $\pi \rho o(\pi \kappa)$, like $\partial \omega \rho e(\alpha)$, without pay or reward, gratis. The verb from which this word is derived meant therefore to make a present of; and thus $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi \rho o(\xi \epsilon)$ is a neat sarcasm, "thou shalt not give me that for nothing," i. e. I will give thee something in return, I will pay thee for it. The connection is here plain and certain.

Whereas to beg is, it is true, the correlative of to make a present of, but on that very account not fit to be joined in the same idea, because language rather strives to make the distinction between such words clearly perceptible. Otherwise it would be easy enough to have recourse to the idea of stretching out the hand as belonging to both actions.

‡ Homer always uscs κεῖσαι, κεῖσο, but we find in the Hymn. Merc. 254. as 2.

sing. κατάκειαι.

§ Whether $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} \omega \mu \alpha \iota$ was a genuine Attic form may be doubted. In an inscription in the Corp. Inscript. I. n. 102. p. 10. stands $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} \iota \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota$.

self down, consequently I lie,) with the redupl. dropped, by which the accent in the compound $\kappa \alpha \tau \acute{\alpha} \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu \iota \iota$, $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \epsilon \imath \sigma \theta \iota \iota$ is accounted for in the most natural way, like $\kappa \acute{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$, $\kappa \alpha \theta \mathring{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. From the shortening of $\epsilon \iota$ to ϵ arose naturally the change to the form in $-\acute{\epsilon} \omega$, whence in Homer $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} o \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, in Herodot. 1, 178. $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$, and in Hippocr. de A. A. L. 9, p. 333. $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$.

Instead of the 3. sing. κεῖται Herodotus has κέεται, and later writers κέαται*: instead of the 3. plur. κεῖνται Homer has κέονται, and very frequently (according to Ionic analogy) κείἄται and κέαται, the latter of which is found only in Homer and the later Ionics. In the 3. plur. imperf. Homer and the Ionics for ἔκειντο have κείᾶτο and κέᾶτο, with an iterative κέσκετο. Od. φ, 41. In the infin. pres. we find in Hippocr. κέεσθαι for κεῖσθαι.

In II. τ , 32. Od. β , 102. Wolf has altered according to the Venet. manuscript the old reading of the text $\kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau a \iota$ (which as an indicat. would be certainly incorrect) to a conjunct. $\kappa \hat{\eta} \tau a \iota$. But this was unnecessary, as by an old usage $\kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu a \iota$, $\kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau a \iota$ served for both conjunct. and indicat. Thus in Plat. Phædo p. 84. e. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ diákei $\mu a \iota$ is conjunct., and in p. 93. a. stands eximple $\delta \iota u = \delta \iota u = \delta \iota u = \delta \iota u$ with a various reading in the Ed. Bas. 2. $\delta u = \delta \iota u = \delta \iota u$, which ought however to be accented $\delta u = \delta \iota u$ on the other hand, Bekker in Isocr. $\delta u = \delta \iota u$. And $\delta u = \delta \iota u$ has corrected from a good codex $\delta u = \delta \iota u$ and $\delta u = \delta \iota u$ or $\delta u = \delta \iota u$ has corrected from a good codex $\delta u = \delta \iota u$. Compare a similar case in $\delta \iota u$ under $\delta \iota u$.

Homer has also an infin. $\kappa\epsilon\iota\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$ and part. $\kappa\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu$, $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ (from KEIQ) as future, Il. ξ , 340. Od. η , 342.; which undoubtedly come from the fut. $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\omega$ contracted to $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}$ and again shortened to $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\omega$. That this form should pass into a desiderative was very natural, Od. θ , 315. Compare a similar future in $\delta\dot{\eta}\epsilon\iota s$, $\delta\dot{\eta}o\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\delta\dot{\eta}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ from a fut. $\delta a\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ and a root $\Delta\Lambda\Omega$.

Κείρω, I shear: fut. κερω; perf. pass. κέκαρμαι; nor. 2. pass. ἐκάρην.—ΜIDD.

The Epic language forms the fut. κέρσω, aor. 1. ἔκερσα. Pindar (Pyth. 4, 146.) has the aor. 1. pass. ἐκέρθην.

Κείω. See δήω, p. 56.; also Καίω and Κείμαι.

* κέαται is properly the Ion. 3. plur, shortened from κείαται, but used as a 3. sing, by those later writers to whom the Ion. dialect was no longer natural. See Reitz ad Luc. de D. S. 6.

† See Herm. ad Vig. not. 526. and De Metr. 1. p. 86. where the very analogous form $\kappa \acute{e}\epsilon \tau a\iota$ for $\kappa \acute{e}\eta \tau a\iota$, like $\phi \theta \acute{e}\epsilon \tau a\iota$, i $\mu e\acute{e}\iota$ for $\mu e\tau a\iota$, &c. is preferred for Homer: and it certainly appears to be an old reading; for at II. τ , 32. the small Schol. have the gloss $\kappa \acute{e}\epsilon \tau a\iota d\nu \tau \dot{\iota}$ $\tau o\tilde{\nu}$ $\kappa \acute{e}\bar{\iota}\tau a\iota$, which should be $\kappa \acute{e}\iota \tau a\iota$ $\kappa \acute{e}\iota \tau a\iota$.

Κελαδέω, *I sound, roar*, is regular; but the Epic language has the participle as from a barytone verb, κελάδων, κελάδωντα: although it is used only as an adjective. [Passow has also κελάδω, which he calls the original form of κελαδέω, and from which he derives the above participle.]

Κέλλω, I run in, land: fut. κέλσω; aor. 1. ἔκελσα.

Κέλομαι, I command, exactly synonymous with κελεόω: fut. κελήσομαι; aor. 1. κελησάμην, Pind. O. 13, 113. The Homeric aor. ἐκεκλόμην, ἐκέκλετο, κεκλόμενοs is most naturally considered as the aor. 2. of this verb with syncope and reduplication (according to the analogy mentioned under Κάμνω), and with the augm. like ἐπέφραδον: it has also exactly the same meaning at Il. π , 657. κέκλετο δ' ἄλλουν φευγέμεναι, he bade them fly. In most other passages however it means merely I call to, although there is generally the collateral idea of I exhort and command implied in it*.

"Εκλεο see under Κλέω.

Κεντέω, I prick, is regular. But Homer (II. ψ , 337.) has the aor. 1. infin. κένσαι from the stem KENT- which shows itself in κοντός, a pole. The verbals κεστός, pricked, and κέντωρ, κέντρον are explained by the omission of ν before σ in the one case, and of σ between ν and τ in the others†.

Κεράννυμι, I mix, also κιρνάω \ddagger , κίρνημι: fut. κεράσω, Att. κερώ \dagger ; aor. 1. ἐκέρἄσα, aor. 1. midd. ἐκερᾶσάμην. The other forms are affected by syncope or rather by the metathesis (which we may see exemplified in β έ β ληκα under Bάλλω,) joined with a contraction into \bar{a} : thus perf. κέκρ \bar{a} κα; perf. pass. κέκρ \bar{a} μην; aor. 1. pass. ἔκρ \bar{a} θην; aor. 1. midd. ἐκρ \bar{a} σάμην; but there is also an aor. 1. pass. ἐκεράσθην.

In the perfect pass. is found also κεκέρασμαι, but only in a later period, to which belongs also Anacr. 29, 13. On the other hand, Homer

^{*} It is generally acknowledged that $\kappa \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$, of which $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\imath} \nu$ is properly the inf. aor. and $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$ the fut., (compare $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \alpha \nu \hat{\omega}$), is the one original verbal stem, which afterwards branched off according to difference of meaning into three verbs, $\kappa \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \mu \alpha \iota$, $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ and $\kappa \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \omega$.

[†] 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;

uses the shortened form in the infin. aor. 1. act. $\epsilon \pi \iota \kappa \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota$, Od. η , 164. For the Ionians have the η in $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho \eta \mu a \iota$, $\kappa \rho \eta \theta \epsilon \iota s$, &c. (KEPA, KPEA, KPH), but in the Attic and common language the η is changed on account of the ρ into \bar{a} in this and other similar cases.

The simple form $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$ is used by the poets: Homer has $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{\omega} \nu \tau as$, $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{\alpha} \alpha \sigma \theta e$, $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega \nu \tau o$. Comicus ap. Athen. 2. p. 48. a. $\kappa \dot{\epsilon} \rho a$. Otherwise $\kappa \epsilon \rho \dot{\omega}$ is the Att. future: see Hesych.

[In the fut. and aor. Homer doubles the σ of the regular form,

making κεράσσω, έκέρασσα.—Passow.]

The Homeric conj. κέρωνται, Il. δ, 260. is not to be traced back to a theme ΚΕΡΩ, but more analogically to κέραμαι, like δύνωμαι conj. of δύναμαι: compare also κρέμαμαι, conj. κρέμωμαι, under Κρεμάννυμι.

Lastly at Il. 1, 203. the text had until very lately the imperat. κέραιρε,

but now has from better sources κέραιε: see under Δαίω.

Κερδαίνω, I gain, is regular in the Attic language, and in the aor. takes the a like κοιλάναι, λευκάναι, and others: thus fut. κερδάνω; aor. 1. infin. κερδάναι. But the Ionics and many of the later writers form κερδήσομαι, ἐκέρδησα.

This Ionic formation is undoubtedly the older, and $-\alpha i\nu\omega$ was originally nothing more than one mode of lengthening the present, as in $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\iota\tau\alpha i\nu\omega$ and similar verbs, so that the simple $\text{KEP}\Delta\Omega$, $-\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$ is the original stem, and $\tau\dot{o}$ $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\epsilon}os$ the verbal subst., as the analogy which it brings with it confirms. But in a very early period some imagined that $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{\epsilon}\alpha i\nu\omega$ sounded like a derivation from $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\epsilon}os$, like $\lambda\epsilon\nu\kappa\alpha i\nu\omega$ from $\lambda\epsilon\nu\kappa\dot{\epsilon}os$, &c., and they accordingly inflected all the tenses in the termination $-\alpha i\nu\omega$. Herodotus has both inflexions; the older $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ 3, 72., $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\epsilon}\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ 4, 152., the other $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\dot{\epsilon}o\mu\epsilon\nu$, 8, 60, 3. This latter has in the Ion. dialect the aor. $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\rho\dot{\epsilon}\eta\nu\alpha$, Hom. Epig. 14, 6.

In the Attic form the perf. has the unpleasant sound of κεκέρδαγκα; hence others formed κεκέρδακα (see Chœrob. Bekk. p. 1285. and compare Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 34.), while others again deduced from the Ionic formation κεκέρδηκα, and Bekker has now restored from the manuscripts προσκεκερδήκασι to Demosth. adv. Dionysod. (p. 1292. Reisk.).

Κεύθω, I envelope, hide: fut. κεύσω; perf. (synonymous with pres.) κέκευθα; pluperf. (synon. with imperf.) ἐκεκεύθειν, Od. ι, 348.; aor. 2.

ραννύω are formed like other verbs in $\mu\iota$ (see "Αγω, ἄγνν $\mu\iota$) by changing the ω of the barytone form into $-\nu\nu\mu\iota$ or $-\nu\dot{\nu}\omega$, only that when ω is preceded by a vowel, the ν is doubled, thus $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$, $\kappa\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$.

Again κιρνάω, κίρνημι are formed from κεράω by changing -άω into -νάω, -νημι, and in some verbs changing the ε of the root into ι; thus κεράω, κιρνάω, κίρνημι: compare Δέμω, and Πίλνημι from πελάω.

ἔκῦθον and 3. sing. without the augm. κύθε, Od. γ, 16., aor. 2. conj. with the Ep. redupl. κεκύθω, Od. ζ, 303. Homer has also the aor. 1. conj. in the compound ἐπικεύσης, Od. ο, 263. Of the passive we find only the pres. and imperf. Sophocles repeatedly [and Æschylus once] use the active κεύθω, and κέκευθα, as intrans., I am hidden*.

Κέω. See Κείμαι and Καίω; also Δήω under ΔΑ-.

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

The Epic language had at first an active in a causative sense, κήδω, I fill with care, fut. κηδήσω, Il. ω, 240.; afterwards a perf. κέκηδα, Tyrt. 3, 28. synonymous with the pres. κήδομαι.

The middle with a short vowel in the inflected syllable is found in Eschyl. Sept. 138. in the imperat. κήδεσαι: and the derivative verb ἀκηδέω has the same inflexion in Il. ξ, 427. ἀκήδεσεν as now corrected

from ἀκήδησ': see Heyne.

In II. θ , 353. we find $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \delta \eta \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \theta a$, which some commentators, looking only at its exterior, have classed with $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \delta \sigma \nu$, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \delta \eta \sigma \omega$ (see $X \dot{\alpha} \zeta \sigma \mu a \iota$); but the sense when critically examined is opposed to that derivation \dagger , and in favour of the old one from $\kappa \dot{\eta} \delta \sigma \mu a \iota$. And since the perf. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \eta \delta a$ is synonymous with the last-mentioned present, it is quite as agreeable to analogy to have a future formed from the one as from the other; and equally analogous is the shortening of the radical vowel required by the rhythm; and which takes place in the a, because, as we see from the Doric $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \delta \sigma \mu a \iota$ (Pind.), a is properly the vowel of the root: in this case therefore it is the Ionic $\ddot{\alpha}$, as $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta$ for $\pi \dot{\eta} \rho a$, $\dot{\alpha} \mu \psi \iota \sigma \beta \ddot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ for $-\eta \tau \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, &c. See also $\dot{\alpha} \rho \ddot{\alpha} \rho \nu \dot{\alpha} u$ under ' $\Delta \rho a \rho \iota \sigma \kappa \omega \dot{\tau}$.

Κίδνημι. See Σκεδάννυμι. ΚΙΚ-. See Κιχάνω. Κικλήσκω. See Καλέω.

Kινέω, I move, is regular.

* [See Sophocl. Aj. 634. El. 868. Œd. T. 968. Ant. 911., Æschyl. Sept. 590.

† In order to explain it in that way we must first understand $\chi \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a i$ $\tau \iota \nu o s$ (which in its common acceptation means to give way to any one) in the sense of to cease from pursuing any one; and then suppose that the two goddesses blame themselves with a certain severity of expression, because, when their friends are pursued by the enemy, they do not assist them against the pursuit of the other

gods; or we must take it without the interrogation (see Heyne), and understand οὐκἐτι χάζεσθαί τινος in the sense of not deserting, and this said by those who, after having long deserted their friends, at last assist them.

‡ I adopt this mode that I may not take $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \delta o \nu$ twice, once from $\chi \acute{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ and once from $\kappa \acute{\eta} \delta \omega$, but that I may ground my argument on two actually existing forms, $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha \delta \circ \nu$ for $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \delta \acute{\eta} \sigma \omega$ from $\chi \acute{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, $\kappa \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \eta \delta \alpha$ for $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \alpha \delta \acute{\eta} \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \iota$ from $\kappa \acute{\eta} \delta \omega$.

In the passive it has an Epic sister-form $\kappa \ell \nu \nu \mu \alpha \iota$, with ι long like the active. This form must not be classed with $\kappa \ell \omega$ (which will be found below), for that verb never gives the idea of continuous motion as $\kappa \iota \nu \nu \nu \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu$ most plainly does at II. ξ , 173., where it is used of oil moved about or shaken: and in other places where $\kappa \ell \nu \nu \mu \alpha \iota$ is used of a crowd of combatants pressing on to battle, it does not express their moving forward, but only the tumult and bustle of their motion; compare II. δ , 281. 332. 427. with Od. κ , 556. I consider it therefore more correct to give it a root for itself, KIN-, quatio*.

Κίρνυμι. See Κεράννυμι.

Κιχάνω and Κιχάνομαι, I obtain, hit: fut. κιχήσομαι; aor. 2. εκιχον, κίχω, &c. These are the only tenses found in the Attic poets; but the Epic language has (beside a new aor. midd. ἐκιχησάμην, -σατο) a very common preterite, which according to form is an imperf. of KIXEQ, KIXHMI, without however this pres. ind. having been ever actually in use. Hence come ἐκίχειs (Od. ω, 283.), 2. sing. imperf. for ἐκίχης, like έτίθουν, έτίθεις, with the plur. ἐκίχημεν and dual ἐκιχήτην, for ἐκίχεμεν $-\chi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \eta \nu$; to which we must add the moods of the present, as the opt. κιχείην, conj. (κιχώ) κιχείω, infin. κιχήναι, part. κιχείς, and the midd. $\kappa_{i}\chi\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$; in which formation in μ_{i} therefore the η is retained quite as far as it is in ἀηναι and δίζημαι. We find then (including the imperf. έκίγανου) 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 κιχάνω or ἔκιχον, but only those above quoted; consequently beyond the indicative they have no distinction between present and agrist. The earliest occurrence of the conj. κίγω, κίγης, &c. is in the Tragedians (Soph. Aj. 657. Eurip. Suppl. 1069.).

In all the above forms the Epics have the ι short: and $\check{\epsilon}\kappa\iota\chi\sigma\nu$ has this quantity in all the poets \uparrow . But in $\kappa\iota\chi\acute{a}\nu\omega$ both the principal syllables are different in the Epic and Attic poets, the former having the ι short and the a long, the latter the ι long and the a short. Now as Hesychius and other Glossographers have the glosses $\kappa\iota\gamma\chi\acute{a}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{i}\gamma\chi\alpha\nu\epsilon$,

^{*} Grammatical analogy also is in favour of it. For while κυνέω, from KΥ- ἔκυσα, retains the υ short, κινέω has the ι long: in the same way κίνυμαι is remote from the analogy of ζώννυμι, ζέννυμι, because it is written almost invariably with a single ν, and therefore (with γάνυμαι, λάζυμαι,

[&]amp;c.) comes under the analogy of those verbs which affix merely $-v\mu\alpha\iota$ to the stem or root.

[†] It was impossible therefore that Simonides could say ἔκῖχε, a reading which Brunck (in Gnomicis) in Sim. Fr. 7. preferred to ἔφῖκε.

'some moderns have explained that to be the true Attic way of writing this verb, and even introduced it already into the latest editions of the Tragedians*.

The analogy of $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\nu\chi\sigma^{\nu}$ $\tau\nu\gamma\chi\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$, or that of $i\kappa\dot{\omega}\mu\eta\nu$ $i\kappa\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$ (with ι short), has been the cause of the general supposition that the stem of the verb is in $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\iota\chi\sigma\nu$. Everything appears to me to lead to a form $\kappa\iota\chi\eta\mu\iota$ ($\kappa\iota$ being a reduplication), with $\kappa\iota\chi\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$ as a sister-form, which in the present prevailed over the former. $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\iota\chi\sigma\nu$ arose from $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\iota\chi\eta\nu$ by a shortening of the syllable, just as $\tilde{\epsilon}\dot{\nu}\nu\iota\sigma\nu$ did from $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\iota\eta\nu$; and metrical causes confused the one with the other. According to this supposition the true stem or root is XE— or XA— (compare the note on $\pi\iota\mu\pi\lambda\eta\mu\iota$, $\pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\eta\nu$), from which came $\kappa\iota\chi\bar{\alpha}\nu\omega$, like $\phi\theta\bar{\alpha}\nu\omega$ from $\Phi\Theta\Lambda$ —.

There is a Doric aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\iota\xi\alpha$, moved away, pushed away, which Schneider in his Lexicon deduces from $\kappa\iota\chi\omega$. There is certainly nothing to hinder this new aorist being formed from $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\iota\chi\sigma\nu$; but the grounds which I have laid down in Schol. Od. λ , 579. make me think it more eligible to give it a stem or root of its own KIK Ω : and this last supposition is confirmed by a fragment of Simonides, although as it now stands unintelligible, $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\iota\kappa\hat{\iota}\kappa\sigma\iota$ $\hat{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\mu\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\iota$, Chærobosc. ap. Bekk. p. 1185. and Herodian in Bandini Bibl. Laur. Med. (Græca) p. 146. See Blomf. ad Callim. pag. ult.†

Κίχρημι. See Χράω.

 $Ki\omega$, Igo; used only in pres. and imperf.; indeed the indic. pres. seldom or ever‡ occurs ($\kappa i\epsilon\iota s$, Æschyl. Ch. 676.); the other moods of the present however, as the optat. $\kappa i \omega \iota \mu$, part. $\kappa \iota \omega \nu$, &c., together with the imperf., are in frequent use in Homer and the other poets. The part. pres. $\kappa \iota \omega \nu$ has the accent on the last syllable, like $i\omega \nu$, but is not therefore an aorist; and the verb itself is to be considered as a sisterform of $I\Omega$, $\epsilon i\mu\iota$, $Ig\omega$.

To be satisfied that $\epsilon \kappa_{10} \nu$ is an imperf. we have only to look at Il. β ,

* 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 $\kappa\iota\gamma\chi\acute{a}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ from Solon; that Eustathius (on Od. p. 209, 32.) cites not merely $\kappa\iota\gamma\chi\acute{a}\nu\nu$ but also $i\gamma\chi\acute{a}\nu\omega$, and that as "more analogical"—these two things appear to me much more against than in favour of the intro-

duction of it. The above supposition that κ_{l} - is a syllable of reduplication, agrees both with the fluctuation of the quantity, (as the Epics had both $\pi i \phi \alpha i \sigma \kappa \omega$ and $\pi i \phi \alpha i \sigma \kappa \omega$,) and with the form $\kappa_l \gamma_k \alpha^l \nu \omega$, which has its analogy in $\pi^l \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu_l$. That $\pi^l \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu_l$ and $\kappa^l \chi \lambda^l \nu \omega$, (the two latter being also in use,) corresponds with other euphonic observances.

† [Passow mentions (from κίκω) a rare poet. aor. ἔκικον, infin. κικεῖν, and a Dor. aor. 1. ἔκιζα, midd. ἐκιζάμην.]

‡ [Passow says that the indic. pres. is not used at all.]

588. ζ , 399.; and that $\kappa\iota\dot{\omega}\nu$ is not an aor. we may be convinced by such passages as $\tilde{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon$ $\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\chi\sigma\sigma\delta\epsilon$ $\kappa\iota\dot{\omega}\nu$, Il. γ , 447. see also π , 263. ω , 328.: while in such as $\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\dot{\epsilon}\eta\nu\delta\epsilon$ $\kappa\iota\dot{\omega}\nu...\theta\dot{\epsilon}\tau\sigma$, κ , 148. we must remember the usage of the participles $i\dot{\omega}\nu$, $\check{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu$, $\phi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$, stated in the construction of participles in the syntax; according to which therefore that sentence is to be construed in the same way as $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon$ $\phi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$, Od. α , 127.

On μετεκίαθον see ἀμύναθον under Αμύνω and ἐδιώκαθον under Διώκω.

The verb κίνυμαι see above under Κινέω.

Κλάζω, I sound, scream, &c.: fut. κλάγξω*; aor. 1. ἔκλαγξα; perf. κέκλαγγα synonymous with the present; whence the fut. κεκλάγξω and κεκλάγξομαι.

See κεκλαγγυῖαι, Xenoph. Ven. 3, 9. 6, 23. Conj. κεκλάγγω and fut. κεκλάγξομαι, Aristoph. Vesp. 929. 930. Both futures are quoted by Suidas. There are other presents formed from some tense of κλάζω; for instance κλαγγέω whence κλαγγεῦντι, Theocr. Epigr. 6. and κλαγγάνω, which however is doubtful†; see Schneid. ad Xen. Ven. 4, 5.

Κλαίω, I weep, Att. κλάω with a long and without contraction: fut. κλαύσομαι (κλαυσοῦμαι, Aristoph. Pac. 1081.); aor. 1. ἔκλαυσα. The fut. κλαιήσω, κλαήσω is less frequent. Verbal adj. κλαυστός and κλαυτός, κλαυστός.—Μιρρ. [Passow remarks that the middle voice is used by Æschylus Sept. 903. but otherwise seldom found in the older writers.]

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

§ On the formation of this future see $\Theta \in \omega$.

^{*} Some verbs in ζ have γγ for their characteristic, as for instance κλάζω, πλάζω, σαλπίζω.

^{† [}Passow however makes no mention of κλαγγάνω being a suspected form, and quotes it from Æschyl. Eum. 126. and Xen.

Ven. 6, 23. He has also κλαγγαίνω.]
† This aor. was formerly quoted from Archiæ Epigr. 28., but the true reading ἀποκλάγξασα is now adopted by Jacobs.

ëκλαεν standing in the text of Theorr. 14, 32. but occurring nowhere else, has been altered by Hermann to ἔκλαι; and no doubt correctly, for that imperf. exactly suits the passage, as it does also 23, 17. in both which the description is that of a continuous-weeping.

Κλάω, I break: fut. κλάσω (with a short); aor. 1. ἔκλάσα; aor. 1. pass. ἐκλάσθην; perf. pass. κέκλασμαι. Thus the a is short in the inflexion; and the passive takes σ .

In Anacr. Fr. 16. we find a syncopated aor. 2. part. ἀποκλάs as from ἀπόκλημι, on which see ἔγνων, &c. under Γιγνώσκω.

Kλείω, I shut, is regular: thus fut. κλείσω, &c. But the perf. pass. is both κέκλεισμαι and κέκλειμαι; while the aor. 1. pass. is ἐκλείσθην only.

The Ionians pronounced this verb κληΐω, and formed it ἐκλήϊσα, κληΐσαι, κεκλήμαι without the σ, but always έκληΐσθην. These forms had therefore, like the corresponding ones from riw, unriw, &c., the i according to the rules of formation long; consequently those editions of Homer which have ἐκλήϊσσε, κληΐσσαι are so far incorrect, and these forms, from being written thus, are erroneously given to κληίζω, which verb has, it is true, in the lexicons, the meaning of to shut, but improperly so; for the old writers know κλητζω ἐκλήτσα in no other sense than that of celebro, and κληΐω ἐκλήῖσα in that of claudo. Hence arose again an Attic form κλήω, ἔκλησα, which occurs frequently in the text, and still more frequently as a various reading in the manuscripts. Valckenaer's (ad Phæniss. 268.) opinion, that κλείω must be older than κλήω because in the earlier times the η was not yet come into use at Athens, is nothing to the point; for the question here is, not how it was written, but how it was spoken: now as κλείω was the general form in use at a later period, κλήω certainly appears to me, wherever it is found, to have great authority as a critical form of the oldest grammarians, who knew that the earlier Attics spoke it so. This decision is however very difficult to be supported through all writers. And equally difficult is it in the case of κέκλεισμαι, κέκλειμαι, κέκλημαι. See Thom. Mag. in voc. Theodosii Canones p. 1020, 25. Chœrob. in Ind. Bekk. v. κέκλειμαι: and among the moderns Elmsl. ad Eurip. Heracl. 729. Matth. ad Hecub. 482. Androm. 495. Schneid. v. κλείω*.

κλημένων τῶν ἐμπορίων. In Eurip. Hel. 983. stands κεκλήμεθα: and in Æschyl. Suppl. 957. κεκλειμένος for κεκλεισμένος. — Ed.]

^{* [}The article in Schneider runs thus: Κλείω, -είσω, whence perf. pass. κεκλεισμένος. According to the Etym. Mag. κέκλειμαι was used for κέκλεισμαι. In Demosth. Philipp. p. 22. Bekker reads κε

The Ionic 3. plur. κεκλέαται (for κεκλήμται from κεκλήμμαι) belongs to this verb quite as much as it does to καλέω when put for κεκλήαται from κέκλημαι: see ἀποκεκλέατο, Herodot. 9, 50. and κεκλέαται (from καλέω), 2, 164.

The Dorians had a fut. κλαξω and an aor. ἔκλαξα formed from κλάζω Dor. for κληίζω: compare Γελάω and Θλάω.

There is one instance of a fut. 2. κλιω as used by the Comic poet Eupolis according to a remarkable observation of Chæroboscus (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 φυγών, δραμών, or they are presents." And then is added, "solitary exceptions there are in έγχεω and in κατακλιεί from κατακλείω in Eupolis έν Χρυσφ γένει. Εὶ μή τις αὐτὴν κατακλιεί."

Κλέπτω, I steal: fut. κλέψομαι; perf. κέκλοφα*; perf. pass. κέκλεμμαι, Att. κέκλαμμαι: [aor. 1. pass. ἐκλέφθην;] aor. 2. pass. εκλάπην.

Κλέω+, κλείω, I celebrate; pass. κλέυμαι, I am celebrated. In Il. ω, 202. ἐκλέο is the 2. sing. imperf. for. ἐκλέεο, like φυβέο, μὶτέο, ἐξηγέο. In Callim. Del. 40. ἔκλεο Δηλος must at all events be accented like the above, ἐκλέο, in as much as either celebrabaris is poet. for vocabaris, or the poet thought himself at liberty to use the syncope thus, ἐκαλέεο, έκαλέο, έκλέο.

Κλίνω!, I bend: fut. κλίνω; aor. 1. ἔκλίνα; aor. 1. midd. εκλινάμην; aor. 1. pass. εκλίνθην and εκλίθην (ζ), both forms in Homer, but ἐκλίνθην § exclusively Ep. and Poet.: much less frequent is the aor. 2. pass. and perhaps used only in the compounds as κατακλίνηναι, Plato and Aristoph. ξυγκατακλίνεις, Aristoph. Ach. 981. Perf. pass. κέκλίμαι, part. κεκλιμένος.--ΜΙDD.

Κλύω, I hear, a poetical verb, whose imperf. ἔκλυον is used as an

placed here merely on account of κλέομαι, 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.

I On the formation of the perf. and aor.

 pass., see Τείνω.
 § Examples however of κλινθηναι may be found in Plutarch (see Stephan. The-saur.); and in Æsop. Fab. 143. Heusing., but in this latter the reading is uncertain.

^{*} It is certain that in the older language the o, which is supposed to be peculiar to the perf. 2. (perf. midd.), belonged to the perf. 1. act.; but as it is not generally so in the language as now grammatically formed, we put down as deviations from the established analogy three perfects, viz., πέμπω—πέπομφα, κλέπτω—κέ-κλοφα, τρέπω—τέτροφα. But this o never goes into the perf. passive.

⁺ This form, which does not appear to have been ever in use, but which I have

aorist, and also in the present sense of to be in the habit of hearing; see above in Εννεπον. Imperat. κλύε, κλύετε, more commonly κλῦθι, κλῦτε, like βῆθι, γνῶθι, &c. and with Homeric reduplication κέκλὔθι, κέκλὔτε; see Κάμνω. Το this syncopated aorist belongs the adjectival part. pass. κλύμενος synonymous with the verbal adj. κλυτός, celebrated.

With regard to the agristic usage of ἔκλυον it is to be observed that the pres. indic. κλύω never occurs in Homer: Hesiod has it once, ε, 724.,

the Tragedians frequently.

ΚΜΑ-. See Κάμνω.

Κνάω, I scrape, scratch, infin. κνᾶν, but in the more accurate Att. writers κνῆν, like σμῆν and ψῆν*, Pollux, 7, 196.; fut. κνήσω; aor. 1. ἔκνησα; of an aor. 2. ἔκνην, as formed from κνῆμι, is found only a 3. sing. κνῆ, and that but once, Il. λ, 639. compare Herodot. 7, 139.—ΜΙDD. κνᾶσθαι, Att. κνῆσθαι, Plat. Gorg. p. 494. c. Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 30. (Schneid. 3.)

Κνώσσω, I sleep: fut. κνώσω, &c. See 'Αρμόττω: but examples of this verb are so rare that we cannot settle its inflexion with any grammatical certainty. In Apollon. 3, 690. the aor. 1. κατακνώσασα is found in many of the manuscripts, but the old reading κατακνώσσουσα is likewise in the best manuscripts (see Brunck), so that nothing can be decided in favour of either.

Κοιμάω, Ion. κοιμέω, Herodot. 2, 95. I cause to sleep, put to rest: fut. κοιμήσω, &c. Pass. (and in the Epics midd. also) I sleep. [Homer has the pass. κοιμάσμαι with fut. κοιμήσομαι, and the aor. κοιμήσασθαι as well as κοιμηθηναι; the former is used by the poets only.—Passow.]

Κολάζω, I punish: fut. κολάσω (Xen. Athen. 1, 9.), and more frequently κολάσομαι (Xen. Anab. 2, 5, 13.); the apparently Attic forms of the fut. κολῶ, midd. κολῶμαι†, are used by Aristophanes, (Equ. 459.) merely as a play on the word; the participle of the fut. midd. κολώμενος (not κολούμενος) is the true reading of Aristoph. Vesp. 244. as we gather from Hesych. in voc. and from the explanation of

^{*} See also $\zeta \hat{y} \nu$ from $Z \dot{\alpha} \omega$, $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ from $X \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$, $\delta \iota \psi \eta \nu$, $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\eta} \nu$, &c.

[†] Most of the polysyllabic verbs in -ίζω prefer the Attic fut. to the other; but of those iu -άζω nothing like a decided ana-

logy can be laid down: for while in $\beta \iota$ - $\beta \acute{a} \zeta \omega$ the Attic fut. is very common, in $\acute{a} \gamma o \rho \acute{a} \zeta \omega$ and others it is a barbarism: see Lex. Seg. p. 331. and Maitt. pp. 47. 48.

the Scholiast. [This form is the more usual one in prose, instead of the poetical κολούω. 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 κολάσω, Xen. Anab. 2, 5, 13. Hellen. 1, 7, 20. Porson post Hemsterh. Plut. p. 575.—Passow.]

Κολούω, I mutilate: fut. κολούσω, &c. The pass. is formed both with and without σ; thus perf. pass. κεκόλουμαι and κεκόλουσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐκολούθην and ἐκολούσθην.

Schneider in Theophr. caus. plant. 2, 20. (15.) invariably reads $\kappa o - \lambda o \nu \sigma \theta e \hat{\imath} \sigma a$, $\kappa o \lambda o \nu \sigma \theta \hat{\jmath}$ on very slight authority: but the form without the σ does occur in other writers (see Stephan. Thesaur.), and $\kappa \epsilon \kappa o \lambda o \nu \mu \epsilon \nu o s$ in Philippi Epigr. 25. is undisputed.

Κομίζω, I bring: fut. κομίσω, Att. - ιω, &c.—ΜΙDD. κομίζομαι, I get: fut. κομίουμαι, &c. See Aristoph. Av. 552.

Koνίω, I cover with dust: fut. κονίσω. This is the old and genuine form of the verb; whence the perf. pass. κεκόνιμαι; and hence in the poets the only way of writing the aorist is ἐκόνισε. The Attic form κονίζω, fut. κονίω and κονίσω, perf. pass. κεκόνισμαι, did not come into use until later*.

Κόπτω, I hew, cut down: fut. κόψω; perf. κέκοφα; aor. 2. pass. ἐκόπην.—ΜIDD.

Homer has the perf. 2. in the sense of the present, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \sigma \pi \omega s$, Il. ν , 60. Od. σ , 334.

Κορέννυμι, I satiate: fut. κορέσω; aor. l. ἐκόρεσα. The

Timon. 45.), that κεκονιμένος and κεκονισμένος are both equally good, cannot, as applied there, be satisfactory: compare μηνίω. Whether, as some critics contend (see Valck. ad Theocr. l. c.), we ought in Thom. Mag. instead of Καὶ κεκονισμένος καὶ κεκονισμένος to read Καὶ κεκονισμένος τ. κ., and whether there be sufficient grounds for the rejection of κονιᾶν in the sense of to cover with dust, requires perhaps a closer investigation.

^{*} See the examples in Stephens, and compare the various readings. Brunck was therefore quite right in Theoer. 1, 30. in preferring the reading of the majority of the manuscripts; as was Jacobs in Hegesippi Epigr. 3. (Anth. Vat. p. 164.) in suspecting the reading of the Vatican manuscript κεκονημένα to be, what is muchmoreprobable, and must at all events be preferred in the hexameter, -μένα. The assertion of Hemsterhuys (on Lucian

pass. takes σ; thus perf. κεκόρεσμαι; aor. 1. ἐκορέσθην.— Μιρρ.

The Att. fut. must have been $\kappa o \rho \hat{\omega}$, for the Epic one is $\kappa o \rho \hat{\epsilon} \omega$, II. θ , 379, ν , 831. The Ionic dialect takes the η in the perf., as act. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \delta \rho \eta \kappa a$, pass. $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \delta \rho \eta \mu a \iota$; and the Epic language has also a perf. part. with act. form and pass. meaning, $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \delta \rho \eta \hat{\omega} s$, Od. σ , 372. See $\tau \epsilon \tau \mu \eta \hat{\omega} s$ in note under $T \hat{\epsilon} \mu \nu \omega$.

Κορύσσω, I arm (with a helmet): fut. κορύζω; aor. 1. midd. έκορυσσάμην (in Hippocr. έκορυξάμην), part. κορυσσάμενος, Il. τ, 397.; perf.

pass. κεκόρυθμαι, part. κεκορυθμένος.

Κοτέω, and more frequently in midd. κοτέομαι, I feel enmity against: Ep. fut. κοτέσσομαι; Ep. aor. 1. midd. κοτέσσατο, part. κοτεσσάμενος. This verb retains ϵ in the formation, except in the Ep. perf. part. κεκοτηώς, with the meaning of the pres. increased in force; thus κεκοτηότι θυμ $\hat{\varphi}$, Hom. The part. of the aor. 1. act. κοτέσασα occurs in Hymn. Cer. 254. The word is entirely poetical.

Κράζω, I scream, croak: fut. κεκράξομαι; aor. 2. ἔκράγον, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 337. Buť instead of this present the perf. κέκραγα (with the force of a pres.) is generally used, whence by syncope 1. plur. κέκραγμεν (pluperf. ἐκέκραγμεν), imperat. κέκραχθι, infin. κεκραγέναι, part. κεκραγώς. The 2. plur. imperat. of the perf. κεκράγετε without syncope in Aristoph. Vesp. 415. is a very rare case; for we find scarcely any instance of the imperative of a perf. unless where that perf. is used as a present like the one before us, and even then in most cases a syncopated form is preferred. Compare γέγωνε, and κεχήνετε under Χάσκω.

Κραίνω, I complete: fut. κράνω; aor. 1. ἔκρηνα, imperat. κρῆνον, infin. κρῆναι, Od.; aor. 1. pass. ἐκράνθην, Pind. The Epic infin. fut. midd. in a pass. sense is κρανέεσθαι, Il. ι, 622. In Eurip. Hippol. 1255. κέκρανται is 3. plur. perf.; nor do I find any instance of it as 3. sing. also. In the Epic language this verb is capable of being produced in all its tenses, as imperf. ἐκραίαινεν, aor. 1. infin. κρηῆναι, perf. pass. κεκράανται*.

the resolution of a contracted syllable, but a production by repeating the vowel or syllable, as $\phi\bar{\omega}s$ is contracted from $\phi\acute{a}os$ and again produced to the Ep. $\phi\acute{o}\omega s$: compare also $\theta\bar{\omega}\kappa os$, $\theta\acute{o}\omega\kappa os$ and $\theta\alpha\acute{a}\sigma\sigma\omega$ in Buttm. Lexil.

^{*} As the Epic aor. of $\varphi ai\nu \omega$ is $\dot{\epsilon} \varphi a\dot{a}\nu - \theta \eta \nu$ because that verb is contracted from $\varphi aei\nu \omega$, so is the remarkable production of the tenses of $\kappa \rho ai\nu \omega$ the result of contraction, and most probably of $\kappa \rho ai\nu \omega$ from $\kappa \rho e ai\nu \omega$: in which this striking peculiarity is to be observed; that it is not

Κρεμάννυμι, I hang (anything); pass. I am hanged; midd. I hang myself: in addition to which comes a particular form for the intransit., $\kappa \rho \epsilon \mu a \mu a \iota$, I am hanging. This last is conjugated like δύναμαι with conj. κρέμωμαι, opt. κρεμαίμην*, κρέμαιτο. In the inflexion a is short, as in the fut. κρεμάσω and aor. 1. ἐκρέμασα, and the pass. takes σ. The Att. fut. is κρεμώ, -ac, -a, &c. The aor. 1. pass. ἐκρεμάσθην is common to the passive (with a passive and middle sense) and to the intransitive; but the fut. κρεμασθήσομαι belongs wholly to κρεμάννυμι, as the intransit. sense has its own future κρεμήσομαι, 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 έκρέμω, 2. sing. aor. 1. for ἐκρέμασο, Il. o, 18. 21. and the aor. 1. infin. κρεμάσα- $\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (with an accus.) to hang anything on, Hes. ϵ , 627. The pres. κρεμάω is used by the later writers. In the pure Attic language the only future is κρεμώ, - ĝs, &c. Epic κρεμόω.

In Aristoph. Vesp. 298. all the manuscripts have the optat. κρέμοισθε from κρέμαμαι, except the Venetian, which has κρέμεσθε, naturally leading us to κρέμαισθε. The other reading however is not to be rejected too hastily: compare μαρνοίμην, μεμνοίμην with the accentuation of the optat. and conjunct. under Δύναμαι. There must however have been a uniformity in Aristophanes, and we find in Nub. 868. Acharn.

944., at least as the text now stands, κρέμαιο, κρέμαιτο.

An Attic sister-form of this verb in the pres. and imperf. is κρήμνημι, κρήμναμαι (the latter for κρέμαμαι), which deviates from analogy by the η in the radical syllable. Hence this way of writing it may well appear doubtful, particularly as κρεμν- and κριμν- are found occasionally in the manuscripts \S . On the whole however they are in favour of the η ; and we find κρημνάμεναι (without any known various reading) in Æschyl. Sept. 231. κατακρημνάμεναι, Aristoph. Nub. 377. κρημνάντων, Pind.

* On the accentuation of these forms see Δύναμαι.

This verb is the only instance of the change of ε to η, κρεμάω and κρεμάννυμι to κρήμνημι: see note under Κεράν-

⁺ Stephens quotes it from two works falsely attributed to Aristotle; Hist. Mirab. c. 6. and Œc. 2.

[§] See Müncker ad Ant, Lib. 13, extr. Var. Lect. ad Eurip. El. 1217. Barnes, et Musgr. ad Eurip. Herc. 520. Piers. ad Mœr. v. Ἐκρεμάννυεν.

Pyth. 4, 43. the imperat. $\kappa\rho\dot{\eta}\mu\nu\eta$, Etym. M. in voc. and in fragments of Euripides there quoted (see Piers. ad Moer. v. $\kappa\dot{\iota}\rho\nu\eta$). Eustathius also on Il. θ , 19. (if any reliance is to be placed on it) expressly mentions the change of ϵ to η . And lastly in the subst. $\kappa\rho\eta\mu\nu\dot{o}s$ (an overhanging precipice), which is of the same family, the η is undoubted.

Κρίνω*, I separate, judge: fut. κρίνω; aor. ἔκρινα; perf. κέκρικα; perf. pass. κέκριμαι; aor. 1. midd. ἐκρινάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐκριθην (ἴ). In Homer is also a poet. part. aor. pass. κρινθείς, Il. ν, 129. Od. θ, 48. This verb has a middle voice, but only in the Epic language (κρίνασθαι ὀνείρους, to interpret, Il. ε, 150.): it has however two compounds, depon. midd.,

άποκρίνομαι, I answer; ύποκρίνομαι, I explain, represent.

Hence in good writers the passive form $\mathring{\alpha}\pi οκριθηναι$ is nothing more than a real passive of $\mathring{\alpha}\pi οκρίνω$, I separate: but later writers used it for $\mathring{\alpha}\pi οκρίνασθαι$: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 108. The perf. 2. κέκρινα belongs to the later writers.

Κρούω, I knock, push: perf. pass. κέκρουμαι, and κέκρουσμαι; aor. l. pass. ἐκρούσθην.—ΜIDD.

Κρύπτω, I conceal: fut. κρύψω. The characteristic is β. Pass. aor. 1. ἐκρύφθην; aor. 2. ἐκρύβην (τ).—ΜΙDD.

The aor. 2. act. ἔκρὖβον and the forms with the simple characteristic φ, as ἔκρυφον, are found only in the later writers, Quintus, Nonnus, &c. See also Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318. The Ep. imperf. κρύπτασκον (see ῥίπτασκον) is in II. θ, 272. The perf. pass. κέκρυμμαι in Od.

Κτάομαι, Ion. κτέομαι, Herodot., I get possession of, obtain: fut. κτήσομαι; aor. 1. ἐκτησάμην; perf. κέκτημαι[‡], I possess, Hes. ε, 439. Ion. ἔκτημαι, Il. ι, 402. perf. conj. κέκτωμαι, η, ηται, &c., perf. opt. κεκτήμην, κέκτηο, κέκτητο, &c. There is also another form of the perf. opt. κεκτψήμην §

^{*} On the formation of the two perfects and the aor. 1. pass., see Γείνω.

[†] Aristoph. Ach. 459. according to the

manuscripts.

[‡] The perf. κέκτημαι, like μέμνημαι from μνάω, is formed with the regular reduplication; but ἔκτημαι follows the analogy of verbs beginning with two conso-

nants (not mutes before liquids), which take e 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 ω in this form may be thus accounted for. As the perfects with the sense of a present borrow more or less

(like μεμνώμην from μέμνημαι), of which we find κεκτώμεθα, Eurip. Heracl. 283. Compare II. 4, 361. Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 3.

In a somewhat later period we find the passive τὰ κτηθέντα. [Indeed κτάομαι 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. ἐκτήθη occurs in a passive sense in Thucyd. 1, 123. the fem. part. aor. κτηθεῖσα in Eurip. Hec. 453. and the perf. part. κεκτημένος in Thucyd. 7, 70. An active κτάω is never found.—Passow.]

Κτείνω, I kill: fut. κτενῶ, Ion. κτἄνῶ; aor. 1. ἔκτεινα; aor. 2. ἔκτᾶνον; perf. 2. ἔκτονα. 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 ἔκτονα. The perf. pass. and aor. pass. were not used in the common language, but in their places the verb θνήσκω in a passive combination, τέθνηκεν or ἀπέθανεν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

From the opinions of the Grammarians which have come down to us confused and corrupted (Thom. Mag. in ἀπέκτονα, Mœr. in ἀπέκτονεν) 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 καίνειν, κανεῖν. See Sturz. in κατακτείνειν. The perf. ἔκτακα, ἀπέκτακα, always however accompanied with the various reading ἔκταγκα, 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 $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta_{-}$, which contained the stem of the verb, making $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\tau\eta oi\mu\eta\nu$. This was changed according to Ionic custom (like $\nu\eta$ ós to $\nu\epsilon\omega$ s) to $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\psi\mu\eta\nu$, and again contracted by the Attics to $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\tau\psi\mu\eta\nu$. The form in $-i\eta\mu\eta\nu$ appears to have been preferred by the older Attics, that of $-i\psi\mu\eta\nu$ to be peculiar to Euripides and Xenophon.

* Of the two non-Attic forms ἔκταγκα was undoubtedly the more disagreeable to the ear, while the better-sounding ἔκτακα was recommended by the analogy of τέτακα. I would therefore, contrary to the opinion of the above-mentioned philologists, acquit the language of Menander at least of having used that form, and in a

fragment of him preserved by Suidas defend the old reading (which is also that of the Ed. Mediol.) ἀπεκτάκασι. The direction in Thom. Mag. 'Απέκτονα κάλ-λιον ἡ ἀπέκτεινα. ἀπέκτανον δὲ ἀδόκιμον πάντη is nonsense arising from repeated mistakes. In that passage three perfects must have been mentioned, and nothing can be more suited to the point in question than, 'Απέκτονα κάλλιον ή απέκτακα. απέκταγκα δὲ αδόκιμον πάντη. That is to say, the strict Atticist preferred the old Attic perfect to all others, even to the well-formed one of the later Attics; but against the form which he saw and heard everywhere around him he cautioned his readers in the strongest language. Mœris, whom we may with the

There existed also a perf. ἐκτόνηκα, formed like δεδοκημένος from δέχομαι or μεμόρηται from μείρομαι*. 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 ἀπεκτόνατε, and of Xen. Hier. 3, 7., the various reading ἀπεκτονότας is in Stobæus: but we must allow that it is used by the later writers, for we find it in Plut. Timol. 16. p. 137. in Parthen. 24. and in all three manuscripts of Aristot. Elench. 33, 2.

The Epic language had the aor. 1. pass. both with and without the ν (see $K\lambda i \nu \omega$ and $T\epsilon i \nu \omega$), $\epsilon \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \nu$ and $\epsilon \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta \nu$, of which the latter was used again in the later prose, as $\kappa \tau a \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \nu a \iota$ in Dio Cassius (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 36.), and $\kappa \tau a \nu \theta \epsilon i s$, Brunck Anal. Ænigm. 34. "E $\kappa \tau \ddot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \nu$ is Æol. 3. plur. for $\epsilon \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$, Il. λ , 691. Od. δ , 537.

Homer has the syncopated aorist, corresponding with the aor. 2., like $\tilde{\epsilon}\beta\eta\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma\nu\omega\nu$, &c. (see under $\Gamma\iota\gamma\nu\omega'\sigma\kappa\omega$); thus, $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\tilde{\alpha}\nu$, $-\alpha$ s, $-\alpha$, plur. $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\tilde{\alpha}-\mu\epsilon\nu$, &c. and 3. plur. $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\alpha\nu$ for $-\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$; opt. $\kappa\tau\alpha'\eta\nu$; infin. $\kappa\tau\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\kappa\tau\dot{\alpha}-\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$ for $\kappa\tau\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha$; part. $\kappa\tau\dot{\alpha}s$. The Homeric conj. is $\kappa\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ for $\kappa\tau\dot{\omega}$ (like $i\sigma\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ for $i\sigma\tau\dot{\omega}$; see " $I\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$), whence $\kappa\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, Od. χ , 216. To this we must add a corresponding aorist midd. with passive meaning, $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$, $-\sigma\sigma$, $-\tau\sigma$ (like $\dot{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$ from $\beta\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$), infin. $\kappa\tau\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, part. $\kappa\tau\dot{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$; all formed as from $\kappa\tau\dot{\alpha}\omega$. Homer has also an Epic conj. pres. $\kappa\tau\epsilon\dot{\iota}\nu\omega\mu\iota$, Od. τ , 490.

The fut. in Hom. is the common one $\kappa \tau \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega}$, but always in a resolved form $\kappa \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{\omega}$, $-\epsilon \epsilon \iota s$, $-\epsilon \epsilon \iota s$, in which the manuscripts agree in almost every instance: only the compound with $\kappa a \tau \hat{\omega}$ takes, as universally, the change of vowel to a, as $\kappa a \tau a \kappa \tau a \nu \epsilon o \nu \sigma \iota v$, Il. ζ , 409. $\kappa a \tau a \kappa \tau a \nu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, ξ , 481. consequently they are fut. midd. with a passive sense. To these we must add the simple form $\kappa a \iota \iota \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau a \nu \epsilon o \nu \tau a \kappa a \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau a$, Il. σ , 309., where however as regards the sense a doubt still prevails. Both old and modern commentators agree indeed that it is a future, translating it "and he who wishes to slay is himself slain" (for the aor. $\kappa a \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau a$ is here used in the sense of to be accustomed to slay). But the context immediately preceding, $\xi \nu \nu \delta s \Lambda \rho \eta s$, requires much rather this sense, "they slay and are slain"; which leads us to conjecture that from $\kappa \tau a \nu \epsilon \bar{\nu} \nu$ arose a new

greatest certainty restore from the manuscripts thus, ᾿Απέκτονεν Ἰττικῶς, ἀπέκταγκεν Ἑλληνικῶς, speaks more concisely to the same point. And lastly, Sextus, who (Adv.Gramm.10.) says, κτείνεται μὲν λέγεται, ἕκταγκα δὲ οὐ λέγεται, speaks not of the language of common life, but of that taught scientifically by the Grammarians. The only thing therefore which we learn from this passage also is, that ἔκταγκα was rejected.

 From κτείνω we suppose a form κτονέω, like φέρω and φορέω (see Δέμω), from which comes regularly ἐκτόνηκα.

† In all verbs which have in the perf. the augment instead of the reduplication, the indicative of this pass. aor. cannot be distinguished from the pluperf.: ωρμην, ἐκτάμην, ἐφθίμην, ἐσσύμην.

‡ [Or still more literally, "war is accustomed to slay the slayer."—Ed.]

present $\kappa \tau a \nu \epsilon \omega$, by which the continuation of the action appears to have been expressed, just as it is by $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \rho a \pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma$ in κ , 421.

An Attic sister-form of this verb for the pres. and imperf. in prose is $\kappa \tau i \nu \nu \nu \mu \iota$; for so this form is generally written in the text; but the manuscripts fluctuate between ι and $\epsilon \iota$, ν and $\nu \nu^*$.

Κτίζω, I found, build: fut. ίσω, &c. The part. pass. κτίμενος (like πτάμενος under πετάννυμι, θύμενος, ἀρπάμενος; see ἐκτάμην under Κτείνω), and the verb adj. κτιτός, which occur in the compounds ἐϋκτίμενος, ἐὖκτιτος, come from the older form in ίω, whence also περικτίονες.

Κτυπέω, I resound: fut. κτυπήσω, &c. is regular: but the Epics have the aor. 2. ἔκτὖπον (like ἔπιτνον under πιτνέω), in which indeed lies the true primitive form or stem of the verb, and the subst. κτύπος as well as κτυπέω are derivatives from it.

Κυλίνδω and κυλίω, I roll (anything). The only formation which occurs from these two verbs is fut. κυλίσω; aor. 1. ἐκύλισα, infin. κυλίσαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐκυλίσθην; perf. pass. κεκύλισμαι.—ΜΙDD. Το these we must add a lengthened present κυλινδέω†, which, in its present tense only, is the prevailing form in Attic prose.

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

With the midd. κυλινδεῖσθαι, to roll (neut.), correspond three other forms,

άλινδείσθαι, καλινδείσθαι, είλινδείσθαι,

* Phrynichus in Lex. Seguer. 1. p. 29, 7. prefers writing $\kappa \tau i \nu \nu \mu \iota$ 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 ν , there is nothing to lead us to a stem $\kappa \tau \iota$ or $\kappa \tau \epsilon \iota$ only to $\kappa \tau a \iota$ ($\epsilon \kappa \tau a \iota$), $\epsilon \kappa \tau a$), and analogy would therefore require $\kappa \tau a \iota \nu \nu \mu \iota$. But if it is formed from $\kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \nu$ as a stem, we have (like $\delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu \nu \mu \iota$) the completely analogous word $\kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \nu \nu \mu \iota$: and as a diphthong before $\nu \nu \iota$ is something unusual, it was to be expected that the pronunciation would

either drop one ν or shorten the $\epsilon \iota$ to ι . The latter is the most current tradition; but $\kappa \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \nu \mu \iota$ is found in the best manuscripts, as for instance almost invariably in the Cod. Clark. of Plato. Hence I conjecture that this is also the opinion of Phrynichus, and that $\alpha \pi \sigma \kappa \tau \iota \nu \dot{\nu} \nu a \iota$, which is now the reading there, is owing to the common corruption of ι for $\epsilon \iota$.

† Of this form we find only the present, but it is probable that the formation in $\gamma h \sigma \omega$, which we see just below in the verbs similarly formed, was borrowed from this.

all used in the intransitive sense of to roll, turn, or drive round; and these we find inflected according to the form in $\dot{\epsilon}\omega$; thus $\dot{\epsilon}i\lambda\iota\iota$ $\delta\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\iota\varphi$ or $\dot{\eta}\lambda\iota\nu$ - $\delta\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\varphi$, Plut. Agis 3., and in a passage quoted by Stephens $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\nu$ - $\delta\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta$. The form $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ $\delta\epsilon\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is pre-eminently the Attic, and of this alone we find an active voice with the meaning of to make (a horse) roll, lead him out to roll on the exercise-ground,

(άλισαι) έξαλισαι, έξήλικα,

for these are the only forms which occur (see Piers. ad Mær. p. 51.), and they are evidently from $\dot{a}\lambda i\nu\delta\omega$, $\dot{a}\lambda i\sigma\omega$. See all these forms detailed fully in Buttm. Lexil. p. 396., &c.

Κυνέω, I kiss: (fut. κύσω*;) aor. 1. ἔκυσα, like βυνέω, ἔβυσα†. The comp. προσκυνέω, I salute, worship, is regular; but in verse it has also the aor. infin. προσκύσαι, e. g. in Soph. Phil. 657. Aristoph. Equ. 156. See Κύω.

Κύπτω, I bow, bend forward, is regular: fut. κύψω; perf. κέκυφα.

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

Κυρέω, I meet with, an Ionic verb, used by the Attics for $\tau \nu \gamma \chi \acute{a} \nu \omega$ in poetry only \ddag , is regular. But the poets made use also of the older barytone form with ν long, $\kappa \acute{\nu} \rho \omega$, which however is not very frequent. Thus we find the imperf. ἐκύρουν, and in Soph. Œd. C. 1159. ἔκυρον, whence 3. sing. κυρε, II. ψ , 821. §. Fut. κυρήσω and κύρσω; aor. ἐκύρησα, infin. κυρήσω, Hom. Epigr. 6, 6., part. κυρήσως, Hes. ε, 757.; and (from κύρω) ἔκυρσα, infin. κύρσωι or κυρσωι, Hes. ε, 693., part. κύρσας, II. γ , 23. The formation from κύρω is more usual in all the poets than that from κυρέω. The midd. κύρομαι is used as a deponent in II. ω , 530.

* The fut. κυνήσομαι depends entirely on the corrupted passage of Eurip. Cycl. 171.: the comp. $\pi \rho o \sigma \kappa v v \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ (Plat. Rep. p. 469. a.) is no argument in favour of the simple form, for in the comp. we find $\pi \rho o \sigma - \kappa \kappa \dot{v} v \eta \sigma \alpha$ as well as $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\kappa} \kappa \dot{v} v \eta \sigma \alpha$ as well as $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\kappa} \kappa \dot{v} v \sigma \dot{\kappa}$ in the simple $\ddot{\kappa} \kappa v \sigma \alpha$ only. In Aristoph. Thesm. 915. $\kappa \dot{v} \sigma \omega$ is conjunctive.

† The midd. κυσάμεναι, kissing or caressing each other, is in Athen. 9. p. 394. d.

1 Κεκυρηκότα in the Second Alcibiades 6. belongs to the orthography of Plato, which it would be so desirable to ascertain.

§ The pres. act. $\kappa \dot{\nu} \rho \omega$ has been also restored to some passages by criticism on which we may depend: see Herm. ad Soph. Aj. 307. Matth. ad Eurip. Hipp. 741. with which I may reckon the passage in Aj. (314. Br.), where Hermann has left $\kappa \nu \rho \epsilon \hat{\iota}$, but the reading of the Scholiast, $\kappa \dot{\nu} \rho o \iota$, is more agreeable. Nor would I reject his historical information that the Attics used in the optat. $\kappa \dot{\nu} \rho o \iota$ rather than $\kappa \nu \rho o \dot{\imath} \eta$ (or $\kappa \nu \rho o \dot{\imath}$).

Κύω and κυέω, I am pregnant. The formation through all the moods and tenses is κυήσω, &c. To these we may add an inchoative form κυΐσκω, and κυΐσκομαι, I conceive

To fix the usage between κύω and κυέω is difficult, because the forms which occur most frequently vary only in the accent, as κύει κυεί, κύουσα κυοῦσα, &c. In Plato however (where in all other instances of this kind the accent fluctuates in the manuscripts, and in Theæt. p. 151. b. we find both κύοντα and κυοῦντα,) all the manuscripts have in the following passages, κυούμεν, Theæt. p. 210. κυούντι, Symp. 206. e. ἐκύει, 209, c.; which seems to me to settle the question as far as regards this writer*. In the authors of a later period the only decisive forms which I have found are in favour of κύω†; for instance, κύοντα, Aristot. H. A. 7, 5. τὰ κυόμενα παιδία, id. Probl. (see Stephens): τὸ δὲ κύεται, is in the womb, Poll. 5. 12. p. 73. ἔκυε, Æl. V. H. 5, 18.; while the accent in Aristotle and the later writers is pretty decisive in favour of this same form. Now as Homer has κυέουσαν, Il. ψ, 266. and ἐκύει, τ, 117. perhaps we may be safest in attributing κυεῖν to the older, and κύειν to the later writers. That is to say, the stem or root KY- with the meaning of to have in itself, is indisputably the old foundation of the verb, which in a very early period took the lengthened form of a present, κυέω, like στυγέω, κτυπέω, &c. To the simple stem belonged also, as in other verbs, an aor. 1. ἔκῦσα with a causative meaning, to fructify, ὅμβρος... ἔκῦσε γαῖαν, Æschyl. Fr. Danaid. ap. Athen: 13. p. 600.: and with this is connected the Epic. midd. κυσαμένη, ὑποκυσαμένη, literally "suffering herself to be impregnated", conceiving, which form, on account of its apparent affinity with $\kappa \dot{\nu} \sigma \alpha \iota$ (see $K \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \omega$), is erroneously written with double o. To express the same meaning was afterwards formed a present κυΐσκομαι (Aristot.); with which the active κυΐσκω as inchaative from κυέω was synonymous 1.

Lexicon [and Passow follows him,] takes $\kappa \nu i \sigma \kappa \omega$ to be the causative of $\kappa \nu i \sigma \kappa \omega \mu a$, 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.

^{*} In Hippocr. I find more than once κυέουσα (e.g. in De Superfetat.), which I think may be reconciled with κύει ocurring frequently in the same writer.
† Macrob. De Verbo Græco cap. 5. ac-

[†] 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 ι for v.

¹ Schneider in the Supplement to his

۸.

Λαγχάνω, I receive by lot or fate: fut. λήξομαι; aor. 2. ἔλαχον, see note under Αίσθάνομαι; perf. είληχα (like είληφα from λαμβάνω), or Λέλογχα*, which the Atticists rejected: see Lucian Solec. 7.

The fut. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \xi o \mu a \iota$ appears to have been rare: I find it in Plat. Repub. 10. p. 617. e. For $\lambda \dot{\eta} \xi o \mu a \iota$ the Ionics have $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \xi o \mu a \iota$, Herodot. 7, 144. with a short according to the Ion. analogy of changing η into short a.

In this verb the aor. with reduplication, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \dot{a} \chi \omega \sigma \iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \dot{a} \chi \eta \tau \epsilon$, Hom., is not the same as the common aor. 2. but has the causative sense to make a person partaker of, as in II. η , 80.

Λάζυμαι and λάζομαι, I lay hold on, take, an Ionic (Hom., Hippocr.) and poetic (Eurip.) defective deponent, used only in pres. and imperfect.

ΛΑΚ-. See Λάσκω.

Λαμβάνω, I take: fut. $\lambda \hat{\eta} \psi \hat{\sigma} \mu \alpha i$; aor. 2. $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \beta \sigma v \uparrow$, imperat. $\lambda \hat{\alpha} \beta \epsilon$ and $\lambda \tilde{\alpha} \beta \hat{\epsilon}$ (see Έρχομαι), infin. $\lambda \tilde{\alpha} \beta \epsilon \hat{i} v$, part. $\lambda \tilde{\alpha} \beta \hat{\omega} v$; perf. $\epsilon \hat{i} \lambda \eta \phi \alpha$ with ϵi prefixed instead of reduplication, like $\epsilon \hat{i} \lambda \eta \chi \alpha$, $\epsilon \hat{i} \rho \eta \kappa \alpha$.—MIDD. aor. 2. $\epsilon \lambda \tilde{\alpha} \beta \hat{\sigma} \mu \eta v$, &c.

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

The Ionics have in the perf. act. $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \acute{a} \beta \eta \kappa a$, Herodot. 3, 42. 4, 79. 8, 122. and (retaining the μ of the pres.) a fut. $\lambda \acute{a} \mu \psi o \mu a \iota$; perf. pass. $\lambda \acute{e} \lambda \acute{a} \mu \mu a \iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \acute{a} \mu \phi \theta a \iota$; aor. 1. pass. $\acute{e} \lambda \acute{a} \mu \phi \theta \eta \nu$ (instead of $\acute{e} \lambda \acute{\eta} \phi \theta \eta \nu$), Herodot. and a verbal adj. $\lambda a \mu \pi \tau \acute{e} o s \ddagger$. The Dorics likewise have $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \acute{a} \beta \eta \kappa a$, and in pass. $\lambda \acute{e} \lambda a \mu \mu a \iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \acute{a} \phi \theta a \iota$ with a long for η . In the fut. they have also $\lambda a \psi o \imath \mu a \iota$ and $\lambda a \psi e \imath \mu a \iota$. The Epics and Ionics have the aor. 2. $\lambda \acute{a} \beta \epsilon \sigma \kappa o \nu$, Hes. Fr. 61. and Herodot.

* In order to bring this change of vowel into an acknowledged analogy, it is perfectly allowable to suppose a change of the stem to $\Lambda E\Gamma X$ — on account of $\pi \acute{e}\nu$ — θ os, $\pi \alpha \theta e \widetilde{\iota} \nu$, $\pi \acute{e}\pi \alpha \nu \theta a$.

† Compare Βλαστάνω ἔβλαστον, Λαγχάνω ἔλαχον, and see note under Αἰσθάνομαι.

‡ The infin. ἀναλελάμφθαι stands in the text of Hippocr. Offic. Med. 7. The

gloss ἀναλελάφθαι in Erotian and Hesychius refers without doubt to it: but although this latter way of writing the perf. corresponds with the Ionicism ($\lambda \dot{\epsilon} - \lambda \mu \mu \mu \alpha_t - \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta \alpha_t$ with short α for $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \mu \mu \alpha_t$, as in $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \xi o \mu \alpha \iota$, &c.), yet the former way agrees too well with the other forms, and (to mention one,) with $\lambda \alpha \mu - \pi \tau \dot{\epsilon} o s$, Herodot. 3, 127. extr., for us to he sitate a moment in retaining it.

Λάμπω and λάμπομαι, I shine: fut. λάμψω and λάμψομαι, whence in comp. ἐλλάμψεσθαι, Herodot. 1, 80. 8, 74.; perf. λέλαμπα, Eurip. Androm. 1025. Tro. 1295.

Λανθάνω, less frequently $\lambda' \eta \theta \omega^*$ (Xenoph.), I lie hid, am concealed: fut. $\lambda' \eta \sigma \omega$; aor. 2. ἔλἄθον, infin. $\lambda \alpha \theta \varepsilon \hat{\iota} v$; perf. $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \theta a$, synonymous with the present. Midd. $\lambda \alpha v \theta \dot{\alpha} v \circ \mu \alpha \iota$, less frequently $\lambda' \eta \theta \circ \mu \alpha \iota$, I forget; fut. $\lambda' \eta \sigma \circ \mu \alpha \iota$; aor. 2. ἐλαθόμην; perf. $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$.

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

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

The Epic $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is the same as $\lambda\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ according to the analogy of $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\acute{a}\mu\omega$, &c. (see $K\acute{a}\mu\nu\omega$), Il. μ , 235. compared with τ , 136.†. But the active form $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is distinguished in usage from $\lambda\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, in as much as it is the exact causative of $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, in the sense of to make to forget, Il. o, 60. β , 600. Hymn. Ven. 40. Theocritus, in order to express this meaning in the present tense, merely changed the accent, and retained the reduplication, using $\tau\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\theta\nu\nu\tau\alpha$ as a fixed epithet for Hades‡.

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

formed from perfects (such as $\delta\epsilon\delta\delta\iota\kappa\omega$, 15, 58. &c.), not only because there is no perf. $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\check{\alpha}\theta\alpha$, but because $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\alpha$ has not this meaning. We may be sure that Theoer. had merely the Homeric $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\theta$ o ν (II. β , 600.) in his mind, and from it formed this part. pres., forsaking the proper analogy, as was frequently done by the later poets who imitated Homer.

^{* [}The old pres. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, midd. $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta o \mu a \iota$, is seldom used by the Attics, frequently by Homer, who on the other hand never uses $\lambda a \nu \theta \dot{a} \nu \omega$, though he has the imperf. of it three times and the imperf. midd. once.—Passow.]

[†] In Hes. θ, 471. ὅπως λελάθοιτο τεκοῦσα, for λάθοι, is an Epic inaccuracy.

[‡] It is quite a mistake to compare this form with those presents of Theocritus

the grammarians in accenting it thus instead of $\epsilon \pi i \lambda \eta \theta o \nu$ as an adjective*. In another passage Homer has for this sense a particular present ληθάνω, ἐκληθάνει, Od. η, 221. Of rare occurrence is the form έκλασαs in Alcæus ap. Hephæst. Gaisf. p. 16.

Λάσκω, I sound, speak: fut. λακήσω; fut. midd. λακήσομαι, Aristoph. Fr. 383.; aor. 1. ἐλάκησα; aor. 2. ἔλάκον, infin. λάκεῖν, Il.; aor. 2. midd. έλακόμην; perf. act. λέλακα synonymous with the pre-

That AAK- is the stem of this verb is evident from the aor. 2.: the σ in the present is therefore inserted to strengthen it, as in ισκω from είκω, τιτύσκω from τεύχω. This however is only the Attic form; the Ionics use ληκέω and the Dorics λακέω. But έλάκησα, λακήσομαι, which belong to the Attics, can according to analogy be formed only from the aor. 2. ἔλακον, λακεῖν, and have therefore the a short, as appears also from λακήσης, Aristoph. Pac. 382.†.

The Epics have the Ionic η in the perf. also, $\lambda \in \lambda \eta \kappa a$, but shorten it in λελάκυῖα, like μεμακυῖα and others; see ἀραρυῖα under 'Αραρίσκω. They have likewise the aor. 2. midd. with redupl., λελάκοντο, Hymn. Merc. 145.

- Λάω. See Λώ. ΛΕΓΧ-. See Λαγχάνω.

 $\Lambda \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \omega$, in the sense of to say, has no perf. act. 1, and in the pass, the perf. $\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \mu a \iota$ and aor. 1. $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \theta \eta \nu$. But in the compounds, which have the meaning of to collect, to choose, the perf. is (είλοχα) συνείλοχα, έξείλοχα, &c.; and this augment remains also most commonly in the passive, κα-

* 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 λήθομαι, I forget; in as much as to forget is "to lose the consideration of an object," but $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \iota \nu \dot{\alpha}$ is "to withdraw oneself from the observation or considera-tion of another." This therefore has the causative idea from the object itself, but έπιλήθειν from a third object. It is however conceivable that usage adopted different forms to express that difference, and thus $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \alpha \theta \epsilon i \nu$ and the compound

ἐπιλήθω, together with the particular form ληθάνω (see above), attached themselves to this particular meaning.

+ We may well therefore be surprised at διαλακήσασα in Nub. 410. of the same writer: unless perhaps we suppose that in this longer word the syllable was lengthened by a licence approaching nearly to the Epic.—[Passow has $\delta \iota \alpha - \lambda \bar{\alpha} \kappa \epsilon \omega$ from $\lambda \alpha \kappa \epsilon \omega$ Dor. for $\lambda \eta \kappa \epsilon \omega$, and quotes as his authority the above passage.]

The perf. act. was in less general use than the other tenses, and where really wanted its place was frequently supplied by the perf. pass., as εὖ λέλεκταί σοι for εὖ λέλεγας.

τείλεγμαι*: with which is joined the aor. 2. pass. κατελέγην. The depon. διαλέγομαι, I discourse, has also διείλεγμαι; but in the aor. 1. διελέχθην, for which Aristotle has διελέγην, Top. 7, 4, 2. 8, 3, 7.

In the old poetry the aorists of this family of verbs have another and a very different meaning: $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi a$, I laid (any one) down to sleep, $\hat{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\xi\hat{a}$ - $\mu\eta\nu$, I lay down to sleep (myself); and in a similar sense to this aor. midd. is used also the syncopated aor. $\hat{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\eta\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\sigma$, &c., with the imperat. $\lambda\epsilon\xi\sigma$ or $\lambda\epsilon\xi\epsilon\sigma$. The pres. and imperf. never occur with this meaning. On $\lambda\epsilon\xi\alpha$, $\lambda\epsilon\xi\sigma\sigma\theta\alpha$, to lay, to lie, see Buttm. Lexil. p. 403.

Beside the above, the syncop. aor. has also some of the meanings belonging to the ideas to reckon, to collect together, sometimes as a middle, in the sense of to choose oneself, offer oneself as a companion to others, $\pi \epsilon \mu \pi \tau \sigma s$ electron. Od. 1, 335. sometimes quite as a depon. $\lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \sigma \delta$ aproprior, he counted the number, δ , 451.

Λείπω, I leave, fut. λείψω, has in the active voice in general use the aor. 2. ἔλίπον, infin. λίπεῖν, and the perf. 2. λέλοιπα.—ΜIDD.

The aor. 2. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\pi\dot{\epsilon}\mu\eta\nu$, with a kind of passive meaning, I was left, I remained behind, is very common in the Epic poets, e.g. Od. δ , 710. ν , 286. and is found also in the later prose of Lucian; see Schæf. ad Greg. p. 463.

In the pure times of the language the aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\psi\alpha$ belonged solely to $\lambda\epsiloni\beta\omega$; it is occasionally however found as the aor. of $\lambda\epsiloni\pi\omega$ 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. $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\tau\sigma$ see $\gamma\epsilon\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ under $\Gamma\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$. In the formation of the aor. 1. pass. the $\epsilon\nu$ of the present was shortened to ν , as $\tau\epsilon\dot{\nu}\chi\omega$ $\dot{\epsilon}\tau\dot{\nu}\chi\theta\eta\nu$, and sometimes in the dialects a change took place of $\epsilon\iota$ to ι , as $\epsilon\lambda\iota\phi\theta\epsilon\nu$, Callim. Cer. 94. See Ernesti on this passage, and Brunck on Apollon. Rhod. 1, 1325.

Λείχω is regular. For λελειχμότες see Λιχμᾶσθαι.

Λέπω, I shell, peel, &c. This verb, like βλέπω, λέγω, πλέκω, φλέγω, ψέγω, does not change the radical e in forming the aor. 2. pass., as, ἐφλέγην, βλεπείς, &c.

^{*} There is also the regular augment with this meaning; e. g. $\xi \nu \lambda \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma$, Aristoph. Eccl. 58. and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \sigma$ from

έπιλέγω is very common: yet in Isocr. Paneg. p. 71. b. Bekker has adopted from the best manuscript ἐπειλεγμένους.

Λεύσσω*, I see. The fut. λεύσω and aor. 1. ἔλευσα are certainly not old forms, if indeed they are Greek, Reisig Comm. Critt. de Soph. Œd. C. 120. We find indeed ἔλευσαs in Æschyl. Pers. 707., but the acknowledged reading is now the imperf. ἔλευσσεs. Again in Soph. Œd. C. 1197. λεύσηs is a very probable emendation for λύσηs, but Tyrwhitt's reading λεύσσηs is as good or better.

Λεύω, I stone. The pass. takes σ .

ΛΗΒ-. See Λαμβάνω.

Λήθω. See Λανθάνω.

Ληκέω. See Λάσκω.

ΛΗΧ-. See Λαγχάνω.

Λιάζω, I bend (anything). Pass. I bend myself, turn aside: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 404. But the perf. λελίημαι see in Λιλιίομαι.

Λίγζε βιόs, the bow twanged, II. δ , 125. For this form a pres. λ ίζω has been supposed, according to the analogy of $\pi\lambda$ άζω, $\kappa\lambda$ άζω, σ αλ π ίζω; but it nowhere occurs†.

Λιλαίομαι, I desire, long for; formed from λάω (see Λω̂) by reduplication. It is used only in pres. and imperfect. But from λιλάω or λιλέω (λιλεῖ φθονεῖ, ἐπιθνμεῖ, Hesych.) comes the perf. λελίημαι, I strive, hasten, for λελίλημαι: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 406.

Λίσσομαι, I beg, less frequently λίτομαι: fut. λίσομαι; aor. 1. ἐλῖ-σάμην; aor. 2. ἐλιτόμην. Homer has the Ep. imperf. λισσέσκετο; of the aor. 1. the Ep. 1. pers. ἐλλισάμην and the Ep. imperat. λίσσαι; and of the aor. 2. the infin. λἴτέσθαι and optat. λἴτοίμην. This is one of the few verbs whose pure theme (from which comes the aor. 2.) is used also as a present: e. g. λίτομαι, Hom. Hymn. 15. λιτόμεσθα, Aristoph. Thesm. 313.

Λιχμάομαι, I protrude the tongue. We mention this verb for the sake of observing that the Hesiodic participle $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \chi \mu \acute{\sigma} \tau \epsilon s$ bears the same relation to it as $\mu \acute{\epsilon} \mu \nu \kappa a$ does to $\mu \nu \kappa \acute{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$; for the diphthong of the radical $\lambda \epsilon \acute{\iota} \chi \omega$ entering into the participle seems to be founded on the natural inclination of the perfect for a long vowel. This participial form and two others very similar,

πεφυζότες, Hom., μεμυζότες, Antim. ap. Eust. ad Od. ν, 401. p. 523, 46. Basil., λελειχμότες, Hes. θ, 826.,

† [Passow says that λίζω occurs only

in the later authors, and in the sense of to give a superficial wound, graze, scratch, consequently akin to the Homeric $\lambda i - \gamma \delta \eta \nu$. He forms $\lambda i \gamma \xi \epsilon$ from $\lambda i \gamma \psi$, and connects it with $\lambda i \gamma a$, $\lambda t \gamma \psi s$.

^{*} The difficulty of ascertaining whether the Greeks ever used a fit. $\lambda e \acute{\sigma} \omega$ is greatly increased by our finding the present very commonly written in the manuscripts with a single σ .

appear to be remains of the earlier periods of the language, when analogies formed subsequently were not yet in existence. In virtue of their characteristic letters (ζ and $\chi\mu$) they are not analogous to the perf. 1. or perf. 2. (perf. midd.): and except in these participles the perfects themselves never occur: nor in the sentence does their 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.

Λούω, I wash: fut. λούσω. The Attic and even the Ionic dialect shorten, in the imperf. of the active and in the pres. and imperf. of the passive voice, all the forms which have ϵ and δ in the termination, as in the imperf. δ λου for δ λουε, and δ λοῦμεν for δ λούσμεν; in the pass. λοῦμαι for λούσμαι, λοῦσαι for λούσσθαι for λούσσθαι, &c. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 189.

Homer has a 3. sing. aor. 2. $\lambda \delta \epsilon$, Od. κ , 361.; and in Hymn. Ap. 120. is a 3. plur. $\lambda \delta \delta \nu \uparrow$: from $\lambda \delta \epsilon \omega$ he has an imperf. $\epsilon \lambda \delta \epsilon \nu \nu$, and an infin. aor. act. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota$, part. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \delta \iota$, an aor. midd. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \tau \delta \iota$, infin. $\lambda \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \delta \iota$; in addition to which he uses all the common as well as the abridged forms. The most natural way therefore of treating this verb is to suppose that from the simple stem $\lambda \delta \omega$ came the lengthened one $\lambda \delta \epsilon \omega$ (compare $K \nu \omega$, $\kappa \nu \epsilon \omega$), and from this by contraction the common $\lambda \delta \nu \omega$, $\epsilon \lambda \delta \nu \sigma \alpha \delta \omega$. Έλο $\nu \epsilon \omega \nu$, Hymn. Cer. 290. is a form of $\lambda \delta \delta \omega \omega$ again produced or resolved.

With regard to those abridged forms, the accentuation of ἐλοῦμεν, Aristoph. Plut. 657. of ἐλοῦτο, Herodot. 3, 125. and of ἐλοῦντο, Xen. Cyr. 4, 5. 4. lead us to suppose that they are contracted from λόω, ἐλόομεν, &c., which is confirmed by the infin. λοῦν as quoted from Hippocr. in Galeni Gloss.; although in the works of Hippocr. it is always written λούειν. Accordingly we do not with some of the older grammarians reckon λοῦμαι among the examples of the syncope like οἷμαι, but sup-

^{*} 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.]

^{† [}In Hes. ϵ . 751. Schneider is correct in having accented it $\lambda o \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ as the infin. aor. midd.: and instead of $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \iota \iota$ (Scol. 21, 4. Br.) the true accentuation is $\lambda o \epsilon \widetilde{\iota} .$ —Passow.]

pose the verb in common use to be a mixture of the contractions of the two old forms $\lambda \delta \omega$ and $\lambda o \epsilon \omega^*$.

This statement is fully confirmed by a further piece of information from Bekker's labours on Aristophanes. In Nub. 838. the old reading is "Ωσπερ τεθνεώτος καταλούει μου τὸν βίον, 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, μου καταλούει, 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, καταλόει. 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 λούει, which is the same as the 3. sing. indic. act., but preferred the shorter form; not however in the inharmonious contraction λοῖ, but without the contraction λόει†.

The 2. and 3. sing. of the pres. act. also might certainly have been $\lambda \delta \epsilon \iota s$, $\lambda \delta \epsilon \iota s$; but these persons were undoubtedly occupied by $\lambda \delta \delta \iota s$, which had already established itself in all the dialects in the 1. sing., as it

* The Scholiast on Aristoph. Plut. 657. has both opinions; ${}^{\prime}\text{E}\lambda \hat{\nu}\hat{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu$ ${}^{\prime}$ ${}^{\prime}$

+ If those forms were abridged by syncope, then, according to general analogy, we should find between λουμαι—λουται and between $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda o \dot{\nu}\mu \eta \nu - \dot{\epsilon}\lambda o \hat{\nu}\tau o$ the second persons $\lambda o \hat{\nu}\sigma a \iota$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda o \nu \sigma o$, nor would the imperat. \overline{voo} be defective. these nowhere occur either in authors or grammarians: for λοῦσαι, which stands in some editions of Phrynichus, (see Ed. Pauw. p. 80.) is a mere corruption of λουται. Lobeck has extracted the whole article from the first edition, according to which the forms disapproved of by Phrynichus (and they are the common ones) are the following—ἐλουόμην, ἐλούου, ἐλούετο, λούομαι, λούεται, ἐλουόμεθα, έλούοντο, λούεσθαι; to which are opposed as pure Attic λοῦσθαι καὶ λοῦμαι, λοῦται, ἐλούμην, ἐλοῦτο, ἐλούμεθα, ἐλοῦντο. Here λούει is omitted in the first series between λούομαι and λούεται, and is therefore silently approved of: while no notice is taken of hoet (which we have brought forward above), pro-

bably because it was strange to the grammarians, who rejected it wherever it occurred in the way that it does in the before-mentioned passage of Aristophanes. On the other hand έλούου is expressly objected to; consequently the form recommended in its stead, which is the very one we are in search of, whether it be ελουσο or ελοῦ (from ελόου), has been omitted by mistake. Now the gloss of Hesychius, Λοῦ, λοῦσαι, will assist us in discovering it. Here λοῦ 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 λόου) 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 instances very commonly overlooked by the grammarians. This analogy shows us also with certainty the 2. sing. imperf. έλοῦ, which by a very conceivable oversight was omitted in Phrynichus before έλοῦτο. The abridged form in the passive voice is therefore, when completed, λοῦμαι, λόει, λοῦται &c., ἐλούμην, ἐλοῦ, ἐλοῦτο &c., infin. λοῦσθαι, imperat. λοῦ.

did also in the optat. $\lambda o'\nu o_i \mu_i$, $-o'i\mu\eta\nu$, in the conj. $\lambda o'\nu\omega$, $-\eta s$, &c., in the part. $\lambda o'\nu\omega$, and probably also in the imperat. act. $\lambda o'\nu\varepsilon$. See note in the preceding page.

Λύω, I loose: fut. λύσω (\bar{v}) ; aor. 1. ἔλῦσα; perf. λέλὕκα; perf. pass. λέλὕμαι; pluperf. ἐλελύμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐλύθην (\bar{v}) .

This verb together with $\delta i\omega$ and $\theta i\omega$ shortens the v in the perf. act. and in the perf. and aor. pass.: see Chæroboscus p. 1286. Praco pp. 45, 26. 87, 25. Compare also $\Delta i\omega$ and $\Theta i\omega$.

In Od. σ , 238. Homer has the 3. sing. optat. perf. pass. $\lambda \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \tau \sigma$ for $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \hat{\nu} \omega \iota \tau \sigma$; where the ν is lengthened by its absorbing the ι of the optative; and the accent on the antepenult., though not according to the directions of the Grammarians, is yet agreeable to analogy, and corresponds with $\delta \alpha \hat{\iota} \nu \nu \tau \sigma$ in Hom. and $\pi \hat{\eta} \gamma \nu \nu \tau \sigma$ in Plato, as they are found accented in the great majority of the manuscripts. Again from an Epic syncop. aor. pass. $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\nu} \mu \eta \nu$ (corresponding with the regular aor. 2. midd.), Homer has a 1. and 3. sing. $\lambda \hat{\nu} \mu \eta \nu$, $\lambda \hat{\nu} \tau \sigma$, and 3. plur. $\lambda \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \sigma$. An imperat. syncop. aor. act. $\lambda \hat{\nu} \theta \iota$ (for $\lambda \hat{\nu} \sigma \sigma \nu$) in Pind. ap. Etym. M. v. $\delta \iota \theta \hat{\nu} - \rho \alpha \mu \beta \sigma s$ 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 $\Lambda\Lambda\Omega$, used only in the three persons of the sing. $\lambda\hat{\omega}$, $\lambda\hat{\eta}s$, $\lambda\hat{\eta}s$, $\lambda\hat{\eta}s$, $\lambda\hat{\eta}s$, $\lambda\hat{\eta}\nu$; compare Markl. Eurip. Suppl. 221.

M.

Maίνομαι, I am mad, has a fut. midd. and an aor. 2. pass. ἐμάνην, infin. μἄνῆναι, part. μἄνείς. The perf. μέμηνα has the meaning of the present. But the aor. 1. act. ἔμηνα, Aristoph. Thesm. 561. has the causative meaning to make mad, in which tense, and indeed in the present also, the compound ἐκμαίνω is more usual.

The fut. 2. pass. μανήσομαι is not Attic*; see Mær. and Thom. Mag. the perf. pass. μεμάνημαι is used in Theocrit. 10, 31. in the same sense as the pres. μαίνομαι.

 [[]Passow says that the Attics use μαεαν , I shall go mad.' He mentions also
νήσομαι as a kind of exclamation, as we
a fult. 2. μανοῦμαι.]

Maίομαι. See MAΩ.

MAK-. See Μηκάομαι.

Mαλκι \hat{q}^{ν} is an Attic infin. mentioned by Phrynichus (in Lex. Seg. p. 51.), Photius and Hesych. from μ αλκιάω, I am frost-bitten. Perhaps the suspected form μ αλκιέ $\hat{\iota}^{\nu}$ in Æl. N. A. 9, 4. should be μ αλκι \hat{q}^{ν} . See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 82.

Μανθάνω, I learn: aor. 2. ἔμᾶθον; fut. μαθήσομαι; perf. μεμάθηκα. See notes under Λαμβάνω and Αἰσθάνομαι; also ᾿Ακαχίζω. The aor. pass. is wanting.

The Dor. fut. 2. μἄθεῦμαι for μαθοῦμαι, Theocr. 2, 60. (like μαχοῦμαι, πιοῦμαι, &c.) supposes a root ΜΗΘΩ.

Μαπέειν. See Μάρπτω.

Μάρναμαι, I contend, fight; used only in pres. and imperf. which follow ἴσταμαι or δύναμαι; thus infin. μάρνασθαι, part. μαρνάμενος, but the optat. is μαρνοίμην, Od. λ, 512. imperf. ἐμαρνάμην. [But ἐμαρνάσθην, II. η, 301. is an aor.—Passow.]

Μάρπτω, I seize: fut. μάρψω; aor. 1. ἔμαρψα; part. perf. μεμαρπώς, Hes. ε, 206. To these must be added the Ep. aor. 2. with redupl. (ἔμαρπον) μέμαρπον, Hes. α, 245. or with ρ dropped (ἔμᾶπον), infin. μἄπέειν, Hes. α, 231. 304. optat. with redupl. μεμάποιεν, Hes. α, 252.

Μαρτυρέω (v short), I bear witness (for or against a person or of a thing). Μαρτύρομαι (v long) depon. midd. I call as a witness.

In this case the active μαρτύρω, which is not in use, must be considered as the causative to μαρτυρέω, I cause witness to be borne; and μαρτύρομαι the midd. of it, I cause witness to be borne for myself, call to witness.

Μάσσω, Att. μάττω, I knead: fut. μάξω; perf. μέμαχα, Aristoph. Equ. 55; perf. pass. μέμαγμαι, ib. 57. Also aor. 2. pass.

See also in note to Maio $\mu\alpha\iota$, p. 172. another $\mu\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ which has been erroneously supposed to exist.

Μάχομαι, I fight: fut. μαχέσομαι and more generally μαχοῦμαι (compare καθεδοῦμαι under 'Ιζω); aor. l. ἐμαχεσάμην; perf. μεμάχημαι. Verbal adj. μαχετέος and μαχητέος.

The perf. μεμάχημαι is in Isocr. Archid. p. 127. b. Another form of the perf. μεμάχεσμαι, found in good manuscripts in Xenoph. Cyr. 7, 1,

14. would be recommended by analogy, but the context makes the common reading preferable, των πρόσθεν ξυμμαχεσαμένων. The form μαχετέον in Plato Sophist. p. 249. c. Rep. 2. p. 380. b. is supported by the authority of good manuscripts.

When in Homer the metre requires a long syllable the reading fluctuates between $\epsilon\sigma\sigma$ and $\eta\sigma$, yet so that the text (at least as it is handed down to us) and a great majority of the manuscripts have in the fut.

μαχήσομαι and in the aor. μαχέσσατο*.

The Ionics had also in the pres. μαχέομαι (μαχέοιτο, Il. a, 272. συμμαχέεται, Herodot. 7, 239.), which form therefore as to time is ambiguous, unless perhaps the Ionic prose used as a fut. μαχέσομαι only: see Fisch. 3. p. 131. Schweigh. Lex. Herodot., and compare Il. β , 366. not. Heyn. Homer has, on account of so many short syllables following each other, lengthened each of the vowels in the pres. part. μαχειόμενος and μαχεούμενος. Compare 'Peoύμενος.

MA-. To this stem or root belong three poetical verbs †:

1. μέμαα, 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. μεμάσσι, and the syncopated 1. plur. μέμαμεν, 2. plur. μέματε, 2. dual μέματον, the 3. sing. imperat. μεμάτω, 3. plur. pluperf. μέμασαν, and the part. μεμαώs of which the fem. is μεμανία, and the gen. μεμαώτος or μεμαότος, Il. β, 818. Theorr. 25, 105. compare βεβαώς and γεγαώς.—The form μέμαεν in Theorr. 25, 64. is a false reading ‡. That all these forms are connected immediately with μέμονα, will be shown under Mévw.

* See Heyne's critical notes on Il. a, 153. β, 801. γ, 137. 254. and on a, 304. B, 377. y, 393. o, 633. It would be a very hazardous step therefore to follow Aristarchus and Wolf in introducing the reading with the η in all the passages. Besides, if we wish to observe analogy, we should rather make the eoo the universal reading, as some of the older critics have proposed: see Heyne on 11. a, 298. Compare the verb Aiδομαι (for although aidéouas became the common form in a later period, it is still to be looked upon like μαχέομαι), of which the fut. αίδέσσομαι is the only defensible form in Il. χ, 419. while in Od. ξ, 388. it is opposed by αἰδήσομαι: on this passage see Porson. in Postscripto.

† The three verbs which we have here joined together on account of their having the same letters in the stem, are certainly so similar to each other in meaning also, that no one would take it on himself to separate them. The identity of the first verb with μέμονα, μένος, will be shown under Mévw; but then it does not unite so immediately with μαίεσθαι, ἐπιμάσασθαι, μάστιξ, (which evidently come from the physical idea of feeling,) as grammatical and exegetic etymology require. We therefore place together, in pursuance of our present object, three verbs only, leaving to the philosophical philologist to extend the inquiry.

‡ If μέμαεν be a true reading, it is one example among many of the later poets having misunderstood the older ones and attributed to them forms which they never used. At all events it cannot be a perf., but must be an imperf. or aor., like δέδαε which is an aor. with reduplication. Brunck has with some probability preferred µéµove, but the context requires the imperf. (pluperf.) consequently $\mu\epsilon$ -

μόνει δέ μιν αιτν έρεσθαι.

2. μωμαι, I desire, seek after: part. μωμενος (Soph. Œd. C. 836.) contracted from μάσμαι; but the ω generally prevails, as in the infin. μῶσθαι, Theogn. 769. the imperat. μώεο, Epicharm. ap. Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 20. formed as from μώσμαι. Compare μνώεσ from μνάσμαι μνώμαι under

Μιμνήσκω, and Ζάω: see also Toup. ad Suid. v. ωχρός.

. 3. μαίομαι, I feel, touch; seek for, desire. To this belong the fut. μάσομαι, aor. έμασάμην, with a short; but occurring principally in the compounds, as infin. aor. ἐπιμάσασθαι, Od. λ, 591. fut. ἐπιμάσσεται, Il. δ, 190. aor. ἐσεμάσσατο, Il. ρ, 564. For that the above present and this aor, answer exactly to each other, we may see by such passages as Od. ι, 441. and 446., confirmed by the analogy of δαίω δάσασθαι, ναίω νάσασθαι*.--Verb. adj. μαστός.

 $M \in \theta i \omega$, I am drunken, used only in pres. and imperf., takes its other tenses from the pass., as, ἐμεθύσθην, &c.: for the other tenses of the active, as ἐμέθὕσα, &c., belong to μεθύσκω, I make drunkent.

Μείρομαι, I share, partake, obtain. The older poets have (beside this present, Il. ι, 616. Theogn. 1228.) a 3. sing. ἔμμορε. This is plainly an aorist in Il. a, 278. ουποθ' όμοιης ξμμορε τιμής βασιλεύς, "never yet has a king received such honour." The later Epics use it in the same way, e.g. Apollon, 3, 4. ἔμμορες. And we might perhaps consider it as an aor. in all the Epic passages, even when by the context it has evidently the force of a present, "he has obtained, he obtained, i. e. he has." In other cases, however, it will be more natural to take it as a perf. (ξμμορα for μέμορα), e.g. in Od. ε, 335. Νῦν δ' άλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι θεων εξ εμμορε τιμής, "now is she a partaker of divine honours." And this is confirmed by the Doric Ἐμμόραντι τετεύχασι, Hesych. ‡.

This perf. 2. as well as the aor. 2. belong therefore, according to the analogy given in the note below &, to the immediate meaning, with which the midd. μείρομαι was used in the present. The act. μείρω (properly to divide, whence μέρος) had therefore the causative sense to give out in

‡ [Thus Passow has μείρομαι; aor. εμμορον; perf. εμμορα.]

§ In many primitive verbs the fut. and aor. 1. act. give the preference to the causative meaning: the aor. 2. and perf. act., particularly the perf. 2., (perf. midd.) prefer the immediate and indeed principally the intransitive.

^{*} We find in the lexicons for μάσασθαι a present μάσσω, fut. μάσω; but there are no grounds for such a present, nor does any such exist. Μάσσω, μάξω, I knead, although perhaps akin to it, is a different

[†] In the well-known Alcaic fragment, instead of Νῦν χρή μεθύσκειν we must read μεθύσθην, Æolic infin. for μεθυσθηναι.

shares, to allot, whence comes the perf. pass., which occurs only in the third person:

είμαρμαι, 3. pers. είμαρται* (with the syllable εἰ instead of the reduplication like είληφα, είρηκα, &c.), it is allotted by fate, it is fated: part. είμαρμένος: ἡ είμαρμένη (scil. μοῖρα) that which is allotted to any one, his fate, destiny. Pluperf. είμαρτο. Compare πέπρωμαι in Πορεῖν.

In Apollonius 1, 646. 973. we find in a similar sense $\mu\epsilon\mu\delta\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, and in 3, 1130. $\mu\epsilon\mu\rho\rho\mu\dot{\epsilon}ros$: the latter with the change of vowel to o retained in the perf. pass. as in $\eta\rho\rho\tau\sigma$, $\ddot{\alpha}\omega\rho\tau\sigma$, the former according to the analogy of $\phi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\omega$ $\phi\rho\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ (see under $\Delta\dot{\epsilon}\mu\omega$), or of $\delta\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta\kappa\alpha$ (see $K\tau\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}\nu\omega$).

Μέλλω, I am about to do a thing, intend to do it: fut. μ ελλήσω; aor. 1. ϵ μέλλησα, I have delayed doing it. The Attics add the temporal augment to the syllabic one of the imperfect making $\mathring{\eta}$ μελλον, like $\mathring{\eta}$ δυνάμην, $\mathring{\eta}$ βουλόμην: see Βούλομαι.

Μέλ $\pi\omega$, midd. μ έλ π ο μ αι, I sing, play. It has no perfect.

Mέλω, I am an object of care or concern, I vex, go to the heart, is used in the active voice principally in the third person; pres. μέλει, μέλουσι; imperf. ἔμελε; fut. μελήσει; infin. pres. μέλειν, fut. μελήσειν, &c., it is an object of care, &c. Pass. μέλομαι, I am careful of, anxious about, more generally ἐπιμέλομαι, -ήσομαι, &c.

The personal use of the active is in its nature rare, according to which it means, for instance, to be the object of care, e.g. Iva $\nu\epsilon\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\iota$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega$, Eurip. Andr. 851. Now as this is most commonly said of impersonal objects, the third persons are naturally the most familiar; and thus arose the impersonal usage. The compound $\mu\epsilon\tau a\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$, it repents,

frequently recurring form in the Milesian Inscription in Chishull, p. 67. ἀφέσταλκα, which supposes the existence of ἔσταλκα. On the other hand the instances of εἰμαρμένοs with the lenis, which Schæfer (Melet. p. 22. and ad Soph. Œd. T. 1082.) has quoted from the later writers, are to be considered as mere sophistry of the later grammarians.

^{*} The aspirate on this word may be compared with that on $"\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha$, and on the presents $"\sigma\tau\eta\mu$ and $"\pi\tau\mu\mu\alpha$, 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

admits indeed of no other. The passive $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda o \mu a \iota$ bears exactly the same relation to the imperf. $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota$, as $\hat{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon} o \mu a \iota$ does to $\delta \epsilon \hat{\iota}$.

The forms of the compound $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\mu\epsilon\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, &c., are generally placed with $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\hat{\imath}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, which is an exactly synonymous sister-form of $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\mu\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$; but this latter is declared by the Atticists (see Mær. 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 $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\mu\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ being the older form, to which the inflexion of $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\mu\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\rho\alpha\iota$ originally belonged.

The perf. $\mu\epsilon\mu\hat{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\kappa\hat{\epsilon}$ μ 01 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. $\mu\hat{\epsilon}\mu\eta\lambda\hat{\epsilon}$, Dor. $\mu\hat{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\lambda\hat{\epsilon}$, 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. $\mu\epsilon\mu\hat{\eta}\lambda\hat{\epsilon}$ for $\hat{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\mu\hat{\eta}\lambda\hat{\epsilon}$ with the force of an imperf., Il. β , 614. The same perf. has, however, sometimes the personal meaning of the pass. $\mu\hat{\epsilon}\lambda \alpha\mu\alpha$; in the first place as a real perfect, $\tau u\hat{\nu}\tau\alpha$ $\mu\hat{\epsilon}\mu\eta\lambda\alpha$ s, these things hast thou thought carefully about, invented, Hymn. Mcrc. 437. and next equally as much like a present, $\mu\epsilon\mu\eta\lambda\hat{\omega}s$ $\tau\iota\nu\hat{c}s$, thinking carefully, anxiously about anything, intent upon it, Il. ϵ , 708. ν , 297.

The pass. μέλομαι is also used poetically for μέλω, as μελέσθω σοι, Od. κ, 505. ξ μελόμεσθα, cui curæ sumus, Eurip. Hipp. 60. in which sense we find also the perf. as a pres. and consequently the pluperf. as imperf., σοὶ μεμέλητο, tibi curæ erat, Theocr. 17, 46. in which usage it has undergone also an Epic abridgement, as perf. μέμβλεται, pluperf. μέμβλετο, II. τ, 343. φ, 516. Hes. θ, 61.* like μεσημβρία from ἡμέρα.—[The aor. 1. pass. μεληθήναι is sometimes used actively, to have taken care of, τάφου, Soph. Aj. 1184. sometimes passively, to be taken care of, Epig. Ad. 112, 3.—Passow.]

Μέμφομαι, I blame: fut. μέμψομαι. Depon. midd. without a perfect.

[This verb occurs first in Hes. ϵ , 188. and Theogn. 795. 871.; but more frequently in Pindar and Herodotus: it is found also in the Attics, as Thucyd. 7, 77. Plato and Isocrates.—Passow.] The Ionics and Tragedians use in a similar deponent sense the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\dot{\epsilon}\mu\phi\theta\eta\nu$ also.

formed. But it is far more correct to compare this with the similar perfects μέμνεο for μέμνησο, and ἀρήρεμαι.

^{*} As no other forms occur than the 3. sing. μέμβλεται, μέμβλετο, a first person μέμβλομαι has been supposed to exist as the present from which these might be

Μένω, I remain: Epic fut. μενέω, Attic contracted μενώ; aor. 1. ἔμεινα; perf. μεμένηκα*. Verbal adj. μενετέος, Plato Rep. 1. p. 328. b.

The Ionic and poet. perfect $\mu \acute{e}\mu o va$, I feel a strong desire, I am determined, I intend, (Herodot. 6, 84. II. ϵ , 482. ω , 657. &c.) belongs to a stem or family differing in meaning from the above $\mu \acute{e}\nu \omega$, as we see from its derivative $\tau \acute{o}$ $\mu \acute{e}\nu o s$, from which again is derived another Epic verb, $\mu e \nu e a \acute{e}\nu \omega$, $\mu e \nu \acute{e}\mu v a$ having in its most common acceptation the same sense as $\mu \acute{e}\mu o \nu a$, e. g. II. ν , 628. o, 565. Od. δ , 282. At the same time the analogy of $\gamma \acute{e}\gamma o \nu a$ $\gamma e \gamma \acute{a}a \sigma \nu$ &c. leads to one evident remark, that the relation between those two perfects is the same as between $\mu \acute{e}\mu o \nu a$ and $\mu e \mu \acute{a}a \sigma \iota \nu$ &c., which latter correspond also in meaning. All this must prevent us from placing $\mu \acute{e}\mu o \nu a$, which could not be done without violence, among the forms of $\mu \acute{e}\nu e \iota \nu$, to remain; although Euripides, who uses $\mu \acute{e}\mu o \nu e$ quite in the old sense at Iph. T. 656. $\delta \acute{e}$ - $\delta \nu \mu a$ $\mu \acute{e}\mu o \nu e$ $\phi \rho \acute{n}\nu$, has the same word in another passage (Iph. A. 1495.) for $\mu \acute{e}\nu e \iota$; this latter is however merely an instance of Lyric caprice, without proving anything as to the language.

METIΩ, or μετίημι, Ion. for μεθίημι; of which we find among others the 3. pres. μετίει, Herodot. 6, 37. 59.; the 3. sing. imperf. midd. μετίστο (or ἐμετίετο) for μεθίετο, Herodot. 1, 12.; the infin. fut. midd. μετήσεσθαι for μεθήσεσθαι, Herodot.; and μεμετιμένοs part. perf. pass. for μεθειμένοs, Herodot. According to the analogy of τίθημι the 3. sing. pres. should be accented μετιεῖ, and μετίει should be the imperf.; see Heyne on II. ζ, 523. where Wolf now reads in his last edition μεθιεῖs. Com-

pare the simple "Ιημι.

Μηκάομαι, I bleat, cry out: probably a depon. midd. like μυκάομαι.

This verb has some simpler Epic forms; e. g. $\mu \epsilon \mu \eta \kappa \alpha$ with the force of a pres. whence part. $\mu \epsilon \mu \eta \kappa \omega$, II. κ , 362. and fem. with the short Ion. α , $\mu \epsilon \mu \tilde{\alpha} \kappa v \tilde{\alpha}$, II. δ , 435. And as this perf. had the sense of a present, an imperf. $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \mu \eta \kappa \sigma \nu$ (Od. ι , 439.) was formed from it, like $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \kappa \alpha \tilde{\alpha} \epsilon \psi \nu \kappa \sigma \nu$, Hes. α , 76. θ , 673. To this we must add the aor. $\epsilon \mu \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu$, of which however only the part. $\mu \alpha \kappa \omega \nu$ remains, II. π , 469. compare Od. κ , 163. Thus this verb is strictly analogous to the Epic forms of $\mu \nu \kappa \omega \sigma \alpha \omega$.

times defective, and sometimes form them as from a verb in -έω, in which latter case μένω may be joined with them, as μεμένηκα, νενέμηκα, δέδμηκα &c.

^{*} The verbs in $\mu\omega$ ($\nu\acute{e}\mu\omega$, $\delta\acute{e}\mu\omega$, $\beta\rho\acute{e}-\mu\omega$, $\tau\rho\acute{e}\mu\omega$) cannot follow the analogy of verbs which have λ , μ , ν , ρ as their characteristic, further than the fut. and aor.; hence in their other tenses they are some-

Mιαίνω, I stain, defile: fut. μιαν $\hat{\omega}$; aor. 1. ἐμίηνα, Att. also ἐμίανα, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 24.; aor. 1. pass. ἐμιάν-θην; perf. pass. μεμίασμαι.

At II. δ , 146. μ iáνθην αἴματι μηροί, the verb is either the 3. dual or plural. The old grammarians explained it to be for μ iaνθήτην, but of such an abbreviation no other instance is to be found; the moderns have considered it to be for $\dot{\epsilon}\mu$ iáνθησαν, but the η is so unusual in the abridged 3 plur., that no example of it can be adduced even in the dialects*; compare $\ddot{\epsilon}\tau\nu\phi\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\ddot{\epsilon}\tau\nu\pi\epsilon\nu$ for $-\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, or $\ddot{\epsilon}\beta\check{\alpha}\nu$, $\ddot{\epsilon}\delta\check{\nu}\nu$ &c. I consider therefore μ iáνθην to be the dual of a syncop. aor. pass.: (3. sing. $\dot{\epsilon}\mu$ iαν-το) 3. dual ($\dot{\epsilon}\mu$ iάν-σθην) $\dot{\epsilon}\mu$ iáνθην, like $\dot{\delta}\epsilon\chi\theta\alpha\iota$, $\ddot{\delta}\rho\theta\alpha\iota$, in both of which the σ is dropped before the θ .

Μίγνυμι, or μίσγω†, *I mix*: fut. μίξω, &c. Pass. aor. 1. ἐμίχθην; aor. 2. ἐμίγην; perf. μέμιγμαι, part. μεμιγμένος, Plat. Legg. 12. p. 951. d.

In the old-Attic inscriptions the derivatives of this verb are very often written with $\epsilon\iota$, as $\xi \acute{\nu}\mu\mu\epsilon\iota\kappa\tau a$, which shows that the ι (except in the aor. 2. pass.) is long. We must therefore write $\mu \imath \xi a\iota$.

Μιμνήσκω, I remind, has from MNAΩ a fut. μνήσω and aor. 1. ἔμνησα, &c., Il. a, 407. Pass. μιμνήσκομαι, I remember, also I mention; aor. 1. ἐμνήσθην; fut. μνησθήσομαι; verbal adj. μνηστός. The perf. pass. μέμνημαι has the force of a present, I remember, whence imper. μέμνησο, optat. μεμνήμην, Il. ω, 745. Att. μεμνοίμην and μεμνώμην, Herm. Soph. Œd. T. 49. (whence μεμνώτο, Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 3. contracted from the Ion. μεμνεψήμην, μεμνέψτο, Il. ψ, 361.), conj. μέμνωμαι, -η, -ηται, &c.‡. To this perf. belong the pluperf. ἐμεμνήμην (whence Ion. 3. plur. ἐμεμνέατο for ἐμέμνηντο, Herodot. 2, 104.), and the fut. 3. (paullo-post fut.) μεμνήσομαι, Herod. 8, 62.

^{*} I must not conceal that in a Cretan inscription in Chishull, p. 111. $\delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\eta\nu$ occurs as a plural; but as the other Cretan inscriptions in the same collection have $\delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu$, it naturally throws great suspicion on the former, which however, whether true or not, would be of very little authority in deciding on a Homeric form.

^{† [}Mi $\sigma\gamma\omega$ is used by Hom. and the Attics, and by Herodot, exclusively, particularly in the pass. voice. The common pres. μ i $\gamma\nu\nu$ μ is never found in Hom. either act. or pass.: in the fut, he has the midd. μ i ξ o μ a μ , and the pass. μ i γ μ o μ a μ μ thile Hes. has μ e μ i ξ o μ a μ .—Passow.] † See κ τ áo μ a μ with notes.

Ionic abbreviations are $(\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \epsilon a \iota) \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta$ 2. sing. indicat. for $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta$ - $\sigma a \iota$, Hom., and $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \epsilon o$ imperat. for $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \sigma o$, Herodot. 5, 105: compare $\mu \epsilon \mu \beta \lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota$ under $M \epsilon \lambda \omega$.

The radical form $\mu\nu$ άο μ αι, $\mu\nu$ $\hat{\omega}\mu$ αι is in the above sense solely Ionic, in which dialect the α is changed into ϵ , consequently we have 3. sing. pres. $\mu\nu$ $\hat{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (like $\chi\rho$ $\hat{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ from $\chi\rho$ $\hat{\epsilon}\omega\mu\alpha\iota$), and by the similar Ionic change of α 0 to $\epsilon\omega$ (like $\chi\rho$ $\hat{\epsilon}\omega\rho\alpha\iota$ 1 to $\chi\rho$ $\hat{\epsilon}\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ 2), we have the part. $\mu\nu$ $\hat{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ 2 again by the Ionic lengthening of ω 1 to ω 0 (like $\chi\epsilon\lambda$ $\hat{\omega}\nu$ 2 $\tau\epsilon$ 5, $\eta\beta$ $\hat{\omega}\nu$ 4 $\tau\epsilon$ 6, $\eta\beta$ 0 $\tau\epsilon$ 7, $\eta\beta$ 0 $\tau\epsilon$ 8, $\eta\beta$ 0 $\tau\epsilon$ 9, $\eta\beta$ 1 $\tau\epsilon$ 9, $\eta\epsilon$ 9,

Μολείν. See Βλώσκω.

MY-. We will here place the following verbs by the side of each other, that it may be at once seen in what they correspond and in what they differ:

Mυέω, I initiate into the mysteries, is regular.

Μύω, (whence also καταμύω, καμμύω) I shut, close, e.g. the lips, eyes, &c., and used both transit. and intransit. This verb is regular. Perf. μέμῦκα, I am shut, I am silent.

Mύζω, I emit a sound by compressing the lips and breathing loud through the nose, I moan, grumble; aor. 1. ἔμνσα, Hippocr. (of the rumbling of the intestines; see Foes. and Schneider): but ἔμνξα, ἐπέμνξαν are used by Homer as sounds of anger and reproach. This latter formation, with γ as its characteristic, is common to many verbs which express the uttering of some sound or exclamation, as κράζω, στενάζω, τρίζω, ολμώζω, whence μνγμός, στεναγμός, ολμωγμός, &c.

Mύζω, I suck: fut. $\mu\nu\zeta'\eta\sigma\omega$, &c., from which inflexion first arose, it appears, in a later æra the pres. $\mu\nu\zeta'\omega$ and $\mu\nu\zeta'\omega^*$.

For the part. μεμυζότε see Λιχμάομαι.

Μύσσω, μύττω, but more generally ἀπομύττω, emungo: fut. μύξω, &c.—Midd.

[The simple verb occurs only in the writings of the Grammarians and

* See Hemst. ad Lucian. Tim. 8. and Schneider's Lexicon. That $\mu\dot{\nu}\zeta\omega$ is the older form appears certain not only from the glosses of Hesychius, who explains $\mu\dot{\nu}\zeta\epsilon\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\nu\dot{\zeta}\epsilon\nu$, $\mu\dot{\nu}\zeta\upsilon\nu\iota$; but in Hippocr. π . $\dot{a}\rho\chi$. 8. we find $\mu\dot{\nu}\zeta\epsilon\iota$ and $\ddot{\epsilon}\mu\nu\dot{\zeta}\epsilon\nu$, and

in Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 27., where the text 'now has $\epsilon i s \ \tau \delta \ \sigma \tau \delta \mu \alpha \delta \mu \delta \zeta \epsilon \nu$, it is evident that this last form, which occurs nowhere else, is corrupted by the addition of a superfluous α .

as the root of ἀπομύττω, ἐπιμύττω, προμύττω, and of the Lat. mungo, emungo.—Passow.]

Μῦκάομαι, I bellow, roar: Dep. midd.

From the simple stem of this verb the Epics have formed a perf. with the force of a pres. $\mu \epsilon \mu \bar{\nu} \kappa a$, part. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \kappa \omega s$, and an aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \mu \bar{\nu} \kappa \sigma \nu$. Compare $M \eta \kappa a \sigma \mu a \sigma$.

N.

Naιετάω, I dwell. This Epic verb is never contracted, nor, except in one instance, produced, but is almost invariably found in a purely resolved form, as ναιετάω, Od. ι, 21. ναιετάει, Hes. θ, 775. ναιετάουσι, ναιετάοντες, Hom. Conj. ναιετάωσι, Hes. θ, 370. The only instance of the regular production is in the imperf. ναιετάασκον, and of an irregular one in the fem. part. ναιετάωσα*.

Naίω, I dwell, forms its tenses with simple ἄ†. In the active, however, we find only the aor. 1. (ἔνᾶσα) ἕνασσα with a causative meaning, to cause to inhabit, settle, or cause to be inhabited, colonize, found. The midd. and pass. fut. νάσσομαι (Apoll. Rh. 2, 747.), the aor. 1. midd. ἐνασσάμην (ἀπενάσσατο, Hom.), and the aor. 1. pass. ἐνάσθην have the intransit. sense of to settle in a place. The post-Homeric poets, however, use the midd. ἐνασσάμην in the sense of ἔνασσα also: see Brunck. ad Apollon. 1, 1356. The perf. νένασμαι is not found before the later poets. See Schneider's Lexicon.

The syncop. aor. κατένασθε, you have settled yourselves, you dwell, (comp. Hesych. νάσθαι—οἰκῆσαι) in Aristoph. Vesp. 662. in the anapæsts would be remarkable, but both the best manuscripts have κατένασθεν, and the third person suits the passage very well.

See also Nάω, I flow.

* That this was the old traditionary form is clear from the observations of the Grammarians in Schol. II. γ, 387. in the Etym. M. in voc., and particularly from Aristarchus having written ναιετόωσα (Schol. II. ζ, 415.). Uncritically enough. For if we suppose that Homer, having used ναιετάουσι, could not use ναιετάωσα, both analogy and the old way of writing lead us to ναιετάουσα, which the manuscripts have here and there, and which in Hymn. 17, 6., is the only reading. And if this be the traditionary form, there

must have been some grounds for it. Compare the imperat. $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega$ under $\Sigma \dot{\omega} \dot{\zeta} \omega$.

† The termination $-ai\omega$, like $-ai\omega$ and $-ai\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$, serves to strengthen the pres. where the a is short in the other tenses.

‡ This verb, like $\dot{a}\phi\dot{\nu}\sigma\sigma\omega$ and some others, follows therefore in its act. voice the general analogy of verbs in $-\sigma\sigma\omega$, with a palatic as its characteristic letter; but in the perf. pass. and verbal adj. its characteristic seems to have been a labial: compare $Ba\sigma\tau\dot{a}\zeta\omega$, $\Delta\iota\sigma\tau\dot{a}\zeta\omega$. See also ' $\Lambda\rho\mu\dot{\nu}\tau\tau\omega$.

The passive formation with the σ , as above given, is most indisputable in the verbal adj. $\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\delta$ s. The perf. $\nu\epsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, too, is undoubted in Aristoph. Eccl. 840., on which and some other suspected passages see the note to N $\epsilon\omega$ 1. The only trace which I find of the regular form $\nu\epsilon\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\iota$ is in Suidas in voc., where it is quoted from Josephus.

 $N\acute{a}\omega$, I flow, an old verb, found only in pres. and imperf.; written also $va\acute{a}\omega$. See Schol. Od. ι , 222. On $v\acute{\omega}\sigma\imath\nu$, &c. see Né ω 2.

Νεικέω, I rebuke, dispute, retains ϵ in its inflexion, thus fut. νεικέσω, &c.

[Hom. and Hes. have also, when the metre requires it, an Ion. sister-form νεικείω, whence 3. conj. νεικείησι; imperf. νείκειον and νεικείεσσον; fut. νεικέσσω; aor. 1. νείκεσσα, &c.—Passow.]

Νείφω. See Νέφω.

Νέμω, I distribute, allot: fut. νεμῶ and νεμήσω; aor. 1. ἔνειμα; perf. νενέμηκα; aor. 1. pass. ἐνεμήθην and ἐνεμέθην*. Verbal adj. νεμητέος.—ΜΙDD.

The fut. νεμήσω is mentioned by Herodian (post Mær. 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 νεμεῖσθαι is in Demosth. Mid. p. 579. infra. [The later writers have also an aor. 1. midd. ἐνεμησάμην, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 742.—Passow.]

Nέφω: 3. sing. νέφει, more generally συννέφει, it is overcast with clouds; or Zeùc συννέφει, covers the sky with clouds, Aristoph. Av. 1489. Perf. συννένοφεν.

See Aristoph. ap. Suid. v. $\xi \nu \nu \nu \epsilon \nu \omega \phi \epsilon \nu$. The forms of the pres. are also written with the circumflex, as $\sigma \nu \nu \nu \epsilon \phi \epsilon i$, $- o \bar{\nu} \sigma a$: see Schneid. Lexicon. The pres. $\nu \epsilon i \phi \omega$ (with the explanation $\beta \rho \epsilon \chi \omega$) which the Grammarians connect with the above verb (see the Etymologica, and Eust. ad II. α , 420.) is only another way of writing $\nu i \phi \omega$, to snow, which the later writers used also of rain: see Stephens in $N i \phi \omega \uparrow$.

Νέω, 1. I heap up: aor. 1. ἔνησα, infin. νῆσαι, &c.; perf. pass. νένημαι οτ νένησμαι. Verbal adj. νητός.

The pres. $\nu \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ is found only in Herodotus, $\pi \epsilon \rho_i \nu \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon_i \nu$, 6, 80. $\hat{\epsilon} \pi_i \nu \hat{\epsilon} \rho_i \omega \sigma_i$, 4, 62. †. Homer has a lengthened form which fluctuates between $\nu \eta \hat{\epsilon} \omega$

† [Passow in his Lex. has the follow-

^{*} We find $\nu \epsilon \mu \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$, Demosth. Neær. 1380. ult. and $\nu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \theta \epsilon i \sigma \eta s$, id. Phorm. 956, 12.

ing article: Νέφω, fut. νέψω, perf. νένοφα, same as νίφω; a rare, nay a suspected form.]

and $\nu\eta\nu\dot{\epsilon}\omega$. The inflexion follows the former, as the imperf. $\nu\dot{\eta}\epsilon\sigma\nu$, II. ψ , 139. aor. 1. $\nu\dot{\eta}\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, Od. τ , 64. infin. $\nu\eta\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$, υ , 321. Herodot. 2, 107. aor. 1. infin. midd. $\nu\eta\dot{\eta}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, II. ι , 137.

The perf. pass. without σ see in Lex. Seguer. 1. p. 13, 24. Thucyd. 7, 87. Xen. Anab. 5, 4, 27. The other form νένησμαι seems to me to stand on good grounds in Aristoph. Nub. 1203., where with ἀμφορής νενησμένοι is the various reading νενασμένοι, which being untenable on account of the sense, could have arisen only from the true verb being written with the σ . Nor is the reading less sure in Aristoph. Eccles. 838., which I will quote at length: 'Ωs ai τράπεζαί γ' εἰσὶν έπινενασμέναι 'Αγαθών ἀπάντων καὶ παρεσκευασμέναι, Κλίναί τε σισυρών καὶ δαπίδων νενασμέναι. Now the reading of έπινενασμέναι is quite as untenable as that of νενασμέναι (looking at the sense) is certain; and Brunck's emendation ἐπινενησμέναι is now confirmed by the quotation in Phryn. Seguer. p. 13. 'Αγαθών πάντων έπινένηται ή τράπεζα: for the writing with the σ is supported here again by the false reading έπινεvaou- and by the similarity of this case to that quoted above from the Nubes. Lastly, we must examine the passage of Theorr. 9, 9. where νένασται is used of a heap of skins, which, it is true, the derivation from váσσω appears to suit: but as the dialect of this poet requires νένακται, it would seem, according to the direction of the scholium σεσώρενται, that in the passage in question it should be pronounced νένασται, ί. ε. νένησται.

2. I spin: fut. $\nu \eta \sigma \omega$, &c.; in addition to which was formed, but at an early period, another pres. $\nu \eta \theta \omega$ (like $\pi \lambda \eta \theta \omega$ from $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$, $\Pi \Lambda \Xi \Omega$); and this became afterwards the common form.

It is difficult to decide anything on the usage of $\nu\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu$ and $\nu\hat{\eta}\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ 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, $N\hat{\eta}\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$, $o\hat{\nu}$ $\mu\hat{\nu}\nu\nu$ $\nu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$, and with what we gather from the glosses of the Grammarians, that the simpler form was peculiar to the older Ionics and Attics. And herein we find an irregularity of contraction; for while the regular form is $\nu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$, $\nu\epsilon\hat{\iota}$, Hes. ϵ , 779. $\epsilon\nu\epsilon$, Hesych., the other contractions are invariably quoted by all the grammarians in ω instead of $o\nu$; as $\nu\hat{\omega}\sigma\nu$, Pollux 7, 32. 10, 125. $\nu\hat{\omega}\nu\tau a$, Hesych. $\nu\hat{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu os$, Phot.*. The contraction to $o\nu$ was therefore studi-

position, which indeed is pretty certain, that the meanings of to heap up (glomerare) and to spin, are properly the

^{*} Photius has also $N\hat{\omega}\nu\tau$ os, $\sigma\omega\rho\epsilon\dot{\nu}$ oν- τ os, belonging therefore to $N\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ 1. This
agrees also very well with the sup-

ously avoided, and from $\nu\hat{\omega}$, $\nu\hat{\omega}\nu$ the ω was carried on through the tenses.

The passive forms I find quoted always with the σ ; but it is possible that these came first into use with $\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, and that the old form for the meaning of to spin was $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \mu a\iota$, to which we are also led by the verbals $\nu \eta \tau \dot{\sigma} s$, $\nu \dot{\eta} \mu a$, &c.

3. I swim. None of the forms of the pres. are contracted by the Attics in this short verb except those in ει (compare Δέω, I bind); thus νέω, νέων, νέομεν, &c., but νεῖ, νεῖν, &c. Fut. νεύσομαι and νευσοῦμαι (like πλέω, πλεύσομαι); aor. 1. ἔνευσα, &c.

An Epic sister-form is $v\eta\chi\omega$, and the later prose writers use $v\eta\chi\sigma$ - $\mu\alpha\iota$, a depon. midd.

4. The poetical verb νέεσθαι, νεῖσθαι, to go, more generally to go away, return, is used in present and imperfect only: the pres. indic. has the force of a future, as νέομαι, contr. νεῦμαι, Ερίς 2. sing. νεῖαι like μνθεῖαι, νεῖται like μνθεῖται.

Nίζω, I wash, takes its tenses from $vi\pi\tau\omega$, an unusual verb in the older writers: fut. $vi\psi\omega$; aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon}vv\psi a$, &c.; perf. pass. $v\acute{\epsilon}vv\mu\mu\alpha\iota$.—ΜIDD.

The pres. $\nu i \zeta \omega$ is found frequently in Homer, also in Herodot. 2, 172. Aristoph. Vesp. 608. Eurip. Iph. T. 1338. Plat. Symp. p. 175. a. All these writers form $\nu i \psi \omega$, &c.: while the pres. $\nu i \pi \tau \omega$ occurs only in the later writers*, except in one single Homeric passage, Od. σ , 178.; and this is the more remarkable, as in ten others the reading is $\nu i \zeta \epsilon \nu \nu$. See Damm.

Nissomai, I go, return to. Two questions have been started respecting this verb, one as to its orthography and another as to its inflexion. With regard to the first, we find $\nu i\sigma o\mu a\iota$, II. ψ , 76. $\nu e i\sigma e\sigma \theta e$, Eurip. Phæn. 1240. $\dot{a}\pi o\nu \iota \sigma \dot{b}\mu e \theta a$, 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 $\nu e i\sigma \sigma o\mu a\iota$ is found in the best manuscripts, (whence we infer that the vowel is long independently

same. Nor is this at variance with the $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\nu\dot{\epsilon}o\nu\sigma\iota$ 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 $\nu\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu$ to heap up, to

spin, formed νῶσι, from νεῖν, to swim-νέουσιν.

^{*} Thom. Mag. admits both forms; καὶ ἔνιπτε καὶ ἔνιζεν: for this is the reading of the manuscripts. The note of Hemsterhuys, which exactly reverses the usage, is incorrect.

of the $\sigma\sigma$,) and its authenticity is further supported by the cognate forms νέομαι, νείομαι, as well as by its being actually found in inscriptions of the purest times, Bockh Pind. Ol. 3, 10. On the other hand usage was in favour of νίσσομαι (see Etym. M. p. 606, 12.); and the Grammarians seem to have agreed in writing the pres. νίσσομαι, the fut. νίσομαι, Eustath. Il. ψ , 76. Heyne Il. ι , 381. There are other passages with the same doubtful orthography, as νείσσονται, Hes. Op. 235. νεισσομένων, Theog. 71. Gaisf., both with the various reading νισσ.; and νίσσοντο, 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 elm and véomai, Il. v. 186. o, 577.: thus in Il. ψ , 76. if we read $\nu i \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ we have the future, if νίσσομαι we have the present with the meaning of a future: compare also the scholium in the passage of Euripides. On the gloss of Hesychius velouvro, until we know to what it refers, nothing can be said.

Νίφω, νείφω. See Νέφω.

Nοέω, I think, has in the Ionic writers the same contraction and accentuation as βοάω; e.g. perf. νένωμαι; pluperf. ἐνενώμην, whence 3. sing. ἐνένωτο for ἐνενόητο, Herodot. 1, 77. and the compound aor. 1. part. ἐννώσαs for ἐννόήσαs, ib. 1, 86. See the note on Βοάω.

Nυστάζω, I nod (as being sleepy), I sleep: fut. νυστάσω and νυστάξω*: but all the derivatives are formed with the palatic letter, as νυστακτής, &c.

Ξ.

Ξέω, I shave, scrape, retains ε in the inflexion, and takes σ in the passive: thus fut. ξέσω, Ερίς ξέσσω.

Ξυρέω, I shave, shear, has more commonly in the midd. ξύρομαι; aor. 1. έξυράμην; but the perfect is έξύρημαι.

The midd. form ξυρέομαι is Ionic; but it occurs in Attic writers, as ξυρούμενον, Alexis ap. Athen. 13. p. 565. b. In the later writers the pres. ξυράω was common, but the inflexion in -άσω is never found. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 205. Passow has also another later form ξυρίζω, ξυρίζομαι.

^{*} See Stephan. Thesaur. in καταννστάζω. Fisch. 2. p. 328. Asclep. Epig.

Ξύω, I shave smooth, polish: fut. ξύσω, &c. It takes σ in the passive: ξύσασθαι, aor. 1. midd. to polish for one's self, for one's own use, Xen. Cyr. 6, 2, 11.

0.

'Οδύρομαι, I lament, bewail; depon. midd. with both trans. and intrans. sense. The act. appears to have never been in use.

'Οδύσσομαι, I am enraged with, I hate. Neither this pres. nor $\partial \delta \dot{\nu} \omega$, $\partial \delta \dot{\nu} \zeta \omega$, or $\partial \delta \dot{\nu} \zeta \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ appear to have been ever in use; but we find in Hom. an aor. 1. midd. ($\dot{\omega} \delta \dot{\nu} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$) -ao, -aτο and 3. plur. without the augm. $\partial \delta \dot{\nu} \sigma a \nu \tau o$, part. $\partial \delta \nu \sigma \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu o s$; also 3. sing. perf. pass. with the force of a pres. $\partial \delta \dot{\omega} \delta \nu \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ for $\ddot{\omega} \delta \nu \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, Od. ϵ , 423.

"Οζω, I send forth a (good or bad) smell: fut. οζήσω; aor. 1. ὅζησα, Aristoph. Vesp. 1059.; perf. with the force of the pres. ὅδωδα. Generally with gen. of the thing or part from which the smell proceeds.

The inflexion $\partial \zeta \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$, $\ddot{\omega} \zeta \acute{\epsilon} \sigma a$ is found in the Ionic (Hippocr. De Steril. 10. De Superfet. 10.) and the later writers.

Οἴγω, or οἴγνυμι, I open: fut. οἴξω; aor. 1. ρίξα, part. οἴξαs: but the Epics generally separate the diphthong in the augmented forms, as in the aor. 1. μίζεν, μίζαν, and in the imperf. pass. μίγνυντο. In prose the following compound is in use:

ἀνοίγω, ἀνοίγνυμι. In the augmented tenses the syllabic augment is added to the temporal as in the imperf. ἐψνοχόει from οἰνοχοέω, ἐἡνδανε from ἄνδανω; thus imperf. ἀνέψγον; aor. 1. ἀνέψξα (infin. ἀνοῖξαι), &c.; perf. 1. ἀνέψχα; perf. 2. ἀνέψγα. This last tense had from a very early period (Hippocr., &c.) an intransitive meaning, I stand open; which however was unknown to the Attics, who in this sense used the perf. pass. ἀνέψγμαι. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 157. 158.

In the dialects, as in Herodot., Theorr., &c., we find the aor. 1. with the regular augment $\partial \nu \hat{\varphi} \xi a$; and in the later writers the act. $\eta \nu o \iota \xi a$, pass. $\partial \nu o \iota \gamma \eta \nu$, &c., Fisch. III. pp. 36. 37.

Οἰδέω, I swell. For this verb with the forms οἰδάω, οἰδάνω, οἰδάνω, οἰδάνω, 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.

Οἰμώζω, I bewail: fut. οἰμώξω* and οἰμώξομαι; aor. 1. ῷμωξα.

Οἴομαι, I think: imperf. ψόμην; fut. οἰήσομαι; aor. 1. ψήθην, infin. οἰηθηναι, part. οἰηθείς. The 1. pers. sing. of both pres. and imperf. was also pronounced in a syncopated form, οἶμαι, ψμην. The 2. pers. sing. of the pres. οἴει, (like βούλει and ὄψει) was not only the Attic form, but almost the only one in use in the common language.

The old grammarians (see Thom. Mag. in voc.) laid it down as a rule, that the form oluar was used only of things fixed and certain, consequently merely a milder expression for "I am convinced, I know well." That is to say, οἶμαι, ζήμην 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 olouar, 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 $oi\omega$, but only in the present; more frequently they separate the diphthong, $oi\omega$, and in the middle always, $oio\mu\alpha\iota$, in which the ι is long: and in this form, which has the midd.

^{* [}Passow says that the Attic fut. is only in the Orac. Sibyll.: see Jac. anim. iμ ώξομαί, not οἰμώξω, which last occurs in Athen. p. 170.]

as well as the pass. aorist, we find only the regular inflexion; e. g. pres. $\delta i \delta \mu a \iota$, $\delta i \delta a \iota$ &c., part. $\delta i \delta \mu e \nu o s$; imperf. $\delta i \delta \mu \mu \nu$; aor. 1. pass. $\delta i \delta \theta \eta \nu$, part. $\delta i \delta \theta \epsilon s$; aor. 1. midd. $\delta i \delta a \mu \mu \nu$, whence in Hom. 3. sing. without the augment $\delta i \delta a \tau o$, and part. $\delta i \delta a \mu e \nu o s$. 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, $\delta i \delta \theta \delta \sigma \iota$ (Ind. 13, 5.), which however may also be written $\delta i \delta \theta \delta \sigma \iota$. From $\delta i \delta \theta \eta \nu$ the later (not Attic) writers formed again an infin. aor. $\delta i \delta \theta \eta \nu \iota$ with the part. $\delta i \delta \theta \epsilon s$: and Aratus has with the common formation an aor. 1. infin. midd. $\delta i \eta \sigma a \delta \theta \iota$, used by still later writers in prose: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 719.

Οίχομαι, I go, I am gone: imperf. (or aor.) ψχόμην, I went away; fut.

οιχήσομαι.

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 σίχομαι never means I am going, but always I am gone. We will first prove this by a number of decisive passages. At II. o, 223. ήδη 'Erroσίγαιος Οίγεται εls άλα διαν, after it had been before said δυνε δέ πόντον ίων. At ε, 472. πη δή τοι μένος σίχεται ο πρίν έχεσκες; see also ξ, 11. Again έκπέφευγ', οίχεται φρούδυς, Aristoph. Acharn. 208. Πόσον χρόνον δέ μητρος σίχονται πνοαί; how long has thy mother's breath been gone? Eurip. Or. 440. compare also 844. In Xenophon we find many instances; e.g. (addressing a dead body) οἴχη δὴ ἀπολιπων ἡμῶς, Cyrop. 7, 3, 8. see also 5, 4, 11. 6, 1, 45. and Anab. 3, 1, 32. This usage is continued in the imperf. ψχόμην, I was gone; as Penelope says to her son, οῦ σ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε "Οψεσθαι ἐφάμην, ἐπεὶ ῷχεο νηὶ Πύλονδε, when I heard that thou wert gone to Pylos, Od. π , 24. See also Pind. P. 4, 145. and Xen. Cyr. 3, 2, 27. It may also be understood in the same sense when at the end of a spirited narrative a phrase is added with ωχετο; e. g. Ούτω δή ούτος μεν ώχετο οί δε Μήδοι παρήσαν : this man was now gone, when the Medes came, Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 5. In the majority of passages however this imperfect cannot without force be made to signify more than simply he went away, e. g. Χωόμενος δ' ο γέρων πάλιν ἄχετο, ΙΙ. α, 380. 'Ακούσαντες δε οί Χαλδαΐοι ταῦτα ώχοντο οϊκαδε, Xen. Cyr. 3, 2, 14. compared with 8, 3, 28.

That the original meaning of σίχεσθαι was simply to go, without the addition of away, is clear not only from the sister-form σίχνέω, but from the compound ἐποίχομαι, I go to or towards, as well as from some passages of Homer, in which the simple verb, but never in the pres. conj. (quære, is this accidental?), is used in that original sense: e. g. κατὰ στρατὸν ῷχετο πάντη Ὀτρύνων μαχέσασθαι, II. ε, 495. and Ἐννῆμαρ μὲν ἀνὰ στρατὸν ῷχετο κῆλα θεοῖο, α, 53. with some similar passages.

Now that particular use of the present mentioned in the last paragraph may be explained, like many others, from the oral language: for whoever goes, is gone: whence "he is going thither" is much the same as "he is gone hence." But all such original ideas lose by custom their exact meaning; and so οἶχεται was used of one who had been gone a long time, who had been long arrived at some other place, or who had quite disappeared from the world. But as soon as the thing is no longer actually present, the difference between the person being then just going away, or being supposed to be on the road to his place of destination, is in most cases unimportant. Although therefore ρίχετο, as imperf. of the common οἴχεται, meant, wherever it was necessary and the context showed it, he was gone; yet it generally signified, agreeably to its origin, he went, went away. And the future had the same meaning; e.g. ἐπειδὰν πίω τὸ φάρμακον οἰχήσομαι ἀπιὼν εἰς μακάρων δή τινας εὐδαιμονίας, 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. ἄχημαι, Ion. οἴχημαι, Herodot. 4, 136.), but in the common language in the compounds only, in which therefore παροίχομαι and παρώχημαι, παρωχημένος are synonymous; see Stephan. Thesaur. and Sturz. Lex. Xen.: and so is the other compound in Herodot. 4, 136. αι ημέραι διοίχηνται, compared with Soph. Aj. 973. A'las διοίχεται. In the older language the perf. is found in an active form also (ψχηκα) which will therefore connect it with οἰχνέω: it is however rare, and in Homer occurs but once, viz. in παρώχηκεν, is past, Il. κ, 252.; of more frequent occurrence is the form οίγωκα*, which has exactly the common meaning of οίγομαι; e.g. οίχωκ', ολωλα, Soph. Aj. 896. οίχωκώς, Herodot. 8, 108. οίκωχότας, 9, 98. In this last writer οἰχώκες, 8, 126. and παροιχώκες, 8, 72. are evidently pluperfects with the force of an imperfect; but at 1, 189. 4, 127. 165. οἰγώκεε is exactly the same as ψχετο in the common language, that is to say used as an aorist, probably because the expression, "he was gone," marked the momentary act of going away +. [An Ion. 3. plur. pluperf. ἐπώχατο also occurs, but seldom. A regular fut. οίξομαι is found in some manuscripts in Herodot. 2, 29.—The pres. οἰχέομαι, contracted by the Ionics to οἰχεῦμαι, is met with only in Leon. Tar.: for the act. o'xw there is no authority.—Passow.]

sition of the two palatic letters, οἴχωκα.

^{*}The formation of this perf. corresponds exactly with that of $\delta \chi \omega \kappa \alpha$ from $\delta \chi \omega$; thus $\delta i \chi \omega$, perf. $\delta i \chi \alpha$, with redupl. $\delta i \kappa \omega - \chi \alpha$ (for the ι of the second syllable could be omitted for no other reason than because there was one in the first; compare $\delta \epsilon i \delta \epsilon \kappa \tau \sigma$ from $\delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu \nu \mu \alpha \iota$), and thence, by transpo-

[†] It is certain that the common meaning of ψχετο may be explained in this same way, that is to say as a pluperf., οἴ-χεται having the force of a perf.: but the view which I have taken of it appears to me simpler.

Οίω. See Οίομαι and Φέρω.

'Οκέλλω, I land, has (beside the pres. and imperf.) only the aor. ὅκειλα, infin. ὁκείλαι, &c.: τὰς νῆας ὅκελλον, they stranded, &c., Herodot. 8, 84.

'Ολισθάνω, I slip up or off from: fut. ὀλισθήσω; aor. 2. ὥλισθον, infin. ὀλισθεῖν, part. ὀλισθών.

The form $\partial \lambda \omega \partial a i \nu \omega$ is not Attic: see Porson ad Phæniss. 1398. Bast. Ep. Cr. p. 248. Isolated instances of its occurrence in the older writers, (as in Plat. Lys. p. 216. c. compared with Cratyl. p. 427. b.), are but little to be depended on: in the later writers, as Lucian, &c., it is found very frequently*.—An aor. 1. $\omega \lambda i \sigma \partial \eta \sigma a$ is also used by the later writers; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 742. Passow has also a perf. $\omega \lambda i \sigma \partial \eta \kappa a$.

"Ολνωμ†, I destroy, annihilate: fut. $\dot{\delta}\lambda\hat{\omega}$; aor. 1. $\ddot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon$ σα; perf. $\dot{\delta}\lambda\dot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\kappa$ α. Midd. I perish, am undone; fut. $\dot{\delta}\lambda\sigma$ μαι; aor. 2. $\dot{\omega}\lambda\dot{\delta}\mu\eta\nu$; to which belongs the perf. 2. (perf. midd.) $\ddot{\delta}\lambda\omega\lambda\alpha$.

The intransitive forms $\dot{\omega}\lambda\dot{\delta}\mu\eta\nu$ and $\ddot{\delta}\lambda\omega\lambda\alpha$ serve at the same time for passives $(\dot{a}\pi\delta\lambda\omega\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota\ \dot{v}\pi\dot{\delta}\ \tau\iota\nu\sigmas$: compare $\dot{A}\pi\sigma\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu$), whence the proper forms of the pass. are not used; none but writers of a very late period having $\dot{\omega}\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, $\dot{\delta}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\dot{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 732.

. Of the same æra is also the fut. $\partial \lambda \epsilon \sigma \omega \ddagger$, e. g. Long. 3, 17. $\partial \pi \sigma \lambda \epsilon \sigma \omega \nu$, Lucian. Asin. 33. The examples quoted from Attic writers in Lobeck p. 746. are not critically examined.

From the perf. act. was formed an Epic sister-form of the present, $\partial \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \S$, of which (both in the act. and midd.) Homer has only the pres. and imperf.; the latter without the augment, $\partial \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \nu$, $\partial \lambda \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \nu \tau \sigma$. Compare $\hat{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \mu \eta \kappa \sigma \nu$ under $M \eta \kappa \hat{\alpha} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$.

In II. τ , 135. stands the iterative imperf. δλέσσκεν, which supposes an imperf. $\ddot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\nu$ not quite agreeable to analogy. Heyne has adopted the reading $\ddot{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu$, which would be the iterative agrist; but the itera-

‡ [What can Buttmann mean by stating $\delta \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \omega$ to be the usage of the later writers only? We find it in Od. ν , 399. Hes. ϵ , 178. and $\delta \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \omega$, Il. μ , 250.—Ed.]

§ [Beside this Epic pres. we find ὅλλω, ὁλέω, ὁλέσκω, which are not Greek, όλ-λυνέω, which is suspected, and ὁλλύω in Hesych.—Passow.]

^{* [}According to Porson $\delta \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \acute{a} \nu \omega$ is the only form used by good writers, but $\acute{o}\lambda \iota - \sigma \theta a \acute{\iota} \nu \omega$ is found in Aristoph. Equ. 494. and is therefore as pure Attic as the other: $\acute{o}\lambda \iota \sigma \theta \acute{e} \omega$ on the contrary is not a genuine form.—Passow.]

[†] If we compare the analogy of ἄγνυμι, &c. with this verb, we shall see that the latter is an euphonic change for ὅλνυμι.

tive imperfect is the only tense to suit the passage, therefore the vari-

ous reading ohé κεσκεν ought to have been adopted long ago.

The part. aor. midd. ολόμενος, beside its proper meaning (e. g. ως σ' ολόμενον στένω, Eurip. Or. 1384.), is used as an adjective with the active sense of destructive, ολομέναν Έριννύν, Phæn. 1036. In the Epic poets, who on account of the metre can have only οὐλόμενος, the adjectival usage is the only one, and generally in the active sense with $\mu \hat{\eta}_{VIS}$, "A77, &c.: but it has also the strictly passive meaning wretched, undone, οὐλομένης ἐμέθεν, τῆς τε Ζεὺς ὅλβον ἀπηύρα, Od. σ, 273.

[At II. θ, 449. ολλύσαι is the regular pres. part. fem. 'Ολέσσαι is the

Ep. aor. infin. in Hom. and Hes.—Passow.]

"Ομνυμι, I swear: fut. όμουμαι, -εί, -είται, &c., infin. ομεῖσθαι*; the other tenses take an o in the inflexion, as aor. 1. ὅμοσα; perf. ὁμώμοκα; perf. pass. ὁμώμοσμαι, part. ομωμοσμένος; but in the remaining forms and in the agrist the Attics generally drop the σ , as in 3. sing. perf. pass. ομώμοται, and aor. 1. pass. ωμόθην.—The middle occurs in the compounds, e. g. ἐπωμυσάμην.

From the σ having been properly admitted into those forms only in which the three μ followed each other, we see that it was done for the sake of euphony; and consequently they never appear without it. But it was afterwards transferred to some of the other forms, perhaps however not in the pure Attic writers. Thus in Demosth. c. Olymp. p. 1174, 8. the reading has always been ὑπομοθέντος, and in Demosth. c. Leptin. p. 805. extr. ὀμώμοται has been restored from the best manuscript.

[Homer generally uses the aor. 1. without the augment, and frequently with double σ, ομόσσαι, &c. In the simple verb he has the imperf. ωμνύε as from ομνύω, but in the compound ἀπώμνυ, Od. β, 377. In Herodot. 1, 153. is the Ionic part. pres. ομούντες as from ομόω.— Passow.]

'Ομόργνυμι, I wipe off: fut. ομόρξω; aor. 1. ωμορξα; aor. 1. midd. ωμορξάμην, infin. ομόρξασθαι, &c. This verb is inflected according to the analogy of ἄγνυμι, δείκνυμι, &c. -Midd.

perides ap. Schol. Aristoph. Plut. 725. υπομοσθείσης; and in Eurip. Rhes. 816., without any necessity from the metre, ομώμοσται.

^{*} This verb is formed according to the analogy of ἄγνυμι: compare also Δεί-κυυμι, "Ολλυμι. † In Andoc. de Pace, p. 27, 43. the text still has ὀμοσθήσεται; in Hy-

'Ονίνημι, I am of use to, I help: (no imperf. act.*) fut. ονήσω; aor. 1. ὅνησα. Midd. ονίναμαι, I derive assistance, advantage; fut. ονήσομαι; aor. 2. ὡνήμην, -ησο, -ητο, &c., part. ονήμενος (Od. β, 33. ω, 30.); but the other moods of this aorist have the a, as optat. οναίμην, infin. ὅνασθαι; and the indicative also borrowed this formation, but not until a later period, ὡνάμην.

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. $\ddot{\omega}\nu\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ and the similar one from $\ddot{\upsilon}\nu a\mu\alpha$, see the latter verb. The aor. pass. $\ddot{\omega}\nu\dot{\eta}\theta\eta\nu$ is also found (instead of $\ddot{\omega}\nu\dot{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$) in Xen. Anab. 5, 5, 2. Theorr. 15, 55.

This is one of those verbs formed by the reduplication of the first syllable like $\dot{a}\rho a\rho (\delta\kappa\omega)$, $\dot{a}\kappa\alpha\chi(\zeta\omega)$; only that in this case the vowel of the reduplication is ι (as in $\gamma\iota\gamma\nu\dot{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$, $\delta(\delta\omega\mu\iota$, &c.), and it is substituted for the vowel of the root, as the temp. augment η is in $\dot{a}\kappa\dot{\eta}\kappa\alpha a$, &c.; thus $\dot{o}\nu\dot{a}\omega$ (whence $\dot{\omega}\nu\dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$) $\dot{o}\nu\dot{\iota}\nu\eta\mu\iota$, like $\dot{a}\tau\dot{a}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\dot{a}\tau\iota\tau\dot{a}\lambda\lambda\omega$, and $\dot{o}\pi\tau\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\nu}\omega$ $\dot{o}\pi\iota\pi\tau\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\nu}\omega$. There is however no instance of $\dot{o}\nu\dot{a}\omega$, $\dot{o}\nu\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ or $\ddot{o}\nu\eta\mu\iota$ being used by any writer.

The 3. sing. pres. act. $\partial v i v \eta \sigma i$ and the midd. $\partial v i v a \mu ai$ 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 $\partial \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i v$. This was the case for instance with the imperf. act. †; and for the same reason it might also seem very likely that the infin. act. $\partial v i v d v ai$ would have been avoided. This however cannot be asserted positively; and there is even great probability in Matthiæ's suspicion that $\partial v i v ai$ in Plat. Rep. 10. p. 600. d. may be a corruption of this word ‡.

"Ονομαι, I think lightly of, reject with disdain, 2. sing. ὅνοσαι, 3. plur. ὅνονται, imper. ὅνοσο and ὅνοσσο §, opt. ὀνοίμην, ὅνοιτο (compare δύνωμαι, δύναιτο, &c. under Δύναμαι); fut. ὀνόσομαι, whence in Hom. the infin. with double σ , ὀνόσσεσθαι; aor. 1. pass. ἀνόσθην; aor. 1. midd.

cannot prefer that aor. 2. act. (unknown in any other instance, and used here for the common $\delta\nu\hat{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$,) to Matthia's correction; particularly as the imperf. is the only tense naturally suited to that passage.

§ Τῶν μηδέν κατόνοσσο, Arat. 1142. according to the Paris manuscript.

^{*} See Grammat. ap. Herm. de Em. Gr. Gr.

^{† [}The imperf. midd. however occurs in Plato. The perf. ωνημαι is also found, but rarely.—Passow.]

[‡] The manuscripts fluctuate indeed between δυίναι, -ῖναι, -εῖναι, -ῆναι, and Bekker has thence adopted ὀνῆναι; but I

 $\dot{\omega}$ νοσάμην, whence in Hom. the opt. $\dot{\omega}$ νοσαίμην, -αιο, -αιτο, and infin. with double σ , $\dot{\omega}$ νόσσασθαι.

From a comparison of the forms we see that this is exclusively an Ionic and Epic verb, a formation in $\mu\iota$ from the root or stem ONO Ω . We must not therefore consider, as others frequently have done, \emph{ovomal} , \emph{ovomal} , \emph{ovomal} , \emph{ovomal} , \emph{ovomal} , \emph{ovomal} , \emph{ovomal} , as forms of the common barytone conjugation.

The inflexion of this verb however is certainly nothing more than a lengthening of the simple root ON- by the insertion of the vowel o, to

which we are led by two Homeric forms: viz.

1. Aor. ἄνατο, Il. ρ, 25. This Homeric form is separated from the ἄνατο of the later language belonging to ὀνίνημι, 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, ὀνίνημι, ὅνίναμαι is a formation in μι with the radical vowel α, ONA—: ἀνάμην therefore bears the same relation to it as ἐστάμην, if it were in use, would to ἵσταμαι, or as ἐπτάμην actually does to ἵπταμαι, and it is the aor. 2. midd. Whereas the formation of ὄνομαι 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 ἀνάμην is the aor. 1. midd. of ONΩ; or (which is the same thing) the aor. 2. ἀνόμην, ἄνετο, &c. took the Ionic a, making ἄνατο, like εύρατο, &c.

2. Pres. $\ddot{v}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, II. ω , 241. Here the o of the radical syllable is lengthened, as in $\ddot{v}\nu\lambda\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$. It stands therefore for $\ddot{v}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, and this again for $\ddot{v}\nu\sigma\theta\epsilon$, which is singular; as there was no metrical reason

for forming this particular present from the simple stem †.

ΟΠ-. See Όράω.

'Οπυίω, I marry, cohabit with, loses in the inflexion the ι; thus fut. ὀπύσω, &c., Aristoph. Acharn. 255.

* [The radical idea of the old root ONQ was perhaps to speak of a person in his absence, give him a good or bad character; whence <code>övoµa</code> (by some incorrectly derived from $v\acute{e}\mu\omega$), a good or bad name; and the same double meaning was originally in <code>öveuöos</code> (likewise a derivative from this word), as in the Lat. honos: <code>ivivnµu</code> on the other hand belongs to a different root, and has no connection with <code>övoµau—Passow.</code>]

† Both ancient and modern commentators, mistaking the Epic language, were led by the explanation ὅνησιν ἔχετε to place this form under ἐνίνημι. But grammatical analogy gains nothing by such an arrangement, for the pres. ove- $\sigma\theta\epsilon$ is as strange in connection with the root ONA- as with ONO-. Yet Hesychius has the glosses Οὐλιᾶσθε (corrupted from $ova\sigma\theta\epsilon$), $Ove\sigma\theta\epsilon$ and $Ovo\sigma\theta\epsilon$, all three with that false explanation; for all evidently refer to the Homeric passage. From this and from Aristarchus writing ὀνόσασθε we see clearly how uncertain the reading was from the earliest times; and I have no doubt therefore that the old and genuine one was ovvo- $\sigma\theta\epsilon$; nay, this becomes a certainty by the occurrence of the same phrase in the 2. sing. $\hat{\eta}$ ővo $\sigma \alpha \iota$. . .; Od. ρ , 378. therefore in plur. $\hat{\eta}$ ($\tilde{o}\nu o\sigma\theta\epsilon$) $\tilde{o}\nu o\sigma\theta\epsilon;$

[According to Piers. ad Mær. p. 278. and Porson on Od. δ. 798. the old and genuine form was $\delta\pi\delta\omega$; compare Schæf. Schol. Par. Apoll. Rh. 1, 45.—Passow.]

'Οράω, I see: imperf. with double augment έωρων (see ἀνοίγω under Οἴγω); perf. έωρακα οτ ἐόρακα*; from the verb εἴδω (which see) were borrowed the aor. 2. εἶδον, imper. ἴδε Att. ἰδέ (see ἐλθέ under Ἐρχομαι), opt. ἴδοιμι, infin. ἰδεῖν, part. ἰδών. Midd. aor. 2. εἰδόμην, imper. ἰδοῦ (as an interjection ἰδού, ecce), infin. ἰδέσθαι; and from an unusual stem ΟΠ... the fut. in the midd. form ὄψομαι (I shall see). The perf. pass. is either έωραμαι (έόραμαι), or ῶμμαι, ῶψαι, ῶπται, &c., infin. ῶφθαι; but in the aor. 1. pass. the Attics use only ἄφθην, while the later writers formed this tense from ὁράω, as infin. ὁραθῆναι. / Verbal adj. ὀρατός and ὁρατέος, or ὀπτός† and ὀπτέος. The midd. ὁρασθαι, ἰδέσθαι is in the simple verbs solely poetical.

The regular imperf. of ὁράω is ὅρων, Ion. ὅρεον from the Ion. pres. ὁρέω, Herodot. 2, 148.; compare ἤντεον from ᾿Αντάω, and μνέεται, χρέεται under Μιμνήσκω. We find also an Epic 2. sing. pres. midd. ὁρῆαι or ὅρηαι (for ὁράη or ὁράεαι), as from ὅρημαι, Od. ξ, 343. If we adopt the latter accentuation we must suppose it formed as from a verb in $\mu\iota$; if the former (which is expressly mentioned by Eustath. p. 548, 40. Basil.), we form ὁράεαι ὁρᾶαι like μνθέεαι μνθεῖαι, and we can

quire eópara. 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, εόρακα has been considered an undoubted Attic form, and adopted in all the above-mentioned passages: see Porson ad Eurip. Phæn. 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 εωρακα, which must then be pronounced occasionally as a trisyllable.

† This same $\delta\pi\tau\delta$ s is also formed from $\delta\pi\tau\delta\omega$, I roast, consequently for $\delta\pi\tau\eta$ - $\tau\delta$ s, as in Lat. assus for assatus.

^{*} The general form of this perfect as handed down to us in all the writers both of the Attic and common dialect is ἐωρα-κα. 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. ὥρακα. There were however other passages where this did not suit; these he altered arbitrarily, substituting for instance in Aristoph. Thesm. 32. 33. ἐωραs: and he supported his general principle by the analogy of ἐάλων and ἥλωκα, both Attic forms. Tyrwhitt however (ad Dawes. p. 454.) quoted two passages of the Alexandrine comic poet Machon, from Athen. 6. 244. with ἐωρακα, as Mɨ) παρεώρακα 'Αρχεφων... and Πτολεμαῖ ἐωρακα πρῶτοs..., both of which verses re-

easily see why the η was preferred to the α , a change not uncommon in the Epic language, as in προσανδήτην and the infinitives in - ήμεναι and -ηναι. The 3. sing. imperf. midd. δρήτο or δρητο, having come down to us only as a various reading of Zenodotus for ὁρᾶτο, cannot certainly with any propriety be admitted into Homer's text, as long as ὁρᾶται and ορασθαι 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 opin. ορή, κοιμήτο, &c. Whatever it is, we may be sure that it was a reading founded on old copies, which Zenodotus was unwilling to erase. To account for it we have no occasion to have recourse to the formation in ut. We should rather say that the infin. in - έμεναι being a sister-form of that in -eir may be supposed to exist in the contracted shape also, and as there is no other Epic sister-form for -αν and -εῖν than that in -ἡμεrat, the natural supposition is that this belongs to the same contraction. There are instances enough in the Epic language of η used for $\epsilon\epsilon$. which is still further supported by a remark of Heraclides in Eustath. ad Od. v, 287. p. 735, 15. Basil., that "the Dorians, whose dialect is used by the old Attics, said επλην, ερρην for επλεεν, ερρεεν." At all events we must remember that a great portion of the Doric dialect is at the same time archaisms, and therefore not surprising in the Epic language. And the infin. in - ήμεναι is proved to be pure Doric by ἀριθμήμεναι in Tim. Locr.—The imperfect generally used by Homer is (always without the augment) the 3. sing. act. ὅρα, midd. ὁρᾶτο, and plur. ορώντο.

[Homer has used this verb both in a contracted and resolved shape, as ὁρῶ, ὁρᾶs, ὁρᾶ, ὁρᾶν, ὁρῶν, ὁρῶσα, ὁρῶμαι, ὁρᾶται, ὁρᾶσθαι, ὁρῶμενος, 3. sing. opt. ὁρῷτο, 3. plur. ὁρῷατο, Hom. Epig. 14, 20. again ὁρόω, ὁράφς, ὁρόων, ὁρόωσα, 2. plur. opt. ὁρόψτε, for ὁράοιτε, ὁρῷτε (Il. δ, 347), ὁράασθαι, &c.—Passow.]

From the root OII— comes the Ion. perf. (2.) $\ddot{o}\pi\omega\pi a$, never used by the Attic prose writers; and thence in the Od. we find the 3. sing. pluperf. $\ddot{o}\pi\dot{\omega}\pi\epsilon\iota$, in Herodot. $\ddot{o}\pi\dot{\omega}\pi\epsilon\epsilon$, 1, 68. 5, 92, 6. 7, 208. but at 3, 37. $\ddot{o}\pi\dot{\omega}\pi\epsilon\epsilon$ is a pure perfect: compare $\ddot{e}\dot{\omega}\theta\epsilon\epsilon$ under $\ddot{e}\omega$.

In the compounds $\epsilon\pi\delta\psi \rho\mu\alpha\iota$ must be distinguished from $\epsilon\pi\iota\delta\psi \rho\mu\alpha\iota$. The former is the common fut. of $\epsilon\phi\rho\rho\hat{q}\nu$ occurring in II. ξ , 145. Od. η , 324.; the latter has the particular sense of to select, choose, II. ι , 167. Od. β , 294. which $\epsilon\phi\rho\rho\hat{q}\nu$ never has. And it is a singular fact that of both forms we find an aor. 1. midd. (the simple being never used*), as

^{* [}Passow speaks of the aor. midd. Œd. T. 1271. See Lobeck ad Phryn. ωψάμην being merely a rare form, whence the 3. plur. opt. ὄψαιντο in Herm. Soph.

for instance, $\epsilon \pi \dot{\phi} \psi \alpha \tau o$, from $\epsilon \phi o \rho \hat{q} \nu$, in Pind. Fr. 58. Bæckh.; and $\epsilon \pi \iota \dot{\phi} \psi \alpha \tau o$, he chose, in an old Attic expression, for which see Piers. ad Mær. ν . $\epsilon \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \eta \phi \dot{\rho} \rho o \iota^*$.

'Ορέγω, I stretch out, reach out: fut. ὀρέζω, &c. with accusative. Pass. and midd. I desire, with genitive; e. g. aor. 1. infin. midd. ὀρέξασθαι, Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 15. aor. 1. pass. ἀρέχθην, ibid. 16.

In the poets the midd. occurs also in its proper meaning, I stretch myself out, or with ποσσίν, χερσί, &c. I stretch out my feet, hands; in which sense is found also the perf. pass. ὀρώρεγμαι, 3. plur. ὀρωρέχαται, II. π, 834. and 3. plur. pluperf. ὀρωρέχατο, II. λ, 26.

Τορνυμι[†], I raise, excite, put in motion: fut. ὅρσω; aor. 1. ὧρσα, part. ὅρσαs, and frequently in Hom. the Ionic aor. ὅρσασκε for ὧρσε. Midd. ὅρνυμαι, I raise myself, rise up; imperf. ὡρνύμην; aor. 2. ὡρόμην, or more frequently by syncope (ὤρμην) 3. sing. ὧρτο, imper. ὅρσο, Ερίς ὅρσεο (like ἀείσεο, λέξεο ‡), contracted ὅρσευ, II., 3. sing. conj. ὅρηται, Od., infin. ὅρθαι § for ὀρέσθαι, part. ὀρμένοs for ὀρόμενοs: for an account of these syncopated forms see ἔγεντο under Γείνομαι.

I know of no authority for the fut. midd. ὅρσομαι, instead of which Homer has (from a fut. 2. ἀροῦμαι) the 3. sing. ὀρεῖται (Il. ν, 140.); but the various reading ὅρηται as aor. 2. conj. may very well be preferred to the future.

With the above are joined two reduplicated forms:

1. ὅρωρα, a perf. belonging to the immediate meaning of the middle, I am risen up. Of this form Homer has only the 3. sing. ὅρωρε, conj. ὀρώρη; pluperf. ὀρώρει and ἀρώρει, Il. σ, 498.

2. (ὅρορον) ὅρορεν, aor. 2. with redupl. according to the analogy of ἥραρεν, ἥκαχεν, &c.; see note on ἀγαγεῖν under Αγω. Like ἤραρεν it has generally a causative meaning and is therefore the same as the aor. 1. ਜਿγοα: but like that perfect it has sometimes the immediate meaning; and this was the foundation of an earlier opinion, according to

^{*} 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 οὐς ἀν οἱ προσήκοντες ἐπιόψωνται," where the common reading is ἐπόψωνται, but the best manuscript has ἐπόψωνται, which is evidently a corruption of that old Attic and unusual form.

^{† [}Homer forms his imper. from the verb in μ , $\delta\rho\nu\bar{\nu}\theta$, $\delta\rho\nu\bar{\nu}\tau\epsilon$, but the rest of the pres. and the imperf. from $\delta\rho\nu\dot{\nu}\omega$ (-v-).—Passow.]

[‡] See ἐδύσετο under Δύω and οἶσε under Φέρω.

[§] This perfectly regular form was for a long time ejected from II. θ , 474. by $\tilde{\omega}\rho$ - $\theta a\iota$, because $\tilde{b}\rho\theta a\iota$ was considered to be the perfect (see Heyne), the cause of the abbreviation being unknown. But Homer never uses the perf. $\tilde{\omega}\rho\mu a\iota$, while he has the aor. $\tilde{\omega}\rho\tau o$, $\delta\rho\sigma o$, $\delta\rho\mu e\nu o$ s frequently. The true reading $\delta\rho\theta a\iota$ is now restored to the text from the most undoubted sources.

which ἄρορε was supposed to be a perfect with the quantities transposed, which idea seemed also supported by Il. ν, 78. Οῦτω νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ περί δούρατι χείρες ἄαπτοι Μαιμώσιν, καί μοι μένος ὥρορε, νέρθε δὲ ποσσίν "Εσσυμαι. But as the agristic meaning of this form is firmly established by analogy and usage, wpope must be understood here as well as elsewhere to indicate the moment of his courage being first roused, and indeed in this passage $\eta \gamma \epsilon \rho \theta \eta$ might have been joined with the pres. and perf. quite as well as Epope.

Beside the above Homer has from a perf. pass. ὀρώρεμαι the 3. sing. όρωρεται (Od. τ, 377. 524.) and the conj. ὀρωρηται (Il. ν, 271.). In the Epic language are three similar perfects ἀκήχεμαι, ἀρήρεμαι, όρωρεμαι: and as from ΑΧΩ, ήκαχον came a perf. pass. ήκαχμαι, so from ἄρηρα and ὅρωρα were formed ἀρήρμαι, ὀρώρμαι, and all three were smoothed off into their present shape according to the analogy of the formation in έω: thus the conj. ὀρώρηται is quite as agreeable to ana-

logy as κέκτωμαι, &c. is from κέκτημαι.

Another Homeric form is $\partial \rho \in \rho \nu \tau \rho$ (II. β , 398. ψ , 212.), which is not quite according to analogy, particularly if supposed to be the same as ωροντο. But according to form it can be only an imperfect; and if we examine the passages more closely we shall see that it belongs to a peculiar meaning. It is said of the Greeks, that 'Ανστάντες ορέοντο κεδασθέντες κατὰ νηας: here δρέοντο being joined with the aor. κεδασθέντεs must mean they hastened, rushed; and the same of the winds, τοὶ δ' ορέοντο ήχη θεσπεσίη νέφεα κλονέοντε πάροιθεν: see Hesych. &c. This is never the meaning of Ερνυντο, &c. We must therefore suppose a separate verb ορέομαι* derived from OPΩ: and we find the pres. of such a verb in the epitaph on Hesiod given by Pausanias (9, 38.) 'Howδου, τοῦ πλεῖστον ἐν Ἑλλάδι κῦδος ὀρεῖται, which must mean not arises, still less will arise, but rushes in every direction, is spread far and wide.

Lastly, there is a difficult form ὄρονται in Od. ξ, 104. ἐπὶ δ' ἀνέρες έσθλοι ορονται, the herdsmen over the herds. Here the old grammarians, as the meaning of the verb is not clear, supposed a separate verb ορομαι with the meaning I take care of; of which οροντο, at Od. v. 471. (where the same phrase recurs) would be imperfect. But at Il. 4. 112. we find in the same sense of an overlooker or superintending servant, έπὶ δ' ἀνὴρ ἐσθλὸς ὀρώρει. I know of no other way to

keep watch, Od. E, 104. Others place the verb in this passage under OPΩ, ὄρνυμι; but neither ὄρω nor ὄρομαι is ever found in actual usage, and the sense of the passage is contrary to it.]

^{* [}Passow has given this verb a place in his Lexicon, and supposes it to be synonymous with ὅρνυμαι.]

^{† [}Passow has the following article: \ Όρομαι (from ουρος, ὁράω) I watch,

reconcile these passages, but to suppose a separate verb \emph{opomal} synonymous with $\emph{opeomal}$; then $\emph{e}\pi\emph{opomal}$ will mean, I bestir or busy myself about anything: while in the third passage, where the metre would not admit of the same form, the pluperf. $\emph{e}\pi\emph{l} \dots \emph{opomel}$ was substituted for it with the sense of, he had bestirred himself, had risen up (to accompany them.). Thus in both passages the preposition $\emph{e}\pi\emph{l}$ gives of itself the idea of guard or protection.

'Ορύσσω, -ττω, *I dig*: fut. ὄρυξω, &c.; perf. (with Attic reduplication) ὀρώρυχα; pluperf. ὀρωρύχειν; perf. pass. ὀρώρυγμαι, Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 7. MIDD. e. g. aor. 1. infin. ὀρύξασθαι, Herodot. 1, 186.

In the later writers the reduplication of the perfect was dropped and the temporal augment substituted for it, particularly in the pass. ὅρν-γμαι, of which we may see instances from the time of Polybius in Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 33. Whether we ought to suffer ὅρνκτο, 1, 186. and ὅρνκται, 2, 158. to remain in the text of Herodotus, when we find ὁρω-ρνκτο only a few lines afterwards in the former passage, I will not venture to decide.

'Οσφραίνομαι, I smell (something): fut. ὀσφρήσομαι; aor. ὡσφρόμην: see note under Αἰσθάνομαι. [It is joined with accus. in Herodot. 1, 80.; in the later writers as Ælian, Lucian, &c. with genitive.—Passow.]

The pres. ὀσφράσθαι was also an Attic form, Antiphanes ap. Athen.

p. 299. e. ἀσφράται, Lucian Piscat. 48.

Instead of ἀσφρόμην we find, but less frequently, ἀσφράμην, whence ὅσφραντο, Herodot. 1, 80, 26. see εἰλάμην under Αἰρέω and εὐράμην from Εὐρίσκω. The aor. 1. midd. ἀσφρησάμην 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. ἀσφρανθῆναι, verbal adj. ἀσφραντός, &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 δσφραίνω τινά τινι, I give a person something to smell at, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 468. But the presents, which have been erroneously derived from aorists, as ὅσφρω, ὅσφρομαι, ὀσφράω, ὀσφρέω and the like, are not Greek.—Passow.]

Οὐλόμενος. See "Ολλυμι. Οὔνεσθε. See "Ονομαι. Οὐρέω, mingo: imperf. (with syllab. augm.) ἐούρουν*; fut. midd. οὐρήσομαι; perf. act. ἐούρηκα. Beside the regular infin. οὐρεῖν, Hes. ε, 760. the common language used οὐρῆν, like ζῆν†.

Οὐτάω, I wound: fut. οὐτήσω; aor. 1. οὔτησα; aor. 1. pass. οὐτήσην. The following Epic forms belong to a syncopated aorist with a short (like ἔκταν, ἔκτα; see ἔγνων under Γιγνώσκω:), as 3. pers. sing. οὖτἄ, infin. οὐτάμεναι and οὐτάμεν, part. pass. οὐτάμενος. Beside the above Homer has the pres. οὐτάζω, with its aor. 1. οὔτάσα, and perf. pass. οὖτασμαι; also the imperf. οὔτασκε and οὐτήσασκε.

Όφείλω, I owe, I ought, I must: fut. ὀφειλήσω, &c. The aor. 2. ὅφελον is used only as a wish, as ὅφελον ποιῆσαι, oh that I had done it! also with είθε and ὡς: so ὅφελες..., ὅφελε.... oh that thou hadst..., that he had..., &c.

There are some Ionic forms of the present which come immediately from ὀφειλέω, as ὀφειλεούση, ὀφειλεύμενος, Euseb. Philos. ap. Stob. S. 44. p. 309.

Homer uses $\partial \phi \in \lambda \lambda \omega$ sometimes as a separate verb with the sense of *I increase*, enlarge, sometimes as synonymous with $\partial \phi \in \lambda \omega$.

The form $\mathring{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda o\nu$, -es, -e (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. $\mathring{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda o\nu$, -es, -e; and in this form as well as in the other the Epics doubled the λ whenever the metre required it, as $\mathring{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda o\nu$, $\mathring{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon$, $\mathring{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda o\nu$, &c. But Hesiod has in a similar case $\mathring{\omega}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda o\nu$; $M\eta\kappa\epsilon\dot{r}$ ener, $\mathring{\omega}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda o\nu$ ey $\mathring{\omega}$ $\pi\epsilon\mu\tau\tau o\iota\sigma\iota$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$, ϵ , 172. $E\mathring{\iota}\theta\epsilon$ $\mu o\iota$. . . $\mathring{\omega}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon$ $\delta o\mathring{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$, Fragm. Melamp. ap. Tzetz. ad Lycophr. 682. And there is no doubt that the imperfect, however it may have been written, was the true old form of

^{*} This verb, like ώθέω and ἀνέομαι, took the syllabic augment instead of the temporal; thus, προσεούρουν, Demosth. c. Conon init. ἐνεουρηκόταs, Aristoph. Lys. ἐούρει, Lucian. Conviv. 35. Compare ἔοικα under Εἴκω.

 $^{+ 0 \}hat{\nu} \rho \hat{q} \hat{p}$ is joined by the Grammarians Gaza and Chrysoloras (see Fisch. I. p. 127.) with $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{q} \nu$ and $\delta \iota \psi \hat{q} \nu$ as an acknowledged form; we may therefore be sure that they had precedents for it from the older Grammarians.

[†] That this verb is sometimes written in Homer $\delta\phi\epsilon i\lambda\omega$ (II. λ , 686. 688. 698.), and sometimes $\delta\phi\epsilon i\lambda\omega$ (II. τ , 200. Od. γ , 367. θ , 332. 462.), is an old mistake naturally arising from tradition. Without wishing to prove the affinity of the two meanings, I have still no doubt of the Homeric form for both being $\delta\phi\epsilon i\lambda\omega$; consequently the three verses in II. λ . ought properly to be written the same as the others.

this wish, "it was my duty to have been there, I ought to have been there." The common $\ddot{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\sigma\nu$ arose therefore entirely from a quick pronunciation of the above formula, and has the appearance only of an aor. 2.

Of $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$, I increase, there is in Homer an anomalous 3. sing. opt. $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$, Il. π , 651. Od. β , 334. If we call this word a present, its irregularity will be quite unexampled. But by a closer examination of the verse in the former of the two passages we shall see that the subject of it is not Hector but Jupiter, who was then in the act of making his decision. In this case then the aor. is the proper form, and it is the more natural one in the other passage. But the aor. of $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$ can be no other than $\delta\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha$, opt. $\delta\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu$; 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 $\delta\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omega$, might have altered it to the clearer but less analogous $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu^*$.

'Οφλισκάνω, I am guilty (of a crime), incur (as a punishment): fut. ὀφλήσω; perf. ὤφληκα; aor. ὧφλον, infin. ὀφλέιν, part. ὀφλών, Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 689. and Eurip. Heracl. 985.

A pres. ὄφλω is nowhere found, and wherever ὧφλον occurs, it presupposes a juridical decision or something equivalent to have already taken place; while ὀφλισκάνω †, ὡφλίσκανον represents the investigation as still continuing, and in a metaphor borrowed from common life describes the situation of one who is constantly exposing himself to something unpleasant, as ὀφλισκάνει γέλωτα, he incurs laughter, makes himself ridiculous, and the like. Bekker was therefore quite right in accenting ὀφλεῖν for ὄφλειν according to the reading of the best manuscripts in Plat. Alcib. I. 35. (p. 121. b.): but with regard to ὀφλών for ὄφλων we must not decide too hastily: compare Πέφνων. The aor. 1. προσοφλήσαι (Alciphr. 3, 26.) belongs therefore to the later forms enumerated in Lobeck's Parerg. c. 5.

Among the Ionic resolutions in Herodotus, one of the most remarkable is that of the 3. pers. of the imperf. $\epsilon\epsilon$ for ϵ in three verbs, $\epsilon'\psi\epsilon\epsilon$, $\epsilon'\epsilon'\ell\chi\epsilon\epsilon$, $\delta'\phi\ell\epsilon\epsilon$, Herodot. 1, 48. 1, 118. 8, 26. See also $\epsilon'\omega\theta\epsilon\epsilon$ under $E\theta\omega$.

It is clear that $\omega\phi\lambda o\nu$ is properly the aor. of $\partial\phi\epsilon\lambda\omega$ according to the

^{*} If all the above suppositions are correct, it will follow that there was an old verb $\delta\phi\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$, imperf. $\ddot{\omega}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$, aor. I. $\ddot{\omega}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\alpha$ with a twofold meaning; 1. I increase: 2. I owe: of which the former became obsolete, and the latter took in the present the form of $\dot{\delta}\phi\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$.

[†] Some verbs have a pres. both in -σκω and -άνω, as ἀμβλίσκω, ἀμβλίσκω: but in ὀφλισκάνω no other present is in use than the one thus doubly strengthened by combining both terminations.

analogy of $\eta \gamma \rho \epsilon \tau \sigma$ and $\eta \lambda \theta \sigma \nu$; and that the other forms for this particular meaning were framed after it.

Π.

Παίζω, I sport, joke: fut. παίξομαι and παιξοῦμαι; whence the later writers formed an aor. 1. ἔπαιξα, perf. pass. πέπαιγμαι, &c.; but in the Ionic and pure Attic dialect the aor. 1. is always ἔπαισα and the perf. pass. πέπαισμαι*, notwithstanding their similarity to the same tenses in παίω.

[This verb does not occur at all in the Iliad; but in the Odyssey we find (beside the pres. and imperf.) the imperat. aor. $\pi \alpha i \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon$, Od. θ , 251. On the other hand the later writers, as Plutarch, &c., have the regular Dor. aor. infin. $\pi \alpha i \xi \alpha i$; the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha i \chi \theta \eta \nu$; perf. act. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha i \chi \alpha$, perf. pass. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha i \gamma \mu \alpha i$, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 240.—Passow.]

Παίω, I strike, is regular. The pass. takes σ.—ΜΙDD. as aor. 1. ἐπαίσατο, Xen.

The Attics have another fut. $\pi \alpha i \eta \sigma \omega$, which is more in use than the regular one, Aristoph. Nub. 1125. Lys. 459.

Παλαίω, I wrestle, struggle: fut. παλαίσω; aor. 1. ἐπάλησα, whence 3. sing. opt. παλήσειε, Herodot. 8, 21. where however one manuscript has παλαίσειεν. The pass. takes σ.

Πάλλω, I shake, swing: aor. 1. ἔπηλα, Soph. El. 710. Pass. aor. 2.

Homer has also the aor. 2. act. with the reduplication in the compound part. $\dot{a}\mu\pi\epsilon\pi\alpha\lambda\dot{\omega}\nu$: and the syncop. aor. 2. midd. $\pi\dot{a}\lambda\tau_{0}$, Il. 0, 645. In Callimachus 1. 64. we find the aor. 1. midd. infin. $\pi\dot{\eta}\lambda\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

Πάομαι, I acquire, occurs only in its aor. 1. ἐπασάμην, infin. πάσασθαι; and perf. πέπαμαι†, 3. sing. pluperf. πέπατο. This verb was used exactly like κτάομαι, κέκτημαι. The aorist is found only in the poets; the perfect and pluperfect in prose also, e. g. in Xenophon.

The agrist of this verb is sufficiently distinguished from the agrist of $\pi a \tau \epsilon o \mu a \iota$, (although they are written the same,) by the a of the former being long while that of the latter is short. The perfect of the latter differs by having the σ .

^{*} See Πιέζω.

[†] A false reading πέπαμμαι, as also πολυπάμμων, is now banished from the printed text. Compare the subst. πᾶμα, κτῆμα.

[‡] 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.

Πάσσω, Att. πάττω, I strew, sprinkle, besprinkle: fut. πάσω (ο -); perf. pass. πέπασμαι.—ΜΙDD. See Πλάσσω and Άρμόττω.

Some of the forms of this verb are written the same as those of πατέομαι.

Πάσχω*, I suffer: fut. πείσομαι as the fut. midd. of πείθω; perf. 2. πέπονθα (from the stem ΠΕΝΘ- as seen in the subst. πένθος); aor. 2. ἔπαθον. Verbal adj. παθητός†.

Beside the above, we find the following old sister-forms; in Od. ρ , 555. a fem. perf. part. $\pi\epsilon\pi\tilde{\alpha}\theta\nu\tilde{\iota}a$, which supposes a perf. $\pi\epsilon\pi\eta\theta a$ according to the analogy of $\tilde{\alpha}\rho\alpha\rho\nu\tilde{\iota}a$ and others under 'A $\rho\alpha\rho(\sigma\kappa\omega)$: and in Æschyl. Agam. 1635. in the lambics the aor. 1. part. $\pi\eta\sigma\alpha$ s (from an aor. $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\eta\sigma\alpha$). The fut. $\pi\eta\sigma\alpha\mu\alpha$ is uncertain.

We find also in Homer a syncopated perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon$ for $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \nu \theta u \tau \epsilon$, like $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \rho \rho \theta \epsilon$ for $\epsilon \gamma \rho \eta \gamma \delta \rho a \tau \epsilon$, by an imitation of the passive termination: that is to say, as soon as in $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \nu \theta a \tau \epsilon$ the θ preceded the τ , it was changed to σ (as $i \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$, $i \sigma \tau \epsilon$) and the ν was dropped, making $\pi \epsilon \tau \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon$; a transition was then made to a passive form $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \sigma \theta \epsilon$.

Πατάσσω, I strike, is regular: it was used by the Attics in the active voice only. See $\Pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$.

 Π aτέω, I tread, is regular. The pres. pass. accidentally coincides with the following verb.

Πατέομαι, I taste, eat, an Ion. depon. midd.: aor. 1. ἐπἄσάμην, infin. πάσασθαι; perf. πέπασμαι. That these forms belong to each other is proved by identity of usage (e.g. Herodot. 1, 73. and 2, 47. ἐπάσαντο and πατέονται τῶν κρεῶν:), as well as by the exact analogy of δατεῖσθαι, δάσασθαι.

Παύω, I cause to cease, stop: fut. παύσω; aor. 1. έπαυσα, &c.: there are no traces of a perfect. Midd. παύομαι, I cease: fut. πεπαύσομαι \$\(\); perf. pass. πέπαυμαι, I have ceased, i. e. I no longer continue to do so; aor. 1. midd. ἐπαυσάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐπαύθην and ἐπαύσθην ||; the former, Ionic and

^{*} Dæderlein has a very good remark, that while from $\Pi A\Theta$ — is formed $\pi \acute{a}$ - $\sigma \kappa \omega$ by affixing the termination $-\sigma \kappa \omega$, the aspiration of the θ , which disappears, is thrown on the κ , making $\pi \acute{a}\sigma \chi \omega$.

[†] The fut. $\pi\alpha\theta\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$, which is quoted by the old Grammarians, rests on a false separation of $\epsilon\dot{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\theta\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$.

[‡] It occurs here and there as a various reading, e. g. in Herodot. 9, 37. Xen. Cy-

fop. 7, 3, 10. See also Schweigh. Index to Polybius.

^{§ [}The regular fut. midd. is παύσομαι, but the purer Attic writers prefer πεπαύσομαι, Soph. Ant. 91. Piers. ad Mær. p. 293.—Passow.]

^{|| [}There is said to have been also an aor. ἐπάην, Chœroboscus A B. 3. p. 1324.

—Passow.]

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. $\pi \alpha \hat{\nu} \epsilon$ is very commonly used in the immediate sense for $\pi \alpha \hat{\nu} o \nu$: and there is one instance mentioned of the aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \nu \sigma a$ in this same sense, viz. Od. δ , 659. $M \nu \eta \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s \delta' \check{a} \mu \nu \delta is \kappa \check{a} \theta \iota \sigma a \nu \kappa \iota \iota \iota \pi \alpha \hat{\nu} \sigma a \nu \check{a} \check{\epsilon} \theta \lambda \omega \nu$, but the excellent Cod. Vindob. 56. has $M \nu \eta \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \rho u s$, 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.

Πείθω, I persuade: fut. πείσω; aor. 1. ἔπείσα†; perf. πέπεικα. Pass. πείθομαι, I am persuaded, I believe, I obey: fut. midd. πείσομαι; perf. pass. πέπεισμαι, I have been convinced, therefore I believe firmly; aor. 1. ἐπείσθην: to which we may add the perf. 2. πέποιθα, generally with the intransitive sense, I trust.

In II. β , 341. δ , 159. we find a syncop. 1. plur. pluperf. $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu$. In this form, as in $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$ from $\kappa\rho\alpha'\zeta\omega$, $\epsilon\imath\lambda\dot{\eta}\lambda\nu\theta$ under " $E\rho\chi\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, and several others, everything between the root and the termination is dropped: and as some of these perfects ($\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\gamma\alpha$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\alpha$, &c.) have the force of a pres., they have also an imperative ending in $\theta\iota$, as $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\chi\theta\iota$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\iota$, Æschyl. Eum. 602. in which latter the diphthong of the root is retained.

Poetry has also (see the Indexes of Aristoph. and Eurip.) the aor. 2. act. $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\sigma\nu$, $\pi\iota\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$ for $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha$, &c. and an aor. 2. midd. $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\nu$, $\pi\iota-\theta\sigma\nu$, $\pi\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ for $\hat{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, &c. The Epic language never uses the act. aor. without the redupl., $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\imath\theta\sigma\nu$, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\epsilon$, $\pi\epsilon\pi\imath\theta\sigma\iota\mu\iota$, &c.; but in the midd. it has the usual $\pi\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. The reduplicated form of the midd. (at least in the only passage where it occurs) belongs as to meaning to $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\alpha$, e.g. $\pi\epsilon\pi\imath(\theta\iota\iota\theta)$ $\hat{\epsilon}$ $\hat{\epsilon}$ $\hat{\omega}$ $\hat{\alpha}$ $\hat{\nu}$ τ $\hat{\nu}$ $\hat{\nu}$

From this agr. 2. arose again other active forms, as fut. $\pi \epsilon \pi \tilde{\iota} \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega$, and $\pi \tilde{\iota} \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega$, agr. 1. $\hat{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\iota} \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega$, and part. $\pi \tilde{\iota} \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega$: but with this difference,



^{*} It must be observed, however, that even in Thucydides (2, 77. 5, 91, 100.) the reading $\pi a v \theta \hat{\eta} v a \iota$ has been restored from the best manuscripts.

^{† [}Of this tense Homer has only the

opt. $\pi \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$, Od. ξ , 123.—Passow.]

‡ Bæckh says the same of the simple aor. part. $\pi \epsilon \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$, Pyth. 3, 28. (50.), but I cannot subscribe to his opinion.

that $\pi \epsilon \pi \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ has the meaning of to persuade, but $\pi \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, $\pi \iota \theta \ddot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ the intransitive sense of $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ and $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \sigma \iota \theta \sigma \iota$, 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 πεποιθώς and πιθήσας would be used in many passages indifferently, without distinction of sense or metre. Now it should be observed, that πεποιθώs, of which the established meaning has always been, trusting to, relying on, fretus, never occurs in any other sense; as κηυσί, λαοίς, χείρεσσι, άλκὶ, πυδωκείησε, πεποιθώς, &c.: while we cannot but feel, that in opposition to these the following two passages, φρεσί λευγαλέησι πιθήσας, Il. ι, 119. and ἀναιδείηφι πιθήσας, Hes. ε, 357. express a very different idea, viz. obeying or yielding to; which sense the future of the same verb has also in the only passage where any part of it occurs beside the participle: e. g. πιθήσειs, thou wilt obey, Od. φ, 369. In the same way when at Il. δ, 398. Tydeus, having slain all the Thebans, (who lay in wait for him.) excepting Mæon, spares him alone, θεων τεράεσσι πιθήσας, it is quite clear that he does it "in obedience to the signs of the gods." When, however, at 4, 183. Bellerophon attacks and kills the terrible Chimæra. and the same expression is used, θεών τεράεσσι πιθήσας, the word can mean nothing more than trusting to, confiding in. But we find in the same sense at Il. μ , 256. speaking of the Trojans attacking the Grecian walls, Τοῦπερ δή (i. e. of Jupiter,) τεράεσσι πεποιθότες: which passage alone makes it very probable that $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta \dot{\omega} s$ was also the original reading in the other, viz. ζ , 183. And this supposition is strengthened by Il. ν, 369. Od. φ, 315. where our text reads πιθήσας in the same sense of trusting to, but the manuscripts actually have the various reading πεποιθώς. 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 πεποιθώs was also the original reading in Il. λ , 235. ρ , 48. χ , 107. and Hes. ϵ , 669.

Πείκω, I shear, comb: fut. πέξω, &c. Compare the Ion. δέξω from δείκνυμι.—Μιdd. In the Attic language the pres. πεκτέω was in use*.

Theor. 5, 98. Etym. M. vv. $\pi \acute{e}\sigma \kappa os$ and $\pi e \acute{\kappa} \omega$ (p. 667, 40.) Etym. Gud. v. $\pi e \acute{\kappa} \omega$ (p. 456.). Aristophanes has $\pi e \kappa \tau e \acute{\iota} v$ and $\pi e \kappa \tau o \acute{\iota} \mu e \nu o v$: but whether $\pi \acute{e}\kappa \tau e \iota v$ or $\pi e \kappa \tau e \acute{\iota} v$ is doubtful. In Pollux 7. c. 33. 1. we find $\pi \acute{e}\kappa \tau e \iota v$ as a pres. of $\pi \acute{e} \xi a \tau o$, but through a misunderstanding the text of our editions has $\pi \acute{e}\kappa e \iota v$. See Jungermann's note. Thus we see that the simple stem $\pi \acute{e} \kappa \omega$ was strengthened by the Attics to $\pi \acute{e} \kappa \tau \omega$, which again was changed to $\pi e \kappa \tau \acute{\omega}$, like $\acute{e} \iota \tau \tau \omega$ to $\acute{e} \iota \tau \tau \acute{\omega}$.

^{*} As the verb occurs but seldom, (in the former sense $\kappa\epsilon i\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ is more usual, in the latter $\kappa\tau\epsilon\nu i\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\xi\alpha i\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$) little can be said with any certainty on the use of its forms. Whether $\pi\epsilon\kappa\omega$ is ever found I know not. Stephens has $\pi\kappa\epsilon \delta\mu\epsilon\nu$ 000 $\delta\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$, but without giving the passage from which he has taken it. The Epies have $\pi\epsilon i\kappa\omega$, $\pi\epsilon \xi\omega$, &c.; and this is the only formation which occurs. That the old Grammarians also considered $\pi\epsilon i\kappa\omega$ as the pres. of $\pi\epsilon \xi\omega$, is clear from Schol.

Πεινάω, I hunger: fut. π εινήσω, &c. This verb, like δ ιψάω, ζάω, &c., has both in the Attic and common dialect an η , as infin. π ειν $\hat{\eta}$ ν, δ ιψ $\hat{\eta}$ ν, &c. We find also $\zeta\hat{\eta}$ ε, $\zeta\hat{\eta}$, έζη, π ειν $\hat{\eta}$ ε, χ ρ $\hat{\eta}$ ται, δ ιψητε, so that in these forms the indic. and conj. are the same.

 $\Pi \epsilon \iota \rho \acute{a} \omega$, I try, is regular, with a long, Ion. η , in the inflexion. The passive as a deponent, with fut. middle, has the same sense; but it means also to experience.

The Epics use the aor. of the midd as well as of the pass in the sense of a deponent. The same poets have a form $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{a}\zeta\omega$ with a frequentative meaning, to try, to prove, which again became common in the language of the later writers, while the Attics always used $\pi\epsilon\iota\phi\acute{a}\nu$ only. The passive with the σ belongs entirely to this later $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{a}$ - $\zeta\omega$. The form $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho a\nu\tau a\iota$ may come also from $\pi\epsilon\rho a\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$. See $\Pi\epsilon\rho\acute{a}\omega$.

Πελάζω, I approach, is regular. The Attic fut. $\pi \epsilon \lambda \hat{q} \nu$ occurs sometimes in the poets.

In the older language this verb has the causative meaning to bring near, carry or place near; whence the pass. $\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}\zeta o\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ takes the immediate sense, which the active has in the common language. Homer has $\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{a}\zeta\omega$ in the older meaning only, succeeding poets in both.

The sister-form $\pi \epsilon \lambda \acute{a} \omega^*$ occurs as a present in Hymn. Bacch. 44. $\pi \epsilon \lambda \acute{a} q \nu$. The poetical aor. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \acute{a} \theta \eta \nu$ used by the Attics, and the verbal adj. $\ddot{a}\pi \lambda \ddot{a}\tau os$ which comes from it and is found both in the Attics and the Epic poets, are supposed to be formed by syncope: but the a is always long; whence it is clear that this is rather a transposition of sounds together with a contraction, like $\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \rho \ddot{a}\kappa a$ from $\kappa \epsilon \rho \acute{a}\omega$, $\pi \acute{\epsilon}-\pi \rho \ddot{a}\kappa a$ from $\pi \epsilon \rho \acute{a}\omega$, &c. And in the same way we must explain in the Epics, 1. the perf. pass. $\pi \acute{\epsilon}\pi \lambda \eta \mu a\iota$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \mu \acute{\epsilon}\nu os$ Od. μ , 108. and 2. the aor. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi \lambda \acute{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$, $\pi \lambda \mathring{\eta} \tau o \uparrow$; that is to say, as syncopated forms from $\pi \epsilon \pi \acute{\epsilon}\lambda a\mu a\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi \epsilon \lambda \acute{a}\mu \eta \nu$, like $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa \tau \acute{a}\mu \eta \nu$ under $K \tau \epsilon \acute{\iota}\nu \omega$. Here therefore a contraction takes place, as it does in the similar case of $\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \rho \ddot{a}\kappa a$ (under $K \epsilon \rho \acute{a}\nu \nu \nu \mu$), Ion. into η , Att. in $\ddot{a} \ddagger$. We find also frequently $\dot{\epsilon}\pi \lambda \acute{a}\sigma \theta \eta \nu$, but this is indisputably through the common fault of corrupting the θ

^{*} Wherever we find in the common language a verb in -άζω, which is not admissible in the hexameter, the Epics generally use a sister-form in -άω.

⁺ This agr. must not be confounded with $\epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ under $\Pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$.

According to general analogy, this

contraction should take place in both dialects in η ; for the α in $\kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho \bar{\alpha} \kappa \alpha$ arises from the influence of the ρ . Perhaps, therefore, the Atticism in this verb was only to avoid a similarity with $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, particularly in $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$ mentioned at the top of the next page.

of the aor. 1. pass. into $\sigma\theta$; for it cannot be supposed that beside $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\dot{\alpha}\theta\eta\nu$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\lambda\dot{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ a third form not required by any metre could have been also in use. See Brunck on Eurip. Hec. 880.

The Tragedians have also a sister-form $\pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$, by adding $-\theta \omega$ to the vowel of the stem or root, and this they again contract in the present (as in the last paragraph) into $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$ with long α .

A pres. $\pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ (for $\pi \epsilon \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$) is also supposed, on account of $\pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\epsilon}$ πλαζε, Od. λ, 583. and the particip. προσπλάζον, Il. μ , 285. And the Epic language furnishes sufficient grounds arising from metrical difficulty, to account for the syncope in these forms. But there are other points to be considered: particularly that these two would then be the only Homeric passages among a very large number, in which the active voice would have the later immediate meaning of to approach. Besides in these two passages the water and the waves are the subject, and the case is the same in a third passage, Il. ϕ , 269. where the wave that is approaching Achilles πλάζ ωμους καθύπερθεν. Hence some of the commentators understand this last also to be for $\pi \acute{\epsilon} \lambda a \zeta \acute{\epsilon}$, although here the context makes it far less probable. In addition to this we must observe that the common πλάζω, -άγξω 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 $\pi\lambda\alpha\zeta\omega$ 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 πλάζεσθαι, to wander about.

Another Epic sister-form is made by changing -aw into -νάω, -νημι, and the ϵ of the root into ι , as $\pi\epsilon\lambda$ άω, π ίλνημι, π ίλναμαι: see κίρνημι from κεράω in note under Κεράννυμι.

Πέλω and more frequently πέλομαι, I am, an old verb which remained in use among the Dorics (πέλει, πέλη, Fragm. 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. ἔπλε; 2. sing. imperf. midd. ἔπλεο, contr. ἔπλευ; 3. sing. ἔπλετο*. And here we find this peculiarity, that the imperfect passive has very commonly the meaning of the present, as II. a, 418. ζ , 434.

To the above verb belong the Epic participles ἐπιπλόμενος, περιπλόμενος † in what appears to be the original meaning, I am employed about, prevail amongst, versor, and with the same syncope: as in Od. ν; 60. (old age and death,) ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται (ἐπιπέλονται,) pre-

^{*[}Homer has also a 2. sing. imperf. midd. $\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\sigma$, Il. χ , 433. and in Hes. Fr. 22, 4. is the 3. sing. $\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\sigma$.—Passow.]

[†] Euphorion indeed (ap. Tzetz. ad Lycophr. 494.) has the simple πλόμενος.

vail among men, frequentant, versantur; in which sense Homer elsewhere uses $\pi\omega\lambda\dot{\epsilon}o\mu\alpha\iota$, $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\pi\omega\lambda\dot{\epsilon}o\mu\alpha\iota$, which is therefore the only instance of the termination $-\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ having the change of vowel to ω .

Πέμπω, I send: fut. π έμψω; aor. 1. ἔπεμψα; perf. π έπομφα*. In the passive Pindar and Herodotus have the aor.
1. part. π εμφθείς, and Photius the part. perf. π επεμμένος.
The other tenses are generally supplied by ἀποστέλλω.

ΠΕΝΘ-. See Πάσχω.

Πένομαι, I am poor: in Hom. I labour, and transit. I prepare by labour, δαῖτα, &c. It is used only in pres. and imperf.

Πεπαρείν or Πεπορείν—and Πέπρωμαι. See Πορείν.

Πέποσθε. See Πάσχω.

Πέπρωμαι, &c. See Πορείν.

Πέπτω. See Πέσσω.

Περάω, I go over, pass over or through: fut. περάσω, Ion. περήσω; aor. 1. ἐπέρασα, Ion. ἐπέρησα. This verb is regular, with a long, Ion. η.

Different from the above is an inflexion with a short, $\pi e \rho \acute{a} \sigma \omega$, $\acute{e} \pi \acute{e} - \rho \check{a} \sigma a$, 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 $\pi e \rho \check{\omega}$, infin. $\pi e \rho \hat{q} v$ is in this sense a future. Hence comes the verb in common use $\pi \iota \pi \rho \acute{a} \sigma \iota \omega$ with the subst. $\pi \rho \hat{a} \sigma \iota s$. 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 $\pi e \rho \hat{q} v$ is to go over, and it governs as a transitive the accusative of the space to be passed, as $\pi e \rho \hat{q} v v \eta v \theta \acute{a} \lambda a \sigma \pi a v$; but it may also be taken causatively, to carry over†; 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 $\pi e \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \omega$ and its derivatives meant only to sell, while $\pi e \rho \tilde{a} \sigma \omega$, $\pi e \rho \acute{i} \rho \omega$ retained only the sense of to pass over, with the single exception of $\pi e \pi e \rho \eta \mu \acute{e} v o s$ in Homer, for which see $\Pi \iota \pi \rho \acute{a} \sigma \kappa \omega$.

With these verbs we must compare a third, $\pi \epsilon \rho \alpha i \nu \omega$, from $\pi \epsilon \rho \alpha s \alpha n$ end, (consequently with the meaning of to complete,) which is regular

Like κέκλοφα from κλέπτω, and τέτροφα from τρέπω: see note under Κλέπτω.

[†] I have not yet found any certain instances of this meaning in its strict and

proper sense; for in the Hymn. Merc. 133. (see Hermann) the reading is not sure; and $\pi\epsilon\rho\hat{a}\nu$ $\pi\delta\delta a$, Eurip. Hec. 53. is like $\beta ai\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\pi\delta\delta a$, for which see $Bai\nu\epsilon\nu$.

and takes a long in the aor., ἐπέρανα, Ion. ἐπέρηνα. Perf. pass. πεπέρασμαι, 3. sing. πεπέρανται, and on account of the metre πειραίνω, πεπείρανται, Od. μ, 37. Soph. Trach. 581.*

Πέρδω, more generally πέρδομαι, pedo: aor. 2. ἔπαρδον; fut. παρδήσομαι; perf. πέπορδα.

In Aristoph. Vesp. 394. $\mathring{a}\pi\sigma\pi\alpha\rho\delta\tilde{\omega}$ is accented falsely. It must be $\mathring{a}\pi\sigma\pi\tilde{a}\rho\delta\omega$ as aor. 2. conj.; for this conjunctive, after the particles \mathring{ov} $\mathring{\mu}\mathring{\eta}$, has the force of a future, even when it is joined in a sentence with real futures.

Πέρθω, I lay waste: fut. πέρσω; aor. 1. ἔπερσα; aor. 2. ἔπράθον†, infin. πράθεῖν, poet. πράθέειν. Homer has also a fut. pass. πέρσομαι, Il. ω, 729. and a syncopated aor. (but only in the infin.) πέρθαι, which is to be explained by ἐπέρθμην, infin. πέρθ-θαι, and dropping the θ πέρθαι, like δέχθαι. The perf. act. πέπορθα is post-Homeric.

Πεσείν. See Πίπτω.

Πέσσω, πέττω, I cook: fut. πέψω, &c.; perf. pass. πέπεμμαι, infin. πεπέφθαι. The pres. πέπτω which corresponds with this formation, is found in the later writers.

That HEH- is the simple stem or root is clear from some of the derivatives, as $\pi \acute{\epsilon} \pi \omega \nu$, $\mathring{\epsilon} \rho \tau \sigma \mathring{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma s$: and the change from π to $\sigma \sigma$ or $\tau \tau$ is found also in $\mathring{\epsilon} \nu l \sigma \sigma \omega$ for $\mathring{\epsilon} \nu l \pi \tau \omega$: compare $\phi \mathring{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma a$ the fem. of $\phi \mathring{\epsilon} \psi$, &c., as well as Kæn. ad Greg. Æol. 42., and Buttm. Lexilog. p. 126.

Πετάννυμι, or πεταννύω, I spread wide, open: fut. πετάσω (ἄ); aor. 1. ἐπέτἄσα, Ερ. πέτασσα, &c. Perf. pass. by syncope πέπτἄμαι; but aor. 1. pass. ἐπετάσθην.

The Att. fut. $\pi \epsilon \tau \tilde{\omega}$, &c., was generally preferred to $\pi \epsilon \tau \acute{\alpha} \sigma \omega$: see Thom. Mag. p. 61. and Meineke Menand. Incert. 190. The later writers took the liberty of using this form or the simple theme as a present, e. g. ἀναπετώσαι (for ἀναπεταννῦσαι), Lucian de Calumn. 21. The perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon \pi \acute{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ occurs in its compound $\acute{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \pi \acute{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ in an oracle of Herodot. 1, 62. and in ἀναπεπέτασται, 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, ἐπετάσθην under that verb; Parmenides (Fragm. v. 18.) had a part. aor. ἀναπτάμενοs in an active sense, having opened; and Zenodotus read at II. a, 351. χεῖραs ἀναπτάs.

^{* [}Hermann doubts the admissibility of this Epic form in an Attic poet, and prefers reading πεπείραται.—Passow.]

[†] In this aor, as in ἔδρακον from δέρκω, the natural length of the middle syllable is removed by transposing the letters.

For the form $\pi i \tau \nu \eta \mu_i$, $\pi \iota \tau \nu i \omega_i$, see $\kappa \epsilon \rho i \omega$ in note under $K \epsilon \rho i \nu \nu \nu \mu_i$, and the end of the article on $H \epsilon \lambda i \zeta \omega$. Schneider in his Lexicon quotes the following authorities for it; viz. $\pi i \tau \nu \alpha$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \nu \alpha$, imperf. of $\pi \iota \tau \nu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, II. ϕ , 7. $\pi \iota \tau \nu \dot{\alpha} s$, part. pres. of $\pi i \tau \nu \eta \mu_i$, Od. λ , 392. $\pi i \tau \nu \alpha \nu$ 3. plur. for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau \nu \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$, Pind. Nem. 5, 20. In Hes. Scut. 291. the reading of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \nu \nu \nu$ from $\pi i \tau \nu \omega$ is doubtful, and Gaisford reads $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \lambda \nu \omega$. Schneider improperly confounds this verb with $\pi \iota \tau \nu \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, $\pi \iota \tau \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, a sister-form of $\pi i \pi \tau \omega$: see the latter.

Πέτομαι, I fly, depon. midd.: fut. πετήσομαι, Hom. and Aristoph. Pac. 77. 1126., but in Attic prose generally πτήσομαι; syncop. aor. 2. ἐπτόμην, infin. πτέσθαι*.

In addition to the above, which according to the Atticists are the only legitimate forms in Attic prose, we find also frequently a pres. $i\pi\tau a\mu a\iota$ with the aor. 1. $i\pi\tau a\mu a\iota$, infin. $\pi\tau a\sigma \theta a\iota$; and in an active form the aor. $i\pi\tau a\nu a\iota$, infin. $i\pi\tau a\nu a\iota$, part. $i\pi\tau a\iota$.

See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 325. Lucian. Lexiph. extr. By these and other testimonies the pres. $i\pi\tau a\mu a\iota$, which is the common one in use among the later writers, becomes very suspicious as a form of the older language, although still found in some passages without any various reading: see Porson. ad Medeam. 1. Lobeck ad Phryn. 1. c.† The aor. $i\pi\tau a\mu \eta\nu$ in the Ionic writers and old poets is unobjectionable and of frequent occurrence: see Porson on the passages quoted, and Hermann on Soph. Aj. 275.‡: but in the prose of the older time it is very doubtful, as in many passages where it is the common reading, the manuscripts have $\pi\tau i\sigma d\mu a\nu$, $\pi\tau id\mu a\nu a\nu$, &c. The form $i\pi \tau id\nu a\nu$ is old and genuine in the poets, although not so frequent; but in the later language it is very common.

Beside the above we find $\pi \epsilon \tau a \mu a \iota$ and $\pi \epsilon \tau a \delta \mu a \iota$ used in the later prose; in which they are free from all suspicion, as even the pass. aor. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon \tau a \delta \theta \eta \nu$ (for $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\tau \delta \mu \eta \nu$), notwithstanding its identity with the aor.

^{*[}Passow adds the perf. act. $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \kappa a$: on which see however the end of this article.]

[†] Porson did not venture to reject the imperfect which occurs in Euripides, although he remarks that in both the passages where it is found (Iph. A. 1608. and Fragm. Polyidi 1.) the aorist would be more accurate. Doubtless he was deterred by the somewhat bold alteration of $d\pi \dot{r}$ -

 $[\]pi\tau a \tau o$ for $\dot{a}\phi i\pi \tau a \tau o$ in the former of the two passages. But as Lucian will not once allow the form $i\pi\tau a \tau o$ to be $\mu\epsilon\tau o\iota\kappa i\nu$, this emendation does not appear to me too bold.

[‡] Hermann's opinion on Soph. Ced. T. 17., that $\pi r \acute{e} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is an imperf., still wants the necessary proofs: in the passage itself the sense of the imperfect is by no means decisive.

pass. of $\pi\epsilon \tau d\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$, occurs in it, e.g. Aristot. H. A. 9, 40. (9, 27, 5. Schneid.) and in Lucian. Rhet. Præcept. 6. For the form $\pi\epsilon\tau a\mu a\iota$ there is older authority in the poets; for $\pi\epsilon\tau a\tau a\iota$ is found not only in Pindar, but also in the chorus and the anapæsts of the dramatic poets*; and Anacreon has the infin. $\pi\epsilon\tau a\sigma\theta a\iota$ and the 2. sing. $\pi\epsilon\tau a\sigma\sigma a\iota$ †.

Lastly come the forms with the change of vowel to o or w according to the analogy of φέρω and φορέω, τρέμω and τρομέω, or στρέφω and στρώφαω, τρέχω and τρωχάω, and others mentioned under Δέμω; in which however it must be observed that this is the only verb with the formation in -άω which changes the vowel to o: for the principal form, used also by the Attic poets, is ποτάομαι (ποτᾶται, ποτῶνται), which in the Epics takes the formation in $-\epsilon \omega$, but only in a resolved shape, as $\pi \omega \tau \acute{\epsilon} \omega \tau \alpha \iota$; and when the metre requires, it has an ω in the stem or root, as $\pi\omega\tau\omega\nu\tau\sigma$. Of the further formation of this verb we find the Doric forms πεπόταμαι, Eurip. Hippol. 564. and ἐποτάθην, Aristoph. Av. 1338. Aristophanes has however the perfect πεπότημαι 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 $\pi \epsilon$ τομαι in the Attic dialect: for I know of no authority for the active $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \kappa \alpha \dagger$ beyond grammatical tradition. If this supposition be correct, the Attic prose usage of the above verb will be as follows:

Πέτομαι, πτήσομαι, ἐπτόμην, πεπότημαι.

ΠΕΤ-. See Πίπτω.

Πεύθομαι. See Πυνθάνομαι.

Πέφνον, ἔπεφνον, I slew; the reduplicated and at the same time syncopated aorist of ΦΕΝΩ (whence φόνος), like ἐκεκλόμην from κέλομαι. The participle is accented contrary to analogy πέφνων (Il. π , 827. ρ , 539.), and this is expressly mentioned by the grammarians as a peculiarity; see Etym. Mag. vv. ἔπεφνον, βαλών, ἐών §. Of the aoristic meaning in all the Homeric forms belonging to ἔπεφνον there can be

* e.g. in Eurip. Ion. 90. and Aristoph. Av. 573. 574. where Brunck, contrary to all the manuscripts, reads as Attic $\pi\acute{e}$

† Whatever may be our opinion of the odes of Anacreon, the 9th is clearly of too pure a period for us to endure such a barbarism as πετᾶσαι. Compare ερασσαι from εραμαι, and ὅνοσσο from ὄνομαι.

† The perfects πέπταμαι, πέπτηκα, πέπτωκα, πεπτηώς (see Πετάννυμι, Πέτομαι, Πίπτω and Πτήσσω), formed from verbs coming from the root ΠΕΤΩ, are to be explained by syncope as for πεπέ-

ταμαι, &c. These perfects, like κέκτημαι and μέμνημαι, are exceptions to the general rule of verbs, beginning with two consonants, and forming their perfect with e instead of the reduplication. See note under Κτάομαι.

§ I see clearly however that we cannot build much on this grammatical tradition. It is possible that the acristic force of this participle, which is not evident at first sight even in the passages where it occurs, was not observed until its accentuation as a present had become firmly established.

no doubt; and the supposition of a pres. $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \omega$, as shown also by the analogy of $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \tau \sigma$ and $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \phi \rho u \delta \sigma \nu$, is perfectly untenable*.

With this we must join the perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon \phi \tilde{\alpha} \mu a \iota$, of which Homer has the 3. sing. $\pi \epsilon \phi a \tau a \iota$, 3. plur. $\pi \epsilon \phi a \tau \tau a \iota$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \phi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$, and the 3. fut. (paulo-post fut.) $\pi \epsilon \phi \tilde{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$, $\pi \epsilon \phi \tilde{\eta} \sigma \epsilon a \iota$, Il. ν , 829. 0, 140. Od. χ , 217. This $\pi \epsilon \phi a \mu a \iota$ bears exactly the same relation to the root ΦEN — as $\tau \epsilon \tau a \mu a \iota$ does to TEN— in $\tau \epsilon i \nu \omega$; while $\pi \epsilon \phi \tilde{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ is formed from $\pi \epsilon \phi a \mu a \iota$ like $\delta \epsilon \delta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ from $\delta \epsilon \tilde{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu a \iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \tilde{\nu} \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota$ from $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \tilde{\nu} \mu a \iota$. The same future form comes also from the root ΦA — in $\phi a \iota \nu \omega$; and Lycophron has allowed himself to use, in the sense of killed, the perf. part. $\pi \epsilon \phi a \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, which belongs also to $\phi a \iota \nu \omega$ and $\phi \eta \mu \iota$.

Πήγνυμι and πηγνύω, I fix: and in the later writers πήσσω, Att. πήττω; fut. πήξω†; aor. 1. ἔπηξα; aor. 1. pass. ἐπήχθην; but more generally aor. 2. ἐπάγην (ἄ); aor. 1. midd. ἐπηξάμην: the perf. 2. πέπηγα has the sense of the pass. πήγνυμαι, I am fixed, I stick firm ‡; pluperf. ἐπεπήγειν: an aor. 2. midd. ἐπηγόμην occurs in Æsop. Fab. 146. Ern.—ΜΙDD.

Πηδάω, I leap: fut. midd. πηδήσομαι.

Πιέζω, I press: fut. π ιέσω; aor. 1. ἐπίεσα, Herodot. 9, 63.; aor. 1. pass. ἐπιέσθην, infin. π ιεσθηναι, but in Hippocr. π ιεχθηναι; perf. pass. π επίεσμαι, but in Hippocr. π επίεχμαι, infin. π επιέχθαι. This. verb therefore, like ἀρπάζω, π αίζω and others, partakes of two formations, the one with a lingual as its characteristic letter, the other with a palatic.

There are some traces of a sister-form $\pi\iota\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\omega$, as we find in Homer $\pi\iota\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\nu\nu$ 3. plur. imperf. for $\epsilon\pi\iota\epsilon\zeta\nu\nu$, in Herodotus $\pi\iota\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\nu$, and in Plut. Thes. 6. $\pi\iota\epsilon\zeta\nu\nu\nu$ 705.

Πίμπλημι, I fill, infin. $\pi \mu \pi \lambda \acute{a} \nu a\iota$, follows $\emph{\'i} \sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$ in its pres. and imperf., imitating it even in the admission or rejection of the forms in $-a\omega$: fut. $\pi \lambda \acute{\eta} \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\emph{\'e}\pi \lambda \eta \sigma a$;

^{* [}The earliest occurrence of the pres. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \phi \nu \omega$ seems to be in Oppian. Hal. 2, 133.—Passow.]

[†] See "Αγνυμι, "Αξω. ‡ See ἔαγα under "Αγνυμι.

aor. 1. midd. ἐπλησάμην; perf. pass. πέπλησμαι; aor. 1. / pass. ἐπλήσθην.

In the compounds of this and the following verb $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta$ - μ , whenever a μ precedes the first π , it is dropped before
the second, as $\hat{\epsilon} \mu \pi i \pi \lambda \eta \theta \iota$, Il. ϕ , 311.; but resumed when
the augment intervenes, as $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \pi i \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$.

The poets observe or disregard the above rule according to the metre; but the deviations from it which occur in prose, at least in the older writers, may be ascribed to the negligence of transcribers. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 95.

The syncopated pass. aor. $\epsilon\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$, imper. $\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\sigma\sigma$, opt. $\pi\lambda\epsilon i\mu\eta\nu$ (like $\beta\lambda\epsilon i\mu\eta\nu$), &c., is one of the few aorists of this kind which are found also in Attic prose; e. g. in Aristoph. $\epsilon\mu\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$, $\epsilon\mu\pi\lambda\epsilon i\mu\eta\nu$ *. In this last the diphthong of the optative $\epsilon\iota$ is remarkable, as the formation $\pi\iota\mu\pi\lambda\hat{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota$, $\pi\iota\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$, &c. supposes a stem or root $\Pi\Lambda\Lambda$ —. But in the same way $\chi\rho\hat{\eta}$, which comes from $\chi\rho\hat{\alpha}\omega$, has in the opt. $\chi\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}\eta$ †. The supposition most agreeable to analogy is, that $\Pi\Lambda\Lambda\Omega$ was changed after the Iono-Doric manner to $\Pi\Lambda E\Omega$, whence therefore the Lat. pleo. To this we must add the Hesiodic (θ , 880.) $\pi\iota\mu\pi\lambda\epsilon\hat{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$ for $-\hat{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$; for as in the Epic Ionicism, unlike to the later, $\alpha\sigma\nu$ in those verbal forms is changed to $\epsilon\nu$, the above participle supposes a present $\pi\iota\mu\pi\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\omega$.

The immediate sense to be full belongs to $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$. This verb, beside the pres. and imperf., has no other tense than the perf. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \theta a$ synonymous with the present, Pherecr. in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 330, 23. Antim. Theb. Fr. 12. Arat. 774.†

• An aor. 2. act. of this form, $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\eta\nu$ like $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\nu$, appears also in the later language, but contrary to general analogy it has the same causative sense as $\pi i\mu\pi\lambda\eta$ - μ ι, $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha$; if indeed the reading $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\epsilon}$ - $\pi\lambda\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ in Alciphron 3, 46. be genuine.

† We have shown in the note on βλεῖο under Βάλλω, that there are no grounds in the analogy of this optative for anything but the pure diphthong $\alpha\iota$ or $\epsilon\iota$. I cannot therefore adopt $\pi\lambda \dot{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$ as proposed by Dawes, although in Aristoph. Ach. 236. the reading $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\pi\lambda \dot{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$ is supported by the Cod. Rav. instead of the common $\dot{\epsilon}\mu-\pi\lambda\dot{\epsilon}(\mu\eta\nu)$; 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, $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\theta'$ $\dot{\eta}$. In this case then, as in $\beta\lambda\epsilon\bar{\iota}o$, $\beta\lambda\dot{\bar{\eta}}o$, I recognise 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 read-

ing έμπλειθ' ή κύλιξ.

This $\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\theta\omega$ is very commonly supposed to be the radical form, principally on account of $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$; but the supposition is erroneous, as we may learn from comparing it with $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ and others. We should much rather say that $\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}-\theta\omega$ 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 $\pi\dot{\iota}\mu\pi\lambda\eta\mu\iota$ we have but a bad authority in Pseudo-Phocyl. 154. On the other hand we find a striking instance of

Πίμπρημι, I burn (transit.), infin. πιμπράναι, follows in the common language the analogy of πίμπλημι in every part of its formation, even to the dropping or retaining of the μ before the π .

Photius in his Lex. v. σέσωται quotes as one of the older Atticisms πεπρημένος.

The shortening of $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon$ to $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\epsilon$ in Hes. 0, 856. is remarkable. Compare the forms under $\Pi(\mu\pi\lambda\eta\mu)$ which lead to a formation in $-\epsilon\omega^*$.

In this verb the form $\pi \rho \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ is synonymous with $\pi l \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu \iota$, but found only in II. ι , 589. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho \eta \theta o \nu$.

Πίνω, I drink: fut. πίσμαι (like ἔδομαι); aor. 2. ἔπιον, infin. πιεῖν, &c., imper. πίε (Od. 1, 347. Eurip. Cycl. 560.) solely poetical, the common term being πῖθι (like κλῦθι, βῆθι, γνῶθι, &c.), Athen. 10. p. 446. B. The other tenses come from the root ΠO —, with variable quantity, as perf. πέπωκα†; perf. pass. πέπομαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐπόθην; verbal adj. ποτός, ποτέος, whence the Lat. poto.

The Ion. particip. πινεύμενος (like πιεζεύμενος) for πινόμενος, is found in Hippocr. de A. A. L. 22.

A future in the shape of the fut. 2. πιοῦμαι is of frequent occurrence from the time of Aristotle. We find indeed πιεῖσθε in Xen. Symp. 4, 7. but probably the old reading πίεσθε ought to be restored: see also Schweigh. Athen. 5. p. 497. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 31.—The ι in πίσμαι 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 πίσμαι (with ι long) as a present for πίνω is found in Pind. Ol. 6, 147.

The syncop. infin. $\pi i \nu$ or $\pi \epsilon i \nu$, accented also $\pi i \nu$, $\pi \epsilon i \nu$, occurs in Lucill. Epig. 28, 3. Meineke Euphor. Fr. 105. See Mus. Antiqu. Stud. p. 247. sqq. Herodian. Hermanni § 47.

the aor. $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$ in a neuter sense in Herodot. 8, 96. $\ddot{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\tau\partial\nu$ $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\mu\dot{\delta}\nu$: for nothing but a very improbable degree of violence can supply a subject to the verb, so as to give it the sense of to fulfil. So decisive however is the usage of the same aorist in its common sense in all the other passages of Herodotus (see Schweigh. Lex. Herod. for the simple verb and all its compounds), that this reading cannot but be looked on

200

with the greatest suspicion. And may not the syncop. aor. $\pi\lambda\bar{\eta}\sigma\theta at$, which we have seen above in the Attic usage, have belonged to Ionic prose also?

* The various reading $\dot{\epsilon}\mu\pi\iota\pi\rho\epsilon$ in Herodot. 8, 159. deserves also in this respect our attention. It may be an ancient form and grounded perhaps on some old uncertainty in the actual usage. Compare $\Gamma\eta\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$.

+ Compare βώσεσθε under Βιόω.

Πιπίσκω, I give to drink: fut. πίσω (Pind. Isthm. 6, 108. with ι long); aor. 1. ἔπισα. Compare Μεθύω and Μεθύσκω.

Πιπράσκω, I sell, Ion. πιπρήσκω, Herodot. It has in the common language neither fut. nor aor. active: the other forms are, perf. πέπρακα; perf. pass. πέπραμαι, infin. πεπρασθαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐπράθην (ā), Ion. ἐπρήθην, Herodot. In all these forms the Ionics changed the long a to η.

In the common language the defective tenses were made up by ἀπο-δώσομαι, ἀπεδόμην. The forms properly belonging to this verb are in the old and Epic language, fut. $\pi \epsilon \rho \acute{a}\sigma \omega$ (with a short), Att. $\pi \epsilon \rho \acute{\omega}$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \rho \acute{a}\nu$, $\pi \epsilon \rho \acute{a}\mu$; aor. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi \acute{\epsilon}\rho \alpha\sigma \alpha$; of which the pres. $\pi \epsilon \rho \acute{a}\omega$, as we have seen above, is nowhere found with this meaning, but occurs only in the cognate sense of to go over, in which however it is inflected with $- \ddot{a}\sigma \omega$, Ion. $- \acute{\eta}\sigma \omega$. The above $\pi \acute{\epsilon}\pi \rho \ddot{a}\kappa \alpha$ with the other forms came from the formation $\pi \epsilon \rho \ddot{a}\sigma \omega$ ($\pi \epsilon \pi \acute{\epsilon}\rho \ddot{a}\kappa \alpha$) by the same metathesis, which we have frequently seen, for instance in $\kappa \epsilon \rho \acute{a}\nu \nu \nu \mu \iota$, $\kappa \epsilon \rho \ddot{a}\sigma \omega$, ($\kappa \epsilon \kappa \acute{\epsilon}\rho \ddot{a}\kappa \alpha$) $\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \rho \ddot{a}\kappa \alpha$, Ion. $\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \rho \eta \kappa \alpha$.

The Homeric $\pi\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\rho\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma$, II. ϕ , 58., formed from $\pi\epsilon\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$, $-\dot{\eta}\sigma\omega$, and referring to $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$ at v. 40., would therefore be a particular deviation from the above; according to which it would stand for $\pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon-\rho\ddot{\mu}\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma$ with the α lengthened on account of the metre: but this metrical necessity was much more likely to have suggested, according to the above analogy, and with the Ionic η , the form $\pi\epsilon\pi\rho\eta\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\sigma$; which

without doubt is the true reading of the passage*.

The pres. $\pi\iota\pi\rho\dot{\eta}\sigma\kappa\omega$ does not occur in the Epic language, but in its stead is found $\pi\epsilon\rho\nu\eta\mu\iota$ (compare $\delta a\mu\nu\dot{a}\omega$, $\delta \dot{a}\mu\nu\eta\mu\iota$ under $\Delta\dot{\epsilon}\mu\omega$). In the old language, therefore, the following is the established usage;

πέρνημι, περάσω (περώ), ἐπέράσα, πέπράκα, &c.

The Atticists lay it down as a rule that $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \acute{a} \sigma o \mu a \iota$, not $\pi \rho a - \theta \acute{\eta} \sigma o \mu a \iota$, is used as the common future: and in reading the Attic writers we shall find that this rule holds good, in as much as the text has $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \acute{a} \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota$ where there is not the slightest expression of certainty or quickness. And what is particularly confirmed by the rule is this, that although $\mathring{\epsilon} \pi \rho \acute{a} \theta \eta \nu$ is good Attic, yet $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \ddot{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is very frequently found, without any of the force of a perfect, instead of the mere aorist, e.g. $\mathring{\epsilon} \kappa \acute{\eta} \rho \nu \xi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \pi \rho \acute{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$, "he proclaimed that...should be sold," Xen.

It is true that in Heyne I find no variety of reading mentioned; but in Seber's Index this verse is quoted under πε-

περημένοs, and under πεπρημένοs, and in each case the other form is expressly referred to as a various reading.

Hell. 6, 2, 15. Τούτοις ἡ μὲν ἔκτισις ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐντάτης πρυτανείας εἰ δὲ μὴ, διπλάσιον ὀφείλειν καὶ τὰ κτήματα αὐτῶν πεπρᾶσθαι, Andoc. de Myst. p. 10, 18. These forms therefore bear the same relation to each other as τεθνάναι does to τεθνήξεσθαι. See Θνήσκω.

Πίπτω, I fall, with ι naturally long*, consequently the imperat. is accented πῖπτε: the formation is from ΠΕΤΩ; e. g. fut. πεσοῦμαι, Ion. πεσέομαι; aor. 2. ἔπεσον†, infin. πεσεῖν; perf. πέπτωκα, Attic part. πεπτώς, ῶτος.

The part. perf. is shortened by the Epic poets to $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \omega s$, by the Attic to $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega s$. The latter carries us back to the regular $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega s \omega s$, as the $\beta \epsilon \beta \rho \omega \tau \epsilon s$ of Sophocles comes from $\beta \epsilon \beta \rho \omega \kappa \omega s$; but $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \omega s$ points to $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \kappa a$ (compare $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \epsilon \omega s$). And this is without doubt the original form (HETQ $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \kappa a$, like $\delta \epsilon \mu \omega \delta \epsilon \delta \mu \eta \kappa a$), from which by the change of vowel came $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \omega \kappa a$: see Buttm. Lexil. p. 137.

We find also both agrists regularly formed from the simple stem or root ΠΕΤΩ: viz.

- 1. ἔπετον, aor. 2. in Pindar and other Doric writers.
- 2. $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma a$, the regular aor. 1. As we shall see hereafter that in $\chi\epsilon\zeta\omega$ a verb of the common popular dialect, the two aorists $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma a$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\nu$ have been confounded together in daily usage; so in the verb before us the aor. 1. was not found, indeed, in the current language of the day, yet it appears to have remained always in the dialects; hence it occurs among others in the Alexandrine and occasionally in the later ones; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 724. Orph. Arg. 519. Among the older writers Euripides has it twice in the Chorus, $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma a$, Tro. 291. $\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon$, Alc. 471. in both which passages these forms have been rejected in the latest editions by a precipitate criticism;.

* [See Draco, p. 73, 18. 79, 21. Hermann ad Eurip. Herc. F. 1371.—Passow.] † Compare ἐδύσετο, p. 73. and οἶσε

under Φέρω.

† That the common form should be found in both passages even in the best manuscripts as a various reading, is natural; but this can be no reason why any one should reject here, more than in other similar cases, the less usual form selected by the poet, unless it be from having fallen into the error (certainly a very pardonable one) of condemning it at once as a barbarism because it is found in the Alexandrine dialect: in which, to mention particulars, it appears to belong to the class of aorists ending in α instead

of or, as $\epsilon i \delta a$, $\epsilon i \lambda a$, $\epsilon \lambda a \beta a \nu$, 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 $\epsilon i \pi a$, $\eta \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa a$, the form $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma a$ on the other hand is the regular aor. 1., and with its future $\pi \epsilon \sigma o \nu \mu a \iota$ answers to $\epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma a$, $\pi \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \sigma \nu \mu a \iota$ and many others, in short to half the language. In this case therefore, where the anomalous $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \sigma \nu$ was in current use, the analogous but unusual $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma a$ (o $\nu \kappa \epsilon \nu \chi \rho \eta \tau \sigma \epsilon \iota$ $\tau \delta \epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma a$, Schol. Aristoph. Av. 840.) might very well remain as a not-discordant dialect in the Lyric poetry of the Iono-Attics, with quite as much reason as

Πιτνέω, I fall; aor. ἔπιτνον, infin. πιτνείν, part. πιτνών. Such appears to be the established formation of this verb by a comparison of some of the passages where it occurs; and thus it comes under the analogy of στυγέω, ἔστυγον and similar verbs, from the agrist of which arises a pres. in -έω: see κτυπέω. The accentuation however of πίτθω for πετνώ, of πίτνοντες, &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. Œd. Col. 1754. (Enarr. p. ccx1.) The only cases where the agrist appears to me evident, are those where we find επιτνον, επιτνε. Since however this agrist does not contain the simple root, which is much more conspicuous in the Pindaric $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\sigma\nu$ (see $\pi(\pi\tau\omega)$; the formation of the aor. $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\sigma\nu$, pres. πίτνω has in its favour the analogy of the aor. ἔδακον, pres. δάκνω. I do not therefore by any means reject the supposition that πίτνω and πιτνέω might have existed together (like βυνέω and βύνω, δυνέω and δύνω), without ἔπιτνον being therefore necessarily an imperfect; for ἔκλυον from κλύω is used by the same Tragedians as an aorist. And here in particular, where from mirvo arose a lengthened present mirvo, it ap-

the similarly analogous and equally unusual energy remained in the Æolo-Doric dialect. Now it is at least worthy of remark, that this is the only one of all those Alexandrine agrists 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 ἔπεσον, πέσοι to have intruded themselves as various readings, it was quite inconceivable that transcribers or correctors of the metre should have interpolated execa and néceie. For who has ever seen an instance of Christian transcribers having introduced into the tragedians or any of the Attic writers those other forms εἶδα, ἔλαβαν, 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 well-known passage of Herodotus 6, 21. the text formerly had es δάκρυα επεσαν τὸ $\theta \epsilon \eta \tau \rho o \nu$. I much fear, that when $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon$ was adopted from some of the manuscripts, the historian was deprived of an intended grammatical figure as well as of his dialect. Longinus (24, 1.) quotes this

passage as an instance of a collective singular used instead of a plural to elevate the diction. And certainly the expression, as It now stands in Herodotus, fully answers that purpose, as does also a passage quoted just before from Demosthenes, ή Πελοπόννησος άπασα διειστήκει. But the passage of Herodotus is so corrupted in Longinus that it contradicts the reason for its being quoted: the manuscripts have έπεσαν or έπεσον οί θεώμενοι. It will perhaps be said that the whole sentence has been corrupted, by the attempts made to explain it, from έπεσε τὸ θέητρον, which is now adopted as the text in Longinus also: this would be possible, if the reading had been only emeson; but how came the commentator or his corrupter by $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$? Let us now suppose that the old reading both in Herodotus and Longinus was ἔπεσαν τὸ θέητρον, and we then discover the corruption in each writer; in the former έπεσε, in the latter οἱ θεώμενοι. 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 agrists έχεσα and έχεσον, the confusion between which was not remarked until very lately.

pears very natural that a distinction should have been made between the aor. ἔπιτνον, and the imperf. ἐπίτνουν*.

Πίτνημι, Πιτνάω. See Πετάννυμι.

ΠΛ-. See Πέλω.

ΠΛΛ-. See Πελάζω and Πίμπλημι.

Πλάζω, I cause to wander, turn from its course: fut. $\pi\lambda$ άγξω; aor. 1. ἔπλαγξα. Pass. $\pi\lambda$ άζομαι, I am driven from my course, I wander about: fut. $\pi\lambda$ άγξομαι; aor. 1. ἐπλάγχθην. See also Πελάζω.

These tenses are formed as from a pres. $\Pi\Lambda\Lambda\Gamma X\Omega$; or, which comes to the same, $\pi\lambda\acute{a}\zeta\omega$ has $\gamma\gamma$ for its characteristic letter, like $\kappa\lambda\acute{a}\zeta\omega$ and

σαλπίζω.

Πλάσσω, I form; fut. πλάσω, &c. This verb, like πάσσω, πτίσσω, ἐρέσσω, βράσσω and βλίττω, has for its characteristic letter a lingual instead of a palatic, which is generally seen by a σ in the inflexion instead of ξ , γ , κ , or χ : see Αρμόττω. From the compounds $i\pi\nu\sigma\pi\lambda$ άθος, κοροπλάθος the characteristic letter would seem to be θ .

Πλέκω, I plat, weave: fut. πλέξω; aor. 1. midd. ἐπλεξάμην; perf. pass. πέπλεγμαι. The aor. 2. pass. is generally ἐπλάκην, but Bekker has always found in the best manuscripts of Plato ἐπλέκην: see Βλέπω.

Πλέω, İ sail: fut. πλεύσομαι, or more generally πλευσοῦμαι; aor. l. ἐπλεύσα; perf. πέπλευκα. The pass. takes σ; thus, perf. pass. πέπλευσμαι; aor. l. pass. ἐπλεύσθην.

This verb was still found in the older Attic writers in a resolved form: at least the instance of $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\nu$ (not $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\epsilon\epsilon$), in Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 27. has great weight; and in Thucyd. 4, 28. Bekker has followed the majority of the Codd. in retaining $\pi\lambda\epsilon\epsilon$. See note to $\Delta\epsilon\omega$, I want.

There is an Ionic form of this verb πλώω†, infin. πλώειν; fut. πλώσω; aor. 1. ἔπλωσα; perf. πέπλωκα. Euripides, who introduced this

* In the passage of Soph. CEd. Col. 1732. I consider the sense of $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\nu\epsilon$ to be evidently that of an aorist, though Reisig doubts it; for the imperfect can hardly be compatible with the meaning of $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$ - ϕ os (cadebat insepultus). On the other hand he appears to me to be perfectly right in his opinion that $\pi\iota\tau\nu\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ in Eurip. Supp. 691, is a present. But then

Hermann can read only πιτνούντων, of which he avails himself also in (προσπίτνοντες) Æschyl. Pers. 461. If my view of the subject be adopted, no change is necessary.

† [Homer seems to have used $\pi\lambda\dot{\omega}\omega$ with its derivatives more in the sense of to swim, and $\pi\lambda\dot{\omega}\omega$ with the meaning of to

sail .- Passow.]

perfect on the Attle stage (Hel. 539.), appears to have been ridiculed by Aristophanes (Thesm. 878.) for so doing. To this verb belongs also an Epic aor. 2. $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\omega\nu$, $-\omega s$, $-\omega$, $-\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, &c.; part. $\pi\lambda\omega s$, $\pi\lambda\omega\nu\tau\sigma s$; and its compounds $\tilde{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\omega\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\omega\nu$, $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\pi\lambda\omega\nu$ with their participles $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\iota\pi\lambda\omega s$, &c., II. ζ , 191. See $\tilde{\epsilon}\gamma\nu\omega\nu$, &c. under $\Gamma\iota\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$.

Πλήθω. See Πίμπλημι.

Πλήσσω, Att. $\pi\lambda'\eta\tau\tau\omega$, I strike: fut. $\pi\lambda'\eta\xi\omega$; perf. 2. (sometimes in a pass. sense) $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\alpha$; perf. pass. $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\mu\alpha$; aor. 2. pass. $\epsilon\pi\lambda'\eta\gamma\eta\nu$.

Beside the active and passive of this verb we find in Homer the middle also $(\mu\eta\rho\delta\nu \pi\lambda\eta\xi\dot{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon)$; 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 $\pi a\tau\dot{a}\sigma$ - $\sigma\omega$, 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 $\epsilon \kappa \pi \lambda \acute{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$ and $\kappa a \tau a - \pi \lambda \acute{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$, 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, $\check{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon \pi \lambda \acute{a} \gamma \eta \nu$, $\kappa a \tau a \pi \lambda a \gamma \mathring{\eta} \nu a$.

On the relative usage of πλήσσω and πατάσσω as laid down above, see Valcken. ad Act. Apost. 12, 7. and the passage of Lysias there quoted, πότερον πρότερον ἐπλήγην ἢ ἐπάταξα, 4, p. 102, 9.

The perfect however appears to have been an exception, which, as it could not be formed from $\pi a r \acute{a} \sigma \sigma \omega$ 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 $\pi \acute{e} \pi \lambda \eta \gamma a$: as in Aristoph. Av. 1350. So $\mathring{a} \nu \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \mathring{\eta} \gamma \eta$ rò $\nu \pi a \tau \acute{e} \rho a$ recorròs $\mathring{\omega} \nu^*$. In the later language the perf. $\pi \acute{e} \pi \lambda \mathring{\eta} \gamma a$ was used in a passive sense: see

much more natural to understand the accusative as the subject of the passive, a construction in which we cannot well use $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \epsilon \nu a \iota$ in Xenophon. I conjecture therefore that under $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \chi \epsilon \nu a \iota$ is concealed the true reading $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \chi \theta a \iota$



^{*} See also Xen. Anab. 5, 9, 5. This passage alone would however leave the point still problematical. The old reading is τὸν ἄνθρωπον πεπληχέναι, a form for which there are nowhere any grounds; with a various reading πεπληγέναι. But from the context it would be

έάλωκα under Αλίσκομαι; Stephan. Thes. in v.; and Oudend. ad Thom.

Mag. v. πεπληγώς, p. 703.

On $\epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma \eta \nu$ and $\epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu$ compare what has been said on "Αγνυμι, $\epsilon \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu$. We have only further to observe that Homer uses on account of the metre $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \gamma \eta \nu$, II. γ , 31.

The Epics have also an aor. 2. act. and midd. but only with the reduplication, as $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \rho \nu$, infin. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, and $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \epsilon \tau \rho$, in the same sense as $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \xi \alpha \nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \xi \alpha \tau \rho$.

From a rare sister-form πλήγνυμι Thucydides 4, 25. has ἐκπλήγνυ-

σθαι.

Πλύνω (\tilde{v}), I wash: fut. π λύν $\hat{\epsilon}$ ω, contracted π λύν $\hat{\omega}$; aor. 1. $\hat{\epsilon}$ πλυνα; perf. $\pi \hat{\epsilon}$ πλύκα; perf. pass. $\pi \hat{\epsilon}$ πλύμαι; aor. 1. pass, $\hat{\epsilon}$ πλύθην (\tilde{v})*. This verb is generally poetical.

Πνέω, poet. πνείω, I blow: fut. πνεύσω, later πνεύσομαι, more generally πνευσοῦμαι; aor. 1. ἔπνευσα, &c.; aor. 1. pass. ἐπνεύσθην.

There is no instance of a perf. pass. formed according to the above formation; the only one in use is the poetical $\pi \epsilon \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \mu a\iota$, with the force of a present and the particular meaning of to be inspired with wisdom, be wise, intelligent: hence perf. infin. $\pi \epsilon \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \sigma \theta a\iota$, and 2. sing. pluperf. (with the force of an imperf.) $\pi \epsilon \pi \nu \nu \sigma \sigma$, Od. ψ , 210. By the same formation come the Epic syncopated aor. 2. $\alpha \mu \pi \nu \bar{\nu} \tau \sigma$ for $\alpha \nu \epsilon \pi \nu \nu \tau \sigma$; the aor. 1. pass. $\alpha \mu \pi \nu \nu \nu \sigma \sigma$ for $\alpha \nu \epsilon \tau \sigma \sigma$ and the imper. aor. 2. act. $\alpha \mu \pi \nu \nu \sigma \sigma$ for $\alpha \nu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma$ used by the later Epics, as Quintus, &c.† On the aor. 1. pass. $\alpha \nu \tau \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma$ see Teirw.

Πνίγω, I choke: fut. midd. (with transit. meaning) πνίξομαι‡ or πνιξοῦμαι, and in Lucian πνίξω; aor. 1. ἔπνιξα, infin. πνῖξαι. Passive, I am being choked: fut. πνιγήσομαι;

• On the formation of the two perfects and the aor. 1. pass, see Τείνω.

† A more strict analogy would have given $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\nu\bar{\nu}\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\mu\pi\nu\bar{\nu}\theta\iota$, to which $\tilde{\epsilon}\mu\pi\nu\nu\epsilon$ bears the same relation as $\pi i\epsilon$ does to $\pi i\theta\iota$, only that $\tilde{\epsilon}\pi\iota\nu$ is actually in use.

Thas been stated rather hastily that the Doric πνιξούμαι 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: οἶον αὶ μύκαι άρ ἐπεσκληκότες πνιξεί-

σθε, Epicharm. ap. Athen. p. 60. Without attempting to restore the whole of this tetrameter, I shall content myself with amending what the language and sense require, oi μύκαι and ώπεσκληκότες (οἱ ἀπεσκλ.): and I therefore understand it as Stephens does, "you will poison (people) like dried mushrooms": which passage is at least an authority for the futmiddle; the probability of the Doric future πνιξούμαι having been used in the Attic dialect is strengthened by φευξούμαι, παιξούμαι. Lucian however (Contempl. 23.) has ἀποψνίξεις.

aor. 2. ἐπνίγην. The ι is long except in the aor. 2. pass., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 107.

ΠΟ-. See Πίνω.

Ποθέω, I long for, regret: Ionic and old Attic fut. ποθέσω, more generally ποθήσω, Xen. Mem. 3, 11, 3., also ποθέσομαι not only Ionic in Herodotus, but in Plato, e.g. Heind. Phædo, p. 98. a.; aor. 1. act. ἐπόθεσα, whence 3. plur. πόθεσαν, infin. ποθέσαι, Hom., and ἐπόθησα, Xen. and Isocr.; both forms of the aor. 1. are found in Herodot. 3, 36. 9, 22.; perf. πεπόθηκα; perf. pass. πεπόθημαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐποθέσθην.

Πονέω, I labour, suffer, is inflected regularly; thus, fut. π ονήσω, &c.: but when it signifies physical pain or suffering, it makes π ονέσω.

Such is the statement of the grammarians; see Chœrob. in Bekk. Anecd. in Ind.; where we find also quoted as an exception, $\pi\epsilon\pi\acute{o}\nu\eta\kappa\alpha$ $\tau\grave{\omega}$ $\sigma\kappa\acute{e}\lambda\eta$, Aristoph. Pac. 820.: but the probability is that the perfect is always formed with the η (whatever be its meaning) as in $\pi o\theta\acute{e}\omega$. The formation of $\pi o\nu\acute{e}\sigma\omega$, &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. πονέομαι, -ήσομαι in an absolute sense: see Homer passim.—Passow.]

Πορεῖν, to give, infin. of ἔπορον, a defective agrist used by the poets. [The indicative without the augment is found frequently in Homer;] the part. πορωίν in Æschyl. Prom. 954.; the infin. πορεῖν in Hesychius.

In Pind. Pyth. 2, 105. is an infin. $\pi \epsilon \pi o \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, but the majority of the manuscripts have $\pi \epsilon \pi a \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$. According to the former reading the word is an infinitive of the above verb with reduplication: but there is in Hesychius an old explanation of $\pi \epsilon \pi a \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu - \hat{\epsilon} \nu \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \xi a \iota$, $\sigma \eta \mu \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$, which appears to me to suit the sense of Pindar better; ostentare. See Beeckh. In this latter case it is therefore a solitary form of some lost verb*.

By the principle of the metathesis, as shown under $Ba\lambda\lambda\omega$ and $Ka\lambda\epsilon\omega$, we find that to the stem or root of $\pi o \rho \epsilon i \nu$ (with the sense of to impart, allot,) belongs the perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \omega \mu \alpha \iota$, I am allotted by fate, fated;

^{*} Perhaps this verb might have arisen $\pi \dot{\alpha} \rho \bar{\alpha}$ it is therefrom the sense of the preposition $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha}$, as

part. πεπρωμένος; whence 3. sing. pluperf. πέπρωτο, Hes. Th. 464. Compare Μείρομαι.

ПО-. See Πίνω.

Πέποσθε. See Πάσχω.

ΠΡΑ-. See Πιπράσκω and Πίμπρημι.

Πράσσω, Ep. and Ion. πρήσσω, Att. πράττω*, transit. I do, intransit. I am doing (well or ill), find myself in a certain state or situation: fut. πράξω, Ion. πρήξω; perf. πέπραχα; perf. 2. πέπραγα ; perf. pass. πέπραγμα, &c. In the older writers πέπραγα was the only perfect; afterwards arose the custom of using πέπραγα in an intransitive sense only, πέπραχα in a transitive. The α is naturally long.

The above usage may be gathered from the direction of the Atticists, who merely tell us that $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \gamma a$ is Attic, $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a \chi a$ common Greek: see Piers. ad Mær. p. 293. Phryn. App. Soph. p. 60. But the latter is found only in a transitive sense: e.g. in Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 42. Hell. 5, 2, 32. Anab. 5, 7, 29. Menand. Incert. 75. (see Meineke, p. 221.), and as a rejected various reading in Aristoph. Equ. 683. Against this usage, therefore, the assertion of the Atticists is directed: and it is now uncertain in this as in many similar cases, with what writers the objectionable usage began, and when it is to be attributed to transcribers.

Πρήθω. •See Πίμπρημι.

Πρίασθαι, to buy, infin. of ἐπριάμην, a defective acrist (according to the analogy of ἐπτάμην), used by the Attics instead of the obsolete acrist of ἀνέομαι; imperat. πρίασο

* [With the exception of the Tragedians, who always use πράσσω, Herm. ad Soph. Phil. 1435.—Passow.]

† That the perfect in -γa 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, κακῶν πέπραγα, εὖ πεπραγώς, ᾶc.; so that when it was wished to express the transitive sense in the perfect, they endeavoured to represent it by the other form, which is also agreeable to analogy. I do not think the above decision of the At-

ticists sufficient to warrant our positively asserting that this form was not used by

Xenophon.

† This is the meaning of the direction of Phrynichus, which is quite free from corruptions, though Lobeck (p. 137.) has misunderstood it. The grammarian directs that nothing of $\dot{\omega}\nu\dot{e}i\sigma\theta a\iota$ should be used, as a form of $\pi\rho\dot{\iota}a\sigma\theta a\iota$ may stand in its place. At the time this was said, no one could misunderstand it, as a pres. $\pi\rho\dot{\iota}a\mu a\iota$ was unheard of in the whole range of Greek literature, and $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\rho\iota\dot{a}-\mu \mu\nu$ was equally unknown as an imperfect. The only thing intended was to guard against some forms of $\dot{\omega}\nu\dot{e}i\sigma\theta a\iota$. The grammarian excludes therefore from

(Aristoph. Ach. 870.), or πρίω (id. Nub. 614.); opt. πριαίμην; conj. πρίωμαι; infin. πρίασθαι; part. πριάμενος. See Lobeck ad Phryn. pp. 137. 360.

Πρίω, \dot{I} saw, gnash (the teeth); imperat. $\pi\rho i\epsilon$, Aristoph. Ran. 927. The passive takes σ ; as, aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\rho i\sigma\theta\eta\nu$; perf. $\pi\dot{\epsilon}\pi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$.

The ϵ is undoubtedly long throughout all the inflexions of $\pi \rho i \omega$; and with this the σ in the passive agrees, according to the rule mentioned under $\dot{a}\rho \dot{\omega} \omega^*$; 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 later period†. See also Buttm. Lexil. p. 485.

Προΐσσομαι. See Καταπρ.

Προσελείν, Προυσελείν. See under Είλω.

Πρῶσαι, an infin. aor. of rare occurrence and of a rather uncertain character, supposed to be a contraction from $\pi\rho$ οῶσαι, and explained as an expression of the palæstra in Lucian. Asin. 10. where (ib. 9.) we find also the imperat. ἐπίπρωσον as an emendation of τ ρώσαs, and again of Straton. Epigr. 48., where the text has the part. π ρώσαs. Both Schneider and Passow derive it from π ροωθέω; fut. π ροωθήσω or -ώσω; aor. 1. π ροέωσα or ἐπρόωσα, contracted ἔπρωσα, infin. π ρῶσαι, &c.

Πταίω, I stumble: fut. πταίσω, &c. It takes σ in the passive, as perf. ἔπταισμαι, &c. See 'Αρόω and Πρίω.

ΠΤΑ-, ΠΤΕ-. See Πετάννυμι, Πέτομαι, Πίπτω and Πτήσσω.

Πτήσσω, I duck or drop the head from fear: fut. $\pi \tau \eta \xi \omega$, &c., is regular: perf. έπτηχα.

In Æschyl. Eum. 247. all the manuscripts have καταπτακών, which some have changed to κατεπτακώς, on account of the Hesychian gloss ἐπτακέναι, κεκρυφέναι. But the verse requires a short α; and an aor. 2. ἔπτᾶκον is quite analogous, as the majority of the cognate words, πτάκες, πτῶκες, &c., show κ to be the characteristic letter of πτήσοω. If, therefore, the gloss of Hesychius be genuine, this is the Dorio perf. 2. with

the Attic style the whole agrist $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}$ - $\mu\eta\nu$, and even the perfect $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\nu\eta\mu\alpha$ in cases where the agrist $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\rho\dot{\iota}\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ would supply its place. Compare Herodian Ed. Piers. p. 453.

* To the verbs mentioned under $\dot{\alpha}\rho\dot{\alpha}\omega$, as taking the σ in the passive, may be

added, ἀκούω, κελεύω, λεύω, θραύω, παλαίω, πταίω, πρίω, χρίω, βύω, ξύω, ὕω.

† See Pollux 7. c. 26. The instance in Plat. Theag. p. 124. a. is of sufficient antiquity, notwithstanding the spuriousness of the dialogue.

a long for $\xi\pi\tau\eta\kappa a$. Consequently the inflexion will run thus, $\pi\tau\eta\sigma\sigma\omega$; fut. $\pi\tau\eta\xi\omega$; aor. 1. $\xi\pi\tau\eta\xi a$; aor. 2. $\xi\pi\tau\alpha\kappa\sigma\nu$; perf. $\xi\pi\tau\eta\chi a$ and $\xi\pi\tau\eta\kappa a$.

We find in the poets other forms from a more simple stem or root IITA Ω ; as in II. θ , 136. $\kappa \alpha r \alpha \pi \tau \eta \tau \eta \nu$, 3. dual aor. 2. from $\tilde{\epsilon} \pi \tau \eta \nu$ (see $\tilde{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \nu$ under $\Gamma_i \gamma \nu \omega' \sigma \kappa \omega$), and a part. perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \eta \omega' s$ (see $Bai \nu \omega$), 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 ($\pi \epsilon \pi \tau -$) comes from the root HET-, as we have observed in a note at the end of $\Pi \epsilon \tau \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$.

Πτίσσω, I stamp (grain): fut. πτίσω; perf. pass. ἔπτισμαι. See Αρμόττω and Πλάσσω.

ΠΤΟ-. See Πίπτω.

Πτύρω, I make fearful: fut. πτυρῶ. Pass. πτύρομαι, with aor. 2. ἐπτύρην, I become fearful, said particularly of horses; infin. πτυρῆναι τὸν θάνατον.

Πτύσσω, I fold up: fut. $\pi \tau \dot{v} \xi \omega$, &c., is regular.—MIDD. [I fold or wrap (anything) round me, with accus. Aristoph. Nub. 267.—Passow.]

Πτύω, I spit: fut. πτύσω. The pass. takes σ, as perf. ἔπτυσμαι.

[It is written also $\psi i\omega$, whence the Latin spuo. The v is long in pres. and imperf., but short in fut., &c.: see Graefe Mel. 124, 7., yet in Theorr. 24, 19. and Apollon. Rhod. 2, 570. 4, 925. the v is short in the imperf., when the syllable following is short also; this is frequently the case in Nonnus.—Passow.]

Πύθω, I cause to rot: fut. πύσω; aor. 1. ἔπυσα, &c. Pass. I rot. The v is long throughout; yet Callimachus (Fr. 313.) has allowed himself to use πύσε for πῦσε with v short. Compare ἔπρεσε and ἔστάσαν.

Πυνθάνομαι, I inquire, learn by inquiry, depon. midd., forms its tenses from $\pi\epsilon i\theta$ ομαι*, which is still used by the Epic and Tragic poets; thus, fut. $\pi\epsilon i\sigma$ ομαι†; aor. $\epsilon \pi v$ - θi μην, [imper. $\pi v\theta$ οῦ, but Ion. with change of accent $\pi i\theta$ εν, Herodot. 3, 68., Epic opt. $\pi \epsilon \pi i\theta$ οιτο, infin. $\pi i\theta \epsilon$ - $\sigma \theta$ αι;] perf. $\pi \epsilon \pi v \sigma$ μαι‡, 2. sing. $\pi \epsilon \pi i \sigma$ αι, Plat. Protag. p. 310.

Like ἀνδάνω, λανθάνω, λαμβάνω, λαγχάνω, μανθάνω, and others: see note under Αἰσθάνομαι.

[†] Perhaps also πευσουμαι, see Brunck.

ad Eurip. Hippol. 1104. Æschyl. Prom. 987.

[‡] On the v of this perf. see note under $X \in \omega$.

b., Ερίς. πέπυσσαι, Od. λ, 494.; pluperf. ἐπεπύσμην. Verbal adj. πευστός, πευστέος.

Πυρέσσω, Att. -ττω, I am in a fever: fut. π υρέζω; aor. 1. έπύρεζα, &c., although it is derived from π υρετός. Compare έρέσσω.

Ρ.

'Paίνω, I besprinkle, forms the following tenses regularly: fut. ράνω; aor. 1. ἔρρανα; perf. pass. ἔρρασμαι.

In the Epic language we observe two irregular forms; 1.) the aor. 1. imper. $\dot{\rho}\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, Od. v, 150. and 2.) the 3. plur. perf. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\dot{\alpha}\delta\alpha\tau\alpha\iota^*$, Od. v, 354. pluperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\dot{\alpha}\delta\alpha\tau\sigma$, Il. μ , 431. That is to say, from the simple stem or root PA— were formed one derivative with its full complement of tenses— $\dot{\rho}\dot{\alpha}i\nu\omega$, and another very defective—PAZ $\Omega\uparrow$.

'Pάπτω, I sew : fut. ράψω, aor. 1. ἔρραψα ; aor. 2. pass. ἔρράφην.

[Nonnus has an irregular aor. ἔρραφε, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318.—Passow.]

'Pέζω, I do: fut. ρέξω; aor. 1. ἔρρεξα or ἔρεξα. This word is the same as ἔρδω, from which it is formed by transposing the two first letters; ἔρδω, fut. ἔρξω, aor. 1. ἔρξα; perf. ἔοργα; pluperf. ἐωργειν. Of the passive we find only ρεχθηναι, as ἔρχθην and ἔεργμαι are formed only πρου πρου χροκοι Vorbol adi πρου κροκοι γροκοι δουνία.

only from ἔργω, εἴργω. Verbal adj. ρεκτός, ρεκτέος.

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; consonants γ and δ , with which is connected that of γ to ζ occurring in other verbs, e.g. $\kappa\rho\acute{a}\zeta\omega$, $\kappa\rho\alpha\gamma\epsilon\imath\nu$. The next thing to be observed is, that the forms $\epsilon\rho\delta\omega$, $\epsilon\rho\xi\alpha$, with the subst. $\epsilon\rho\gamma\sigma\nu$, have the digamma in the old language, and that the aspirate which is joined with the ρ was frequently in the dialects changed into the digamma, for instance in the Æolic $\beta\rho\acute{o}\delta\sigma\nu$, i. e. wrodon for $\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\delta\sigma\nu$, a rose. We must therefore consider $\epsilon\rho\xi\alpha$ as werxai, $\epsilon\rho\xi\alpha$ as weworga,

† According to Apollon. de Adv. p. 600, 28. the fut. $\dot{\rho}a\nu\hat{\omega}$ was used by the Attics with a long; on white see $\Phi ai\nu\omega$.

^{*} Though there is neither δ nor ζ in the present to account for the δ in this form, yet there are sufficient grounds for it in the σ of $\delta\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$; for this perf. may be considered as the connecting link with a form in $-\dot{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, from which comes $\dot{\rho}\dot{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau$ e.

^{‡ [}Consonants are divided into aspirated, as θ , ϕ , χ ; smooth, a π , τ ; and middle, as β , γ , δ .]

in order to distinguish in them the same appearance as we find in δέρκω, δρακεῖν, δέδορκα*.

'PE-. See Εἰπεῖν.

'Pέω, I flow: fut. ρεύσομαι, Theogn. 448.; aor. 1. ἔρ-ρευσα; but these two forms are seldom found in the Attics (see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 739.), who generally use the fut. ρυήσομαι, the aor. 2. pass. (with an active sense) ἐρρύην, and the perf. ἐρρύηκα. This fut. and perf. are formed from the aorist.

We may easily conceive that a neuter idea like that of to flow may be understood in an active as well as passive sense, and it is therefore unnecessary to have recourse to a theme PYHMI in order to form ἐρρύην.

The part. ρεούμενος in an oracle in Herodot. 7, 140. ἰδρῶτι ρεούμενος, dropping with sweat, is merely a lengthening of the o in ρεόμενος, like μαχεούμενος for μαχεόμενος; and the various reading ρεεύμενος, introduced into the passage without the slightest authority, is therefore to be rejected.

'Pήγνυμι, I break: fut. ρήξω‡, fut. midd. ρήξομαι; aor. 1. ἔρρηξα, aor. 1. midd. ἐρρηξάμην; aor. 2. pass. ἐρράγην. All the above have a transitive meaning, in which, however, there occurs no perfect; but we find in an intransitive sense a perf. 2. ἔρρωγα, I am broken, with the change of vowel from η to ω: on which see note on ἀγήοχα under "Αγω, and ἐάλωκα under 'Αλίσκομαι.

[In Homer we find an Epic imperf. ρήγνυσκε for ἐρρήγνυ, II. η, 141. and in Arat. Dios. 85. an Ion. 3. plur. pass. ρηγνύατο. There is a sister-form of ρήγνυμι in II. σ, 571. ρήσσω, Att. ράσσω: this last, however, is particularly used as an expression of the palæstra, to throw to the ground, Jac. Ach. Tat. p. 821.—Passow.]

'Pīγέω, I shudder: fut. ριγήσω; perf. with the force of a pres. ἔρρῖγα. On the irregular Epic part. ἐρρίγοντι (Hes. Sc. 228), see κεκλήγοντος under Κλάζω, and πεφρίκοντας under Φρίσσω. [The word is solely poetical.—Passow.]

nounced; therefore wright is ῥέκτης. Compare Buttm. Lexil. p. 376.

^{*} 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-

^{† [}A pres. ρέομαι occurs also in the poets.—Passow.]

† Sec "Αγνυμι.

'Pιγόω, I freeze: fut. ριγώσω, &c. This word, like ἰδρόω, is contracted into ω and ω instead of the regular ου and οι; e.g. infin. ριγών, Aristoph. Vesp. 446. Av. 935. (yet we find ριγούν, Nub. 442.); dat. part. ριγώντι, Ach. 1145.; part. fem. ριγώσα, Simonid. De Mul. 29.; opt. ριγώνν, Brunck. Aristoph. Ach. 1146. Av. 935. Lucian De Luct. 11. Plut. Apophth. Lac. p. 233. a. Hippocr. De Sal. Diæt. 1.; conj. ριγώ, Plat. Gorg. p. 507. d. (p. 527. Heind.) with Buttm. notes. See also Piers. ad Mær. pp. 336. 339. All these are Attic forms.

'Pίπτω, I throw: fut. ρίψω, &c.; aor. 2. pass. ἐρρίφην. There are also two sister-forms ριπτέω*, ριπτῶ, from the former of which comes the imperf. ἐρρίπτεον, Herod. 8,53.; but the formation follows ρίπτω. The ι is long by nature (whence ρίπτε, ρίψαι), except in ἐρρίφην.

In Homer we find an Epic imperf. ρίπτασκον, -ες, -ε, like κρύπτασκον, the only two instances in Homer of a instead of ε, except perhaps the doubtful ἀγνώσσασκε, Od. ψ, 95. To these we must add ἀνασσείασκε, Hymn. Apoll. 403. and ροίζασκε, Hes. θ, 835. [A reduplicated infin. perf. pass. ρερίφθαι is found in Pind. Fr. 281.—Passow.]

'Polζασκε, Epic imperf., with the force of an aorist, from ροιζέω; see

the preceding paragraph,

'ΡΥ-. See 'Ρέω. 'Ρύομαι. See 'Ερύω. 'ΡΩΓ-. See 'Ρήγνυμι.

'Ρώννυμι or ρωννύω, I strengthen: fut. ρώσω, &c. (compare 'Αγνυμι, Κεράννυμι, Ζώννυμι): perf. pass. ἔρρωμαι (with the force of a pres.), I am strong, in health, [whence the pluperf. ἐρρώμην has the sense of an imperf., e.g. ἔρρωντο, Thucyd. 2, 8.]; imperat. ἔρρωσο, like vale, farewell: part.

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 $\dot{\rho}\iota\pi\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ and $\dot{\rho}i\pi\tau\omega$ to the Attic writers.—Passow.]

^{* [}The form $\dot{\rho}\iota\pi\tau\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ is found only in the pres. and imperf., and seems to bear the same relation to $\dot{\rho}\iota\pi\tau\omega$ 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-

ἐρρωμένος. The aor. 1. pass. is the only tense which takes the σ, as ἐρρώσθην.

'Ρώομαι, [an old Epic depon. midd.] I move with rapidity, rush, wave, Il. ψ, 367.: fut. δώσομαι; aor. 1. ἐδδωσάμην, Il. ω, 616. Od. ψ. 3. It is probably akin to δέω, as πλώω is to πλέω, χώομαι to χέω. [Some, however, connect it with δώννυμι, δώμη, δύομαι, δύμη and the Lat. ruo.—Passow.]

Σ .

Σαίρω, I brush, sweep away: fut. σαρω; aor. 1. ἔσηρα, part. σήρας, Soph. Ant. 409. No other tenses are in use.

Another form σαρόω, -ώσω 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 σαίρω, I know not. Lycophron (389.) has σαρούμενος.

From the same stem or root, but with a different radical meaning, comes a perfect, with the force of a present, σέσηρα, I grin; part. σεσηρώς, -υῖα, -ός, Theocr. 7, 19. Epic fem. σεσάρυῖα, Hes. Sc. 268.

Σαλπίζω, I blow the trumpet: fut. σαλπίγξω; aor. 1. ἐσάλπιγξα, II. φ, 388., but the later writers use σαλπίσω, ἐσάλπισα, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 191. So also the old subst. was σαλπιγκτής, the later one σαλπιστής. Compare Πλάζω and Συρίζω.

Σαόω. See Σώζω.

Σάω, an old form for $\sigma \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, I sift, whence 3. plur. $\sigma \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota$, Herodot. 1. 200.

Σβένννμι, or σβεννύω (Pind.), I extinguish: fut. σβέσω, less frequently σβήσομαι, Plat. Legg. 7. p. 805. c.; aor. 1. ἔσβεσα*; the perf. ἔσβηκα, and the syncopated aor. 2. ἔσβην, 1. plur. ἔσβημεν, opt. σβείην, infin. σβῆναι have the intrans. sense of the passive†. Pass. σβέννυμαι, I am extin-

[Passow, however, advises us not to be too hasty in condemning it, on account of the fut. $\sigma\beta\dot{\eta}\sigma\rho\mu\alpha\iota$.] † See note under $\text{Te}\dot{\nu}\chi\omega$.

^{*} The direction in Phryn. Appar. p. 16. that the aor. 1. act. should be written with an η , not with ϵ , appears to be an error. Aristophanes Plut. 668. has $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\sigma\beta\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha$ s.

guished, I die away, dry up; perf. ἔσβεσμαι; aor. 1. ἐσβέσθην. The passive therefore takes σ. On the formation of ἔσβην see ἔγνων under Γιγνώσκω: and on the intrans. sense of ἔσβην and ἔσβηκα see note under Τεύχω.

Strictly speaking, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\epsilon\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ 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 $\sigma\beta\hat{\epsilon}\nu\nu\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ serve for a pres. to $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\eta\nu$, $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\eta\kappa\alpha$, but also $\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ stands for $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\eta\nu$, only that this latter, or rather its compound $\tilde{\alpha}\pi\hat{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\eta\nu$, is by far the more common of the two.

In the Doric dialect ἔσβην takes an α, ἔσβαν, Theocr. 4, 39.

Σέβω or σέβομαι, I revere, is found only in the present, and in the aor. 1. pass. ἐσέφθην, I was filled with reverence, Soph. ap. Hesych. whence part. fem. σεφθεῖσα, Plat. Phædr. p. 254. b.

[The act. $\sigma \epsilon \beta \omega$, fut. $\sigma \epsilon \psi \omega$, is post-Homeric.—Passow.]

Σείω, I shake: fut, σείσω; aor. 1. ἔσεισα, &c.; perf. pass. σέσεισμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐσείσθην. For the Epic imperf. ἀνασσείασκε see ρίπτασκον under 'Ρίπτω.

Σεύω, I drive: pass. and midd. I hasten. This verb, like those beginning with ρ , doubles the first consonant in the augmented tenses, and retains it even in the perfect instead of the reduplication; e.g. imperf. ἔσσευον; imperf. pass. and midd. ἐσσευόμην; perf. pass. ἔσσυμαι*; aor. 1. pass. ἐσσύθην, Soph. Aj. 294. And having the σ thus doubled, it has none in the termination of the aor. 1. act. or midd., as ἔσσευα (see ἔκηα under καίω), ἐσσευάμην, part. σευάμενος, &c. The forms with one σ are of less frequent occurrence; ἐσύθην, Eurip. ἐξεσύθη, Hom. In this as in other cases, the Epic dialect rejects the augment entirely; as σεῦα, σεῦα, σεῦα.

The perf. pass. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\nu\mu\alpha\iota$, I am put in motion, has the meaning of, I am restless, eager for, as in II. ν , 79. Od. κ , 484. in which sense the particip. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\acute{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s (see $\check{\alpha}\kappa\eta\chi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s under ' $\Lambda\kappa\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\omega$) has the accentuation of a present, $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\acute{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s $\pi\sigma\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\sigma\nu$, II. ω . 404. According to this the pluperf. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\acute{\nu}\mu\eta\nu$ would have the force of the imperfect; but it coincides in form with the syncop. aor. (see $\check{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ in note under $K\tau\epsilon\acute{\nu}\nu\omega$) as in 2. sing. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\nu\sigma$ for $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\nu\sigma\sigma$, in 3. sing. $\check{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\nu\sigma$, Epic $\sigma\acute{\nu}\tau\sigma$, part. $\sigma\acute{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$; and the sense is therefore always that of an aorist. In the second

[•] On the change from the diphthong to the v of this perf. pass. see note under Xéw.

person of this pluperf. or aorist $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\nu\sigma$ (Il. π , 585.), the σ in the last syllable is rejected for the same euphonic reason as in $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu\sigma$.

We find also syncopated forms of the present; as 3. sing. σεῦται, Soph. Trach. 645. but most commonly with a change of vowel, σοῦμαι, σοῦται, Æschyl. Ch. 636. σοῦνται, Pers. 25., whence the imperatives used in common life, σοῦ, run, quick, Aristoph. Vesp. 209. or σοῦσο, σούσθω, σοῦσθω, αοῦσθω, αοῦσθαι*. [These forms are used only by the Attic poets.—Passow.]

And lastly to this place belongs the well-known Laconian ἀπέσσουα, he is gone, from Xen. Hellen. 1, 1, 23. explained to be an aor. 2. pass.

for ἀπεσσύη.

Σήπω, I make rotten or putrid. Pass. σήπομαι, I rot, putrefy, mortify; aor. 2. ἐσάπην; perf. act. (with the intrans. meaning of the pass.) σέσηπα.

Σίνομαι, Ion. σινέομαι, I harm, injure; a defective depon., used only in pres. and imperfect. The rare perf. σέσιμμαι is found in an inscription in a passive sense.

[We find, however, in Herodot. 8, 31. the aor. 1. midd. ἐσίναντο. The act. σίνω never occurs; and, except in the above-mentioned perfect and in Orph. Arg. 212., σίνομαι has never a passive sense.—Passow.]

Σκάπτω, I dig: fut. σκάψω; perf. pass. ἔσκαμμαι; aor. 2. pass. ἐσκάφην. The characteristic letter is therefore φ.

Σκεδάννυμι, or -ννύω, I disperse, scatter: fut. σκέδασω, Att. σκεδώ, -ᾱς, -ᾱ, Aristoph. Vesp. 229. but found also in Herodot. 8, 68. The passive takes σ, as perf. ἐσκέδασμαι; aor. 1. ἐσκεδάσθην.

Sister-forms of the above are σκίδνημι (compare κίρνημι from κεράννυμι), σκίδναμαι; and in the Epic poets, dropping the σ, κεδάννυμι, κίδνημι, like σμικρός, μικρός, &c. Apollonius and others have also κεδαίω: see δαίω. [Such a form as σκεδάζω appears to have never occurred.—Passow.]

* As σεῦται is indisputably a syncopated form, we class the others with it on account of the greater simplicity of the analogy; therefore σεύω, σοῦω σεῦται, σοῦται. Otherwise we may suppose a theme ΣΟΩ, particularly on account of σοῦ; as then σοῦσο would be from σόσμαι, soutr. σοῦμαι, like ζεύγνυσο from

ζεύγνυμαι. In case we adopt the syncope, σοῦσο will be quite regular, and σοῦ, 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 Λοῦω.

Σκέλλω, or σκελέω, I dry anything. But more frequently used in the pass. σκέλλομαι or σκελοῦμαι, I become dry: fut. σκλήσομαι; to which we must add (with the same intransitive sense of the passive) the active forms, aor. 2. ἔσκλην, opt. σκλαίην, infin. σκλῆναι; and perf. ἔσκληκα. See note under Tεύχω.

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 $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\lambda a$. But in the Epic writers we find forms of an aorist $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\eta\lambda a$, as opt. $\sigma\kappa\dot{\eta}\lambda\epsilon\iota\epsilon$, II. ψ , 191. conj., $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\iota\sigma\kappa\dot{\eta}\lambda\eta$, Nicand. Th. 694. These lead us to a theme $\sigma\kappa\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, which also exists, but which in the common language is a completely different verb from the above, signifying to scratch, scrape. So common, however, is the mutual change of the vowels a and ϵ , that we may with full confidence suppose a theme $\sigma\kappa\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ to have existed in the old Ionic dialect with the former meaning, as we find the a in the optative $\sigma\kappa\lambda\alpha\dot{\iota}\eta\nu$ (although known to us only from $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\sigma\kappa\lambda\alpha\dot{\iota}\eta$ in Hesychius), and we have therefore here the metathesis $\Sigma\kappa\Lambda\lambda$, $\Sigma\kappa\Lambda\lambda$, according to the analogy of $\beta\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\beta\dot{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$, $\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ $\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$ and many others.

Σκέπτομαι, I look around me, consider, (a depon. midd.) is inflected regularly. The Attics scarcely ever used the pres. and imperf., but generally σκοπῶ οτ σκοποῦμαι; on the contrary in the future always σκέψομαι, never σκοπήσω οτ σκοπήσομαι, as also in the aor. ἐσκεψάμην, and in the perf. ἔσκεμμαι, part. ἐσκεμμένος, Elmsl. Eurip. Heracl. 147. In this last-quoted passage it has its usual active signification, but in Demosth. Mid. p. 576, 27., and Erot. p. 1403, 21. it is used passively, although even in this writer its regular usage is active. Verbal adj. σκεπτέος.

The pres. and imperf. belong principally to the Epic language; e.g. $\sigma\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\pi\tau\epsilon\tau\sigma$, II. π , 361. imperat. $\sigma\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma$, II. ρ , 652. Theogn. 1091. $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$, Apoll. Rhod. In the older Attics I have found $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ in Plat. Lach. p. 185. and $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\pi\tau\epsilon\tau\sigma$ in Thucyd. 8, 66. (see however the note below.) In the later writers these tenses are found more frequently, as in Lucian, &c.*

^{*} The above account of the genuine Attic usage of this verb does not, it is true, rest on any statement of the old

Grammarians; but that the great rarity of the pres. $\sigma\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is not accidental, is proved by the very frequent occurrence

An aor. 2. pass. ἐσκέπην is found in the LXX, as in Numb. 1, 19. ἐπεσκέπησαν, they were numbered.

Σκοπέω, or σκοποῦμαι, idem. It is used only in the pres. and imperf.: all the other tenses are supplied by σκέπτομαι; which see.

Σκώπτω, I joke, make a joke of: fut. midd. σκώψομαι, Elmsl. Aristoph. Ach. 278. 844. [aor. 1. ἔσκωψα; and in Aristoph. Nub. 296. Reisig has restored to the text the act. fut. σκώψω. Compare Comm. Crit. de Soph. Œd. C. 398.—Passow.]

Σμάω, Ion. σμέω, I smear, anoint: fut. σμήσω, Dor. σμάσω; aor. 1. midd. ἐσμήσαμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐσμήχθην; verbal adj. σμηκτός. These two last are formed from a sister-form σμήχω, (fut. σμήξω, aor. 1. ἔσμηξα, &c.,) used by the Epics and in the later language: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 253. The present is contracted to σμῶ and inflected in η, as σμῆς, σμῆ, &c., infin. σμῆν; (see πεινάω) nor do σμᾶς, σμᾶν, &c., ever occur before the time of Lucian; Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 61.

Σοῦμαι. See Σεύω.

Σπάω, I draw: [fut. σπάσω; aor. 1. ἔσπασα; perf. ἔσπακα; perf. pass. ἔσπασμαι; aor. 1. midd. ἐσπασάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐσπάσθην.] The a is short in all the tenses.

Σπεῖν, &c. See "Επω.

Σπείρω, I sow: [fut. σπερω; aor. 1. ἔσπειρα; perf. 2. ἔσπορα; perf. pass. ἔσπαρμαι;] aor. 2. pass. ἐσπάρην with a short.—ΜIDD.

of ἐσκεψάμην, σκέψομαι, ἔσκεμμαι, σκοπῶ, σκοποῦμαι (compounds as well as simple), coupled with the decided defectiveness of the forms of σκοπεῖν in -ἡσω, and -ῆσαι, of which I nowhere find any mention. Instances where σκέπτομαι formerly stood in the text may be seen in Sturz. Lex. Xenoph, in voc.; these require the particular examination of the critic. In the passage of Thucydides, all the manuscripts have τὰ ἡηθησόμενα

πρότερον αὐτοῖς προυσκέπτετο. There is no objection here to the imperfect as a tense, but as the imperf. of a depon. in a pass. sense, it excites suspicion. If now we read προῦσκεπτο, 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.

Σπένδω, I pour oùt: fut. σπείσω; aor. 1. ἔσπεισα; perf. ἔσπεικα, Plut. Sertor. 14.; perf. pass. ἔσπεισμαι.

[Homer has the Ionic imperf. σπένδεσκε and the aor. σπείσασκε, as also the Ep. 2. sing. conj. pres. σπένδησθα, Od. δ, 591.—Passow.]

 $\Sigma \tau \acute{a} \zeta \omega$, I drop: fut. $\sigma \tau \acute{a} \xi \omega$, &c. Compare Βαστάζω, Διστάζω.

Στείβω, I tread, tread upon: [fut. στείψω; aor. 2. ἔστί-βον;] aor. 2. pass. ἐστίβην, Soph. Aj. 883.

Στείχω, I stride, march: fut. στείξω; aor. 1. ἔστειξα; aor. 2. ἔστίχον. [The word is solely Poet. and Ion.]

Στέλλω, I send: [fut. στελώ, Ep. στελέω; aor. 1. ἔστειλα; aor. 1. midd. ἐστειλάμην; perf. ἔσταλκα; perf. pass. ἔσταλμαι; pluperf. ἐστάλμην;] aor. 2. pass. ἐστάλην; and in the poets aor. 1. ἐστάλθην.

In Herodot. 7, 89. we find a 3. plur. pluperf. ἐσταλάδατο, which however is perhaps nothing more than an old error for ἐστάλατο, occurring in Hes. Scut. 288.

Στενάζω, I groan: fut. στενάξω, &c. Compare Στάζω, Βαστάζω, Διστάζω.

Στένω, I sigh, is used only in pres. and imperf. *.

The poets (Æschyl. and Eurip.) use also a pass. στένομαι, Ερίς στείνομαι, in the sense of I am narrow, full.

Στέργω, I love, am contented with: fut. στέρξω, &c.; perf. 2. ἔστοργα, Herodot. 7, 104.

Στερέω, I deprive, bereave: fut. στερήσω, but also στερέσω, Schæf. Schol. Par. Apollon. Rh. 1, 850. Jacob. Anthol. Poet. pp. 680. 711. whence the infin. aor. στερέσω, Od. ν, 262. This verb is complete and regular in all its tenses in its compound ἀποστερέω, which, beside the more general idea of to deprive, has oftener the more immediate sense of to take away; e. g. fut. ἀποστερήσω; aor. 1. ἀπεστέρησα, &c.: pass. ἀποστεροῦμαι; aor. 1. ἀπεσ

^{* [}Reisig conjectures that we should 1710.—Passow.] read a fut. στενεί in Soph. Œd. Col.

στέρηθην; with the fut. midd. ἀποστερήσομαι. In the simple verb the pres. in general use is στερίσκω, στερήσω, ἐστέρησα, &c.; and in the passive στερούμαι οr στερίσκομαι, privor, I lose; fut. στερήσομαι; perf. ἐστέρημαι; aor. I. ἐστερήθην.

A particular form is $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o \mu a \iota$ with the meaning of I am in the state of a person deprived of anything, I am without it. [In prose this form is used only in pres. and imperf.—Passow.]

We must not confound, as is too commonly done, this στέρομαι with στερούμαι or στερίσκομαι. The meaning of στερόμενοs is always deprived, that of στέρεσθαι to be deprived; so that these forms would be considered as an acrist of the principal verb, if the indic. pres. did not occur in the same full meaning in Xen. Symp. 4, 31. νῦν δ' ἐπειδὴ τῶν ὑπερορίων (of my foreign property) στέρομαι καὶ τὰ ἔγγεια οὐ καρποῦμαι: see also Anab. 3, 2, 2.

The poets have also from $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \mu a \iota$ the part. agr. 2. pass. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon i s$, synonymous with $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$ and $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \epsilon i s$.

Whether the simple verb στερῶ, στεροῦμαι occurs as a pres. in the old Attic writers I cannot venture to assert positively in the present imperfect state of our catalogues of Greek verbs. In Lucian and others it is, at least in the passive, not uncommon. But in Xen. Anab. 1, 9, 13. πολλάκις δ' ἢν ἰδεῖν καὶ ποδῶν καὶ χειρῶν καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν στερουμένους ἀνθρώπους, the sense requires στερομένους, deprived.

Homer seems to have inflected στερέω with the ε, for he has the aor. 1. infin. στερέσαι, Od. ν, 262. The fut. ἀποστερεῖσθε for ἀποστερήσεσθε, which occurs in the old Atticism, (Andocid. Myster. extr.) is

to be explained by the same inflection.

Στεῦται, 3. sing. pres. and στεῦτο, 3. sing. imperf., Epic defective deponent. The above forms occur frequently in Homer in the sense of he gives to understand, promises, threatens: and we find the 3. plur. στεῦνται once in Æschyl. Pers. 49. in the same sense. At Od. λ, 584. στεῦτο δὲ διψάων, in a description of Tantalus, Passow derives it from ἴστημι, and translates it in its literal sense, he stood, but Voss renders it, he strove, endeavoured.

Στηρίζω, I fix: fut. στηρίσω; aor. l. ἐστήριξα; aor. l. midd. ἐστηριξάμην; perf. pass. ἐστήριγμαι; pluperf. ἐστηρίγμην. Compare Βαστάζω, Διστάζω.

Στίζω, I prick: fut. στίξω; aor. l. ἔστιξα; perf. pass. ἔστιγμαι. See the preceding.

Στορέννυμι, I spread, strew, abbrev. στόρνυμι, and by metathesis στρώννυμι; so also in the formation*, fut. στορέσω οτ στρώσω (Att. παραστορώ, Aristoph. Equ. 484.); aor. 1. ἐστόρεσα οτ ἔστρωσα; in the other tenses the usual forms are perf. pass. ἔστρωμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐστρώθην; verbal adj. στρωτός.

Hippocrates uses καταστορεσθήναι; see Foes. Œc. Hippocr.: and Hesychius explains ἐστορέσθη and ἐστορήθη by ἐστρώθη†.

Στρέφω, I turn (transit.); fut. στρέψω; perf. 2. ἔστροφα, Theognet. Conv. Athen. 3. p. 104. c. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 578. perf. pass. ἔστραμμαι (like τέτραμμαι and τέθραμμαι, with a instead of ε‡); aor. 1. pass. ἐστρέφθην (compare Ἐτρέφθεν under Τρέπω); aor. 2. ἐστράφην.

The aor. 1. pass. ἐστράφθην occurs in the Doric dialect of Theocr. 7, 132. I know of no authority for a pres. στράφω; compare τράπω, τράφω. In II. σ, 546. στρέψασκον is 3. plur. aor. for ἔστρεψαν.

Στυγέω, I fear, hate, is regular. The perf. ἀπεστύγηκα has the force of a present, Herodot. 2. 47.

From an obsolete stem $\Sigma TY\Gamma\Omega$ or $\Sigma TYZ\Omega$ Homer has the aor. 2. $\xi \sigma \tau \nu \gamma \rho \nu$; and an aor. 1. $\xi \sigma \tau \nu \xi \alpha$, opt. $\sigma \tau \nu \xi \alpha \iota \mu \iota$, Od. λ , 502. with the causative meaning of to make terrible; which latter form is however again used by the later poets, e.g. by Apoll. Rh. 4, 512., in its original sense.

Συρίζω, Att. συρίττω, I pipe: fut. συρίξω, more frequently and purer Attic συρίξομαι, Non-Attic συρίσω, Dor. συρίσδω; see Hemsterh. Aristoph. Plut. p. 229. The aor. 1. infin. συρίσαι is found in Lucian. Harmon. 2. Compare Βαστάζω and Διστάζω.

Σύρω, I draw, drag along. Pass. σύρομαι; aor. 2. ἐσύροην.

^{*} Compare 'Αγνυμι and Κεράννυμι.
† Stephens in his Thesaurus quotes κατεστόρηντο from Herodot. 8, 53., where

however the text has κατάστρωντο without any various reading. ‡ See note on τέτραμμαι under Τρέπω.

Σφάζω, Att. σφάττω, [I cut the throat, slaughter, offer up in sacrifice: fut. σφάξω; aor. 1. ἔσφαξα; perf. pass. ἔσφαγμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐσφάχθην, Herodot. 5, 5. and Pind.] but in the Attic writers generally aor. 2. ἐσφάγην, part. σφάγείς. Compare Βαστάζω, Διστάζω.

Σφάλλω, I deceive: [fut. σφἄλω̂; aor. 1. ἔσφηλα, infin. σφῆλαι; aor. 2. ἔσφαλον, Pind.; perf. pass. ἔσφαλμαι;] aor. 2. pass. ἐσφάλην.

Σφίγγω, I tie together, fasten together: fut. σφίγξω; perf. pass. ἔσφιγμαι, (but 3. sing. ἔσφιγκται,) infin. ἔσφιγξαι, &c.

Σφύζω, I beat (as the pulse does), palpito: fut. σφύξω, &c. Compare Στάζω, Στίζω, &c.

Σχάζω, I drop, open: fut. σ χάσω, &c. This verb has in the older language a pres. in -άω, as σ χάω, infin. σ χ $\hat{q}\nu$: imperf. $\hat{\epsilon}\sigma$ χων; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 219.; but in the formation the α is always short.

[Both the act. and midd. voices of this verb have a transit. and intransit. meaning; in the former it seems connected with $\xi\chi\omega$, $\sigma\chi\dot{\epsilon}\theta\omega$, $\delta\sigma\chi\omega$. An Alexandrian form $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\dot{\alpha}\zeta\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu$ for $\ddot{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\alpha\zeta\sigma\nu$ is found in Lycophr. 21.—Passow.]

Σχείν, εσχον, εσχεθον. See Έχω.

Σώζω, I save: fut. σώσω, old Attic σώω; aor. 1. ἔσωσα; perf. pass. Att. σέσωμαι, otherwise generally σέσωσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐσώθην.—. ΜΙDD.

There is perhaps no instance whatever in the Epic writers of the pres. $\sigma\omega\zeta\omega$. In the other tenses they use the resolved form only, as fut.

^{* [}Hence the part. σώοντες, Od. ι, 430. and the Ionic imperf. σώεσκον, Il. θ, 363. Apoll. Rhod. has also σώετε, and the midd. σώεσθαι.—Passow.]

⁺ Bekker has in many cases restored the old form from the manuscripts.

[†] The single occurrence of $\sigma \omega \omega \nu$ in Od. ϵ , 490. is most likely a false reading for $\sigma \omega \omega \nu$, as we find at ι , 430. $\sigma \omega \omega \nu \tau \epsilon$: and in Hes. ϵ , 374. $\sigma \omega \omega \tau$ are rejected reading. Among the Alexandrine Epics Apollon. Rhod. has invariably $\sigma \omega \omega$, &c.

σαώσω; aor. 1. ἐσάωσα; aor. 1. pass. ἐσαώθην; fut. midd. σαώσομαι; and in the present beside σώω, &c., a shortened form of it; as, conj. σύης, σύη, σύωσιν, Il. ι, 393. 424. 681. But the resolved form is seldom found in the present in the Epic writers; gaoî. Theogn. 868. Bekk. and Callim. Del. 22. σαοῦσι*, Tyrt. 2, 13. The imperative would therefore be σάου, and the imperf. (ἐσάουν) 3. sing. ἐσάου, σάου, and so the imperative is written in the manuscripts and in the text of the common editions in the following passages; Hom. Hymn. 12. (13.) Callim. Epigr. 35. Theodorid. Epigr. 4. Epigr. Adesp. 179. But Homer has $\epsilon \sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega$, $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega$, Il. ϕ , 238. π , 363. as the 3. sing. imperf., and $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \omega$, Od. v, 230. p, 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 σάω. Besides it has been already mentioned under ναιετάω, that this form is lengthened in the same anomalous manner as ναιετάωσα; that is to say from έσάου, σάου came έσω, σω; which contraction, instead of being resolved into -ow according to general analogy, was changed to -aw.

In an Attic inscription in Corp. Inscr. Gr. T. 1. p. 107. no, 71. stands legibly Σ OO, while the context requires the fut. $\sigma \omega \sigma \omega$: that form must therefore be read $\sigma \omega \omega$, which is the same old future as the Epic $\epsilon \rho \omega \sigma \omega$, $\tau \alpha \nu \omega \sigma \omega$, and which had therefore left its traces in the Attic language: see $\epsilon \kappa \gamma \epsilon \gamma \omega \sigma \tau \omega \omega$ under $\Gamma \epsilon \nu \omega \omega$, and the end of the article on $E \rho \omega$.

T.

TA-. We must suppose this stem or root on account of the old imperative $\tau \hat{\eta}$, take! here! (in French tiens!) to which belonged also a plural $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ (Sophron. ap. Schol. Aristoph. Ach. 204.), formed according to the analogy of $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$, &c.

Akin to the above is another stem or root TAT-,† from which Homer

has a redupl. part. aor. 2. τεταγών, seizing.

That the supposition of a stem or root TA- for the formation of $\tau \epsilon$ - $\tau \alpha \kappa \alpha$, &c. from $\tau \epsilon i \nu \omega$ is grammatically unnecessary, although there may be etymological grounds for it, is shown under $T \epsilon i \nu \omega$. See also an account of all above-mentioned forms in Buttm. Lexil. Art. $T \epsilon \tau \alpha \gamma \omega \nu$, p. 503. et sqq.

TAΓ-. See TA- (TAΩ). Taλάω. See Tλάω.

gave rise to the adoption of a form σάω. † Compare ετμάγην under Τέμνω (τέτμηκα).

^{*} The false reading $\sigma\acute{a}ov\sigma\iota$, and the similar error of $\sigma\acute{a}o\iota$ (amended by Bekker in the above-quoted passage of Theognis)

Τανύω, I stretch out, strain: fut. τανύσω; perf. pass. τετάννσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτανύσθην. The Epic fut. in -ύω*, τανύουσι occurs in Od. ϕ , 174. In Il. ρ , 393. we find a 3. sing. pres. τάννται, as formed from τάννμαι. The ν is short in all the tenses, so that Homer, in order to lengthen it, doubles the σ .

Ταράσσω, Att. ταράττω, I disturb: fut. ταράξω[†], &c. Its inflexion is regular.

This verb has a sister-form of less frequent occurrence, 1.) in the Attics $\theta \rho \acute{a}\tau\tau \omega$ with long a, whence the neut. part. $\tau \grave{o}$ $\theta \rho \acute{a}\tau\tau \sigma \nu$: the pres. was used in prose, the aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon}\theta\rho a \xi a$, infin. $\theta \rho \acute{a}\xi a$ by the poets. 2.) in the Epic writers the perf., with an intransit. sense, $\tau \acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\eta\chi\alpha$, I am agitated, stormy.

Τάσσω, Att. τάττω, I set in order, arrange: fut. τάξω; perf. pass. τέταγμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτάχθην; aor. 2. (less frequent) ἐτάγην. Midd. τάσσομαι, &c.; aor. 1. ἐταξάμην.

Ταφείν and ταφήναι. See Θάπτω and ΘΑΦ-.

Tείνω, I stretch out, extend (anything): fut. τενώ; aor. 1. ἔτεινα; perf. τέτἄκα; perf. pass. τέταμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτάθην. See TA-, and Τανύω.

This verb with $\kappa\lambda\ell\nu\omega$, $\kappa\rho\ell\nu\omega$, $\kappa\tau\epsilon\ell\nu\omega$, and $\pi\lambda\ell\nu\omega$ drop the ν in the perf. act., perf. pass., and aor. 1. pass., and take the short vowel of the future; the two verbs in $-\epsilon\ell\nu\omega$ changing also the ϵ to α . When we observe that $\epsilon\ell\omega$ and $\ell\ell\omega$ and $\ell\ell\omega$ belong, both in form and meaning, to $\ell\omega$ and $\ell\omega$ (not $\ell\omega$), that $\ell\omega$ belong, both in form and meaning, to $\ell\omega$ and $\ell\omega$ (not $\ell\omega$), that $\ell\omega$), that $\ell\omega$ and $\ell\omega$ must come from $\ell\omega$ and $\ell\omega$, there being no trace of a pres. in $-\nu\omega$ for either, and that $\ell\omega$ comes from $\ell\omega$, $\ell\omega$, $\ell\omega$, $\ell\omega$. &c., we may conclude that the above five verbs also ($\ell\omega$) came originally from roots which according to the more general analogy would be pure, and that another present was afterwards formed by the very common insertion of the ν . But as in these five verbs the ν is carried on to the future,

^{*} See the end of the article on $\Sigma \omega \zeta \omega$, and the references there given.

^{† [}Thucyd. 7, 36. has the fut. midd. ταράξομαι in a passive sense.—Passow.]

which is not the case with the other anomalous verbs in $-\nu\omega$, and there exists also a plain analogy between these and other verbs which have for their characteristic letter λ , μ , ν , or ρ , particularly in the change of the vowel ϵ to α ; it seems to me a more grammatical and more practical arrangement to join them thus with each other and with the verbs in $-\nu\omega$, than to refer certain tenses to such themes as KPI Ω , TA Ω , &c., by which the number of verbal anomalies would be unnecessarily increased.

Teίρω, I rub out (attero), wear out, torment, is used only in pres. and imperf. Toρεῖν and Τέρσομαι must be considered as distinct stems or roots, which, although akin to each other, have been separated by usage. See both in their places.

sage. See both in their p

TEK-. See Τίκτω.

Τελέω, I finish, complete, fulfil: fut. τελέσω*, τελέω (II. θ , 415.), and Att. τελώ, Plat. Protag. p. 311. b.; in the passive also τελεύμενα (Herodot. 3, 134.) is a future. See Δέμω and Καλέω. Pass. τελέομαι; fut. τελέσομαι; perf. τετέλεσμαι; aor. l. pass. ἐτελέσθην.

[Homer has also the aor. 1. act. $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$, $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$, of which Herodotus uses the infin. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$. We find also in Homer the Epic pres. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega$ both in the act. and pass. voice.—Passow.]

Τέλλω, an old verb†, occurring only in its compounds, which may be found in the Lexicons; e. g. ἀνατέλλω, ἐπιτέλλω, &c. It is inflected regularly according to the analogy of verbs having as their characteristic letter λ , μ , ν , or ρ ; and in the passive has only the aor. 1.—ΜΙDD.

[Passow gives the following inflection: τέλλω; fut. τελω, Æol. τέλ-σω; aor. 1. ἔτειλα, Æol. ἔτελσα; perf. pass. τέταλμαι; pluperf. ἐτετάλ-μην; aor. 1. ἐτάλθην. Midd. τέλλομαι; aor. 1. ἐτειλάμην.]

Τέμνω, *I cut*: fut. τεμῶ; aor. 2. ἔτεμον and ἔταμον; perf. τέτμηκα‡; perf. pass. τέτμημαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτμή-θην; 3. fut. τετμήσομαι, whence ἐκτετμήσεσθον, Plat. De Rep. 8. p. 564. c.—Midd.

In Il. ν, 707. τέμει is a solitary instance of a pres. τέμω; and so it is

‡ The part. perf. τετμηώs is found in

Apoll. Rhod. 4, 156. in a passive sense. See κεκορηώς under Κορέννυμι, and κεκμηώς under Κάμνω.

^{* [}In Homer, where the metre requires it, $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega$.—Passow.] + See the note on $T\lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$.

considered by Heyne: but Wolf and Passow read $\tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \hat{i}$ as a future. The common form however in both Epic and Ionic writers is $\tau \hat{a} \mu \nu \omega$; yet the aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau a \mu o \nu$ is found in the Attics, and was probably one of the older Atticisms, e. g. Thucyd. 1, 81. Eurip. Hel. 1240.

An Epic sister-form is $\tau\mu\eta\gamma\omega$; aor. 1. $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\mu\eta\xi\alpha$; aor. 2. $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\mu\alpha\gamma\nu$; aor. 2. pass. $\hat{\epsilon}\tau\mu\dot{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu$. See also $T\dot{\epsilon}\tau\mu\nu\nu$.

Τέρπω, I delight: fut. τέρψω; aor. 1. ἔτερψα, &c. This verb is regular.

The pass. τέρπομαι, I am delighted, satiated, has in the Epic language three varieties of the aorist; viz. ἐτέρφθην (Od. θ, 131.); ἐτάρπην (II. λ, 779. whence the infin. ταρπῆναι, ταρπήμεναι); and ἐταρπόμην (whence the conj. ταρπώμεθα, II. ω, 636.) or with redupl. τεταρπόμην, τετάρπετο, τεταρπώμεσθα, τεταρπόμενοs. But the aor. 1. pass. is found likewise in many passages of Homer with a change of vowel, e. g. τάρφθη, Od. τ, 213. τάρφθεν, ζ, 99.: for this however there are not sufficient analogical grounds; and as there is still less foundation for imagining that these two forms were used indifferently for each other in the same poem, it is possible that the one with the change of vowel might have been an impure dialect foisted into Homer's text at some very early period*.

Three times (II. γ , 441. ξ , 314. Od. θ , 292.) Homer has $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon i \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$, which is aor. 2. conj. pass. for $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$, and formed according to the analogy of verbs in μ_i , that is like $\theta \epsilon i \rho \mu a_i$ from $\tau i \theta \eta \mu_i$, or $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \rho \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ from $\sigma \tau \mu \mu_i$. But in the above passages the verb comes from $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi \omega$, not from $\tau \rho \epsilon \pi \omega$, by the same metathesis as in $\xi \pi \rho \alpha \theta \nu \nu$: see $\Pi \epsilon \rho \theta \omega \uparrow$.

Τέρσομαι, I become dry, depon. pass.; aor. 2. pass. (ἐτέρσην) infin. τερσῆναι, τερσήμεναι, Il. π , 519. Od. ζ , 98. The active voice does not occur in any ancient writer, but in its stead we find, in a causative sense, Τερσαίνω, I make dry, dry up, (regularly inflected) whence aor. 1. ἐτέρσηνα Il. π , 529.

At Il. π, 519. we find τερσηναι to become dry, and at v. 529. τέρσηνε

from $\tau \rho \acute{\epsilon} \pi \omega$, grounded on grammatical construction, is correct. To which we may add that Homer in such a sense (to turn oneself toward) never uses $\tau \rho a \pi \dagger \nu a t$ but $\tau \rho a \pi \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$; while on the other hand we meet with the same expression $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \rho \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ $\phi t \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \tau \eta \tau t$ at Od. ϵ , 227. In the passage of Od. θ , 292, we must join $\epsilon \acute{\nu} \nu \eta \theta \acute{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon$ $\lambda \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \rho \sigma \nu \acute{\epsilon} c$, like $\dot{\epsilon} s$ $\theta \rho \acute{\epsilon} \nu \sigma \nu$ $\dot{\epsilon} c$ and the like

^{*} Indeed the use of the two forms $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho - \phi \theta \eta \nu$ and $\epsilon \tau \acute{a} \rho \pi \eta \nu$, 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 $\tau \acute{a} \rho - \phi \theta \eta$ (for which indeed at Od. τ , 213. some have read $\tau \acute{a} \rho \pi \eta$,) is a mixture of the two genuine old readings above-mentioned.

[†] Heyne's objection to the derivation

he made dry; hence the two forms, thus standing in evident relation to each other, have been generally considered as infinitive and indicative of the same verb, with no other difference than that of sense. Now as $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta \nu e$ can be nothing but an aor. 1. act., $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ would then be the infinitive of the same tense, with an immediate or neuter meaning. But $\tau \epsilon \rho - \sigma \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ (Od. ζ , 98.), which exactly corresponds with it, is clearly an aor. passive*.

Nicander (Ther. 96. 693. 709.) has some forms of an aor. $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma a$ for $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta \nu a$; and again in Theorr. 22, 63. I would, rather on account of the context, consider $\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon \iota$ to be a future than a present. If this be so, and these forms of Nicander, like others of the same poet, were not made by himself, they come probably from $\tau \epsilon \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \omega$, I dry up (see the last note); fut. $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \omega$; aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma a$.

Τετάγών. See TA-.

... Τετευχησθαι, to be armed, Od. χ, 104. a perfect derived from the subst. τεύχεα. Compare Ἐσθημένος.

Τετίημαι. See TIE-.

Τέτμον, ἔτετμον, I found, hit upon, attained: a defective agrist, of which we find no other tense than the conj. τέτμης, η, Od. ο, 15. The analogy of ἔπεφνον and ἐκεκλόμην appears to lead us to a theme ΤΕΜΩ, which however being totally different in meaning from ΤΕΜΩ the stem or root of τέμνω, must be kept distinct from it, at least by the Grammarian.

[Of this latter root we find ἐτέτμετο in Orph. Arg. 366. which, as well as ἔτετμον, Passow forms from an obsolete pres. τέτμω.]

Τετραίνω. See Τιτράω.

Τεύχω. The two following cognate verbs must be kept distinct from each other.

1. Τεύχω, I prepare: a poetical word, regularly inflected, as fut.

* It is true that there is no other instance of an aor. 2. pass. in $\sigma\eta\nu$; but this arises only from there being in the common language no verb with σ as its characteristic. This aorist is therefore quite regular; and consequently to suppose an intransitive active $\text{TEP}\Sigma\Xi\Omega$, to which these infinitives might belong according to the analogy of $\phi\rho\rho\bar{\eta}\nu\alpha t$, $\phi\rho\rho\bar{\eta}_{\mu\nu\alpha t}$, would be to increase unnecessarily the number of themes. Besides these forms must then be in the present, synonymous with $\tau\dot{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\varepsilon\sigma\theta\alpha t$, 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

τέρσεσθαι with τείρειν by means of a future and an aorist of this verb according to the analogy of κείρω ἔκερσα (compare 'Αλέξω), must be pronounced incorrect, because the σ in τέρσεσθαι is in the root through the Ionicism of $\rho\sigma$ for $\rho\rho$, as shown by the derivative subst. $\tau\alpha\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\dot{\phi}$ s and $\tau\alpha\rho\sigma\dot{\phi}s$, and the Lat. torreo. Nor is there so immediate an agreement between the meanings of $(\tau\dot{e}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\omega)$ τ $\dot{e}\rho\sigma\omega$, I dry up, and $\tau\epsilon\dot{\rho}\omega$, I rub off, which latter may indeed have been pronounced in the Æolic dialect $\tau\dot{e}\dot{\rho}\dot{\rho}\omega$ also (see Greg. Cor. in Æol. ii.), as to justify the grammarian in joining both verbs under the same inflexion.

τεύξω; aor. 1. ἔτευξα; perf. τέτευχα; perf. pass. τέτυγμαι*; fut. 3. τετεύξομαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐτύχθην†. Verbal adj. τυκτός οτ τευκτός.

2. Τυγχάνω, I happen, chance to be, hit upon: fut. τεύξομαι; aor. 2. ἔτυχον; perf. τετύχηκα. On the formation of these tenses from τεύχω see notes under Πυνθάνομαι and Αίσθάνομαι: and on the derivation of τετύχηκα from ἔτυχον (without having recourse to a new theme τυχέω) see 'Ακαχίζω and note.

The meaning of τυγγάνω, έτυγον is that of the passive of τεύχω with an intransitive immediate force. That is to say τετύχθαι very frequently means in the Epic poets to be fated, destined, brought on by circumstances, whence τετύκται is much the same as έστί, for which was afterwards used τυγχάνει ών or τυγχάνει; and ἐτύχθη in Il. β, 320. (θαυμάζομεν, οδον έτύχθη) had precisely the same meaning as ετυχεν in prose. Thus ἔτυγέ μοι τοῦτο, this happened to me, was much the same as έτύχθη μοι: compare II. λ, 683. οὔνεκά μοι τύχε πολλά, because much had happened to me, with ρ, 704. μεγάλη δὲ πόθη Πυλίοισιν έτύχθη, was prepared for them, was their lot: and sometimes in this as in other cases the relation is reversed, έτυχον τούτου, I obtained that as my lot, whence comes the meaning of to obtain, light upon, find. In a similar way it is easy to distinguish in the two aorists of the same theme, erevea and erver, 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 hoesha and ήριπον, in έφυσα and έφυν t, and in others: e. g. θεοί κακα κήδεα έτευξάν μοι (Od. a, 244.) and κακὰ κήδεα έτυχε μοι, like τύχε μοι πολλά.

With this aor. 2. is connected also, according to the analogy given in the last note, the perf. act. from the same simple form, $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \chi \alpha$. This was the true Ionic perfect of $\tau \nu \gamma \chi \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, e. g. in Herodot. 3, 14. extr., which in a later period became frequent in the non-Attic writers, as in Aristot. Eth. 3, 14. Polyb. 1, 81: see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 395. Nay, the part. of this perfect occurs in Homer in a completely passive sense

πέφυκα, I am produced, I grow.

[•] On the change of the diphthong to v, see note under $X \in \omega$.

[†] See the end of Art. on $\Lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega$.

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,

φύω, φύσω, έφυσα, I produce, -- έφυν.

The same may be observed of $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\nu$ and $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\alpha$, of $\epsilon\delta\nu\nu$ and $\delta\epsilon\delta\nu\kappa\alpha$, of $\epsilon\sigma\beta\eta\nu$ and $\epsilon\sigma\beta\eta\kappa\alpha$, of $\epsilon\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\nu$ and $\epsilon\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$ (in $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega$), of $\epsilon\sigma\kappa\eta\nu$ and $\epsilon\rho\eta\rho\iota\pi\alpha$. Again by usage $\tau\epsilon\tau\nu\alpha$ belongs not to $\tau\epsilon\nu\chi\omega$, but to $\tau\nu\chi\chi\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$; and the Epics join $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\phi\alpha$ with $\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\phi\nu$.

in Od. μ , 423. βοὸς ρίνοῖο τετευχώς, "made of cow-hide:" of which similar instances may be seen in a note under Αλίσκομαι. For the perf. of τεύχω in an active sense, there is no genuine undisputed authority*.

From ἔτυχον, τυχεῖν were formed (according to the analogy of ἤκαχον, ἀκαχεῖν, ἀκαχήσω, ἤκάχησα: see ᾿Ακαχίζω and note) a new aorist and perfect, precisely synonymous with those above-mentioned, viz. ἐτύχησα and τετύχηκα, of which the aor. 1. remained in Epic usage, while the perfect became the Attic and common form.

The same uncertainty which is found in the vowel of $\tau \nu \kappa \tau \acute{o}s$, $\tau \epsilon \nu \kappa \tau \acute{o}s$, appears to have existed also in the aor. 1. pass.; at least in Anacr. 10. $\tau \acute{o} \tau \epsilon \nu \chi \theta \acute{e}\nu$ is the better accredited reading. Perhaps it was wished to distinguish $\acute{e}\tau \epsilon \acute{\nu} \chi \theta \eta \nu$ with the proper sense of $\tau \epsilon \acute{\nu} \chi \omega$, from $\acute{e}\tau \acute{\nu} \chi \theta \eta \nu$, which has in all other instances a neuter meaning.

The Epic language has another aorist, always found in a reduplicated shape, the aor. 2. τετυκεῖν, Midd. τετυκέσθαι, and corresponding in meaning with τεῦξαι, τεύξασθαι, to prepare: see Od. o, 94. Il. a, 467. The κ comes from the Ionic dialect (see Δέκομαι), and is retained in this old form, which may be compared with κεκαδεῖν under Χάζω.

• In II. v, 346. the reading of most of the manuscripts, and, until very lately, of the text also, was τετεύχατον in the sense of to prepare. But as the perfect cannot possibly stand in that passage, the other reading τετεύχετον, 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 - τον for - την, such a form as τετεύχω for τεύχω or τέτευχον for ἔτευχον 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 (ἐτεύχετον for erevyerny), is the only true one. That is to say, as the termination in - TOV of this imperfect, though not without parallel cases (II. κ , 364. σ , 583.) in the old Epic poetry, was yet contrary to the common rules of grammar established at a later period, the word was first altered to a supposed present $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu$, and then to a perfect, which, as far as regarded formation, was a correct one. The present Scholium of this verse is most corrupt; that at II. κ , 364. attributed to the Alexandrines, and containing the Scholiast's opinion of this dual in all three passages, reads indeed in the one before us $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu$, but it can only be rendered consistent with itself by our reading there also $\dot{\eta} \rho \dot{\omega} \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \sigma \nu \dot{\nu} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \chi \sigma \nu \nu$.

† See also Stephan. Thesaur. in ἀποτυγχάνω, and Lex. Seguer. (Antiatt.) p. 79., where the still more astonishing form ἀποτετύχηται is explained by ἀπο-

τέτευκται.

With this τετυκέσθαι is joined in the same Epic language a new present τιτύσκομαι, like λάσκω from λακείν, ίσκω from είκω. At Il. 6. 342, this form has plainly and without force the meaning of revyery, to prepare (fire); and so it was understood by the ancients, as the usage of Apollonius proves, who uses it (4, 248.) in the sense of "to prepare the sacrifice." The active voice is found in the Alexandrine poets, as in Arat. 418. Antim. Fr. 26. Lycophr. 1403. Opp. Hal. 2, 99. Compare Ruhnk. Epist. Crit. p. 38. At the same time this form belongs also to the other meaning, that of τυγχάνω; for τιτύσκεσθαί τινος (Il. v. 159.) to aim at any one, bears the same relation to Tuyelv Tivos, to hit any one, as ἀποδιδράσκει, he runs away (spoken of one who may still be caught), does to ἀπέδρα, he escaped, or as captare does to capere, and the like*.

· Τόσσαι for τυχεῖν, see in its alphabetical place.

Τήκω, I melt, soften, (trans.): fut. $\tau \eta \xi \omega$, &c. Pass. $\tau \eta$ κομαι, with aor. 2. ἐτάκην (α), and perf. τέτηκα, I melt, (intrans.): see ἔαγα, &c., under "Αγνυμι, and note under Τεύχω.

TIE-, whence τετίημαι, I am vexed, of which we find only the 2. dual. τετίησθον, Il. θ, 447. and the part. τετιημένος, Il. λ, 555. In the same sense Homer uses also the active form τετιηώς, -ότος, Il. ι, 30. λ, 554. Compare κεκαφηώς, κεκμηώς, βεβαρηώς, &c.: see also βεβαώς under Baivw.

Τίκτω, I bring forth, pario†: fut. τέξω‡, more generally τέξομαι; aor. 2. ἔτεκον; perf. τέτοκα, part. τετοκώς, -υία, -óc, Hes. ϵ , 593.

* Modern critics have attempted to connect this verb with τιταίνω, by deducing the idea of taking aim from that of drawing tight the string of the bow, and because at Il. θ, 41. ὑπ' ὅχεσφι τιτύσκετο is used of attaching the horses to the chariot, i.e. straining or drawing tight the But independently of the two verbs (τιταίνω and τιτύσκω,) being similar only in appearance, the similarity vanishes entirely between τείνω and τιτύσκω; nor can τιτύσκεσθαι πῦρ be explained by means of this deduction without very unusual force; and as for the idea of the horses straining or stretching the traces, it does not correspond with any Greek or Latin expression whatever,

for Homer uses τιταίνειν ἄρμα in the sense of the horses drawing along the chariot. Τιτύσκεσθαι in the above passage is therefore only a slight deviation from τεύχειν, with the sense of to set in order, make ready, and hence the Greek commentators unanimously explain it by έτοιμάζειν.

+ [Sometimes also, I beget, Eurip. Suppl. 1092. in which sense Homer very frequently uses the middle voice, Il. β , 742.—Ed.]

1 Decisive authorities for this active form in the Iambic trimeter of the Attics will be found in Aristoph. Thesm. 509. Eurip. Tro. 742. Æschyl. Prom. 868.

The perf. pass. τέτεγμαι and aor. 1. pass. ἐτέχθην 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, τέτογμαι occurs in Synes. Epist. 141. The middle voice, with the same meaning as the active, is poetical only; τίκτεται, Æschyl. ap. Athen. p. 600. b. aor. 2. ἐτεκόμην, τέκετο, τεκέσθαι, Hom. [The aor. 1. τέξασθαι is found in some editions of Hes. θ, 889., but perhaps the better reading is τέξεσθαι. The aor. 1. act. ἔτεξα is very rare, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 743.—Passow.]

A fut. infin. τεκεῖσθαι (as from τεκοῦμαι) is found in Hymn. Ven. 127., but I think τεκέσθαι would suit the syntax of the passage quite as well, in which case τεκεῖσθαι might be an old correction. The form τεξείεσθε, Arat. 124., which must be explained by supposing a fut.

τεξοῦμαι, τεξείομαι, is very suspicious*.

Τίλλω, I pluck, tear up; fut. τἴλω; aor. 1. ἔτιλα; perf. pass. τέτιλμαι.—Μιρρ. This verb is inflected like κρίνω.

Τίνω, τίννυμι. See Τίω.

Τιτράω, I perforate: fut. τρήσω; aor. 1. ἔτρησα. We have also a sister-form Τετραίνω, fut. τετρανῶ, aor. 1. ἐτέτρηνα, Aristoph. Thesm. 18., but in Theophr. ἐτέτρανα†. This latter verb, which is properly nothing more than a strengthened form of the other, became the general one in Attic usage. The perfects are however always taken from the radical form, thus perf. act. τέτρηκα, perf. pass. τέτρημαι, Herodot. 4, 158.—Μιdd.

The aor. $\epsilon r \epsilon \tau \rho \eta \nu a$, formed contrary to the general rule of verbs in $-a i \nu \omega$ (see $K \epsilon \rho \delta a i \nu \omega$), is an Ionicism which remained in the Attic language. Authorities from Theophrastus for $\epsilon \tau \epsilon \tau \rho a \nu a$ may be seen in Stephan. Thesaur. The form $\tau \iota \tau \rho a i \nu \omega$, wherever found, is a corruption.

Τιτρώσκω, I wound: fut. τρώσω, &c. Perf. part. pass. τετρωμέναι νέες, injured, Herodot. 8, 18.

The stem or root of τιτρώσκω is in the verb τορεῖν, (as ΘΟΡ- is the root of θρώσκω, BOP- of βιβρώσκω,) by the well-known metathesis detailed more at length under Βάλλω, Θνήσκω, and Καλέω. But as the

+ We find also in Hippocr. De Nat.

Puer. c. 4. an Ionic form $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\dot{\eta}\nu\omega$, which Passow pronounces to be a false reading for $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\dot{\iota}\nu\omega$.

^{* [}Passow is of opinion that Buttmann has not sufficient grounds for suspecting these two forms.]

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, τρώω, τρώεις; but only once, and then in the general sense of to hurt or injure, Od. φ, 293.

Τιτύσκω. See Τεύχω.

Tiw. As usage has separated the two following verbs, it will be better to do the same.

Τίω, I honour, is solely poetical, and quite regular; e.g. fut. τίσω; aor. 1. ἔτισα, &c.; perf. pass. τέτιμαι, Il. v, 426. Od. v, 28., &c.

Tίνω, I pay or suffer (the penalty of an offence), forms, like the preceding, a fut. τίσω; aor. 1. ἔτισα, &c.; perf. τέτικα; but the Attics make the ι short in all the tenses, and the pass. takes σ, as perf. τέτισμαι; aor. 1. ἐτίσθην. Midd. τίνομαι, I punish (a person), avenge (a thing): fut. τίσομαι; aor. 1. ἐτισάμην.

According to the general analogy of verbs in $-i\nu\omega$, the Epics have the ι long in $\tau i\nu\omega$ and all its tenses. The Attics, on the contrary, generally use it short: see, as instances of $\tau i\nu\omega$, Æschyl. Prom. 112. Soph. Œd. Col. 1203. Eurip. Or. 7.; and of $\tau i\sigma a\iota$, Aristoph. Eccl. 45. Vesp. 1424. The ι of the present is also short in the Doric dialect of Pindar (Pyth. 2, 44.); in the early time of Solon (5, 31.), as well as in that of the later Epigrammatists, Jac. Anthol. Poet. p. 823. On the other hand, the fut. and its derivative tenses have the ι long in Pind. Ol. 2, 106., in the Anapæsts of Aristoph. Eccl. 656. 663., in the Iambic Trimeter of Soph. Trach. 1113. Phil. 1041. and in a lyric passage of Aj. 182.; see Reisig. Comm. Crit. de Soph. Œd. Col. p. 220.

We find an Ionic sister-form of the pres. τίνω in τίννυμι, τίννυμαι, written in the Attic poetry τίνυμαι with ι short, Eurip. Or. 313*.

Τληναι, to bear or suffer, bear up manfully, venture, dare. Of this verb there is neither present nor imperfect: fut. $\tau\lambda\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$; perf. $\tau\epsilon\tau\lambda\eta\kappa\alpha$; aor. 2. $\epsilon\tau\lambda\eta\nu$, imper. $\tau\lambda\eta\theta\iota$, opt. $\tau\lambda\alpha\eta\nu$, infin. $\tau\lambda\eta\nu\alpha\iota$, part. $\tau\lambda\alpha\sigma\alpha$, $\tau\lambda\alpha\sigma\alpha$, $\tau\lambda\alpha\nu$. Compare $\epsilon\gamma\nu\omega\nu$, &c., under $\Gamma\iota\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$.

These forms are used both in poetry and prose, while the defective tenses are supplied from the verbs of similar meaning $i\pi o \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega$ and

^{* [}Passow objects to the writing of this form with $\nu\nu$, and prefers $\tau i\nu\nu\mu\iota$ in all cases, with the ι long in the Epic, and

short in the Attic writers, like τίνω.]

† The conjunctive is not in use.

ἀνέχομαι. Τέτληκα is a regular perfect, and used as such in Aristoph. Plut. 280., but the poets have formed from it (with the force of a present,) the following syncopated forms; perf. plur. τέτλαμεν, τέτλατε, τετλάσι, dual τέτλατον; imper. τέτλαθι, τετλάτω, &c.; opt. τετλαίην*; infin. τετλάναι (ἄ), τετλάμεν and τετλάμεναι; part. τετληώς, -ότος; pluperf. plur. ἐτέτλαμεν, ἐτέτλατε, ἐτέτλασαν, dual ἐτέτλατον, ἐτετλάτην. The Epic language has also an unusual aor. 1. ἐτάλασα, ἐτάλασσα†, Il. ρ, 166., whence conj. ταλάσσω, -ης, -η, Il. ν, 829. ο, 164., and in a later period we find a fut. ταλάσσω, Lycophr. 746.

TM-. See Τέμνω and Τέτμω.

Τμήγω. See Τέμνω.

Τορεῖν (Hesych.), to pierce, stab; aor. 2. ἔτορον, a defective aorist, Il. λ, 236., and (of less frequent occurrence,) aor. 1. ἐτόρησα, part. τορήσας, Hymn. Merc. 119. A pres. τορέω is nowhere found. [There are also traces in Hesych. of a reduplicated aor. τέτορον explained by τρῶσαι.—Passow.]

The same idea of piercing lies in τετορήσω, 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 τορεύω (Thesm. 986.)‡.

Τόσσας, Dor. τόσσαις, an aor. part. synonymous with τυχεῖν, Pind. Pyth. 3, 48., compare Bœckh. var. lect. p. 456. Beside the above we find only the compound ἐπέτοσσε, part. ἐπιτόσσαις, Pind. Pyth. 4, 43. 10, 52.

Τραπείω. See Τέρπω. Τράπω. See Τρέπω.

 $T\rho\epsilon\mu\omega$, I tremble, is used only in the pres. and imperf.

Τρέπω, I turn: fut. τρέψω; aor. 1. ἔτρεψα; aor. 1. midd. ἐτρεψάμην; aor. 1. pass. ἐτρέφθην; aor. 2. ἔτραπον; aor. 2. pass. ἐτράπην; aor. 2. midd. ἐτραπόμην; perf. 2. τέτροφα§

* The conjunctive is not in use.

† There is no doubt of the verb $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ having had in the older language the meaning of to bear, traces of which we see in the Lat. tollo and tuli. Now $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} - \nu \alpha t$, $\tau \lambda \alpha i \eta \nu$ have the same relation to $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$, as $\sigma \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha t$, $\sigma \kappa \lambda \alpha i \eta \nu$ have to $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$. In the course of time forms disappeared, and the meaning became modified, but was still quite perceptible in $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha t$ and tollo. The simple meaning of to bear remained only in tuli. The present $\tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ disappeared entirely as a simple verb; in its compounds, in which

it has the aor. 1. ἔτειλα, the original sense is most evident in ἐπιτέλλειν.

† As $\tilde{\epsilon}\mu\mu\rho\rho\rho\nu$ comes from $\mu\epsilon i\rho\omega$, so is $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau o\rho\rho\nu$ indisputably the aorist of a stem or root TEP-, which may be compared etymologically with $\tau\epsilon i\rho\omega$, although this latter cannot in its precise meaning be joined grammatically with $\tau o\rho\epsilon \bar{\imath}\nu$. Hesychius has preserved forms of the reduplicated aorist $\tau \epsilon \tau o\rho\rho\nu$ ($\tau \epsilon \tau o\rho\epsilon \nu$, $\tau \epsilon \tau \delta \rho \eta$), but which are explained by $\tau \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha \iota$. See $T\iota\tau \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$.

§ See note under $K\lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \omega$. This $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \rho \phi \alpha$ is found in Aristoph. Nub. 858. in

and $\tau \acute{e}\tau \rho a \phi a$; perf. pass. $\tau \acute{e}\tau \rho a \mu \mu a \iota^*$.—Midd. Verbal adj. $\tau \rho e \pi \tau \acute{o}c$, and with the sense of the middle voice $\tau \rho a \pi \eta \tau \acute{e}oc$. With regard to the aorist, $\tau \rho \acute{e}\pi \omega$ is the only verb which prefers the aor. 2. to the aor. 1. in all three voices: still, however, the latter is used in each voice to express certain deviations of meaning; but this is a subject for the Lexicons.

A very singular instance of the aor. 2. midd. in a passive sense is found in Plat. Cratyl. p. 395. d. ἡ πατρὶς αὐτοῦ ὅλη ἀνετράπετο.

In this verb, as in $\sigma\tau\rho\acute{e}\phi\omega$ and $\tau\rho\acute{e}\phi\omega$, the a of the perf. pass. is not carried on to the aor. 1. excepting in the Ionic and Doric dialects \uparrow : thus the Attics use $\dot{\epsilon}\tau\rho\acute{e}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, $\tau\rho\acute{e}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, $\tau\rho\acute{e}\phi\theta\acute{e}is$, Xen. Ven. 12, 5., but Herodotus (4, 12. 9, 56.) has $\dot{\epsilon}\tau\rho\acute{a}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, $\tau\rho\acute{a}\phi\theta\acute{e}is$. At the same time it is difficult to form a decided judgement on this point, as Herodotus has not only a pres. $\tau\rho\acute{a}\tau\omega$, but also (3, 155.) $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\rho\acute{a}\psi\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, and (4, 202.) $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\acute{e}\tau\rho\acute{a}\psi\acute{e}$; though in all these instances the reading is uncertain \ddag . Compare $\sigma\tau\rho\acute{e}\phi\omega$.

We find in a multiplicity of verbs, as in $\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \rho \mu a \iota$, $\delta a \rho - \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \mu a \iota$, &c. certain tenses formed from the aor. 2. (see ἀκαχήσω and note under ᾿Ακαχίζω): but in the verb before us, as well as in κτείνω, we have instances of a present so formed, e.g. ἐπιτραπέουσι, Il. κ, 421. We must here bear in mind that $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \dot{\epsilon} \omega$, I tread (the grapes), is a very different verb. See $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \dot{\epsilon} \iota \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ under Τέρπω. [We find also in Homer an imperat. perf. pass. $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \partial \omega$, Il. μ , 273., an Epic 3. sing. of the pluperf. pass. $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \alpha \pi \tau \iota$, and the Epic and Ionic 3. plur. of the perf. and pluperf. pass. $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \alpha \tau \sigma$.—Passow.]

Andocid. Myster. p. 17, 13. Ald. and in Soph. Trach. 1009.; but it is probable that at a very early period, in order to avoid confusion with τέτροφα from τρέφω, it was changed to τέτραφα, although from the uncertainty of the readings it is difficult to ascertain with any degree of accuracy when this change took place. We find, for instance, in Demosth. Pro Cor. 324, 27., in the same passage quoted by Longin. 32., and in Æschin. c. Timarch. p. 179. Ctesiph. p. 545. ἀνατέτραφα always accompanied by the various reading άνατέτροφα, which latter Reiske has adopted in his text. Again in Dinarch. c. Demosth. pp. 23. 73. and c. Philocl. p. 93. we find τέτραφα, but without any various reading hitherto discovered.

* This a is peculiar to the three per-

fects passive of τρέπω, τρέφω and στρέφω: in κλέπτω also usage fluctuates between κέκλεμμαι and κέκλαμμαι. See Etym. M. νος. ἐπιτετράφαται, and Not. Crit. ad Aristoph. Vesp. 57. et ad Athen. 9. p. 409. c.

† [Passow adds the Epic language of Homer, and quotes $\epsilon \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \theta \eta \nu$ from Od. o, 80. but the reading seems to be un-

certain .- Ed.]

‡ However singular it may appear that in the Ionic dialect the verb should be inflected $\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega$, $\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\omega$, yet this is by far the most common mode of inflexion in our copies of Herodotus: see Schweigh. in $\dot{e}\pi\iota\tau\rho$: nay, in the two passages quoted above we find $\dot{e}\pi\iota\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\sigma\nu\tau\alpha$ and $\dot{e}\pi\acute{e}\tau\rho\acute{e}\psi\acute{e}$ in very excellent manuscripts.

Τρέφω, I nourish: fut. θ ρέψω*; aor. 1. ἔθρεψα; perf. 2. τέτροφα (see τέτροφα and note under Τρέπω); perf. pass. τέθραμμαι (see τέτραμμαι and note under Τρέπω), infin. τεθράφθαι†; aor. 2. pass. ἐτράφην: verbal adj. θ ρεπτός.

The stem or root of this verb had both the immediate sense to become fat, large, strong, and the causative one to make fat, &c. From this latter comes the common meaning; the former occurs in the Epic language, but only in the aor. 2. $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\phi\sigma\nu$ and the perf. $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\sigma\phi\alpha$, according to the rule laid down in the note under $T\epsilon\nu\chi\omega$: and undoubtedly these two forms had in that Epic language this intransitive meaning only, but in a later period the perfect took the causative sense also, as we see it in Soph. Œd. Col. 186. Alcæ. Messen. Epigr. 18. (Anal. 1. p. 490.), and Polyb. 5, 74., while the aor. 2. ($\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon$, Il. ϕ , 279. $\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\tau\eta\nu$, ϵ , 555. $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $-\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$, η , 199.) became obsolete. That is to say, when in this as in other similar verbs, that neuter meaning to become large, grow up, began to be expressed in the present by the passive voice (see Il. ι , 143.), it soon spread to the aor. and perf. passive: and thus we find, even as early as Homer, the forms $\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\phi\eta$, $\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$, and $\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\nu$ or $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\nu$ for $\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\phi\eta\alpha\alpha\nu$.

* Among the laws which regulate the Greek aspirates, we may observe the following; that where two successive syllables begin each with an aspirate, one of the aspirates, generally the first, is changed to the tenuis of the same organ: and when by any formation the second disappears, the first is restored. Thus, the root of this verb is $\Theta PE\Phi_-$, whence $\tau \rho \acute{e}\phi \omega$, and again $\theta \rho \acute{e}\psi \omega$.

† Not τέτραφθαι, which belongs to τρέπω, and which, though found in all the manuscripts in Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 24. (17.), must nevertheless be a corruption. Τέθραφθε in Plat. Legg. init. is the correct reading. Compare τεθάφθαι under

θάπτω.

‡ [Yet in Callim. Jov. 55. we find

ετραφες for ετράφης.—Passow.]

§ Of the passages in which these passive forms are now found, we must first reject Il. β , 661. where the old reading $T\lambda\eta\pi\delta\lambda\epsilon\mu\sigma$ s δ' èreì σὖν $\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\phi'$ èvì $\mu\epsilon\gamma\dot{\alpha}-\rho\sigma$ ts è $\ddot{\nu}\pi\dot{\gamma}\kappa\tau\sigma$ ts was first changed by Barnes to $\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\phi\eta$ èv, to the injury of the rhythm, and at the same time in opposition to almost all the manuscripts; for not one has $\tau\rho\dot{\alpha}\phi\eta$ èv 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 $(\gamma, 201. ^{\circ}\text{Os } \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta} \mu \phi$, and λ , 122. $^{\circ}\text{Os } \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\eta} \kappa y$), which those grammarians did not attempt to reconcile, and in which we ought 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. τράφεν, for instance, liad taken the place of τράφον, and that the original reading of the two passages quoted above was "Os τράφεν εν δήμφ, and "Os τράφ' ενί θρήκη. This conjecture is much strengthened by the circumstance, that the remaining passage, of which the emendation is not so easy, ('Aλλ' ὁμοῦ, ὡς ἐτράφημεν ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισιν, 11. ψ, 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 Æschines (c. Timarch. p. 21.), has this striking difference, 'Ωs ὁμοῦ ἐτράφεμέν περ ἐν ὑ. δ. Surprising as this latter form is, we see at once

The present with the radical vowel α , $\tau \rho \acute{a} \phi \omega$, is exclusively Doric, as in Pind. Pyth. 2, 82. 4, 205. Isthm. 8, 88. (7, 40. Bæckh.)*

Τρέχω, I run, forms its future like τρέφω (see note under that verb); thus fut. θρέξομαι; aor. 1. ἔθρεξα: but by far the more common future comes from a very different stem or root, fut. δραμοῦμαι†; aor. 2. ἔδραμον; perf. δεδράμηκα.

The forms ἔθρεξα, θρέξομαι 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, μεταθρέξομαι (see Fischer ad Well. 3. p. 182. Herm. ad Nub. 1005.) and περιθρέξαι, 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, τράχω: see Bœckh on Pind. Pyth. 8, 34.

The perf. δεδράμηκα; is formed from the aor. 2. ἔδραμον according to the analogy described in note on ἀκαχήσω under Άκαχίζω. The fut.

that, with the mere additional insertion of dé after 'Os required to connect it with the context, this was the old and genuine reading of the verse: instead of which some grammatical Diaskeuastes removed the ws from its natural place, where it answered to the corresponding "Ωs δὲ καὶ ὀστέα, and sacrificed the méo which served to exalt the comparison, merely to introduce into the verse the regular ἐτράφημεν, grating as this erp...must have been to an Ionic ear by the harshness which it gave the metre. Now as far as regards this ἐτρά-φεμεν, Bœckh (on Pind. Pyth. 4, 115.) is of opinion that the ancients saw in all these Homeric forms (τράφε, τραφέμεν, &c.) nothing more than a shortening of the n. 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 ἔτραφε and τέτροφε, and the great leading analogy mentioned in a note under Meipopai, and again more fully illustrated in a note under Τεύχω. The form ἐτράφην is not Homeric, but ἔτραφον had the intransitive sense expressed afterwards by ἐτράφην 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 τράφε, τραφέ-την, &c., to be merely a metrical shortening * In all three passages the forms in question are by some accented as aorists, $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\epsilon\hat{\imath}\nu$, $\tau\rho\alpha\phi\hat{\omega}\nu$: but we dare not so easily suppose $\tilde{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\phi\sigma\nu$ to be used for $\tilde{\epsilon}\theta\rho\epsilon\psi\alpha$. In all three passages the present is correct, in the last it is indispensable.

† This future in an active form is found in the comic writer Philetærus ap. Athen. 10. p. 416. $\dot{\vartheta}\pi\epsilon\rho\delta\rho\alpha\mu\bar{\omega}$: for such is the syntax of that whole passage that the Attic language does not allow it to be transferred altogether to the conjunctive $(\beta\acute{a}\lambda\omega,\,\delta\rho\acute{a}\mu\omega)$ by a change of accent.

‡ Sufficient authority for this perfect is collected in Fischer vol. 3. p. 183. to which may be added ἐπιδεδράμηται, Xen. (Εc. 15, 1. That the old Grammarians cite their proofs of δεδράμηκα 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.

 $\tilde{c}\rho a\mu \omega \tilde{\nu}\mu a\iota$ cannot be formed from it in the same way, for then it would end in -ήσομαι like $\mu a\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o\mu a\iota$, $\gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma o\mu a\iota$, &c. It must be derived, therefore, from the theme itself, which, on account of the old perf. $\tilde{c}\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\epsilon}\rho o\mu a$ (Od. ϵ , 412. ζ , 45.), is supposed to be $\Delta PEM\Omega$; from which, it is true, that future cannot be formed in the usual Attic manner of verbs having λ , μ , ν , or ρ as their characteristic letter; but a fixed analogy in the change of the vowel is not to be expected in these primitive verbs, the present of which was probably never in actual existence-Compare what has been said on $B\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ and $\Lambda\alpha\gamma\chi\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$.

The 3. sing. of a fut. ἀναδράμεται is found in Philipp. Thess. Epigr. 24, 4. for which it is probable the writer had some old Epic

authority.

Τρέω, I tremble, retains ϵ in the inflexion: thus infin. τρέω: fut. τρέσω; aor. l. ἔτρεσα. This verb keeps all its forms resolved, except where they can be contracted in ϵ : see $\Delta \epsilon \omega$, I bind.

[The Epic poets double the σ , making (with the omission of the augment) the aor. $\tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, $\tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha r$, &c. A poetical present is $\tau \rho \epsilon l \omega$.—Passow.]

Τρίβω, I rub: fut. $\tau \rho i \psi \omega$; aor. 1. pass. $\epsilon \tau \rho i \phi \theta \eta \nu$, Thuc. 2, 77. but more frequently is used the aor. 2. $\epsilon \tau \rho i \beta \eta \nu$, (on which see $\Gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega$); perf. pass. $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho \iota \mu \mu \alpha \iota$.

[Homer has the aor. 1. act. of this verb in its compound $\delta\iota\alpha\tau\rho\iota\psi\alpha s$, Il. λ , 846. The fut. midd. $\tau\rho\iota\psi\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ is used in a passive sense in Thucyd. 6, 18.—Passow.]

Τρίζω, I twitter, chirp: fut. τρίσω and (Hemsterh. Aristoph. Plut. 1100.) τρίξω; perf. with force of a pres. τέτρῖγα, like κέκραγα, λέλακα, κέκλαγγα, &c. The pure characteristic letter of this verb is γ.

The Epics allowed themselves the liberty of pronouncing long the accented o in the oblique cases of the part. perf., as $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho_i \gamma \hat{\omega} \tau as$ for $-\gamma \acute{o}\tau as$, Il. β , 314. Compare $\gamma \epsilon \gamma a \acute{\omega} s$, $-\hat{\omega} \tau o s$, with note, p. 51.

ΤΡΥΦ-. See Θρύπτω.

Τρύχω, I rub in pieces, wear out, consume, forms from τρυχόω (a present of rare occurrence) an aor. 1. έτρύχωσα; aor. 1. pass. έτρυχώθην; part. perf. pass. τετρυχωμένος, &c. The pres. pass. τρυχοῦται is found in Mimnerm. Fr. 2.

Τρώγω, I gnaw, eat: fut. τρώξομαι; aor. 2. ἔτραγον; aor. 2. pass. ἐτράγην.

The α in this agrist would seem to lead us to a theme TPHΓΩ, a sister-form of $\tau \rho \dot{\omega} \gamma \omega$, like $\pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\pi \tau \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \omega$. An agr. 1. in the compound $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \dot{\zeta} \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s$ is found in Timon Phlias. Fr. 7.

Τυγχάνω. See Τεύχω.

Τύπτω, I beat: fut. τύψω, &c.; aor. 2. pass. ἐτύπην.— Midd.—Instead of the regular inflexions the Attics used a fut. τυπτήσω, a perf. pass. τετύπτημα, and a verbal adj. τυπτητέος.

On the above deviation from the regular inflexion, see Thom. Mag. in voc. and Stephan. Thesaur. The fut. midd. $\tau \nu \pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \rho \mu a \iota$ in Aristoph. Nub. 1382. with a passive sense, may possibly be a mistake for $\tau \nu \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \rho \mu a \iota$; as the old reading $\dot{\omega} \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ in Eurip. Med. 336. is now proved by the Codd. to have been a corruption from $\dot{\omega} \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$. The aor. 1. $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \nu \psi a$, $\tau \dot{\nu} \psi \rho \nu$, &c., appears to have been in constant use from Homer's time: the aor. 2. $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \nu \pi \rho \nu$ is seldom found, but it does occur in Eurip. Ion. 766.

Τύφω, I smoke, burn : fut. θύψω*; aor. 1. ἔθυψα; perf. pass. τέθυμμαι or τέθυμαι; aor. 2. pass. ἐτύφην.

Y.

Ύπισχνέομαι. See "Εχω.

Ύφαίνω, I weave; fut. ὑφᾶνῶ; aor. 1. ὕφηνα, Att. ὕφᾶνα, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 26. perf. ὕφαγκα.

A very suspicious reduplicated perf. pass. $i\phi\dot{\eta}\phi\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ is quoted by Suidas in voc. Phrynich. Seguer. p. 20, 3. Herodian π . $\mu \sigma \nu$. $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi}$. 44, 25. The Grammarian in Suidas is puzzled how to account for the η in the second syllable, whence I conjecture it to be a corruption of $i\phi\dot{\iota}\phi\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, which is quoted in the Etym. M. in voc. as an old and rare form from Zenodotus. In all our Attic writers we find invariably $i\dot{\iota}\phi\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$. Homer has from the radical form $i\dot{\iota}\phi\dot{\iota}\omega$ a sister-form $i\dot{\iota}\phi\dot{\iota}\omega$, whence the 3. plur. $i\dot{\iota}\phi\dot{\iota}\omega\sigma\iota$, Od. η , 105.

"Yω, I rain, make wet with rain: fut. νσω; aor. 1. νσα. Pass. νομαι,

^{*} On the formation of this future see Τρέφω, Θρέψω and note.

I am rained upon, made wet with rain; fut. midd. (in the same sense) υσομαι, Herodot. 2, 14. aor. 1. pass. υσθην, Herodot. 3, 10.

Φ.

ΦA-. See Φημί: also Φαίνω and Πέφνον. ΦΑΓ-. See Εσθίω.

Φαίνω, I bring to light, show: intrans. I shine. Pass. I am brought to light, I appear. Act. φαίνω; fut. φάνω; aor. 1. έφηνα, infin. φηναι; perf. πέφαγκα*; perf. 2. πέφηνα. Pass. φαίνομαι; fut. φανήσομαι; aor. 1. ἐφάνθην; aor. 2. εφάνην, infin. φανήναι; perf. πέφασμαι. Midd. φαίνομαι; fut. φανούμαι; aor. 1. infin. φήνασθαι,/ Soph. The active voice has in the transitive sense the aor. 1.; in the intransitive the pres. the imperf. and the perf. 2. The passive has (beside the meaning attributed to it above) the strict passive sense of φαίνω as a transitive verb, and in this sense it employs the aor. 1.; e. g. τὰ φανθέντα, the things announced or declared, Demosth. c. Theorr. p. 1325., Φρούρα ἐφάνθη, was announced, Xen. Hell. 6, 4, 11., ἀπεφάνθη, Lys. De Aristoph. Bon. p. 155, 28.; but in the sense of to appear the aor. 2. pass. is used. In this last sense we find a double future, viz. the fut. midd. which is the more common, and the fut. pass. which is of rarer occurrence: the latter is found more frequently in verse, but it is met with in prose also, e.g. φανήσοιντο, Isæ. De Philoct. p. 58, 33. ἀναφανήσονται, Xen. Hell. 3, 5, 11. The perf. 2. of the active serves as a perf. to paivouat in this intransitive sense; while the perf. pass. (beside its proper passive meaning, I have been announced) has also the neuter sense of, I have appeared. And lastly we find a form of the middle voice (the aor. 1. infin. φήνασθαι, Soph. Phil. 944.) in the transitive sense of the active, which is particularly common in the compound anopairw.

^{*} Dinarchus has ἀποπέφαγκα twice.

This verb is contracted from the old pacive (Hom.), as a pow is from άείρω. Hence in the Epic writers the radical syllable admits of being lengthened, as έφαάνθην* and the comparative φαάντερος, &c. aor. 1. is used by Homer in the same sense as ἐφάνην.

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 φαενώ. Apollonius (De Adv. p. 600, 28.) expressly mentions this quantity, and Bekker notices the same in Aristoph. Equ. 300, where the words καί σε φανώ (- · · ·) have been arranged differently in opposition to all the Codd. The coincidence of this verb with the same appearance in alow makes the thing certain: still however in both verbs the usual quantity is not altered in the Attic writers: e.g. φανώ, Soph. Aj. 1362. and φανούμαι 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. π , 299, the old editions certainly did read the 3. plur. ἔφανον ‡; but as many of the most undoubted forms of φανήναι occur in Homer, it has been correctly altered to έφανεν, which is found in the best manuscripts. It is true that φάνεσκεν (II. λ , 64.) appears to point to such an act. agrist; but this iterative may very well be formed from έφάνην, as έσκε was from ην, στάσκε from εστην, &c. The forms προῦφανες (Soph. Phil. 1191.) and φάνης (Philem. Fr. inc. 52. b.) are more than suspicious from their transitive meaning: see Buttmann's notes on Soph. Phil. And lastly in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 34. instead of φανοίμην the various reading φαινοίμην ought to have been long ago adopted. In Soph. Aj. 313. φανοίην is the Attic. optat. fut. of the active voice.

At Od. ξ, 502. we find the stem of this verb in its most simple form, the 3. sing. oáe in the sense of the aorist, "the morning broke," which may be considered as the aor. 2. (ἔφαον, φαεῖν) from which came the pres. φαείνω. But Aratus has taken the liberty of using this simple form as a present, $\lambda \epsilon \pi \tau \dot{a} \phi \dot{a} o \nu \sigma \alpha \iota$, v. 607. where the sense of the agrist 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. πεφήσομαι, II. p, 155. (will have appeared, will have burst over,) written precisely the same as the fut. of $\Phi EN\Omega$.

· See note under Kpaivw.

αίρω: or is ρανῶ correct, and did the ρ produce the same effect here as in κέρα-

[†] It is singular that Apollonius does not, as might have been expected, quote apa from alow as similar in quantity to φανω, but pava, of which the proofs are not so strong as they are of the two others. But perhaps the original word there was kpaνω, which is very similar to φαίνω and

^{1 [}Passow unhesitatingly condemns this agrist as entirely obsolete; see Pors. Eurip. Or. 1266. Buttm. Soph. Phil. 1191. Meineke Menand. p. 416 .- Ed.]

Φάσκω. See Φημί.

Φαύσκω or Φώσκω (compare τρῶσαι, τραῦμα), I appear or break forth as the morning does; a verb occurring only in its compounds with διά, ἐπί, and ὑπό (see the examples in Schneider's Lexicon*), of which the inflexion (fut. φαύσω, aor. ἔφαυσα) 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. ὑπόφαυσις, Herodot. 7, 36.

The Epic verb πιφαύσκω, πιφαύσκομαι, I show, give to understand, of which we find only the pres. and imperf., is distinct from φαύσκω.

Φείδομαι, I spare, Depon. midd.; fut. φείσομαι; aor. 1. εφεισάμην, infin. φείσασθαι, Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 17.

The Epic poets have the aor. 2. with reduplication, e. g. infin. $\pi\epsilon\phi\tilde{i}-\delta\epsilon'\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, opt. $\pi\epsilon\phi\iota\delta\delta(\mu\eta\nu)$, whence a fut. $\pi\epsilon\phi\iota\delta'\eta\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$: compare $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta'\eta-\sigma\omega$ from $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\tilde{i}\nu$ under $\Pi\epsilon\dot{i}\theta\omega$, and $\dot{a}\kappa\alpha\chi'\eta\sigma\omega$ with note under ' $A\kappa\alpha\chi'\iota-\zeta\omega$. In Euseb. 10. p. 130. Valckenaër (ad Herodot. 8, 10.) has correctly amended $\phi\iota\lambda\epsilon\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota$ to $\phi\epsilon\iota\delta\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota$ as from $\phi\epsilon\iota\delta\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu$ in Euseb. and $a\dot{\iota}\rho\epsilon\dot{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ in Hesiod.

ΦΕΝ-. See Πέφνον.

Φέρβω, I feed, nourish: perf. πέφορβα; pluperf. ἐπεφόρβειν, Hymn. Merc. 105. Pass. I am nourished, τινός, Hom. Hymn. 30, 4. The fut. and aor. are defective both in the act. and pass.

Φέρω, I bring or carry, forms its tenses from very different stems or roots; thus, fut. οἴσω, 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. οἴσε, οἴσετε, οἰσέτω, οἰσόντων †, Od. χ, 106. 481. Aristoph. Bat. 482. Ach. 1099. 1101. 1122. Antim. Fr. 10.: see ἐδύσετο, p. 73. From the stem ΕΓΚΩ or ΕΝΕΓΚΩ come the aor. 1. ἤνεγκα, aor. 2. ἤνεγκον. In the first person of these two aorists and in the optative (ἐνέγκαιμι, ἐνέγκειε, and -οιμι, -οι) the usage is very fluctuating, as the Grammarians have observed‡. Of the remaining forms we find

† To these must be added the Epic infin. οἰσέμεν, οἰσέμεναι (which occurs as

an aorist in Od. γ, 429. II. γ, 120., but as a fut. in II. σ, 191.), and οἴσειν, which has the force of a present in Pind. Pyth. 4, 181.

‡ See Greg. Cor. in Att. 78. with the quotations there made by Koen.; and Phryn. Appar. p. 35, 24.

^{* [&}quot;Αμ' ἡμέρη διαφανσκούση, Herodot. 3, 86. Διεπιφώσκω, Dionys. 9, 63. Ἐπιφώσκειν φέγγος ἐρυθρόν, Poct. Vet. De Herb. 25. 'Υποφώσκει ἡμέρα, Diod. Sic. 13, 18.]

a preference given (the Attic usage is sometimes exclusive), in the active voice to the infin. ἐνεγκεῖν, the part. ἐνεγκών, ἐνεγκόντος, and the 2. sing. imper. ἔνεγκε, all from the aor. 2.; while the others together with the whole of the middle are taken from the aor. 1., e.g. ἤνεγκαν, -κατε, -κατο, ἐνεγκάτω, -κάσθαι, -κάμενος, &c.: imperat. midd. ἔνεγκαι. Perf. ἐνήνοχα; pass. ἐνήνεγμαι, ἐνήνεγξαι, ἐνήνεγκται (e. g. Corp. Inscr. i. 76, 4.) and ἐνήνεκται; aor. 1. pass. ἦνέχθην; fut. pass. ἐνεχθήσομαι and οἰσθήσομαι: verbal adj. οἰστός, οἰστέος (poet. φερτός).—ΜIDD.

In the aorist the Ionics have ήνεικα, conj. ἐνείκω, infin. ἐνεῖκαι, &c., midd. ἡνεικάμην, &c., and pass. ἐνήνειγμαι, ἡνείχθην. The most simple theme which can be adopted for these forms is ΕΓΚΩ, whence by redupl. ἡνεγκον, like ἡγαγον, ἀλαλκεῖν, &c.* The relation of the aor. 1. to ἡνεγκον is the same as that of εἶπα to εἶπον as described at p. 9. under εἶλα. Let us now suppose ΕΓΚΩ lengthened to ΕΝΕΚΩ (compare ὀρέγω ὀργυιά, ἀλκή ἀλέξασθαι), then ἐνήνοχα (see κέκλοφα under Κλέπτω), ἐνήνεγμαι and ἠνέχθην are quite regular. The Ionic ἡνεικα appears to have been produced from ἡνεγκα by a mere change of pronunciation, and the same formation was then extended by a false usage to other forms, e. g. to ἡνείχθην, ἐνήνειγμαι, and to the pres. συνενείκεται in Hes. Scut. 440.; still however we find the perf. ἐνήνεγκται in old Attic inscriptions: see Corp. Inscr. Græc. to. 1. Inscr. Att. no. 71. p. 116.

The old Aorist, of which the imper. olor and infin. olor em v are the only remaining tenses, was mentioned at the beginning of this article and in the note there subjoined. If this olor and the other imperatives quoted below be considered as isolated instances of an imperative future, such a supposition is at variance with all usage, for strictly speaking either all imperatives are futures, or none are so. Hence it is more agreeable to analogy to suppose a new theme arising out of the future from which these aorists may be formed; compare $\dot{a}ei\sigma eo$, $\lambda \dot{e}\xi eo$, $\ddot{o}\rho - \sigma eo$, $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma eo$, and $\dot{e}\delta \dot{v} \sigma e \tau o$, $\delta \dot{v} \sigma e o$, p. 73. This aorist occurs also with the common termination of the aor. 1.; of which the surest instance is found in Herodotus, but with an unusual lengthening of the radical syllable, in the compound $\dot{a}v\dot{\phi}\sigma a\iota$ (1, 157.); and this lengthening is again found in another form, in which it is quite as extraordinary, $\dot{a}v\dot{\omega}$ -

^{*} Compare also ἀνάγκη, which is evidently a reduplication from the stem ἄγχειν.

 $i\sigma\tau os$ (6, 66.), both words having the same sense of sending (referre) to consult an oracle*. Suspicious examples of the aorist oloau from succeeding writers, and genuine ones of a very late period may be seen in Lobeck Parerg. p. 733. We find in Lucian Parasit. 2. a solitary instance of the perf. pass. $\pi\rho ool\sigma\tau a\iota$, in which for the sake of perspicuity the $o\iota$ is left unchanged, and the augment therefore can only be recognised by means of the accent.

Φεύγω, I fly: fut. φεύξομαι and φευξοῦμαι;; perf. πέφευγα; aor. 2. ἔφυγον. There is no passive voice. Verbal adj. φευκτός, φευκτέος.

The perf. pass. $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \gamma \mu a \iota$ is a passive in form only, as the Epics use the part. $\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \gamma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu o s$ in the active sense of having escaped, Od. a, 18 §. On the ν of this perf. see note under $X \dot{\epsilon} \omega$.

The Epic language uses the verbal adj. φυκτόs: whence ἄφυκτοs came into the common dialect.

For the Homeric part. πεφυζότες see λελειχμότες under Λιχμάομαι.

* Reiz, Schneider in his Lexicon voc. ἀνώϊστος, and Lobeck, Parerg. p.733. consider both as corruptions and read ἀνοῖσαι, ἄνοιστος; and certainly in Herodot. 7, 149. we find the fut. avoiceiv in a similar sense (referre ad populum) without any various reading. Hermann on the contrary conjectures it to be an old Ionicism, and he has this in his favour; that Aretæus, who affects the Ionic dialect, has (2, 11.) ἀνώϊστος from ἀναφέρω, consequently an imitation of Herodotus. But errors are frequently found even in works of great antiquity; and as we meet with this incorrect form in this compound only, the mistake was perhaps caused by the similar sound of the other άνώιστος, unexpected, which is correctly formed from à and (οἴομαι) ὀϊστός, like ανώνυμος, ανώμαλος, &c. And why

should not the gloss of Suidas, ἀνοῖσαι, although explained only by the general expression κομίσαι, refer to the above passage of Herodotus? Still however greater certainty is requisite before we alter the text of Herodotus.

† Of this verb we find an instance (φορέσαι) as early as Isæus; in the later

authors it is more frequent.

‡ [Φευξοῦμαι is properly Doric, but is found in Aristoph. Ach. 203. and elsewhere in that writer. Very late authors have a fut. 2. φυγῶ.—Passow.]

§ We may compare this participle with cecaκρυμένος; 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 ἀλιτήμενος.

Φημί, I say: φής, φησί, &c., imper. φάθι*, opt. φαίην, conj. φω (3. sing. φήη, Hom.), infin. φάναι, part. φάς; imperf. ἔφην; fut. φήσω; aor. 1. ἔφησα. Of the midd. were used the following forms, viz. the infin. and part. pres. φάσθαι, φάμενος; both used by Homer, the latter by the Attics also; and the imperf. εφάμην. Of the passive we find some perfect forms, as the part. πεφασμένος, Il. ξ, 127. and the imperat. πεφάσθω. Verbal adj. φατός, φατέος, and the Hesiodic φατειός.

This yerb is the only genuine instance of a dissyllable in - µ (beginning with a consonant) without the reduplication. The radical form is $\Phi A\Omega$. The indicative present, with the exception of the 2. sing., is enclitic, i. e. throws back the accent on the word preceding. In the formation of this 2. sing. $\phi \eta s$ there is no ground for the ι subscriptum, and the acute accent instead of the circumflex is unusual, but both are

supported by very strong tradition †.

This verb has a twofold meaning, viz. 1. the general idea of I say. and 2. the more precise one of I assert, maintain, assent, allow; with its converse ού φημι, I dissent, deny. The present φημί 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 $\epsilon i\pi\epsilon i\nu$. On the other hand the fut, and the aor. 1. are generally found in the second sense; in which also the imperfect with the infin. and part, present, in order to avoid ambiguity, are generally expressed by φάσκειν (which does not otherwise occur in prose), and by the midd. φάσθαι, φάμενος; e.g. έφη σπουδάζειν, he said he was in haste, but έφασκε σπουδάζειν, he maintained that he . . . ; φάσκων, asserting, maintaining; οὐ φάμενος, denying.

In the 2. sing. of the imperfect we generally find in the Attic writers έφησθα; see Thom. Mag. p. 397.: the simple έφης becomes more frequent in the later authors; see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 236. This conv is commonly used as a complete agrist, synonymous with $\epsilon l\pi o\nu$; and

the 2. sing. indic. should be written with-

out the i subscriptum, like "orns, but the conjunctive with it. Passow however in his Lexicon says expressly φής (not φής or $\phi \bar{\eta} s$): the latter he restricts to the 2. sing imperf. Ion. for $\xi \phi \eta s$, Hom. See the Etym. M. voc. $\phi \psi s$ and Chærobosc. MS. ap. Bekk. p. 345. v.-Ed.

^{*} The Grammarians are at variance on the accent of this form: see Schol. Aristoph. Equ. 22. Lobeck (ad Phryn. pp. 60. 172.) unhesitatingly rejects φάθι, but I prefer it to φαθί, as this imperative is not enclitic like $\phi \eta \mu i$.

† Matthiæ in his Grammar directs that

to this imperfect we may add the infin. $\phi \acute{a} \nu a \iota$, which is confined so entirely to express past time only ($\phi \acute{a} \nu a \iota$ rò ν Herikáa, that Pericles has said) that as soon as an infin. pres. is wanted, $\lambda \acute{e} \gamma e \iota \nu$ or $\phi \acute{a} \sigma \kappa e \iota \nu$ 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. $\check{e} \phi \eta \nu$, which retained the η in the plural, and had $\phi \mathring{\eta} \nu a \iota$ or $\phi \mathring{a} \nu a \iota$ in the infinitive, it is entirely unfounded. If we find $\phi \mathring{a} \nu a \iota$ occasionally in the text of some authors, it is either an error of transcription, or if correct (as it is in Eubul. ap. Athen. p. 8. c.) it is a poetical licence like $\tau e \theta \nu \mathring{a} \nu a \iota$.

By aphæresis the following forms have arisen from $\phi\eta\mu\dot{\iota}$ in the language of common conversation; $\dot{\eta}\mu\dot{\iota}$, say I (inquam), in a quick repetition in Aristoph. Nub. 1145. Ran. 37.; and again in the imperf. $\dot{\eta}\nu$ δ ' $\dot{\epsilon}\gamma\dot{\omega}$, said I, $\dot{\eta}$ δ ' δ s, said he, (for $\xi\phi\eta\nu$, $\xi\psi\eta$,) in the conversational narrative of Aristoph. Equ. 640. and Plato; to which belongs also the Epic

 $\tilde{\eta}$, he spake, Il. α , 219.

[In the Homeric usage we find the 1. plur. opt. pres. $\phi a \hat{i} \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\phi a \hat{i} \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$; the 3. conj. $\phi \hat{i} \eta$ for $\phi \hat{i} \hat{j}$; the imperf. $\phi \hat{i} \nu$, $\phi \hat{i} \hat{s}$, $\phi \hat{i} \hat{j}$ for $\xi \phi \eta \nu$, $\xi \phi \eta \hat{s}$, and the 3. plur. $\xi \phi a \nu$, $\phi a \nu$ for $\xi \phi a \sigma a \nu$; also the imperat. midd. $\phi a \hat{j} \hat{j} \hat{j} \hat{j} \hat{j} \hat{j} \hat{j}$ for $\delta a \sigma \hat{j} \hat{j} \hat{j} \hat{j} \hat{j}$.—Passow.]

Φθάνω†, I get before, anticipate: fut. φθήσομαι; aor. 2. ξφθην, opt. φθαίην, conj. φθῶ, infin. φθῆναι, part. φθάς; perf. ἔφθἄκα. The aor. 2. is preferred by the Atticists to the aor. 1. ἔφθᾶσα; but this latter is used by the best Attic writers, e. g. by Thucyd. 3, 49. and from the time of Xenophon is the more usual form of the two.

The fut. $\phi\theta\acute{a}\sigma\omega$ is found only in the later writers, e. g. in Dio Chrys. 12. p. 195.; and an aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\theta\acute{a}\sigma\theta\eta\nu$ occurs in Joseph. Ant. 8, 6. A part. aor. midd. ϕ $\theta\acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s is used by the Epic poets synonymous with ϕ $\theta\acute{a}$ s, like $\phi\acute{a}$ s, $\phi\acute{a}\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma$ s from $\phi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$. We find also a Doric fut. ϕ $\theta\acute{a}$ z ω , aor. 1. $\check{\epsilon}\phi\theta a$ z α . $\Pi a\rho a\phi\theta a\acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\iota$ in Il. κ , 346. is a lengthened aor. opt. not conj.; as the $\alpha\iota$ would be an unheard of diphthong in the conjunctive of $\check{\epsilon}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, and the $-\sigma\iota$ is admissible in lengthening the optative, though less usual than in the conjunctive.

Φθέγγομαι, I sound, depon. midd.; fut. φθέγξομαι; aor. 1. ἐφθεγξάμην. The active φθέγγω never occurs.

in the Attic writers; and in the later authors common; see Jacob. Anthol-Poet. p. 884.—Passow.]

However, in Plat. Hipp. Maj. p. 289.
 φάναι is considered as a genuine present.

^{† [}The a is long in the Epic, but short

Φθείρω, I corrupt, is regular: thus, fut. φθερῶ (Epic φθέρσω, II. ν, 625.); perf. ἔφθαρκα; perf. 2. ἔφθορα; perf. pass. ἔφθαρμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐφθάρην; verbal adj. φθαρτός. The perf. 2. ἔφθορα, διέφθορα had originally the intransitive sense, I am become corrupt, am destroyed, undone; this is its meaning at II. 0, 128., and it was so used by the Ionics and by all the later writers from Theophrastus. The pure Attics on the contrary gave it a transitive sense, and used intransitively the pass. ἔφθαρμαι, ἐφθάρην. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 160. Still however we find the perf. 1. ἔφθαρκα in the early Attic writers: see the old instances collected in Piers. ad Mœr. p. 127.

The fut. of the neuter meaning is generally $\phi\theta a\rho\eta\sigma o\mu\alpha\iota$, for which the Ionics have the fut. 2. midd. (with the change of vowel to a,) $\delta\iota a-\phi\theta a\rho\epsilon o\mu\alpha\iota$, Herodot. 8, 108. 9, 42*.

Φθίνω and φθίω, I pass away, come to an end, perish. This verb is generally poetical, and the pres. φθίω with its imperf. ἔφθιον 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 $\phi\theta\ell\omega$ with the causative sense of I bring to un end, consume: for the imperfect in Il. σ, 446. φρένας ἔφθιεν is to be understood intransitively, as is also φθίω at Od. β, 368. ως κε δόλω φθίης. The transitive meaning of φθίνω is found in Soph. El. 1414. and Theorr. 25, 122. In general this form has the neuter sense, in which it is used in prose also, still however only in certain expressions which do not proceed from the present. The remaining forms, which the poets use in an intransitive sense, are taken from the midd. of $\phi\theta i\omega$, as the fut. $\phi\theta i\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, the perf. ἔφθιμαι, and the pluperf. ἐφθίμην, which last form is at the same time (see ἐκτάμην in note under Κτείνω) a syncopated aorist, e.g. in Eurip. Hipp. 839. Soph. Œd. T. 962. 970., and in this respect it has its own moods, as opt. $\phi\theta i\mu\eta\nu$, $(\phi\theta io)$, $\phi\theta i\tau o$, Od. κ , 51. λ , 330 †; conj. $\phi\theta i\omega$ μαι, shortened to φθίσμαι, φθίσται; infin. φθίσθαι; part. φθίμενος.

On the other hand the transitive meaning is established in the fut. act. and aor. 1. $\phi \theta i \sigma \omega$, $\tilde{\epsilon} \phi \theta i \sigma \alpha$: see note under $M \epsilon i \rho \rho \mu \alpha i$, and compare $\tilde{\epsilon} \gamma \eta \rho \alpha \sigma \alpha$ under $\Gamma \eta \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$.

the pluperfect διεφθάρατο.

† In the latter passage the reading of

^{*} Διεφθαρέατο in Herodot. 8, 90. would be 3. plur. aor. 2. midd., of which tense however there is no other instance whatever. Some manuscripts have the imperfect, but we must adopt, with Hermann,

the text was until lately $\phi\theta$ etro, arising from a false conception of the unusual form $\phi\theta$ tro.

The quantity of the ι (both in the present in -1 ω and in the tenses formed from $\phi\theta i\omega$) is the same as that of $\tau i\nu\omega$, long in the Epic poets, but short in the Attic writers: e. g. compare $\phi\theta i\nu\omega$, Od. λ , 182. ξ , 161. with Soph. Ant. 695. Eurip. Alc. 201.; and $\phi\theta i\sigma\omega$, &c. II. π , 461. χ , 61. with Soph. Trach. 709. Aj. 1027. On the contrary the perf. pass., and consequently the syncop. aor. also, together with the derivatives $\phi\theta i\sigma\iota$ s, $\phi\theta\iota\tau is$, have always the ι short. Compare the ν short in $\lambda \dot{\epsilon}\lambda \dot{\nu}\mu a\iota$ and $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda \dot{\nu}\theta\eta\nu$ while it is long in $\lambda \dot{\nu}\omega$, $\lambda \dot{\nu}\sigma\omega$.

The neuter φθίνω came into more general use in the later writers, who formed for themselves a new inflexion in -ήσω: thus φθινήσαιτες (having perished), Lucian. Parasit. 57., καταφθινήσας καὶ τιμωρηθεὶς

ἀπέθανεν, Plut. Cons. ad Ap. κατεφθινηκότες, Vit. Cicer. 14.

In a verse thrice repeated (Od. ϵ , 110. 133. η , 251.) Evb along $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ along $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ are the me in - $\theta \omega$ (compare $\hat{a}\mu \hat{\nu}\nu a\theta o\nu$, p. 22.) has always maintained its ground in the text against $\hat{a}\pi \hat{\epsilon} \phi \theta \iota \theta o\nu$: 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 $\hat{\epsilon} \phi \theta \iota \theta \epsilon \nu$. The perf. $\hat{\epsilon} \phi \theta \iota \mu a \iota$ (without σ , and with ι short) is quite sufficient ground for an aorist $\hat{\epsilon} \phi \theta \iota \theta \eta \nu$.

Φιλέω, I love, is regular.

The Epic language has from the stem of this verb an aorist in the middle voice with ι long, $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\iota}\lambda\alpha\tau_0$, imperat. $\dot{\phi}\dot{\iota}\lambda\alpha\iota$. The analogy of $\dot{\iota}\iota\lambda\lambda\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\tau\dot{\iota}\lambda\alpha$ enables us to form a correct opinion of this old form. In Hes. θ , 97. and Hom. Hymn. 25. (see Hermann on that passage) we find the conj. of this aorist $\dot{\phi}\dot{\iota}\lambda\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ corrupted in the text to $\dot{\phi}\iota\lambda\epsilon\dot{\nu}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$; while in Hymn. Cer. 117. Wolf has restored it from $\dot{\phi}\dot{\iota}\lambda\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, and v. 487. from $\dot{\phi}\iota\lambda\dot{\omega}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$.

Φλέγω, I burn, transit.: fut. φλέξω. The aor. 2. pass. is ἐφλέγην: see note under Bλέπω.

Φλέω, I am full to overflowing: used only in pres. and imperf. This verb is connected by Onomatopæia with $\phi\lambda\dot{\nu}\omega$, I overflow; chatter: ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλνε, Il. ϕ , 361., $\phi\lambda\hat{\nu}\sigma\alpha\iota$, Æschyl. Prom. 504.: which was formed also $\phi\lambda\dot{\nu}\zeta\omega$, $\phi\lambda\dot{\nu}\zeta\alpha\iota^*$. But $\phi\lambda\dot{\nu}\omega$, I singe, burn, is quite distinct from the above; of which we find $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\phi\lambda\dot{\nu}\epsilon\iota$ in Aristoph. Nub. 395. with ν

^{* [}Μανίης ὕπο μυρία φλύζων, Nicand. Alex. 214.—Schneid. Lex.]

long, instead of which Herodotus (5, 77.) has the diphthong περιπεφλευσμένος.

Φοβέω, I terrify: fut. φοβήσω; aor. 1. ἐφόβησα, &c.; aor. 1. midd. imperat. φόβησαι. Pass. φοβέομαι, I am terrified: [fut. midd. φοβήσομαι and fut. pass. φοβηθήσομαι, without any difference of meaning, Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 19. 3, 3, 30. 6, 7, 15.; aor. 1. pass. ἐφοβήθην; perf. pass. πεφόβημαι.—Passow.]

[The perf. pass. has particularly the sense of to be put to flight, to fly, II. and Herodot. 9, 70. The aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\phi o\beta\eta\sigma\dot{a}\mu\eta\nu$ belongs to the latest and worst period of the language; e.g. Anacr. 3, 11.—Passow.]

Φορέω. See Φέρω.

Φράζω, I say, point out: fut. φράσω; aor. 1. ἔφράσα; perf. πέφρακα. Pass. (in Herodotus) I perceive, observe: imperf. ἐφραζόμην, Herodot. 3, 154.; aor. 1. ἐφράσθην, part. φρασθείς, ib. 1, 84. 5, 92. 7, 46. 9, 19.; perf. πέφραδμαι or πέφρασμαι. Midd. (in the Epic poets) I perceive, observe; also I consider, reflect, consult, plan: fut. φράσομαι; aor. 1. midd. ἐφρασάμην.

The active voice has in the Epic poets a reduplicated aorist $\pi\epsilon\phi\rho\tilde{a}$ - $\delta\sigma\nu$ (see $K\dot{a}\mu\nu\omega$), or with the augment $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\dot{\epsilon}\phi\rho\tilde{a}\dot{\delta}\sigma\nu$ (compare $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\tau\sigma$ under $K\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$), Il. κ , 127., particularly used in the 3. sing. $\pi\dot{\epsilon}\phi\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon$;
dual $\pi\epsilon\phi\rho\alpha\delta\dot{\epsilon}\tau\eta\nu$, Hes. θ , 475.; infin. $\pi\epsilon\phi\rho\alpha\delta\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ and $\pi\epsilon\phi\rho\alpha\delta\dot{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$, Od. η , 49. τ , 477.; optat. $\pi\epsilon\phi\rho\dot{a}\delta\sigma\iota$. The part. perf. pass. with a δ , and in a passive sense, occurs in Hes. ϵ , 653. In a fragment in Athen. 11. p. 465. f. $\phi\rho\dot{a}\dot{c}\eta$ is a false reading, instead of which there is a various reading $\phi\rho\dot{a}\sigma\theta\eta$.

[The active of this verb is frequent in Xenophon; otherwise it is not often found in prose: the middle occurs only in the Epic poets and in an oracle in Herodotus 3, 57.—Passow.]

Φράσσω, Att. φράττω, (in the later writers φράγνυμι also), I fill, stop up, place close together, fortify: fut. φράξω; aor. 1. ἔφραξα; aor. 1. pass. ἐφράχθην; aor. 1. midd. ἐφραξάμην; perf. pass. πέφραγμαι; aor. 2. pass. (in the compound) ἀπεφράγην, Lucian. Dial. Mort. 28, 2.

Φρέω, I suffer to pass: fut. φρήσω. This verb is used

only in composition, e.g. ἐκφρέω, εἰσφρέω, διαφρέω, I let out, in, through: in addition to which we find a decompound ἐπεισφρέω in Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1267. and Seidl. Eurip. El. 1028*. MIDD. I suffer to pass to myself, take to myself, admit; e.g. εἰσεφρούμην, Eurip. Tro. 647. to which belongs the fut. εἰσφρήσεσθαι, Demosth. Cherson. p. 93, 18.: for the fut. act. (ἐκφρήσω, εἰσφρήσω, διαφρήσω, Aristoph. Vesp. 156. 892. Av. 193.) is in common use. The aor. 1. pass. ἐκφρησθήναι occurs in Ælian. ap. Suid. in voc.

The Grammarians mention also an imperat. $\epsilon i \sigma \phi \rho \epsilon s$, $\epsilon \kappa \phi \rho \epsilon s$, which belongs to the syncopated formation of $\pi i \theta_i$, $\kappa \lambda \hat{\nu} \theta_i$, $\sigma \chi \hat{\epsilon} s$ from $\pi i \nu \omega$, $\kappa \lambda \hat{\nu} \omega$, $\hat{\epsilon} \chi \omega$; but we know not any passage where it really occurs†. 'Eξεφρείσμεν in Aristoph. Vesp. 125. is a very singular form‡. Whether the unusual present $\pi_i \phi \rho \hat{\alpha} \nu a \omega$ belongs to $\phi \rho \hat{\epsilon} \omega$, by a change of the radical vowel (compare $\delta \epsilon_i \pi \nu \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ and $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$), is uncertain: see Schneider in 'E $\mu \pi i \phi \rho \eta \mu \iota \S$, and on Aristot. H. A. 5, 5. Schæf. on Gregor. p. 521. not. \parallel

Φρίσσω, Att. φρίττω, I shudder: fut. φρίξω; aor. 1. ἔφριξα; perf. (its pure characteristic letter is κ , as in the subst. φρίκή,) πέφρικα.

The Doric part. $\pi\epsilon\phi\rho$ ίκονταs (Pind. Pyth. 4, 326.) is either a perfect formed according to the analogy of the present, like $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda$ ήγοντες under Κλάζω, and ἐρρίγοντι under 'Ριγέω, or it is a present from a form $\pi\epsilon$ φρίκω. Compare also ἀνεστάκουσα, Archim. and see Greg. Cor. in Ætol. 56. Maitt. p. 239.

* Έπεισφρείς is also quoted by Hermann from Eurip. Phaëth. 2, 50.

† This form is mentioned by all the Grammarians and in Stephan. Thesaur. in voc., but I know not from what writer it is taken. The simple φρέs 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 ἔκφρες must have been the original reading in Aristoph. Vesp. 162. instead of ἔκφερε, which cannot be the true one.

‡ [Passow has Ἐκφρείω Poet. for Ἐκ-

'§ [În Schneider's Lexicon we find Έμπίφρημι, like ἐμφράττω, I thrust in, in order to fill up an aperture, Aristot. II. A. 5, 6. ἐμπιφράναι εἰς τὸν μυκτῆρα. But the word is suspicious.—Passow omits it altogether in his Lexicon.]

 \parallel $\Phi \rho \acute{e}\omega$ has been most improperly reckoned among the sister-forms of $\phi \acute{e}\rho\omega$: for though it may be wished to class it etymologically with that verb, still its totally distinct meaning requires a grammatical

treatment equally distinct.

Φρύγω, I roast: fut. φρύξω; aor. 1. ἔφρυξα; aor. 1. ρass. ἐφρύχθην, infin. φρυχθηναι, Hom. Epigr. 14, 4. aor. 2. pass. ἐφρύγην, infin. φρύγηναι.

ΦΥΖ-. See Φεύγω.

Φυλάσσω, Att. φυλάττω, Iwatch: fut. φυλάξω,&c.—MIDD. I stand on my guard, guard mysolf against, take heed of.

The imperative Nηὸν δὲ προφύλαχθε (Hymn. Apoll. 538.) in whatever way we explain it, is a very anomalous form. If we suppose it to be the perf. pass. for $\pi\rho\sigma\pi\epsilon\phi\dot{\nu}\lambda\alpha\chi\theta\epsilon$, the immediate context $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon$ $\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ $\phi\dot{\nu}\lambda'$ άνθρώπων, seems greatly in favour of that supposition, particularly as the imperat. perf. was also in use, e.g. in Hes. ε, 795. πεφύλαξο: but this form, as well as the whole of the middle voice, has always the definite sense of to be on one's quard, and with the accus. to be on one's quard against, watch against; whereas the simple meaning of watching over is expressed by the active only, φυλάσσω, προφυλάσσω: 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 agrist, 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 προφύλαχθε to be a syncopated form of the pres. act. like φέρτε, consequently for προφυλάσσετε, formed from the stem or root ΦΥΛΑΚ-, yet instead of the termination -κτε taking that of $-\chi\theta\epsilon$, like $\check{a}\nu\omega\chi\theta\epsilon^*$.

Φύρω, I mix, particularly by adding moisture; whence, I knead; and in Homer, I wet, moisten, stain: it has in the older language a fut. φύρσω; aor. 1. ἔφυρσα, &c.: but in prose it changes to the inflexion of -άω, as fut. φυράσω, and in Hippocr. Diæt. 2, 8, 10. φυρήσω; aor. 1. ἐφύρασα; aor. 1. midd. ἐφυρασάμην (infin. φυράσασθαι, Aristoph. Nub. 979.); aor. 1. pass. ἐφυράθην (part. φυραθεῖσα, Plat. Theæt. p. 147. c.); see Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 205. In the perf. pass. both πεφύραμαι and πέφυρμαι† were in use; the latter

^{*} In Xen. Cyr. 8, 6, 3. διαπεφυλάκασι is a false reading for -λάχασι.

[†] Whether both were used in Attic prose, is still a question. In Thucyd.

^{3, 49.} criticism has declared in favour of πεφυραμένοs: but the exclusive usage of πεφυρμένοs in succeeding writers, e.g. in Lucian, Plutarch, and others, leads us to

in Homer and Xenophon; compare Od. 1, 397. and Xen. Ages. 2, 14.

Lucian has the aor. 2. pass. $\epsilon\phi \nu\rho\eta\nu$ (συναναφυρέντες, Epist. Saturn. 28.): on the other hand the present $\phi \nu\rho\hat{\omega}$, $\phi \nu\rho\hat{q}\nu$ appears not to have been in use, except perhaps among some of the later writers. The formation of $\phi\nu\rho\sigma\omega$ always remained in the language of poetry; and Pindar (Nem. 1, 104.) has also the fut. 3. (paullo-post) $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\rho\sigma\sigma\nu\mu\alpha\iota$; which rather confirms than opposes the observation made in my Grammar, "that verbs with λ , μ , ν or ρ as their characteristic letter, seldom have a third future, if they are inflected regularly:" for $\phi\nu\rho\omega$, by its inflexion in $-\sigma\omega$, no longer preserves its analogy with those verbs.

Φύω, I beget*, is inflected regularly. But the perf. πέφῦκα and the aor. 2. ἔφῦν, infin. φῦναι, part. φύς (see note p. 53. and note p. 238.) have the immediate meaning of to spring up, be produced or begotten†, to which belong also the pres. pass. φύομαι, and fut. midd. φύσομαι, e.g. Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 32. θάρσος δὲ ἐμφύσεται. Compare Δύω and the statement there made of this yerb.

The moods of $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\nu\nu$ correspond also with those of $\tilde{\epsilon}\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\nu$. The conj. $\phi^{i}\omega$ (probably with ν long) is found in Xenoph. Hier. 7, 3. $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is $\tilde{\epsilon}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}\mu\phi^{i}\eta$ $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\omega$ s. The 3. sing. opt. $\phi^{i}\eta$ occurs in Theocr. 15, 94. If this optative had followed strictly the analogy of verbs in $-\mu$, the optatives in $-\epsilon i\eta\nu$, $-\alpha i\eta\nu$, $-\epsilon i\eta\nu$ would have required the corresponding termination to be $-\nu i\eta\nu$: but as this diphthong is never found before a consonant, the passive optative could not be $-\nu i\mu\eta\nu$, $-\nu i\tau$ 0, but became $-i\mu\eta\nu$, $-\nu\tau$ 0, and therefore to preserve conformity the active was written $\phi^{i}\nu^{i}\eta^{i}\nu$, not $\phi^{i}\nu^{i}\eta^{i}\nu$. Compare $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\hat{\nu}^{i}\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\nu^{i}\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ p. 73. and Buttm. Lexil. p. 425. with note;

Beside $\check{\epsilon}\phi\nu\nu$, an aor. 2. pass. was formed with the same sense, viz. $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\dot{\nu}\eta\nu$, conj. $\phi\nu\dot{\omega}$, infin. $\phi\nu\dot{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$, &c., which was in use as early as the time of Hippocrates, and among the later writers became the common form. To this belongs also a fut. $\phi\nu\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, of which we find the infin. $\dot{\alpha}\nu\alpha\phi\nu\dot{\eta}\sigma\sigma\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ in Lucian. Jup. Trag. 19.

conjecture that there were older precedents for this latter. See Valck. ad Schol. Eurip. Phæn. 1201.

in Porson. Eurip. Phæn. 34. of a mother.
—Passow.]

‡ [Passow is however of opinion that φύην still remains very doubtful.]

^{* [}This verb is not confined to the above sense; it has the general meaning of to produce, bring forth, and is used of plants, trees, the hair, the teeth, &c.; and

[†] In the later writers φύs, οἱ φύντεs is used in the causative sense; see Bekker on Phot. Bibl. p. 17. a. (Appian.)

Instead of $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota$ we find in Homer the Epic $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\alpha\sigma\iota$, and instead of the part. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\kappa\omega$, - $\delta\tau\sigma$, the Epic $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\omega$, - $\delta\tau\sigma$, fem. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\nu\alpha$: on the omission of the κ , see $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega$ p. 37. and on the length of the oblique cases see $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\omega$, $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\omega\tau\sigma$ with note p. 51. or $T\rho\iota\zeta\omega$. In the pluperf. Homer always uses the mere reduplication without the augment; while Hesiod (ϵ , 151. α , 76. θ , 152. 673.) has in a particular instance restored the augment, and formed a 3. plur. $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\kappa\sigma$ (for $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\kappa\sigma\sigma$) like the imperf. of a pres. $\pi\epsilon\phi\nu\kappa\omega$: see $M\eta\kappa\alpha\nu\mu\sigma$.

[Parmenides has ventured to use $\phi \hat{v} \nu$ for $\phi \hat{v} \nu a \iota$; but the 3. plur. aor.

2. ἔφῦν for ἔφυσαν is principally Epic.—Passow.]

Φώσκω. See Φαύσκω.

X.

Χάζομαι, ἀναχάζομαι*, I retire, retreat: depon. midd.

The prose usage of this verb is known only from Xenophon, who has the imperf. $\dot{\alpha}_{\nu\epsilon\chi\alpha}\zeta\dot{\alpha}_{\mu\eta\nu}$, Anab. 4, 7, 7. and Cyr. 7, 1, 17. (24.); but he has also in the same sense an instance of the unusual active voice of this same verb, $\dot{\alpha}_{\nu\alpha\chi}\dot{\alpha}\zeta_{\nu\nu\tau\epsilon}$, Anab. 4, 1, 12. (16.) We find also $\ddot{\alpha}_{\gamma\chi\alpha}\zeta_{\epsilon}$ quoted from Soph. in Lex. Seguer. 6. p. 340. In the older language the active voice of this verb had also the causative sense of I cause to retire, drive back: see Pind. Nem. 10, 129. where the reading $\ddot{\epsilon}_{\chi\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu}$ 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. κέκαδον, and in the midd. a. 3. plur. κεκάδοντο, with a fut. act. κεκαδήσω formed from it. These forms came by an old Ionicism (compare $\tau \epsilon \tau \nu \kappa \epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu$) from $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi u \delta o \nu$, which usage has retained in this unchanged shape under the cognate verb $\chi a \nu \delta \tilde{a} \nu \omega$. Hence κεκάδοντο (Il. δ, 497.) is precisely the same as $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi \tilde{a} \sigma a \nu \tau \sigma$; but the active forms (Il. λ, 334. Od. φ, 153.) with the genitive have the sense of to deprive, in which lies the same causative sense as in $\tilde{a} \nu a \chi \tilde{a} \zeta \omega$, I make a person yield or retire from anything, expressed more simply in Latin by cedere facio. On κεκαδήσομαι see Κήδω.

Χαίνω. See Χάσκω.

Χαίρω, I rejoice: fut. χαιρήσω; aor. 2. (from the passive voice) ἐχάρην; and from this aorist was formed again a perf. κεχάρηκα or κεχάρημαι, with the force of the present increased, I am rejoiced: compare 'Ανδάνω ἔαδα, Θάλλω τέθηλα, Κήδομαι κέκηδα, Πείθομαι πέποιθα. On the for-

^{* [}There is no instance of the simple xázw in the active voice,-Passow.]

mation of the perfect from the agrist see $\frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial t} =$

The perfect κεχάρηκα is found in Aristoph. Vesp. 764.; the part. κεχαρηκώς, rejoiced, is of frequent occurrence in Herodotus, and without the κ (κεχαρηότα, &c.) in the Epic poets: the perf. pass. κεχάρημαι occurs likewise in Aristoph. Vesp. 389. and its part. κεχαρημένος in Hom. Hymn. 6, 10. Both the futures formed with reduplication from these perfects are found also in Homer, e.g. κεχαρησέμεν, Il. 0, 98., κεχαρήσεται, Od. ψ, 266.

Of the regular inflexion, we find in the poets (from an Epic aor. 1. midd. έχηράμην) the 3. sing. χήρατο, II. ξ, 270.: compare Jacob. Anthol. Poet. p. 262. and (from a reduplicated aor. 2. midd. κεχαρόμην) the 3. plur. κεχάρουτο with the optatives κεχάρουτο, κεχαροίατο, II. and Od. The part. perf. κεχαρμένοs, rejoiced, occurs in Eurip. Or. 1122. El. 1077. and other tragedies of the same writer. The verbal adj. is χαρτόs.

The aor. 1. ἐχαίρησα is found in the later writers, e.g. in Plut. Lucull. 25.*. The fut. χαρήσομαι which occurs in the LXX., although formed analogically from ἐχάρην, like ἀκαχήσω from ἤκαχον (see note p. 12.), is decidedly a form to be rejected: see Thom. Mag. [The pres. midd. χαίρομαι was a notorious barbarism, Aristoph. Fr. 291.: nor were χαιρέω, χαρέω or χάρω ever in use.—Passow.]

Xαλάω, I loosen, relax: fut. χαλάσω, Dor. χαλάξω, &c. This verb has a short in the inflexion; and takes σ in the passive; e.g. perf. pass. κεχάλασμαι.

Xανδάνω, I contain: fut. χείσομαι (Od. σ, 17.); aor. ἔχάδον; perf. (synonymous with the present) κέχανδα. This future is generally placed by mistake with a theme ΧΕΙΩ, although it is evident that χείσομαι bears exactly the same relation to ἔχαδον as πείσομαι to ἔπαθον. It comes therefore from the root ΧΑΝΔ-, with a change of the radical vowel. See Buttm. Lexil. p. 181.

Χάσκω, I open (intrans.), open my mouth, gape: imperf. ἔχασκον. This verb borrows from χαίνω (which is not used

^{*} Lobeck (ad Phryn. p. 740.) is wrong in speaking of this reading as suspicious. The expression où $\chi \alpha \iota \rho i \sigma \epsilon \iota s$, "you shall have cause to rue it," was so common, that the transition to the acrist became quite natural, and it is at the same time very conceivable that où $\kappa \epsilon \chi \acute{a} \rho \eta$ would

have given a somewhat different meaning. Hence I cannot but think it a question worth considering, whether the earlier writers would not have used the same expression in this case, and whether Plutarch had not some precedent for his use of it.

by any of the older writers) a fut. $\chi a \nu o \hat{\nu} \mu a \iota^*$, an aor. $\tilde{\epsilon} \chi a \nu o \nu$, and a perf. (synonymous with the pres.) $\kappa \hat{\epsilon} \chi \eta \nu a \dagger$, 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. xuivw ..

In the passage of Aristoph. Ach. 133. ὑμεῖς δὲ πρεσβεύεσθε καὶ κεχήνατε, Herodian found κεχήνετε written, (see Chœrobosc. in Bekk. Anecd. III, p. 1287. where "Ορνισιν is a corruption,) which he considers to be an inflexion of the indicative for -ατε. For that some of the older authors preferred writing the perf. act. of the verb with ε, is clear from Apollon. Synt, 1, 10. (p. 37, 9. Be.): see also ᾿Ανήνοθα 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. Κεχήνετε is the imperative, which mood is most suitable to the context of that passage; and the rarity of its occurrence misled the commentators: see κεκράγετε under Κράζω.

Χέζω, caco: fut. χεσοῦμαι; perf. κέχοδα; aor. ἔχεσα and ἔχεσον; perf. pass. κέχεσμαι (part. κεχεσμένον, Aristoph. Ach. 1185.).

I have some doubt whether the aor. ἔχεσον be a genuine form; and I may say the same of the infin. χεσεῖν 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 εἰπεῖν and ἐνεγκεῖν; compare ἔπεσον and ἔπεσα, and see ἐδύσετο pp. 73. 74. Aristophanes (Eccles. 320. Nub. 174.) has the part. aor. 1. χέσας, καταχέσαντι; but the form χέσαιτο (Equ. 1057.) proves as little in favour of the aor. 1. •as it does of the middle voice of this verb, for it is used in that passage in a play on the word.

Χείσομαι. See Χανδάνω.

Χέω, I pour: fut. χέω, χεῖς, χεῖ; fut. midd. χέομαι; aor. l. ἔχεα (see ἔκηα under Καίω), imper. χέον, χεάτω,

† [According to Ap. Dysc. there was also a perf. κέχαγκα.—Passow.]

^{* [}Buttmann, in his Lexil. p. 181. supposes another fut. χήσομαι, of which the 3. sing. χήσεται may be read in a corrupted passage of Hom. Hymn. Ven. 253.]

[†] The mention by Chrysoloras in his Grammar that χαίνω was not in use, shows that the older Grammarians had before taught the same.

conj. χέω, infin. χέαι; aor. 1. midd. εχεάμην; perf. κέχυκα; perf. pass. κέχυμαι; aor. l. pass. ἐχύθην*.—ΜIDD.

The forms χεύσω, έχευσα appear to have never occurred †, but are only supposed to have existed from the derivative χεῦμα and the shortness of the v in κέχυκα, &c. That χέω is fut. as well as pres. was first remarked by Elmsley, and proved by the following examples: κάρα τε γώρ σου ξυγχέω ρανεί τε . . . , Eurip. Thes. Fr. 1. οὐ κατορύξεις καὶ μύρον ἐπιχεῖς, Aristoph. Pac. 169....παραχέων ἔρχομαι, Plat. Com. ap. Athen. p. 665. c. To which we may add xeóueror (said of pouring out the libation,) καὶ ἐναγιοῦντα, Isæus 6. p. 61.: which passages had been previously explained sometimes as harshness of syntax, at others as harshness of contraction. And thus έγχεω 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 έγχέω ..

The Epic language has an aor. ἔχευα, conj. χεύω (χεύωσιν, Il. η, 86.), midd. έχευάμην; and at Od. β, 222. Il. η, 336. we read χεύω, χεύομεν, which may be the conj. aor. supplying in Homer's usage the place of the future, quite as well as the Epic fut. χεύω answering to the Attic fut. χέω (compare δήω, κείων, κέων, σώω); both which views are in syntax fundamentally the same. Again δάκρυσι χεύω, Eurip. El. 181. (where I proposed on a former occasion to read the false form χεύσω,) is, as far as regards the verb, quite correct. Χεύω in that passage is not the present, (it never occurs as a present even in the Epic language, the metre being satisfied by $\chi \epsilon i \omega$: see Od. 1, 10. Hes. θ , 83.) but it is the Epic future of Homer which suits the lyric stanza, and may be joined with $\kappa \rho o \dot{\nu} \sigma \omega$ in the preceding verse, without offending against $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota$ in

the following one.

The Epic language has also the syncop. aor. pass. έχύμην, ἔχυτο, χύμενος (to be poured out,) formed after the perfect.

^{*} Some verbs change the diphthong ev of the radical syllable in the perf. pass. to υ; e.g. τεύχω τέτυγμαι, φεύγω πεφυγμένος, σεύω έσσυμαι, πεύθομαι πέπυσ-μαι. Χέω, as one of the verbs in -έω which take sv in the inflexion, follows the same analogy. In all these perfects the v is short.

⁺ Whatever appearance there was in Homer of these forms, has now been changed on the best authority to the Epic formation mentioned above in the next paragraph.

Limsley very correctly compares this future with τελέω, whose fut. τελέσω, by the Ionic omission of the σ , becomes again τελέω, Attic τελώ; 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 χέω, χέσω was the ori-ginal formation is shown by the aorist έχέθην, which remained in common use to quite a late period: an additional cause for the other formation without the σ, was the coincidence of the fut. and aor. of χέω with those of χέζω.

On the aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\dot{\epsilon}\theta\eta\nu$, $\chi\epsilon\theta\hat{\eta}\nu\alpha$, which was very common in the later writers, see the preceding note, and Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 731.

ΧΛΛΔ-, whence an Ionic perf. κέχλαδα*, of which Pindar (Ol. 9, 3. Pyth. 4, 319.) has the part. κεχλαδω΄s, gen. κεχλάδοντος, swelling: compare πεφρίκοντας under Φρίσσω. [We find also in Pind. Fr. 48. a perf. infin. κεχλάδειν for κεχλαδέναι.—Passow.]

Χόω, I heap up (generally, a mound of earth): fut. χώσω, &c.; infin. pres. χοῦν, part. χῶν. The passive takes σ, e. g. perf. κέχωσμαι; aor. l. ἐχώσθην, infin. χωσθῆναι.

The above formation is frequent in Herodotus, while the pres. $\chi \omega \nu \nu \nu \mu \iota$ belongs to the later writers. $\chi \omega \nu \mu \iota$ may be found in its alphabetical place.

Χραισμεῖν, to help, infin. of a defective agrist ἔχραισμον, from which again came a fut. χραισμήσω and agr. 1. ἐχραίσμησα: compare ἀκαχήσω and note p. 12. See also Buttm. Lexil. pp. 541—8.

 $X\rho\acute{a}\omega$. To this stem belong many verbs with particular meanings; all those, however, which are used in prose may be easily traced to the same idea, commodare, to give, lend†. All have the inflexion with the η , e.g. $\chi\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$, &c., and that even in the Doric dialect. The contracted forms take also η as the vowel of contraction, as in $\chi\acute{a}\omega$, $\kappa\nu\acute{a}\omega$, $\sigma\mu\acute{a}\omega$, &c., while this peculiarity is also to be remarked, that the Ionic dialect here takes \bar{a} as the vowel of contraction, as in $\kappa\nu\acute{a}\nu$, $\sigma\mu\acute{a}\tau a\iota$, &c., Herodot. 9, 110. We will now describe five forms which are used in prose.

1. Χράω, I give an oracle, foretel: fut. χρήσω; aor. 1. ἔχρησα. Pass. χράομαι; fut. midd. χρήσομαι; perf. pass.

• If we suppose a present from which to form this perfect, it must be $\chi \lambda \dot{\eta} \delta \omega$ (like $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \theta a$); which is connected with $\chi \lambda \iota \dot{\delta} \dot{\eta}$, but not with $\kappa a \chi \lambda \dot{a} \zeta \omega$, a term signifying sound; nor is it akin to $\kappa \lambda \dot{a} \zeta \omega$, partly because the stem of this latter has $\gamma \gamma$, partly because analogy gives us the change of χ to κ (in $\kappa \epsilon \kappa a \dot{\delta} \omega \nu$ and the like), but not the converse of κ to χ which would be required in this case. [Passow, however, forms this perfect from a present $\chi \lambda \dot{a} \zeta \omega$, Dor. $\chi \lambda \dot{\eta} \zeta \omega$, which he makes exactly synonymous with its compound $\kappa a \gamma \chi \lambda \dot{a} \zeta \omega$ (Pind. Ol. 7, 2. $\kappa a \gamma$ -

χλάζοισα), supposing both to mean the bursting forth of water from a spring or any confined place, or the bubbling of boiling water.

† Some other old deviations of meaning in this verb come from the idea of to lay hold on: see χράω, ἐπιχράω, χραύω, and χραίνω, in Schneider's Lexicon; where, however, there are no striking peculiarities of deviation. It appears to me evident that all these and the meaning of to give, &c., come etymologically from χείρ, χερός.

κέχρησμαι; aor. l. pass. ἐχρήσθην. Thus the passive takes σ. See also χρήζω.

In the Attic tragedians we find the present and imperfect contracted in η ; thus $\chi\rho\hat{\eta}$ is 3. sing. pres. for $\chi\rho\hat{q}$, Herm. Soph. El. 35. $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\eta$ is 3. sing. imperf., Soph. Œd. C. 87. On the other hand Herodotus has frequently the 2. sing. $\chi\rho\hat{q}s$, 3. sing. $\chi\rho\hat{q}$, and in the infin. $\chi\rho\hat{q}\nu$; and he is followed by the later writers, as Lucian, &c. In the Ionic dialect $\chi\rho\dot{a}\omega$ is sometimes changed to $\chi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega$, whence the part. pres. $\chi\rho\dot{\epsilon}o\nu\sigma a$, Herodot. 7, 111.; and in the Epic poetry it becomes $\chi\rho\epsilon\ell\omega$, whence the part. $\chi\rho\epsilon\dot{\iota}\omega\nu$, Od. θ , 79.

In many passages of Herodotus all the manuscripts have the perfect passive with the σ : in others the σ is wanting: see Schweigh. Lex. Herodot. It is easily seen that uniformity must be preserved by

adopting it in all cases; κέχρημαι belongs to χρησθαι only.

In the middle voice the meaning of this verb approaches very nearly to that of the common $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, as in the expression $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\mu\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\iota\dot{\varphi}$, which appears to be exactly the same as $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\mu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\kappa\tilde{\eta}$ in Xenophon; sometimes however it stands absolutely, as $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ $\pi\circ\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\mu\circ\nu$: so that $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\nu$, to foretell, answers correctly to $\chi\rho\tilde{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, to consult an oracle. See Od. θ , 79. 81. κ , 492.

2. Χράομαι, I use, depon. midd.: fut. χρήσομαι; aor. 1. ἐχρησάμην; perf. (without σ) κέχρημαι. The present and imperf. are contracted in η instead of the regular a, thus χρῶμαι, χρῷ, χρῆται, infin. χρῆσθαι, &c., Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 61. Κέχρημαι is sometimes used in the strict sense of a perfect, e. g. in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 30. (24.) ὁ πολλάκις αὐτῷ κεχρημένος: but it has generally the sense of the present, as in Xen. Equ. 4, 5. κεχρῆσθαι ταῖς ὁπλαῖς, and in most instances the force is increased, I am always using and therefore I have*. Verbal adj. χρηστός, χρηστέον, Plat. Gorg. 136.

In the Epic language κεχρησθαι has the meaning of to be in need of; hence in Homer and Hesiod κεχρημένος is used as an adjective in the sense of needy. Τίνος κέχρησθε; Theorr. 26, 18. Fut. κεχρήσεται, id. 16, 73. Compare χρή and the note under Χρήζω.

the Epic poets, but there are instances of it in the Attic also, e. g. in Elmsl. Eurip. Heracl. 801.—Passow.]

^{*} See 'Ανδάνω ἔαδα, Θάλλω τέθηλα, Κήδομαι κέκηδα, Πείθομαι πέποιθα. † [This meaning properly belongs to

In the unusual case of a passive tense being formed from this middle verb (compare $\beta\iota\dot{a}\zeta\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$), the agrist has the σ (as in $\chi\rho\dot{a}\omega$, I foretell), $a\dot{\iota}\nu\dot{\eta}\epsilon s\ldots\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, Herodot. 7, 144. again, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\rho\eta\sigma\vartheta\dot{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$, to be put to death (from $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\sigma\vartheta\dot{\alpha}\iota$ $\tau\iota\nu\alpha$), Herodot. 9, 120. with which the verbal adjective agrees.

In this verb the forms of the Ionic dialect are difficult to be ascertained with any degree of certainty: for sometimes the passages and manuscripts of Herodotus give the contractions $\chi\rho\hat{a}\tau\alpha\iota$, $\chi\rho\hat{a}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\chi\rho\hat{a}\sigma\theta\omega$, &c.; at other times the α is changed to ϵ in the same forms, as $\chi\rho\hat{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\partial\alpha\iota$: in some passages we find $\chi\rho\hat{\epsilon}\omega\tau\tau\alpha\iota$, in others $\chi\rho\hat{\epsilon}\omega\tau\tau\alpha\iota^*$. In the imperative Herodotus (1, 115.) has, according to all the manuscripts, $\chi\rho\hat{\epsilon}\omega$, while Hippocrates frequently uses $\chi\rho\hat{\epsilon}\sigma$ shortened from $\chi\rho\hat{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma$, like $\hat{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\sigma$, which see under $\kappa\lambda\hat{\epsilon}\omega$.

3. Κίχρημι, I lend: fut. χρήσω; aor. 1. έχρησα, &c.; infin. pres. κίχραναι. Midd. κίχραμαι, I borrow.

It has been correctly remarked, that $\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$ in Herodotus means simply to give, grant (see Herodot. 7, 38. and Schweigh. in Lex.). But a present $\chi\rho\hat{\alpha}\omega$ never occurs in this sense; we place, therefore, the present $\kappa(\chi\rho\eta\mu\iota)$ instead of it, although in the instances where it occurs in Demosthenes and others, it has the proper meaning of to lend. The aor. 1. midd. $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\eta\sigma\dot{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ was avoided by the Attic writers in this sense: see Antiatt. Bekk. p. 116.

Χρή, (oportet) it is necessary; an impersonal verb:
 ορτ. χρείη, conj. χρῆ, infin. χρῆναι, part. (τὸ) χρεών.
 Imperf. ἐχρῆν, or in prose χρῆν. Fut. χρήσει.

The indicative of this verb may be considered as the 3. sing of $\chi\rho\dot{a}\omega$ — $\chi\rho\hat{\eta}$, with the tone or accent shortened. The participle also comes exactly, according to analogy, from $\chi\rho\hat{a}\sigma\nu$, like $\nu\bar{a}\dot{o}s$, Ion. $\nu\eta\dot{o}s$, Att. $\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}s$ (compare the subst. $\chi\rho\dot{\epsilon}\omega s$ and the neut. part. $\tau\epsilon\partial\nu\epsilon\dot{\omega}s$): but it has the anomalous accent of $i\dot{\omega}\nu$ and the Ionic $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\nu$: It is indeclinable; that is to say, it occurred so seldom in any construction requiring other

* All the above-mentioned forms are undoubtedly pure Ionic; and this uncertainty of usage is not otherwise than surprising, even in a dialect. That the same writer should have had a twofold usage in the same form, is an unreasonable supposition. Undoubtedly, therefore, the variation in the forms of this verb in Herodotus arose entirely from the uncertainty of tradition, and from the different Grammarians who employed themselves on the

text. Whoever examines the passages and their various readings with the help of Schweighæuser's Lexicon Herodot., will find it most probable that Herodotus always contracted in a the forms which were grounded on $a\epsilon$, while those in a0 were changed to $\epsilon\omega$. To decide between $\epsilon\omega$ and ϵ 0 is much more difficult. There can be, however, no hesitation in rejecting from the text of Herodotus such forms as $\chi\rho\bar{\eta}\sigma\theta\alpha$ and $\epsilon\chi\rho\bar{\eta}\tau\rho$.

than the nominative or accusative case, that the other cases became obsolete. It is found sometimes as a genitive, e.g. in Eurip. Hippol. 1256. Herc. Fur. 21. Joseph. Ant. 8, 284. but there is perhaps no instance of its being used as a dative, $\tau \bar{\varphi} \chi \rho \epsilon \omega' \nu$.

In the other three moods (opt., conj., and infin.) this verb follows the formation of verbs in μ_{ℓ} , retaining, however, the η in the infinitive, and ϵ_{ℓ} instead of α_{ℓ} in the optative, as in a similar case under $\Pi \ell \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu_{\ell}$.

We find twice in Euripides (Hecub. 258. Herc. Fur. 828.) $r \hat{\sigma} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$, which Thom. Mag. in voc. affirms to be a poetical infinitive; therefore contracted for $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$. At the same time it is not to be denied that the participle $\chi \rho \epsilon \omega \nu$, which is preferred by some critics, and which may be pronounced as a monosyllable, would suit both passages better.

The imperfect, whether it followed the conjugation of contracted verbs or of those in μ , would be $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\rho\eta$: therefore $\hat{\epsilon}\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\nu$ or $\chi\rho\hat{\eta}\nu$ (the only forms ever used) are to be compared with the 3. sing. $\hat{\eta}\nu$, Ion. $\tilde{\epsilon}\eta\nu$ from $\epsilon i\mu i$. But the accent of the augmented form is so strikingly anomalous that we should be forced to consider it incorrect, did not the vain attempts of the Grammarians to explain it show (see Eustath. ad Od. κ , 60.), that it was founded firmly on tradition*.

In the older language this verb had also the meaning of opus est, one has need, I have need; and in this sense it was afterwards used or rather misused personally: e.g. $\tilde{\phi}$ $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} s$, of which thou hast need, Cratin. ap. Suid. v. $\chi \rho \hat{\eta}$; où $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a$, thou hast no need, Megarensis ap. Aristoph. Acharn. 778. compare $\Delta \epsilon \omega$. From this verb Herodotus (3, 117.) has a middle voice with a similar meaning in the form $\chi \rho \eta t \sigma \kappa o \mu a t$. Compare $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \eta \mu a t$ above, and note on $\chi \rho \eta t \omega$ below.

5. ἀπόχρη, is sufficient. This verb has the anomaly of the preceding one in this 3. sing. pres. indic. only, inasmuch as it is shortened from ἀποχρῆ; in all its other forms it follows regularly χράω, &c.: thus 3. plur. ἀποχρῶσιν; infin. pres. ἀποχρῆν; imperf. ἀπέχρη; fut. αποχρήσει; aor. 1. ἀπέχρησεν, &c. ΜΙDD. ἀποχρῶμαι, I have enough; infin. ἀποχρῆσθαι. In this voice it is inflected like χράομαι, 2.

The Ionics have also the regular 3. sing. pres. indic. ἀποχρᾶ. In the same or a similar sense Herodotus has other compounds, καταχρᾶ, ἐκχρήσει, ἐξέχρησε, ἀντέχρησε.

This verb is not an impersonal, although, like other personal verbs, it

^{*} Perhaps the shorter form $\chi\rho\bar{\eta}\nu$ had the augmented one was made by degrees become so general in common life, that to conform to it.

is sometimes used impersonally; on the contrary, in many instances its subject stands plainly before it, and hence it has the plural $\mathring{a}\pi o\chi\rho\mathring{\omega}\sigma\iota$: but as things or objects in the third person are its most natural subject, the other persons became obsolete; yet not entirely; see Epicharmus in Heindorf's Note on Plat. Gorg. 131. ϵ Is $\mathring{\epsilon}\gamma\mathring{\omega}\nu$ $\mathring{a}\pi o\chi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, I alone am sufficient. See a similar appearance in Mé $\lambda\omega$, where however the 1. and 2. person have remained in use somewhat more than in this verb. A solitary irregularity occurs in the middle voice in $\mathring{a}\pi\epsilon\chi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\sigma$ (Herodot. 8, 14.) used impersonally for $\mathring{a}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho a$; compare $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\tau a$ for $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota^*$.

 $X\rho\eta\zeta\omega$, I desire, wish†. The Attics use it in present and imperfect only.

In the Ionic dialect it is $\chi\rho\eta\dot{\tau}\zeta\omega$: whence the more precise Grammarians write the common form $\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\dot{\zeta}\omega$, like $\ddot{a}\tau\tau\omega$: see Greg. Cor. in Ion. 42. The Ionics have also other tenses, as $\chi\rho\eta\dot{\tau}\sigma\omega$, $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\ddot{\tau}\sigma\alpha$ (Herodot. 7, 38. 5, 20. 65.), because in this form no confusion can possibly be made with the tenses of $\chi\rho\dot{a}\omega$. But in the printed text all these are constantly written with η in Herodotus also. $\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\dot{\zeta}\omega$ in the sense of $\chi\rho\dot{a}\nu$, to foretell, see in Schneid. Lex.‡.

Χρίω, I besmear, anoint: fut. χρίσω, &c.; perf. pass. κέχρισμαι; but the perf. part. (without the σ) κεχριμένος is found in Com. ap. Athen. 13. p. 557. f.—Midd.

This verb has also the meaning of to sting, as spoken of insects and the like; on which Phrynichus (Appar. p. 46.) gives the following rule, that in this latter sense the perfect passive is written $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$, in the former $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota$. In this last incorrect form (although in that writer the diphthong $\epsilon \iota$ is expressly named,) we must look for nothing more than the correct form $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho i \sigma \theta a \iota$; and the direction given by Phrynichus must necessarily be extended thus: $\chi \rho \iota \omega$, $\epsilon \chi \rho i \sigma a \iota$, $\chi \rho i \sigma a \iota$, $\kappa \epsilon \chi \rho i \sigma a \iota$

Χρώννυμι or Χρώζω, I colour: fut. χρώσω, &c.

(anything) forward, offer; hinreichen, to reach or extend to any certain point, and also to be sufficient.

† This meaning arises from those forms of $\chi\rho\delta\omega$ which have the meaning of I need, in which sense, however, the verb $\chi\rho\eta\zeta\omega$ itself occurs in the later writers only: see Stephan. Thesaur.

‡[Schneider quotes $\chi\rho\dot{\eta}\zeta\omega$ in this sense from Æschyl. Choeph. 338. Soph. Œd. C.

1426. Eurip. Hel. 523.]

^{*} Such an irregularity could arise only from the original meaning of the expression being entirely forgotten. In these compounds the active $\chi\rho\acute{a}\omega$ is used exactly in its true sense. The thing supplies us with what we need; in $\acute{a}\pi\sigma\chi\rho\ddot{a}$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\chi\rho\ddot{a}$ it supplies us to the extent of our need; in $\acute{a}r\tau\iota\chi\rho\ddot{a}$ it supplies us by acting in opposition to our need. The similarity of the German expression to the Greek illustrates this in a most striking manner: in German darreichen means to reach

In Eurip. Phen. 1619. we find $\chi\rho\omega\zeta\omega$ and in Med. 497. $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$, but in both passages with the meaning of to touch, and the collateral idea of a polluting touch. Perhaps in the old Attic language this was the only meaning of $\chi\rho\omega\zeta\omega$, and $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ belonged to this present only: for according to the analogy of $\zeta\omega\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$ and $\sigma\omega\zeta\omega$, we might expect the perfect passive of $\chi\rho\omega\nu\nu\mu\iota$ in the old Attic to be $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, which appears merely as the various reading of $\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, e. g. in Aristot. De Color. 3. But in Eth. Nicom. 2, 3. all the manuscripts have $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\chi\rho\omega\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$ os.

Χώννυμι. See Χόω.

Χώομαι, I am angry, depon. midd.: fut. χώσομαι; aor. 1. έχωσάμην.

Χωρέω, I yield, go: fut. midd. χωρήσομαι, but sometimes also χωρήσω: see Poppo Obs. Crit. in Thucyd. p. 149. and Buttmann's Notes in the Auctarium ad Plat. Theæt. 117. Ed. 2.

Ψ.

Ψαύω, I touch: fut. ψαύσω, &c.; perf. pass. έψαυσμαι; aor. 1. pass. έψαύσθην.

[It is generally joined with the genitive, sometimes with the dative, whether with an accusative depends on Soph. Ant. 858. 962.—Passow.]

Ψάω, I rub: fut. ψήσω, &c., like κνάω, σμάω; see also Πεινάω. The passive fluctuates between the formation with and without the σ ; as, perf. ἔψημαι, ἔψησμαι; aor. 1. ἐψή-θην, ἐψήσθην.

See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 254. The sister-form $\psi \dot{\eta} \chi \omega$ (compare $\sigma \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$, $\sigma \mu \dot{\eta} \chi \omega$) has the more precise sense of to rub down (a horse); to rub in pieces; to the latter of which belongs $\kappa ar \dot{\epsilon} \psi \eta \kappa \tau a\iota$ in Soph. Trach. 698.

Ψέγω, I blame, reproach : fut. ψέξω, &c. ; perf. ἔψογα ; aor. 2. pass. ἐψέγην (see $B\lambda \acute{\epsilon}\pi \omega$).

Ψεύδω, I deceive, cheat: fut. ψεύσω, &c.; perf. pass. ἔψευσμαι; aor. 1. pass. ἐψεύσθην. MIDD. I deceive, lie: οὐκ ἐψεύσαντο τὰς ἀπειλάς, they did not make their threats false, made them good, Herodot. 6, 32.

Ψήχω. See Ψάω.

Ψύχω, I cool: fut. ψύξω; aor. 1. pass. ϵψύχθην; aor. 2. pass. ϵψύχην, and ϵψύχην, Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 318.

 Ω .

'Ωθέω, I push: fut. $\dot{\omega}$ θήσω and $\ddot{\omega}$ σω. All the other tenses are formed from ΩΘΩ, and with the syllabic augment, e. g. imperf. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}\theta$ ουν; aor. 1. $\ddot{\epsilon}\omega$ σα, infin. $\dot{\omega}$ σαι; perf. $\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ κα; perf. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\omega$ σμαι; aor. 1. pass. $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\omega}$ σθην, Pors. Eurip. Med. 336. Plat. Tim. p. 79. e.—Midd.

'Ωνέομαι, I buy, depon. midd.: fut. ωνήσομαι, &c. This verb has also the syllabic augment, e. g. imperf. ἐωνούμην; aor. l. ἐωνησάμην, infin. ωνήσασθαι: but instead of this aorist the pure Attic writers used ἐπριάμην, πρίασθαι.

[This verb was seldom or never used as a passive in the sense of to be sold, yet we find in Plat. Phæd. p. 69. b. the part. ἀνούμενα, where Heindorf's reading ἀνούμεθα appears to be unnecessary. The pluperf. ἐώνητο occurs in Aristoph. Fr. 1175. On the aor. 1. pass. infin. ἐωνηθῆναι and ἀνηθῆναι see Markl. Lys. p. 720. Isæus De Philoct. Hered. 19. A part. perf. act. ἐωνηκώs is quoted by the Grammarians from Lysias.—Passow.]

THE END.

INDEX.

N. B.—The following Index is intended to assist the Student, where the alphabetical arrangement of the work may fail him: consequently those forms only will be found here, which do not begin with the same letter or syllable as the verbs to which they respectively belong. Nor has it been thought necessary to mention all the persons, moods, participles, &c. which occur in the work; in most cases the 1. pers. sing. of the indicative (if that form be in use,) will be found a sufficient guide to all the other moods and persons of any particular tense. The references are to pages.

'Αγέομαι, 7. άγηλαι, 1. ἄγημαι, ἄγημαι, 121. άγήοχα, 6, 7. άγινεόμενον, 7. άγνώσσασκε, άγνώσσεσκε, 4, 223. άγοράσω, 152 note. άγορεύει, 89. άγχαζε, 262. άδέσθαι, 24. άδον, άδήσω, 24. ἄεισι, 36. čίικες, 11. αἰρεύμενος, 10. αΐρω, 10, 250. άκάχημαι, 9, 12. άκάχων, 6 note. ἀκείομαι, 13. άκήκοα, 13. ἀκήχεμαι, 12. άλάλημαι, 9. ἄλαλκον, 6 note, 15. άλασθαι, 18. άλείs, 83. αλέκω, 15. άλεν, άλέν, 83. άλέσθαι, 18. άλεται, 18. ἀλήθω, 15.

άλήλεκα, 15. άλήλιφα, 14. άληναι, άλημεναι, 83. άληται, 18. άλινδεῖσθαι, 159. άλίνδω, άλίσω, 160. άλοίην, άλω, 16. **ἄλοιτο**, 18. άλσο, άλτο, 18. άμεναι, 36. άμπεπαλών, 198. άμπίσχω, 113. άμπνυε, άμπνύνθη, 216. αμύζειν, 177 note. άμφέξω, 113. άμφιέννυμι, 96. άμφιέσω, άμφιω, 96. άναβέβρυχα, 46. άναβησάμενοι, 38. άναβιώσκομαι, 42. άναβράττω, 45 note. άναβρόξειεν, 46. άναβροχέν, 46. άναγιγνώσκω, 54. άναδράμεται, 247. ἀναδών, 64. ἀναλελάμφθαι, 162 note. αναλτος, 14. άναπεπέτασται. 205. άναπετώσαι, 205. άνασσείασκε, 223.

ἀνατέλλω, 235. άνατέτραφα, άνατέτροφα, 244 note. άναφανήσονται, 249. άναφυήσεσθαι, 261. άναχάζομαι, άναχάζοντes, 262. άνεβίων, 42, 43. άνέγνωσα, 54. άνειμεν, άνειτε, 115. ανεξίτητος, 86 note. άνξονται, 115. ανέπλημεν, 209 note. ἀνέσαιμι, 117. άνέσει, ἄνεσαν, 117. άνεστάκουσα, 259. άνετράπετο, 244. ἀνεχαζόμην, 262. άνέχω, &c., 113. dνέφγα, 5 note, 183. ανέφγμαι, ανέφγον, 183. άνέωνται, 115. ανέωξα, ανέωχα, 183. dνηβαν, 120. ἀνῆκεν, 117. ανήνηται, 23. ανήνοθα, 7 note, 25. ανηρειψάμην, 100. ανήσει, 117. aviel, ariei, 116 note.

ανίειν, 116. ανοίγνυμι, ανοίγω, 183 avoiveir, 253 note. αντείπου, 89. αντέχρησε, 269. αντιλέγω, 89. ἀντιχρᾶ, 270 note. ἄνωγα, 7 note. ανώϊστος, 252. ανφξα, 183. ανώσαι, 252. άνωχθι, 26. άξαι, 7. άξαι, 11. άξαντο, 5, 7. άξας, άξασθε, 7. άξέμεν, άξετε, 6, 7. άξω, 4, 6. απαγγέλη, απαγγέλω. μεν, 2. απαγορεύω, 89. απαλεξήσαιμι, 14. απαμβλίσκω, 21. απάφων, 6 note. απεδέδεκτο, απεδέχθην, 58. απεδόμην, 211. απέδρα, 240. απέδρασαν, 68. απεζεσμένος, 120. απειπείν, 88. απείπον, 89. απείργασται, 99. απειργε, απείργε, 91: απέκτακα. απέκτονα, 157. απέλα, 93. απέπλων, 215. απερούμαι, 88. απέσβην, 225. απέσσουα, απεσσύη, 226. απεστέρησα, απεστερή- $\theta \eta \nu$, 229. απεστύγησα, 231. απευήκασιν, 109. απεφάνθη, 249. απέφθιθον, 257. απεφράγην, 258.

άπεχθάνομαι, 109. απέχθομαι, 110. απεχρέετο, 270. απέχρη, απέχρησεν, 269. απεωσθέντος, 6. απήγγειλεν, απήγγε- $\lambda \epsilon \nu$, 2. απηγγέλη, 3. απήγγελον, 2, 3. απήμβροτον, 20. απηξας, 7. απηύρων, 34. $d\pi\eta\chi\theta\delta\mu\eta\nu$, 110. απίκαται, 132. απλακείν, 21 note. απλατος, 202. αποβεβάναι, 38. απόβριξας, 46. αποδιδράναι, 68. αποδιδράσκει, 240. απόδοιντο, 69. αποδράναι, 68. απόδρας, αποδράσα, 68. αποδρύφοι, 71. αποδώσομαι, 211. αποειπείν, 88. αποέργει, 92. απόερσε, 103. αποζεσθείς, 117. αποθνήσκω, 127. αποθορόντες, 128. αποθρώσκων, 128. αποκλάγξασα, 149 note. 80, αποκλάς, 150. αποκρίνομαι, 156. απολωλέναι, 187. απομύττω, 177. άπονισόμεθα, 181. αποπαρδώ, 205. αποπέφαγκα, 249 note. αποπλήσαι, 210 note. αποπνίξεις, 216 note. αποσβέσας, 224 note. απόστα, 134. απυστερείσθε, 230. απυστερέω, 229. αποτετευγμένος, 239. αποτετύχηται, 239 note. απούρας, 34.

απουρήσουσιν, απουρίσσουσιν, 34 note. αποφαίνω, 249. άποχρά, 270 note. αποχρέω, 270. απόχρη, 269. άπώμνυ, 188. αραίρηκα, αραίρημαι, 9. αράρη, 6, note. ἄραρον, 30. $a\rho\epsilon is$, $a\rho\epsilon i\sigma\theta\epsilon$, 10. αρέσθαι, 10. άρεσσα, 31. αρήμεναι, 29. αρήρειν, 30. αρήρεκα, 31. άρήρεμαι, 30. αρήρομαι, 32. αρθεν, 30. αρόμην, αροίμην, 10. αρουμεν, 10. αρσάμενος, 30. αρώ, αρωμαι, 10. αρώμεναι, 33 note. άσα, ἄσασθαι, 1. ãoa, 36. ἄσομαι, 7, 8. ἄσσω, 6. ἄσσω, ἄσσω, 11. άσω, ασώ, 8. ατάω, ατέω, 1. **ἄττω, ἄττω, 11.** άτωμαι, 1. αδάτα, 1. άφείθην, άφεθείς, 115. άφεικα, 6 note. άφείλαι; 9 note. άφείναι, 115. άφεινται, 6 note. άφεῖσαν, 115. άφεῖτο, 116. άφείω, 116. άφέλαι, 9 note. άφελουμαι, 9. αφέμενος, 116. άφες, 115. αφέσταλκα, 173 note. αφεστήξει, 136. άφετος, 116.

αφεύω, 109. άφέω, 116. αφέωκα, αφέωνται, note, 115 note. άφίγμαι, 132. αφιείεν, αφιήτε, 116 note. αφικνέομαι, 132. αφίοιτε, 116. αφίουν, 115. αφίχθαι, 132. άφοῦ, 116. $\vec{a}\phi\hat{\omega}$, 115, 116. αχέων, 12. ἄχομαι, ἄχνυμαι, 12. $A\Omega$, 1. йшрто, 6 note.

В. Βάμες, 38. βάν, 37. βασεύμαι, 37. βάτε, βάτην, 38. βέβαα, βέβακται, 37. βέβαμμαι, 39. βεβάρημαι, 40. βεβαρηώς, 37. βεβίηκεν, 40. βέβλαμμαι, 43. βεβόλημαι, 39. βεβρεγμένος, 45. βέβριθα, 46. βέβροχα, βέβρυχα, βέβρωκα, 41. βεβρωμένος, 44. βεβρώς, 37, 38. βείω, 38, 40. βέω, βήη, 38. βιβάσω, 152 note. βιόμεσθα, 40, 42. βιώναι, 42. βλάβεται, 43. βλείμην, 39. βλήεται, βλησθαι, 39. βλημην, βληο, note. βλήσομαι, 39. βλώσκω, 39 note. βρώσομαι, 41.

βωθεῖν, 44. βώσατο, 44 note. 6 βώσεσθε, 43. βώσομαι, 44.

Γ.
Γέγαα, 50, 51.
γέγονα, 5 note, 49.
γέγωνα, 48.
γεγωνίσκω, 48.
γείνατο, 50.
γελοίων, 48.
γεναθῆμεν, 50.
γενάμενος, 9.
γέντο, 50, 51.
γεύμεθα, 51.
γρηγορέω, 75.

 Δ άηται, 55. δαίρω, 62. δαϊσθείς, 56. δαμάα, 62. δαμάζω, 62. δαμείς, 62. δαμνάω, δάμνημι, 62. δαρήσομαι, 62. δαρθείς, δαρτός, 62. δάσομαι, 55. δαύσω, 56. δέαται, 58. δέγμαι, 63. δέδαα, 56. δεδαίαται, 55. δεδαιγμένος, 56. δεδακρυμένος, 253 note. δέδαρκα, 62. δέδασμαι, 55. δεδαυμένος, 56. δέδεγμαι, 63. δέδεκα, δέδεμαι, 64. δεδέξομαι, δεδέχαται, 63. $\delta \epsilon \delta \eta a$, 5 note, 55. δέδηγμαι, 57. 39 δεδήσομαι, 64, 208. δέδηχα, 57. $\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \alpha$, 59. δεδιξάμενος, 58. δέδμηκα, 61, 62.

δέδοικα, 59, 60. δεδόκημαι, 70. δεζοκημένος, 64. δέδομα, 61. δέδυμαι, 68. δέδορα, 62. δέδορκα, 62, 81 note. δεδραγμένος, 70. δέδρακα, 67, 71. δέδραμαι, 71. δεδράμηκα, 246. δέδραξαι, 70. δέδρασμαι, 71. δέδρομα, 247. δεθήσομαι, 64. δείδεγμαι, 59, 63. $\delta \epsilon i \delta i \alpha$, 59, 60. δειδίσκομαι, 59 note. δείδοικα, 60. δεικανάσθαι, 59 note. δείμομεν, 61. δείν, τό, 65. δείομαι, 61. δείρω, 62. δέκομαι, 63. $\delta \epsilon \xi \omega$, 58. δέομαι, 61. δέον, 64. δεύομαι, 66. δέχαται, 63. δήξομαι, 57. δήραι, 62. $\delta \hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \nu$, 64. δήω, δήεις, 56. διαβέβλησθε, 39 note. διαβύνεται, 47. διαδούμαι, 64. διαειμένος, 87, 115. διάκειμαι, 143. διαλακέω, 164. διαλέγομαι, 165. διατρίψας, 247. διαφαυσκούση, 251 note. διαφθαρέομαι, 256. διαφρέω, διαφρήσω, 259. δίδημι, 64. διδρήσκω, 67. δίε, 61. διεζωσμένοι, 120.

διείλεγμαι, 165. διελέγην, διελέχθην, 165. διεπιφώσκω, 251 note: διέρσας, 92. δίεσθαι. 61. διεφθάρατο, διεφθαρέατο, 256 note. διέφθορα, 256. διηγγέλη, 3. διήγγελον, 2. δίημι, 61. διήξα, 121. διήρεσα, 100. διοίχηνται, 186. δίω, δίον, δίομαι, 61. διωκάθειν, 22, 70. δίωμαι, 61. δμηθείς, 62. δοάσσατο, 58. δοκείν, τό, 65. δόσκον, 69. δοῦν, δοῦντι, 64. δράθι, δραίην, 67. δραμούμαι, 246. δράναι, 67. δραπών, 71. δράσομαι, δράς, 67. δρατός, 62. δρήσομαι, 67. $\delta \rho \hat{\omega}$, 67. δρώμι, δρώσιμι, 71. δύναντα, δύναντος, 74. δύσατο, δύσετο, 73 note. δύσεο, 73. δυσόμενος, 74. δύσκεν, 73. δώομεν, δώσι, 69. δώσω, 68. δώω, δώης, 69.

Ε. ἔδησεν for ἐδέησε έδι το ἀδέησε τος ἐδέησε τος ἐδέησε τος ἐδιξησάμην, 69. ἔδικον, ἔδιξα, 69 ἐδιώκαθον, 22, 7 ἐδλωκα, ἐάλων, 16, 17. ἔδμητο, 62 note. ἔδραθον, 57. ἔδρακον, 62.

ξασιν, ξασσα, 84. έαται, έατο, 118. ἔατε imperf., 85. έάφθη, 29. έβην, 37. έβήσετο, 7, 8, 38. έβίβασκε, 39. ϵ βλάβη ν , 43. $\ddot{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\nu$, 39. *ἔβραχον*, ἐβράχην, 45. έβωσα, έβώσθην, 44. έγγεγύηκα, 74. έγγυήσατο, 74. έγδούπησα, 70. **ἔγημα**, 47. έγκαθείσατο, 131. έγκεκαλινδημένη, 160. έγκεχρωσμένος, 271. έγρετο, 75. έγρήγορα, 5 note, 75. έγρηγορθα, 75, 76 note. έγχέω, έγχεῶ, 265. έδάμην, 62. έδαόμην, 55. έδάρην, 62. έδασάμην, 55. έδδεισα. 59. έδέγμην, έδεδέγμην, 63. έδέδιμεν, 59. έδέθην, 64. *ἔδειμα*, 61. ἔδειρα, 62. έδεξα, 58. έδέρχθην, 62. έδέσω, 108. έδεύετο, 66. έδεύησα, 64. έδήδεσμαι, 108. έδήδοκα, 6 note, 7, 108. έδήδομαι, 7 note, 108. έδησα, 64. έδησεν for έδέησεν, 66. έδιζησάμην, 69. *ἔδικον*, ἔδιξα, 69. έδιώκαθον, 22, 70. έδμήθην, 62. έδραθον, 57. έδρακον, 62.

ἔδραμον, 246. έδραν, 67. εδρασα, 68. έδρην, 67. έδυν, έδύσετο, 73. ΕΔΩ, 131 note. έδων, 68. έειδόμενος, 80. έειπον, 88. έεισάμην, 80, 87. έέλδομαι, 94. ἔελμαι, ἐελμένος, 83. έέλπομαι, 80 note, 94. έέλσαι, 83. ἔελτο, 84. ἔεργμαι, έέργνυ, ἔεργον, 92, 221. έέργω, 80 note, 92. **ἔερμαι, έερμένος, ἔερτο,** ἔερχατο, 92. έέσσατο, 118. έέσσατο, ἕεστο, 96. $\ddot{\epsilon}\zeta\eta\nu$, $\ddot{\epsilon}\zeta\omega\nu$, 119. **ἔηκα**, 115. ἔην, 85. έήνδανον, 24. έησθα, 85. έθάφθην, 122. έθέρην, 124. έθηεῖτο, έθηήσατο, 123. $\tilde{\epsilon}\theta\eta\nu$, 115. έθήσατο, 123. έθυρον, 128. **ἔθραξα**, 234. **ἔθρεξα**, 246. ἔθρεψα, 245. έθυψα, 248. ἔθωκα, 77. elaou, 74. εΐαται, εΐατο, 117. είατο, είατο, 84. είατο, 95. ἔίγμαι, 81, 82 note. είη, 87. einr, 115. $\epsilon \ddot{\imath} \theta \eta \nu$, 115. είθισμαι, 76. elka, 81 note. είκα, είκειν, 115.

είκαθον, 80. δίκτην, είκτο, είκτον, 81, 82 note. είκως, είκός, 81. είλα, είλάμην, 9. είλεγμαι, 89 note. είλει, 84. είλήλουθα, 106. είλήλουθμεν, 200. είληφα, 89 note, 162. είληχα, 89 note, 162. είλιγμαι, 94. είλινδείσθαι, 159. είλκυσα, είλκύσθην, είλκύσμαι, 94. είλξα, 94. $\epsilon i \lambda o \nu$, 9. είλοχα, 89 note, 164. είλω, 9. είσαί, είμαι, 95. είμαι from ίεμαι, 115. єї нарта, 89 note. είμεν, είμες, 85. είμεν, είτε, είσαν, 115. είμην, 116. είναι, 115. είνυμι, 96. είξασι, 82. είοικυῖαι, 81. $\epsilon i\pi \alpha$, $\epsilon i\pi or$, 9. $\epsilon l\pi o\nu$, 97. eipa, 92. είργασμαι, 99. είργνυμι, 92. είρεῦσαι, 89. είρηκα, είρημαι, 88. *εἰρήσομαι*, 88, 102. εϊρομαι, 101, 102. εἰρύμεναι, 105. είρυνται, είρυντο, 104. είρυτο, 105. είρω, 88. eïs, 115. είσα, 117. είσάμην, είσατο, 87. είσαμην, 131. είσας, είσαμενος, 117. είσεται, 118.

είσεφρούμην, 259. είσθα, 86 note. είσιτητός, 86 note. είσο, 116. είσομαι, 78, 87. είστηκειν, 134. είσφρέω, είσφρες, είσφρήσεσθαι, 259. είτε, είτην, 85. είτο, 116. είχεε, 112. είω, είης, είη, 84. eïw for iw, 87. είωθα, 6 note, 76. είων, 74. έκαθέσθην, 131. έκαθήμην, 118. ёкагог, 139. ἔκαον, 139. είται, έκάρην, 142. έκβάλαι, έκβηλαι, note. έκβράσσομαι, 45 note. έκβώντας, 37. έκγεγάονται, 51. έκδυμεν, 73. έκεκάσμην, 138. ἐκεκλόμην, 144, 207. έκέκραγμεν, 200. έκέρασα, έκερασάμην, 144. ἔκερσα, έκέρθην, 143. ἔκηα, 139. ἔκιξα, 148. έκιχον, 147. έκκέαντες, 140. ἔκλαγον, 149. ἔκλαεν, 150. ἔκλαξα, 149. έκλάπην, 151. έκλελάθοντα, 163. εκλεο, έκλέο, 141, 151. έκλήθανει, 163. ἔκλησα, 150. έκλίθην, 151. έκμαίνω, 169. έκπεπέτασται, 205. έκπλήγνυσθαι, 216. έκπλήττω, 215.

εκραγον, 154. έκράθην, 144. **ἐκρέμω**, 155. ἔκρηνα, 154. έκτάθην, 158. ёктака, 53 note, 157. έκτάμην, 158 note. **ἔκταν, ἐκτάνθην, 158.** έκτετμήσεσθον, 235. έκτέτμησθον, 39. ёктога, 157. έκτόνηκα, 158. ἔκυθον, 146. ἐκφρείω, 259 note. ἔκφρεs, 259. έκφρέω, έκφρήσω, φρησθήναι, 259. έκχρά, 270 note. έκχρήσει, 269. έλ*α̂*, έλα, 93. έλάαν, 93. *ἔλαθον*, 163. έλαι, 9. . έλάκησα, 164. έλάμφθην, 162. έλαν, έλασα, έλάσω, 93. έλαχον, 162. έλάω, 93. έλέγμην, έλεκτο, 165. έλειν, 9. έλειπτο, 51, 165. έλειψα, 165. έλέλικτο, 94. **ἔλεξα, ἐλεξάμη**ν, 165. έληλάδατο, 93. έλήλαμαι, έλήλασμαι, 93. έληλέατο, 93. έλήλεγχα, έλήλεγμαι, 94. έληλέδατο, 93. έλήλυμεν, έλήλυτε, 106. έλησάμην, έλήσθην, 163. έλιπεν, 3, 165. έλισάμην, έλιτόμην, 166. έλλάμψεσθαι, 153. έλλισάμην, 166. έλόευν, 167. έλσαν, έλσαι, έλσας, 83. έλυμην, 169.

έλυσθήναι, 83. $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\omega}$, 9. έλω, έλων, 93. ξμακον, 175. ξμαπον, 170. έμβεβώσι, 38. ξμεινα, 175. έμέμηκον, 175. έμεν, έμεναι, 85. **ἔμεν, ἔτε, ἔσαν, 115.** έμην, 116. ἔμηνα, 169. έμίηνα, 175. έμμεν, έμμεναι, 85. **ἔμμορε**, 172. έμνήμυκα, 122. έμνησα, 176. ξμολον, 39 note, 44. έμπίπληθι, 209. έμπιπρείς, 210 note. έμπίφρημι, 259. $\epsilon \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon i \theta'$, 209 note. έμπλείμην, έμπλήμενος, 209. έμυκον, 178. έμφράττω, 259 note. έμφύη, έμφύσεται, 261. έναλδήνασα, 14. έναρω, 95. ένασα, ένασσα, 178. ένδίεσαν, 61. ένδυνέουσι, 74. ένεγγύησα, 74 note. ένεγκείν, 6 note, 252. ένείκω, 252. ενειμα, 179. ένεφμένος, 93. ένείχεε, 77, 114. ένεμήθην, ένεμέθην, 179. ένένιπον, ένένιπτον, 6 note, 95. ένένισπον, 95. ένενώμην, 182. ένεουρηκότας, 196 note. ένεπίμπλασαν, 209. ένεπον, 90. ένέπρηθον, 210. . ἐνέπω, 89. ένευσα, 181.

ένεχθήσομαι. 252. ένήνεγμαι, ένήνειγμαι, ξοργα, 80 note, 221. 252. evήroθα, 7 note. ėvijvoya, 7 note, 252. ένηράμην, 95. ένθεῖν, 106. ένίπτω, 90, 95. ένισκήλη, 227. ένισπήσω, 89. ένισπον, 89, 90, 95. ένίσσω, 95. évivu, 89. ἔννεπον, 90. έννέπω, 89. έννώσας, 182. έντί, 84. έξαλίσαι, 160. έξαλιφή, 14. έξαμβλουμεν, 20. έξαπάφησεν, 28. έξεαγείσα, 6. έξεβλάστησε, 43. έξεβράσσοντο, 45 note. έξέδραμεν, 68. έξείλοχα, 164. έξείρας, 92. έξεπλάγην, 215. έξερασαι, 98. έξεφρείομεν, 259. έξέχρη, 267. έξέχρησε, 269. έξεωσεις, 6. έξήλικα, 160. έξήμβλωσα, 21. έξήραμμαι, 12 note. έξηρήσατο, 9. έξυράμην, έξύρημαι, 182. εοιγμεν, 81, 82 note. čoida, 82 note. ёока, 80, 81, 82 note. **ἔοιμι, 84.** έόλει, έόλητο, 83. $\ddot{\epsilon}$ ολπα, 5 note, 80 note, $\dot{\epsilon}$ π $\dot{\epsilon}$ χω, 112. 94. εον imperf., 85. εοντι, 84. έοντων, έοντω, imperat., έπηξα, 208. 85.

έόρακα, έόραμαι, 191. έπάγην, 208. έπάην, 199 note. έπαθον, 199. έπαινέω, 8 note. έπάλμενος, έπάλτο, 18. επαρδον, 205. έπαρεί, 10. έπασάμην, 199. έπαύρασθαι, 9. έπαῦρον, 34. έπαφανάνθην, 35. έπέγεντο, 50. έπέζωσε, 120. έπειλεγμένους, 165 notc. έπείνυσθαι, 96. έπειρεόμενος, 102. έπειρήσομαι, 102. έπεισφρέω, 259. έπέλησεν, 163. έπέμυξαν, 177. έπενήνοθε, 95. έπεπήγειν, 208. έπέπιθμεν, 200. έπέπλων, 215. έπεπύσμην, 221. έπέρασα, έπέρασσε, 211. έπερέσθαι, 102. ἔπεσα, 212. έπεσκέπησαν, 228. ἔπεσον, 7, 212. έπέσπον, 97. έπέσποντο, 97 note. έπετάσθην, 205, 206. έπετον, 212. έπέτοσσε, 243. έπέτραψε, 244. έπέτρεψε, 244 note. ἔπεφνον, 207. έπεφύρβειν, 251. έπέφραδον, 258. έπέφυκον, 262. έπηγόμην, 208. έπήϊσα, 12. έπηλα, 198. έπηθρον, 34.

έπήχθην, 208. έπιάλμενος, 18. έπιβασκέμεν, 38. έπιβήσειν, 37. έπιβητον, 38. έπιδεδράμηται, 246 note. έπιειμαι, έπιειμένος, 95. έπιέσασθαι, 96. έπιθον, έπιθύμην, 200. έπικαλέσεται, 141 note. έπίκειμαι, 142. έπικίκοι, 148. έπικρήσαι, 145. έπιλέλαθα, 163. έπιλελεγμένος, 165 note. έπιλήθω, 163. έπιμάσσομαι, έπιμάσασθαι, 172. έπιμέλομαι, 173, 174. έπινένηται, έπινενήσμεναι, ἐπινενάσμεναι, 180. έπινέουσι, 179. έπιον, 210. έπιόψομαι, 192. έπιπλόμενος, 203. έπιπλως, 215. έπίπρωσον, 219. έπιπωλέομαι, 204. ἔπισα, 210. έπισπείν, έπίσπου, 97. έπίστα, 96. έπιστέωμαι, 96 note. έπίστη, 96. έπιτέλλω, 235. έπιτετράφαται, 244 note. έπιτόσσαις, 243. έπιτραπέουσι, 159, 244. έπιτράψονται, 244. έπιτρέψονται, 244 note. έπιφώσκειν, 251 note. έπιχεις, 265. έπιώψατο, 193. ἔπλαγξα, έπλάγχθην, 214. έπλάθην, 202. έπλάκην, 214. έπλάσθην, 202. $\ddot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\epsilon$, 203.

έπλεεν, 214. έπλεο, έπλευ, 203. ἔπλευσα, έπλεύσθην, 214. $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\mu\eta\nu$, 202, 209. έπλησα, 208, 209. έπλων, 215. **ἔπλωσα**, 214. έπνύνθην, 216. έπόθην, 210. έπόρομαι, 195. έπορον, 217. έποτάθην, 207. έπόψατο, 193. έπόψομαι, 192. . έπράθην, 211. ἔπραθον, 205. ἔπρεσε, 210. έπρήθην, 211. έπρησε, 210. έπριάμην, 218. έπρόωσα, ἔπρωσα, 219. ἔπτακον, ἐπτακέναι, 219. έπτάμην, 206. έπτηχα, 220. έπτην, 206. έπτόμην, 97, 206. έπωμοσάμην, 188. έπωχατο, 112. έπψχατο, 186. έραασθε, 98. *ἔρασσαι*, *ἐράσσατο*, 98. ξραται, 98. έργω, 91, 221. **ἔ**ρδω, 221. έρέεσθαι, έρέοντο, 102. έρείομεν, 103. ĕρεξα, 221. έρέριπτο, 100. ἔρεσσα, 100. έρεύμενον, 10. έρευξομαι, 103. ϵρϵω, 88, 89, 103. έρηρέδαται, 99. έρηρέδατο, 93. έρήρεικα, έρηρεισμαι, έρηρεινται, 99.

έρηριπα, 99, 100.

έρηρισμαι, 101. έρησάμενος, 102. έρηται, 98. έριδήσασθαι, 101. έριζήσασθαι, 101 note. έρίπεντι, 100. έρμένος, 92. ἔρξα, ἔρξα, 91, 92, 221. **ἔρξω**, 221. έρραγην, 222. έρραδαται, ερράδατο, 221. ἔρρασμαι, 221. ἔρρεξα, 221. ἔρρευσα, 222. έρρηθην, 88. έρρίπτεον, 74 note. έρδυηκα, έρδυην, 222. έρρυσαμην, 104. *ἔρρυτο*, 105. ἔρρωγα, 5 note, 6, 222. ἔρρωμαι, 223. έρρωσάμην, έρρωσθην, 224. ἔρσα, 92. έρύεσθαι, 105. έρυκακέειν, 95, 103. *ἔρυτο*, 105, 106. έρχαται, έρχατο, 92. **ἔρχθην**, 221. έρύω pres. and fut. 103, 105 note. έρω, 88. čs. 115. έσαγείρατο, 3. έσαι, 95, 117. έσάμενος, 117, 118. έσαν, 85. έσάουν, 233. έσάπην, 226. εσας, 117. έσαω, έσαωσα, έσαώθην, 233. ἔσβαν, 225. ἔσβεσα, 224. έσβέσθην, εσβεσμαι, 225. έρηριγμαι, έρηριμμαι, 99. Εσβηκα, Εσβην, 224. έσεισα, 225.

έσεμάσσατο, 172. εσέφθην, 225. έσήλατο, 18 note. έσηρα, 224. εσθαι, 116. εσθην, 131. $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\hat{\omega}$, 131 note. έσίναντο, 226. ἔσκαμμαι, ἐσκάφην, 226. έσκεδάσθην, έσκέδασμαι, 226. ἔσκεμμαι, 277. έσκέπην, 278. έσκεψάμην, 277. ἔσκηλα, 227. ἔσκληκα, ἔσκλην, 227. έσκον, 85. έσκωψα, 228. έσμηξα, έσμησάμην, έσμήχθην, 228. έσομαι, 95, 117. έσουμαι, 85. ἔσπακα, 228. έσπάρην, έσπαρμαι, 228. έσπασα, έσπάσθην, έσπασμαι, 228. ἔσπεικα, 229. ἔσπειρα, 228. ἔσπεισα, ἔσπεισμαι, 229. έσπετε, 89. έσπόμην, 97. έσπον, 97. ἔσπορα, 228. έσσα, έσσάμην, 95. εσσαι, 117. έσσεῖται, 85. έσσέομαι, 122. ἔσσευα, ἐσσευάμην, ἔσσευον, έσσευόμην, 225. ἔσσο, 84. έσσο, 96. έσσομαι, 85. έσσουμαι, 122. έσσύθην, ἔσσυμαι, 225. έσσύμην, 158 note, 225. έσσω, 95. έσσώθην. 122. έσταλάδατο, έστάλατο, έτάλασα, έτάλασσα,243. έφαυσα, 251. 229. έτάλθην, 235.

έσταλκα, έσταλμαι, έ-ξεταμον, 235. στάλθην, ἐστάλην, 229. ἐτανύσθην, 234. εσταμεν, εστάναι, 136. Εταξάμην, 234. έστείλα, έστειλάμην, 229. έστειξα, 229. έστέρησα, έστερήθην, έστέρημαι, 230. έστηκα, 134. έστήκω, 135 note. έστήριξα, έστήριγμαι, ἔτελσα, 235. 230. ἔστησα, 134. έστιβον, έστίβην, 229. ἔστιγμαι, 231. έστιχον, 229. €στο, 96. έστοργα, 229. έστόρεσα, έστορήθη, 231. ёотраннац, ἔστροφα, 231. εστρωσα, εστρώθην, εστρωμαι, 231. έστυξα, έστυγον, 231. *ϵστως*, 136. έσύθην, 225. έσύρην, 231. έσφάγην, έσφαγμαι,232. ἔσφαλον, ἐσφάλην, ἔσφαλμαι, 232. ἔσφαξα, ἐσφάχθην, 232. ἔσφηλα, 232. ἔσφιγμαι, 232. έσχάζοσαν, 232 έσχεθον, 22, 112. ἔσχον, 111. ἔσχων, 232. εσω, 95. έσωσα, έσώθην, 232. έτάγην, 234. έτάθην, 234. έτάκην, 240. .

εστασαν, έστασαν, 137. ετάρπην, εταρπόμην, 236. έτάφην, 122. έτάχθην, 234. ἔτειλα, ἐτειλάμην, 235. ἔτεινα, 234. έτεκόμην, 241. **ἔτεκον**, 240. έστηξω, εστηξομαι, 134, ετέλεσα, ετέλεσσα, ετελέσθην, 235. **ἔτεμον**, 235. ἔτεξα, 241. έτερσα, 237. έτέρσην, έτέρσηνα, 236. ἔτερψα, ἐτέρφθην, 236. έτετάλμην, 235. έτέτλυμεν, 243. έστορέσθη, έτετμον, έτέτμετο, 237. έτέτρηνα, 241. έστράφην, ἔτευξα, 238. έστράφθην, έστρέφθην, έτευχετον, 239 note. έτευχθην, 239. έτέχθην, 241. ἔτμαγον, ἐτμάγην, 236. έτμήθην, 235. έτμηξα, 236. έτόρησα, έτορον, 243. έτραγον, έτράγην, 248. ἔτραφον, ἐτράφην, 245. έτρέφθην, 244. **ἔτρησα**, 241. έτρίβην, έτρίφθην, 247. έτρύφην, 128. έτύθην, 128. έτύχησα, 329. έτύχθην, έτυχον, 238. ευαδον, 24. εύκτο, 109. εὖρα, εὐράμην, εΰρον, 9, 109. έφαάνθην, 250. έφαγον, 108. έφάμην, 254. έφειντο, 116.

ἔφερον, 253. έφεσπόμην, 97. έφέσσαι, έφεσσαι, 117. ἐφέσσεσθαι, 117 note. έφέσσομαι, 117. έφεστάκει, 137 note. έφεστώσιν, 136. έφηπται, 29. ἔφθακα, ἔφθαξα, 255. ἔφθαρκα, ἔφθαρμαι, 256. ἔφθασα, ἐφθάσθην, 255. $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\theta\eta\nu$, 255. $\epsilon \phi \theta i \mu \eta \nu$, 159 note. έφθιον, 256. $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\theta$ opa, 5 note, 256. έφθός, 114. έφιζε, έφῖζε, 80. έφίσταμαι, 96. έφοραν, 192. έχαδον, 263. έχανον, 264. έχάρην, 263. έχασσαν, 262. έχεα, 264. έγέθην, 266 .. έχεισθα, 111 note. έχεσα, έχεσον, 212, 264. έχηράμην, 263. έχρησθησαν, 268. έχύθην, έχύμην, 265. έχωσάμην, 271. έχωσθην, 266. έψεε, 77, 114. έψευσμαι, έψεύσθην, 271. έψημαι, έψησμαι, έψήθην, έψήσθην, 271. έψογα, 271. έψύγην, έψύχην, έψύχθην, 272. εω, 84. ἔωθα, ἐώθεε, 77. έωθουν, 272. έωκα, 272. εωκα, 6 note, 115 note. έψκειν, 80, 81 note, 82 note. έωλπειν, 94. ἔωμεν, ἐῶμεν, 36.

ἔων, 74.
ἐών, 84.
ἐωνηθῆναι, 272.
ἐωνηκώς, 272.
ἐωνησαμένην, 6, 272.
ἐωνησάμην, ἐωνούμην,
ἐώνητο, 272.
ἐώρακα, ἐώραμαι, 191.
ἐώργειν, 221.
. ἐώρταζον, 96.

H, 116. $\tilde{\eta}$ for $\tilde{\epsilon}\phi\eta$, 255. n for nv. 85. ηα, 85. na, 86, 106. ήγαασθε, 2. ήγαγον, 6. ήγασθην, ήγασσατο, 2. ήγγειλα, 2. ήγγέλης, ήγγέλθης, 3. ήγγύων, ήγγύησα, 74. ήγειρα, 74. ήγείροντο, 3. ήγερέεσθαι, 3. ήγερέθομαι, ήγερέθονται, ήγερέθοντο, ήγερέθεσθαι, 3. ήγηλα, 1. ήγμαι, 7. ήγρόμην, 74. ήδειν, 77, 78, 82 note. ήδεσάμην, 8. ήδεσαν, 79. ήδέσθην, ήδεσμαι, 8. ήδέσθην, 108. $\tilde{\eta}\epsilon$, 87. ήειδε, ήείδειν, 78, 79. ήείδη, 77. ήειν, 86. ήεν, 85. ήερέθονται, 10. ήην, 85. nivunv, 82 note. ήїкто, 81 note, 82 note. ήίου, 87.

ήίσαν, 79, 87. ηκα, 7. ήκα, 121. ήκα, 115. ήκαμην, 116. ήκασα, ήκασμαι, 80. ήκαχόμην, 12. ήκαχον, 6 note, 12. ήκήκοειν, 13. ήκουκα, ήκουσμαι, ήκού- $\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, 13. ήκροασο, ήκροω, 13. ήκω, 121, 132. ήλάθην, 93. ήλαλκον, 15. ηλάμην, 18. ήλάσθην, 93. ήλδανε, 14. ήλειψα, ήλείφθην, 14. ήλεξάμην, 14. ήγασάμην, ήλεύατο, 15. ήλήθην, 13. ήλινδημένω, 160. ήλισκόμην, 16. ήλιτον, 17. ήλκησα, 94. ήλλάγην, ήλλάχθην, 18. ήλοιφα, 14. ήλόμην, 18. ήλουν, 15. ήλυξα, 19. ήλφον, 20. ήλωκα, 16, 17. ήλώμην, 13. ήλων, 16, 17. ήμβλωκα, ήμβλωσα, 20. ήμβροτον, 20. ήμαι, ήμην, 118. ήμην, 84. ήμί, 255. ήμπείχετο, ήμπέσχετο, 113. **ἥμπισχον, ἠμπισχόμην,** 113. ήμπλακον, 21. ημφίεσα, ημφιεσάμην, ημφίεσμαι, 22, 96. ήμων, 20. ην for έφην, 255.

ήνάλωκα, ήνάλωσα, 23. ήναρον, 95. ήνδανου, 24. ήνεγκα, 9, 251. ηνεγκον, 6 note, 9, 252. ηνέθην. 8. ήνεικα, ήνείχθην, 252. ήνειχόμην, 113. ήνεκα, ήνεσα, 8. ήνεσχόμην, 113. ήνέχθην, 252. ήνημαι, 8. ήνηνάμην, 23. ήνησα, 8. $\eta \nu \theta o \nu$, 106. ηνίπαπε, 95. ήνοιξα, ήνοίγην, 183. ήνον, ηνόμην, 26. ήντεον, 25. ήνωγον, ήνωξα, 26, 27. ηξα, 11. ήξα, 121. $\tilde{\eta}\xi\alpha,\,\tilde{\eta}\xi\varepsilon,\,4,\,7.$ ήξάμην, ήξαν, 7. ηομεν, 87. ήπαφον, 6 note, 28. ήραρον, 6 note, 30. ήρασμαι, ήράσθην, ήρασάμην, ήράσσατο, 98. ήρατο, 10. ηρέθην, 9.ήρείσατο, 99. ήρεον, 89 notc. ήρεσα, ήρεσσα, 100. ήρεσα, ήρεσαμην, ήρεσμαι, ήρέσθην, 31. ήρετο, 102. ήρηκα, ήρημαι, 9. ηρηρειν, 30.ήρήρειστο, 99. ήρησα, 9. ηρθην, 30. ήρικον, 99. ήριπον, 99, 100. ηρίσταμεν, 32. ήρπάγην, ήρπαξα, 33. ῆρρηκα, ῆρρησα, 103. ήρσα, 30. ήρυγυν, 103.

ήρύκακον, 95, 103. is for nv. 85. ησα, 8... ησαν, 78, 79, 82 note. ήσαs, 121. ήσατο, 121. ησθα, 85. ησθανόμην, 11. ήσθημένος, 108. ήσθην, ήσθήσομαι, 121. ήσθητο, 108. ήσθόμην, 11. ήσι, 116. ησμεν, 78, 82 note. ησω, 115. ηστε, ηστον, 78.ἥσχυμμαι, 12. η τω, 85. ήύγμην, 109. ηΰδα, 33. ηδδον, 108. ηὐξάμην, 109. ήΰσα, 35. ήφασα, 35. ηφείθη, 115.ήφευμένος, 109. ήφίειν, 116. ήφίουν, ήφίεσαν, 115. ήφυσα, 35. $\eta \chi \alpha$, 6, 7. ήχθέσθην, 36. ήχθημαι, 110. ήχθόμην, 109. θ. Θαέομαι, θάομαι, 123. θείομαι, 236. θέσιτο, 125. θέρμετο, 124. θεύσω, θεύσομαι, 125. θηέομαι, 123. θησαι, θησαίατο, θησάμενος, θήσατο, θησθαι, 123.

θόρνυμαι, 128.

θορούμαι, 128.

θρέξομαι, 246.

θύψω, 248. Ίασι, 86. ίγμαι, 132. ίδέω, 77, 78. ίδμεν, ίδμεναι, 77, 78, 82 note. ίδον, 77, 191. ίδυῖα, 78. ίε, 87. ίεμαι, 115. ίεμαι, 87. ίεμαι, Ιέμην, 86. iev. 87. ίεσο (ίεσο), 86. ίζε, 80. ίθύνω, 132. ίκανω, 132. ίκτο, ίκμενος, 132. ίμεν, ίμεναι, 87. ιόντων, 86. ΐπταμαι, 206. loar, 79, 82 note. ίσασι, 78, 82 note. ίσθι, 77, 78. loi, 87. ίσμεν, 78, 82 note. ϊστασκε, 134. Ιστέον, 78, 79. ζστον, 78. ίσχω, 111. ίτην, 87. ίτητός, 86. ίτον, ίτων, 86. ίων, 86.

θρέψω, 245.

θύμενος, 128.

K. Καθεδούμαι, 150, 131. καθείμεν, 115. καθελεί, 9. καθεσθήσομαι, 131. κάθημαι, 118. καλινδείσθαι, 159. θράττω, θρᾶττον, θρᾶξαι, κατάβα, 37. καταβαίνει, 38. καταβρόξασαι, 41.

καταβρόξειε, 41, 46. καταβρώξασαι, 41. καταγείς, 6. καταδάρθειν, 57. καταθρώσκων, 128. κατακαιέμεν, κατακειέμεν, κατακηέμεν, 140. κατάκειαι, 142 note. κατάκειμαι, 142. κατακηέμεν, 140. κατακλινήναι, 151. κατακλιώ, 151. κατακνώσασα,κατακνώσσουσα, 152. κατακρημνάμεναι, 155. κατακτανέουσιν, 158. καταλούει, 168. κατάξαντες, 7. καταπλαγήναι, 215. καταπλήττω, 215. καταπτακών, 219. καταπτήτην, 220. κατάσσω, 6. καταστορεσθήναι, 231. κατασχόμενος, 112. κατατρώξαντες, 248. καταφθινήσας, 257. καταχέσαντι, 264. καταχρά, 269. καταχρησθαι, καταχρησθηναι, 268. κατεαγείς, κατεαγή, 6. κατεάξαντες, 6. κατεάσσω, 6. κατέαται, 118. κατέβρωξα, 41 note. κατεγήρα, 52. κατεδάρθην, 57. κατεδιήτησα, 67. κατείλεγμαι, 165. κατείργειν, 92. κατεκαύθην, 139. κατέκτα, 158. κατένασθε, 178. . κατενήνοθε, 95. κατεπλήγην, 216. κατεπτακώς, 219. κατεράσαι, 98. κατερήρειπτο, 100.

κατέσχετο, 112. κατεφθινηκότες, 257. κατέψηκται, 271. κάτημαι, 118. κατηνάλωσα, 24. κατήξα, 5. κατθανείν, 127. καυάξαις, 5. καύσω, 139. κέαντες, 140. кє́атаі, 143 note. κεδάννυμι, κεδαίω, 226. κέεται, κέεσθαι, 143. κείαι, κειάμενος, 140. κείαντες, 140 note. κειέμεν, κείων, 143. κείωνται, 142 note. κεκαδησόμεθα, 146, 162... κέκαδμαι, 138. κέκαδον, 262. κεκάμω, 141. κέκαρμαι, 143. κέκασμαι, 138. κεκαφηώs, 37, 142. κεκέρασμαι, 144. κεκέρδακα, κεκέρδηκα, κεκέρδαγκα, 145. κέκηδα, 5 note, 146. κέκηφε, .142. κέκλαγγα, 149. κέκλαμμαι, 151,244 note. κέκλασμαι, 150. κεκλέαται, 151. κέκλειμαι, κέκλεισμαι, 150. κέκλεμμαι, 151, 244 note. κέκληγα, 149. κεκλήϊμαι, 151. κέκληκα, 141. κέκλημαι, 150. κέκλιμαι, 115. κεκλόμενος, 144. κέκλοφα, 151. κέκλυθι, 152. κέκμηκα, 141. κεκμηώς, 37, 141. κεκορηώς, 154. κέκοφα, 153. κεκράανται, 154.

κέκραγα, 154. кекрака, 202, 211. κεκράξομαι, 154. κέκραχθι, 200. κέκρηκα, 211. κέκρημαι, 145. κέκρικα, κέκριμαι, 156. κεκύθω, 146. κένσαι, 144. κέονται, 143. κέρα, 145. κέραιε, κέραιρε, 145. κεράσω, 144. κέρσω, 143. κερώ, 144. κέρωνται, κερώντας, 145. κέσκετο, 143. κέχανδα, 263. κεχάρηκα, κεχάρημαι, 263. κεχαρησέμεν, κεχαρήσε-Tai, 263. κεχαρηώς, 37, 262. κεχαρμένος, κεχαρόμην, 263. κέχεσμαι, 264. κέχηνα, 264. κέχλαδα, 266. κέχοδα, 264. κέχρησμαι, κέχρημαι, 267. κέχρωσμαι, 271. κέχυκα, κέχυμαι, 265. κέχωσμαι, 266. κήαι, κήον, 140. κήται, 143. κιγχανείν, 147. κίδνημι, 226. κίρνημι, 144. κιχείην, κιχήναι, 147. κίχρημι, 268. κίχω, 147. κλαξώ, 151. κλαύσομαι, 149. κληθήσομαι, 141. κληΐζω, 150. κληΐω, 150. κλήω, 150. κλιώ, 151.

κολώ, κολώμαι, 152. κραιαίνω, 154. κρανέεσθαι, 154. κρεμόω, κρεμώ, 155. κρηήναι, 154. κρηθείς, 145. κρήμνημι, 155. κρηνον, 154. κρύπτασκον, 223. κταίην, κτάμεν, 158. кта́vai, 53 note, 158. κτανέοντα, κτανθήναι, κτάσθαι, 158. κτέω, κτέωμεν, 158. κτίννυμι, 159. κύθε, 146.

 Λ . Λαθείν, 163. λακήσω, 164. λάμψομαι, 162, 163. λάξομαι, 162. λασεύμαι, 163. λασθημεν, 163. $\lambda \alpha \sigma \tilde{\omega}$, 163. λαψούμαι, 162. $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon$, 3. λελάβηκα, 162. λέλαθον, 6 note, 163. λέλακα, λελάκοντο, 164. μεμετιμένος, 116, 175. λέλαμμαι, λελάφθαι, 162. λέλαμπα, 163. λέλασμαι, 163. λελάχωσι, 162. λέλεγμαι, 164. λελειχμότες, 166. λέληθα, 163. λέληκα, 164. λέλημμαι, 162. λέλησμαι, 163. λελίημαι, 166. λέλογχα, 162. λέλοιπα, 165. λελύσομαι, 169, 208. $\lambda \dot{\epsilon} \lambda v \tau o$, 169. λέζαι, λέζασθαι, 165. λέξεο, λέξο, 7, 165.

ληθάνω, 164. λήθω, λήθομαι, 163. λήξομαι, 162. λήσω, λήσομαι, 163. λοέσσομαι, λύε, λόον, λύμην, λύτο, λύθι, 169.

M. Μαθήσομαι, 170. μακών, 175. μανήσυμαι, 169. μαπέειν, 170. μάσομαι, 172. μεθείμαι, 115, 175. μεθίετο, 116, 175. μεληθήναι, 174. μέμαα, 171, 175. μέμαγμαι, 170. μεμακυία, 38. μέμαλε, 174. μέμαμεν, 171. μεμάνημαι, 169. μέμαρπον, 170. μέμαχα, 170. λαψεθμαι, μεμαώς, 171. μέμβλεται, 174. μέμβλωκα, 39 note, 44. μεμέληκε, 174. μεμένηκα, 175. μέμηκα, 175. μέμηλε, 174. μέμηνα, 5 note, 169. μεμίασμαι, 12 note. μέμνημαι, 176. μεμόλυσμαι, 12 note. μέμονα, 175. μεμόρηται, 173. μεμορμένος, 173. μεμυζότε, 166. μέμυκα, 178. μενεαίνω, μενέηνα, 175. μεταθρέξομαι, 246. μεταμέλει, 173. μετασπών, 97. μετείω, 84. μετεκίαθον, 149. μετήσεσθαι, 175.

μετίει, μετίετο, 116, 175. μνάομαι, 176, 177. μνᾶσθαι, 177. μνέεται, μνεώμενος, 177. μνήσω, 176. μνώοντο, 177. μολουμαι, 39 note, 44. μώμαι, 172.

N. Νάσσομαι, 178. νείαι, νείται, 181. νείσεσθε, 181. νένακται, 179. νένασμαι, 178. νένημαι, νένησμαι, 179, 180. νένιμμαι, 181. νένοφα, 179 note. νένωμαι, 182. νεύμαι, 181. νεύσομαι, 181. νήεον, 180. νήθω, νήσω, 180. νήχω, νήχομαι, 181. νίσσοντο, 182. νώμενος, νώντα, νώσιν, 180.

Ευγκατακλινείς, 151. ξυγχέω, 265.ξυλλελεγμένος, 165 note. ξυμβλήμεναι, 39. ξυμβλήτην, 39. ξύμμεικτα, 176. ξύνιε, ξύνιον, 116.

0. Όδωδα, 183. όδώδυσται, 183. οζέσω, 183. οίδα, 78, 82 note. οίήσασθαι, 185. olka, 77 note, 81, 82 note. οίμαι, 184. οίσθήσομαι, 252. οίσω, 251. οίχωκα, 112.

ὄκωχα, 112. ολέκεσκεν, 188. δλωλα, 5 note, 187. ομουντες, 188. ομώμοκα, 188. ὄνεσθε, ἄνοσθε, 190. οντων, imperat., 85. οπύσω, 190. ὄπωπα, 192. όπωπεε, 77, 192. όρεῖται, 193, 194. ορέοντο, 194. ὄρηται, 18 note, 193. ορθαι, δρμένος, 193. ορονται, 194. ορσασκε, 193. ορσεο, 7, 193. ορσευ, 193. ὄρωρα, 6 note, 193. ορώρεγμαι, 194. όρωρεμαι, 194. ορώρυγμαι, 195. ὄσφραντο, 9, 195. ού, imperat., 116. ούλόμενος, 188. ούνεσθε, 190. όφλήσω, όφλεῖν, 197. őya, 112. οχωκα, 112, 186 note. οψομαι, 191.

Πάλτο, 198. παραβέβαμαι, 37. παρακαλούντας, 141 note. παράστα, 134. πάρασχε, 112. παράσχω, 111. παραφθαίησι, 255. παραχέων, 265. παρδήσομαι, 205. παρεκαθέζετο, 130. παρέπλων, 215. παρήγγελε, 2, 3. παριωμεν, 116 note. παροίχομαι, παρώχηκεν, παρώχημαι, 186. πάσασθαι, 199.

πατάσσω, 215. ολόμενος, πείν, πείν, 210. πείσομαι, 199. πελάθω, 203. πέξω, 201. πεπαθυῖα, 199. πέπαμμαι, 198 note. πεπαρείν, 217. πέπασμαι, 199. πέπεικα, 200. πεπείρανται, 202, 205. πεπείραται, 205 note. πέπεισθι,πέπεισμαι,200. πέπεμμαι, 205. πεπεμμένος, 204. πεπέρασμαι, 205. $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma s$, 204, 211. πέπεφθαι, 205. $\pi \epsilon \pi \eta \gamma a$, 5 note, 208. πέπηθα, 199. πεπίεγμαι, πεπίεσμαι, πεπίεχθαι, 208. $\pi \epsilon \pi \iota \theta o \nu$, 200, 251. πέπλεγμαι, 214. πέπλευκα, πέπλευσμαι, περιεφθήναι, περιεφθή-214. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha$, πέπληγμαι, 215. $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma o \nu$, 6 note, 216. πέπλημαι, πεπλημένος, 202. πέπλησμαι, 209. πέπλωκα, 214. πέπνυμαι, πέπνυσο, 216. πέποιθα, 5 note, 200, περιφλύει, 257. 201. πέπομαι, 210. $\pi \epsilon \pi o \mu \phi a$, 151, 204. πέπονθα, 199. πέπορδα, 205. πεπορείν, 217. πέπορθα, 205. πέποσθε, 76 note. 199. πεπόταμαι, πεπότημαι, πέφαγκα, 249. 207. πέπραγα, 218. πέπρακα, 202, 211. πέπραμαι, πεπρασθαι,

πεπράσομαι, 211.

πέπραχα, 218. πεπρημένος, 210. πέπρισμαι, 219. πέπρωμαι, 217. πέπταμαι, 205, 207 note. . $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau \epsilon \omega s$, 212. πέπτηκα, 207. πεπτηώς, 37, 207 note, 220. πέπτω, 205. πέπτωκα, 6 note, 207 note, 212. πεπτώς, 212. πεπύθοιτο, πέπυσμαι, 220. πέπωκα, 210. περάω, περάσω, περάν, περάαν, 211. περιδδείσας, 59. περιείπεν, 97. περιελώ, 9. περιέρξαντες, 91 note. περιέσπε, 97. σεσθαι, περιέψεσθαι, περιηγέω, 121. περιήρχετο, 107. περιθρέξαι, 246. περινέειν, 179. περιπεφλευσμένος, 258. περιπλόμενος, 203. περισπείν, 97. πέρνημι, 211. $\pi\epsilon\rho\hat{\omega}$, 211. πέσειε, πεσούμαι, 212. πέταμαι, πέτασθαι, 206, 207. πετασαι, 207 note. πετω, 205.πεύθομαι, πεύσομαι, 220. πέφαμαι, 208. $\pi \acute{\epsilon} \phi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, 12, 249. πεφασμένος, 208, 249, 254. πεφάσθω, 254.

 $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \phi \eta \nu a$, 5 note, 249. πεφήσομαι, 208, 250. πεφιδήσομαι, πεφιδοίμην, πεφιδέσθαι, 251. πέφορβα, 251. πέφραγμαι, 258. πέφραδμαι, πέφρασμαι, 258. πέφραδον, 258. πέφρικα, πεφρίκοντας, 259. πεφύασι, 262. πεφυζότες, 166. πεφύρσυμαι, 261. πεφυώς, 262. πήλασθαι, 198. πήξω, 208. πήσας, 199. πήσσω, πήττω, 208. πιείσθε, 210. πιέζευν, πιεζεύμενυς. 11, 74 note. πιεζούντος, 208. πιεχθηναι, 208. $\pi i\theta i$, 210. $\pi i \theta \eta \sigma \omega$, 200, 201. πίλνημι, 203. $\pi i \nu$, $\pi i \nu$, 210. πινεύμενος, 11. πίομαι, πιουμαι, 210. πιπράσκω, 204. πίσω, 211. πίτνα, πίτναν, πιτνάς, προσεούρουν, 196 note. 206. πιτνάω, πίτνω, πίτνημι, προσέπλαζε, 203. 206. πιτνέω for πίπτω, 213. πιφαύσκω, 251. πιφράναι, 259. $\pi\lambda\dot{a}\gamma\xi\omega$, 203, 214. πλάζω, πλάθω, 203. πλείμην, 209.

πλείν, τό, 66.

πλήγνυμι, 216.

πλήσο, 209.

 $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\omega$, 208.

 $\pi\lambda\hat{\eta}\tau o$, 202.

214.

πλεύσομαι, πλευσοῦμαι,

πλώς, πλώντος, 215. πλώω, 214. πολυπάμμων, 198 note. ποτάομαι, ποτέονται, 207. ποτέος, 210. ποτίθει, 125. ποτύς, 210. πραθείν, 205. πραθήσομαι, 211. πρίασθαι, 218. πρίω, πρίωμαι, 219. πρόβα, προβῶντες, 37. πρύεσθε, προέσθαι, 116. προεστέατε, προέστατε, 137. προέωσα, 219. πρόηται, 116. προήκασθε, 116. προυφανες, 250. προήχα, 7. προθέουσι, 125. $\pi poiei$, 116 note. προΐειν, 116. προΐσσομαι, 142. προοίσται, 253. προού, 116. προσαρήσεται, 30. προσδέεται, 65. προσεικέναι, 81. προσείναι, 87. προσελείν, 84. προσέπεσα, 212. προσηϊκται,προσηϊξαι,81 προσήξαν, 7. $\pi \rho o \sigma \theta i ξ ε ι s$, 125 note. προσκαθιζήσει, 131 note. προσκεκερδήκασι, 145. προσκυνέω, 160. προσοφλήσαι, 197. προσπλάζον, 203. προυσελείν, 84. προυσκέπτετο, 227, 228 προφυλάσσω, προφύλαχ- σταθήσομαι, 134. $\theta \epsilon$, 260. προωθέω, 219.

πρόωμαι, 116. προώσαι, πρώσαι, πρώσas, 219. πτέσθαι, 97, 206. πτήσομαι, πτόμενος, 206. πωλέομαι, 204.

Ράσσω, 222. ρεούμενος, 222. ρερίφθαι, 223. ρεύσομαι, 222. ρηθήσομαι, 88. ρήσσω, 222. ρητός, 88. ροίζασκε, 223. ρυήσομαι, 222. ρυσάμην, 104.

Σ. Σαοί, σάου, σαούσι, 233. σαόω, σαώσω, 232, 233. σαρόω, 224. σάω, 233. σαώσω, σαώσομαι, 233. σβέσω, σβήσομαι, 224. σεσαρυία, 224. σέσεισμαι, 225. σέσηπα, 5 note, 226. σέσηρα, 224. σέσιμμαι, 12 note, 226. σέσωμαι, σέσωσμαι,232. σεῦται, 226 note. σήρας, 224. σκάλλω, 227. σκίδνημι, 226. σκλήσομαι, σκλαίην, σκλήναι, 227. σόη, σόης, 233. σοῦ, σοῦμαι, σοῦσθαι, σοῦσθε, σούσθω, σοῦσο, 226. σύωσιν, 233. σπείν, σπείο, σπέο, σπέσθαι, σπου, σπών, 97. σταίην, σταιμεν, 73, 134. στάσκον, 134.

στείομεν, 236. στείω, 73, 135. στεῦται, 230. στέω, 73, 134. στήης, 73, 135. στήκετε, στήκοντες, 135 τεθνήξω, στημεν, στήμεναι, 134. στήσω, στήσομαι, 134. στρώννυμι, 231. συγγνώη, 53, 54. συγκέηται, σύγκειται, 143. συμβαλλεύμενος, 74 συμβεβάναι, 38. σύμενος, 225. συμμαχέεται, 171. συναίγδην, συναίκτην, συναναφυρέντες, 261. συνειδήσεις, 78. συνείλοχα, 164. συνεληλάμενοι, 93. συνενείκεται, 252. συνεράσαι, 98. συνήψας, 114. συνηχας, 7. συννέφει, συννένοφεν, 179. συνοχωκότε, 112. συσχόμενος, 112. σχέ, 112. σχεθείν, σχεθέειν, 22, 112. σχείν, 97, 111. σχήσεισθα, 111 note. σωπάν, 43. σῶσι, 224. σώω, 232.

Ταλάσσω, 243. ταρπώμεθα, ταρπηναι, τάρφθη, τάρφθεν, 236. τέθαλα, 122. τεθάφθω, 123. τεθέληκα, 76.

τέθηλα, 123. τέθηπα, 123. τεθλαγμένος, 125. τεθλιμμένη, 126. τέθναμεν, 126. τεθνήξομαι, 126, 127. τέθορα, 128. τέθραμμαι, 245. τέθραφθε, 245 note. τέθυμμαι, 248. τέκετο, 241. τέλλω, 243 note. τέξασθαι, τέξεσθαι, 241 τέξω, τέξομαι, 240. τέταγμαι, 234. τεταγών, 233. τέτακα, 233, 234. τέταλμαι, 235. τέταμαι, 208, 234. τετάνυσμαι, 234. τεταρπόμην, 236. τέταφα, 122. τέτεγμαι, 241. τετέλεσμαι, 235. τέτευγμαι, 239. τετεύξομαι, 238, 239. τέτευχα, 238. τετεύχαται, τετεύχατο, τορεύω, 243. 239. τετεύχατον, τετεύχετον, 239 note. τετευχήσθαι, 237. τέτηκα, 5 note, 240. τετίημαι, τετιημένος, 240. τετίησθον, 240. τετιηώς, 37, 240. τέτιμαι, τέτισμαι, 242. τέτληκα, 243. τετληώς, 37, 243. τέτμη, 237. τέτμηκα, τέτμημαι, 235. τέτμης, 237. τετμήσομαι, 235. τετμηώς, 37, 235 note. τέτμον, 237. τέτογμαι, 241. τέτοκα, 240.

τετορήσω, τέτορον, 243. τέτραμμαι, τέτραπτο, τέτραφα, τετράφαται, τετράφατο, 244. τέτραφθαι, 245 note. τετράφθω, 244. τετραχυμένος, 12 note. τέτρηκα, τέτρημαι, 241. τετρήνω, 241 note. τέτρηχα, 234. τέτριγα, τετριγώτας, 247. τέτριμμαι, 247. τέτροφα, 151, 243, 245. τετρυχωμένος, 247. τετρωμένος, 241. τέτυγμαι, 238. τετυκείν, τετυκέσθαι, 239. τετύχηκα, 238, 239. τέτυχθαι, 238. τευχθέν, τό, 239. τή, τήτε, 233. τιταίνω, 240 note. τιτύσκω, τιτύσκομαι, 240. τλάς, 242. τμήγω, 236. τραπείομεν, 236. τραπέω, 244. τραπέωμεν, 236. τράπω, 244. τραπώμεν, 236. τραφθείς, 244. τράχω, 246. τρείω, 247. τρέσσε, τρέσσαν, 247. τρέσω, 247. τρεφθήναι, 244. τρήσω, 241. τρώσω, 241. τρώω, 242.

Υ. Υπαλεύεο, 15. ύπεμνήμυκα, 122. υπερβαλλέειν, 74 note. υπέρβασαν, 38.

υπερδραμώ, 246 note. υπερθορών, 128. ύπεσχόμην, 114. ύπισχνέομαι, 114. υπόεικον, 80. υποείξομεν, 80. υποκρίνομαι, 156. ὑπομόθεντος, 188. υπομοσθείσης, 188. ύποσχέθητι, 114. ύποσχήσομαι, 113. υποφώσκει, 251 note.

Φάγω, φάγομαι, 108. φάε, φαείν, φαείνω, 250. φάθι, φαίην, 254. φαίμεν, 255. φάμενος, 254. φάν, 255. φάναι, 254, 255. φάουσαι, 250. φάς, φάσθαι, φάσκω, 254. φέρεσκε, φέρησι, φέρτε, 253. $\phi \eta \eta, 255.$ φημί, 89, 254. $\phi \tilde{\eta} \nu$, 255. φθάς, φθάμενος, φθάξω, 255. φθαρήσομαι, 256. φθείτο, 256 note. φθέρσω, φθερώ, 256. φθήσομαι, φθώ, 255. φιλεύμενοι (false reading), 251. φορέω, 253. φράδη (false reading), ωλίσθηκα, 258.

φυράσω, φυρήσω. 260.

Χαίνω, χανούμαι, 264. χαρήσομαι, 263. χεθήναι, 266. χείσομαι, 263. χεόμενον, fut., 265. χεύω, fut., 265. χεύω aor. 1. conjunct. 265. χήρατο, 263. χράται, χράσθαι, 268. χρέεται, 268. χρείων, 267. χρέω, 268. χρηΐσκομαι, 269. χρώζω, 271. χύμενος, 265. χωσθήναι, 266. χώσυμαι, 271. χώσω, 266.

Ψ.

Ψύω, 220.

 Ω .

 Ω , 115. ώδυσάμην, 183. ώζεσα, ώζησα, 183. ω ήθην, 184.ώϊγνυντο, 183. ὤϊξα, 183. ωϊόμην, ωϊσάμην, ωΐ- $\sigma\theta\eta\nu$, 185. ώλεσα, ώλέσθην, 187. ώλίσθησα, 187.

ώλόμην, 187. ωμαι, 116.ψμην, 184. ῶμμιι, 191. ἄμνυε, 188. ωμορξα, 188. ὥμοσα, ὼμόθην, 188. ώμωξα, 184. ωνάμην, from ονίνημι, 189. ωνάμην, from ὄνομαι, 190. ώνησα, 189. ώνόσθην, ώνοσάμην,189. ώόμην, 184. ωξα, 183. ώρεον, 191. брето, 18 note, 193. ώρέχθην, 193. ὤρμην, 158 note, 193. ώρνύμην, 193. ώροντο, 194. ώρορε, 6 note, 193. ώρυγμαι, 195. ώρώρει, 193.

σφρησαμην, 195. ωσω, 272. ώφελον, ώφελλον, ώφειλον, 196. $\ddot{\omega}\phi\theta\alpha\iota, \ddot{\omega}\phi\theta\eta\nu, 191.$ ώφλεε, 77, 114, 197. ώφληκα, ώφλον, 197. ψχημαι, 186. ψχόμην, 185, 186.

ώρτο, 18 note, 51 note.

ωσφρύμην, ωσφράμην, ω-

ωρσα, 53, 193.

ώρων, 191.

END OF THE INDEX.









PA 337 B813

Buttmann, Philipp Karl
A catalogue of irregular
Greek verbs

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

