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II.—PRO DOMO MEA.

PART II.

[CONCLUDED FROM A. J. P. XXXVII 72.]

B. The Nasal Verb Flexion.

5. Etymology. IE. Vney-, a. ‘ducere, trahere, ferre’, etc., in Indo-Iranian náyati (náyate); b. specialized as ‘ducere (trahere) lanam’ >‘nera’ in European tongues; c. intrans. ‘ducere’, like Germ. (sich) ziehen, Lat. (se) agit; d. inchoative-diminutive = ‘takes-to, incipit’, etc. (§ 20 c).

6. Inflection. a. (s)ne(i)mi, ne(i)si, n(e)i(t)í (cf. -ë-ny ‘span’, possibly Lat. nēs net); plur. nē(i)mós, etc., and in composition -n[ə]mos (cf. Av. frya-nmahi, fryag- being from *priyom-, §§ 7 a, 10). b. sg. nēmi, nasi, nati, cf. Lat. dō-dās, dāt, as found in compounds like trādō, etc., and Celtic -nami -nati in the nasal verbs (Thurneysen, Gr. § 592).


7. Reduction in the priora. a. An IE. group like *budhi nēti (Skr. infin. budh-ī, § 4 b1) or *būdhn nēti, if run together when the force that produced the zero vowel-grade was active, would have yielded *budhnēti. Or m <om is admissible under these conditions. b. The combination mṛr-i-nēti would likewise have yielded an allegro *mṛnēti (= Skr. mṛṇāti, cf. चगु-nōti. Lat. cer-nit is from *kr-i-nēti, cf. OHG. (h)l-ī-

nēn 'clinare'. Likewise a loc. muni or -mn-i would reduce to mū- (or lento m[n]i-) as in Balto Slavic *mi-nē (§ 9). C. Aeolic πώ-νοι 'bibo' and Skr. j[ṇ]ā-nāti (inchoative, § 5 d) have a prius of the type of Av. pōi 'defendere' (ōi not necessarily = IE. -āzi), Skr. (prā-)dāi. With the prius of πέ-νοι cf. Av. infin. fra-xṁī (ū or i); -i is from -ōi, reduction form of -ōi (Bartholomae, Gr. Ir. Phil. 1, §§ 217, 219 b). Here (in)clinat belongs. From *sthā[i]-nēti we get *sthā-nēti in Lat. de-stinat (cf. OIr. con-osnaim <con-od-stān-, but in OPruss. po-stānmai stā, unless due to recomposition, will be a lento form like πω- (πό-νο). Also, under proper conditions, *sthā-nēti would reduce to -stnēti.8

8. Proof of 7 ab. δάμ-νημ (mi-)nare 'to (bind,) punish' (ā as in maneō); Skr. damā-s ‘poena’, damana-m ‘bestrafung’ (Germ. strafe: στρεβλός ‘twisted ’). Lat. (con-?)sternat, prius str-i- ‘zur starrheit’ (cf. Plautine timore t or peo) + nayeti (see below).

9. Proof of IE. -nē(y)-. Besides OBulg. infin. mi-nē-ti (mi-nijq with -ny- as in 6, g.) = Lith. mi-nē-ti (mi- as in 7 b; see further on -nē-, § 20) we have OHG. stor-nēm 'zur starrheit ziehe' (§ 5 c; cf. AJPh. 25, 386 q.) = stupeo (‘atonitus sum’), with original ē (now fictitiously explained as analogical) or ē <ṣi (see Brugmann, Gr. 1. § 272). The Greek dialects entirely fail to certify -nē- for δάμνημ, etc., but all the -vā- forms belong to δάμναι, etc. (-vā- after ὀραω, into which ā

1 In κρ-νημι πίλνα-μαι metathesis of κρι- πλ- after κεράννυμι πέλαξω. (πλτημι< *πύ-νημι?).

2 For the combination of *pōi 'bibere' with *nēy 'ducere' note Lat. ducit 'quaiffs, bibit'; recalling the other minute correspondence between Skr. nāyati and Lat. ducit, as in the marriage ritual; also carmen (epos) ducere with ukthāni + nī § 10.

3 The conditions portrayed in § 7 are, in a sense, the general conditions of vowel gradation, but the reduction of a group to a word might seem to have more far-reaching consequences. That language of most even stress, Greek, reduces τοῦρψ before -i to τουρψι (Aristophanes). Under like conditions there was vowel syncope in δάμ[i]-νημ (§ 8) and μαν[i]-νο (§ 31). The reduction of priora in -āz(y) presents all the stages of vowel reduction now recognized for "roots" or "bases" in -āz(y). Of course, no "root" or "basis" ever existed and my combinations reveal, glimpse-like, how (among other things) "roots" are case forms.
may likewise have been introduced from -vāw verbs); -vāw by 6 f. In consternās -nāmus -nātis ā may be a contraction of āyō āyē (aes: aēnus different in rhythm and accent); or original -nō -nāt -nāmus -nānt (like dō dāt dāmus dānt, §6 b) may have followed the quantity pattern of stō stās (dās) stāt stāmus stātis stānt.

10. Proof of ai/ī. Av. vṛṛa-naēta ‘chose’ = Skr. á-vṛṛāta (Gr. Iran. Phil. 1, §46; note, after J. Schmidt and pace Bartholomae, l. c., n[ə] in Gāthic vṛṛa-n-tē ‘chooses’, §132; cf. friyq-n-mahī after §6 a and cṛ[u]-nōti, §7 b), in the which -nī- has been blandly disqualified, but see the data for OPruss. -nai- (Bezzenberger in KZ. 41, 93) and connect ai in Goth. kun-nai⁹ (: Skr. jānātī, §7 c). These widely separated sporadic manifestations of -nai- are not to be voided (pace Brugmann, Gr. 2, 3, §212, anm.) by a glozing appeal to other ai (ai oi) forms, for which, rather, the -nai- forms provide a reliable etymological source. In view of the inchoative note in the nasal verbs, e. g. kunnaip = ‘noscit’ (for Germanic, see Braune’s Got. Gram., §194¹; supra, §5 d); and inasmuch as our original verb was (s)nēy- :—Umb. per-smimu ‘precator, po s c ito’ is to be derived from a primate prīk-i- (i- lost by § 7 a; er as in Av. īrēśā ‘interrogare’, OHG. fērgōn; also in Umbr. pe-peorcust) + snēy/-snī, cf. on Av. ṭṛṛsa-nyeiti ‘interrogat’ §14 i. Skr. ṇnī is idiomatically employed with words meaning ‘carmen’ (= Skr. ni-thā-m), e. g. ukthāni. Goth. fraih-na-n comes from IE. prēk-(i)-no- (prius = Lat. prece) ‘zur frage ziehen’ ; cf. allegro πυκνός: lento πυκ-c-vός (prius: πυκ-a) ‘close-drawn’. Note Skr. ṇnī with anu = precari.

II. The nōw/nī verbs. Besides its applicability to the nē(y)/nī verbs my theory of composition also accounts for the verbs in (s)n̄u (AJPh. 25, 387²), from the parallel root (s)nēw- (snēy-uv-?).¹ The nēy and nōw suffixes are interchangeable at will because they are different flexion forms of one root suffixally employed. In the deik-nuμ type, also, the prius was an infinitive, dēi-k-i or dēi-k-n ‘ad speciem’ + nōw-mi ‘duco’.

¹ Why should Walde s. v. neo credit to Marstrander my two years earlier explanation of Skr. ni-v-i-s (AJPh. 25, 373)? Note tautological (?) ni-viā (: vāyas ‘web’).
12. Phraseological use of Skr. ni. The rôle played by (s)ney ‘ducere’ continued to be played by Vni in Sanskrit, as follows: a. mṛtyāve niyate (Vedic prose) = Morti ducitur. From aliquem Nēcī (dat.; necē loc.) ducit the sense of a. necat would derive. b. duhitīve (loc.) nayati (Epic.) = ‘to daughterhood brings, makes a daughter of’. c. vācam nayati (RV.) = ‘<in> potentiam ducit’ is typical of a large number of turns with terminal accusative, often amounting to peri-phrases for verbs; nē + aitvṛddham ‘exaugescit’; + abalimānam ‘debilitat’ (?); + adhānam ‘pledges’ (?); + ucchrāyam ‘auget’; + kṣayam ‘necat’ (cf. φθi-vu, intrans., § 5 c); + duḥkham quasi ‘infortunat’; + dvāy-akṣaratām ‘makes two syllabled’; + pāritoṣam ‘delectat’; + pustim ‘auget’; + ca- 

mam ‘quietat’; + prasādam ‘delectat’, cf. the gerundial prasāda-nīya-s ‘delectants’, perhaps with -da <dṃ (§§ 7 a, 14 a; cf. Bull. § 87); + bhāsmāt (advb.) ‘cinéfacit’; + vi-kṛtīm ‘mutat’; + vikrayam ‘vendit’ (cf. kṛī-nāti ‘emit’, according to § 7 c; Bull., § 86); + vi-nācam ‘necat’ (see a), + vya-ava-hāram quasi ‘causidicat’; + vyāghratām ‘makes into a tiger’; + vṛīḍam ‘embarrasses’; + čamam ‘tran-quillat’ (cf. čama-nīya-s ‘tranquillans’); + cūdratām ‘makes a peon of’; + sam-rābham <in> iracundiam ducit’; + saman-tām ‘aequierat’; + sākṣyam ‘testem facit’ (cf. in ius ducito), In Avestan we find tēm vā ahūm . . . naḍṣai = <in> eam vos vitam ducat.

13. Parallels with Germ. ziehen (= ducere); zu rate-, zur verantwortung-, in zweifel-; nutzen-; krumm- (and virtually intrans., sich k. z.), vollziehen; den atem ziehen = atmen; sich ins gelbliche z., s. in die lange z.; s. zurecht z.

14. Compounds, often factitive, in -n(ḍ)yēti (§ 6 fg.): a. Skr. is-a-nāyantā = ad celeritatem ducebant (= accelerant): is-a-nayati. But lairw = ‘liquefacio, calefacio’. Prior IE. is-min, acc. to the noun in Skr. is- ‘erquickung; liquor’ (sucus, saft) isa-nyā- ‘impetus’ is post verbal. Loc. infin. isa-nī ‘to pour’: *ism-o-nā ‘liquori-ductio’. In RV. Vni is

1Also used with kar. Apte remarks of ni in his lexicon: ‘bring or reduce to a state or condition . . . in this sense used . . . much in the same way as kr’.

2Hyphenation responsive to Sanskrit lexical usage instead of to mere morphological theory.
common with objects meaning ‘aqua’ (cf. nī-ra-m = water), as ducere is in Latin; *avā-nī = ‘abgiessen’ (? avā-nī-s ‘water course’), à and nī + nī = ‘eingiessen; pra-nīta = holy water.—b. Skr. dhiṣ-a-ṇyāntas quasi ‘curantes’: dhiṣ-quasi ‘cura’; note the allegro adjective dhiṣ[a]-ṇya- (§ 7 a).

c. uda-ṇyāti. prius acc. n. udn- as in uda-dhi-s ‘water-holder’ (or ‘giver’ = cloud, spring)1; uda-ṇyās (dhrās) = aquamducentes (fluvi); uda-ṇyān (abhriyas) = a.–d. (>nubes.)

The current division, udan-yāti, etc., was made without lexicographic consideration2 (cf. a).—d. Skr. prta-ṇyāti: prius *prta-, accus. to Indo-Iranian *prta-3 (Skr. loc. plur. *prtsu 31°; once “reduplicated” (?) *prtsu-ṣu; Av. gen. sg. *prṣṭ-ās); *prta-ṇyāti (tva)4 ‘te <in> pugnam ducit’. Note for its long grade prta-nāy-u-s ‘hostilis, hostis’ (nāy-u-5: nāyā-s ‘dux’ [cf. danda-nāya-ka-s ‘strafrichter’] :: upāyū- ‘appropinquans’: upāya-s ‘aditus’) and prta-ṇyāu-s ‘hostis’; prta-nāyāntam (accent as in chāyāti, § 6 d ?) ‘pugnamentem’, post verbal prta-nā, 1) exercitus hostilis (= pugnam-infērens), 2) ‘pugna’ (<quasi ‘incursio’). The Avesta has pōṣanā/ pōṣana-m. With Skr. prtanājam ‘proelium-agentem’ (equum) compare Avestan yaba asānī pōṣana = ut agam proelia. The good fortune that has preserved forms of the moribund monosyllable prt- (on the tendency of monosyllables to vanish, see Bull. § 10) enables us very clearly to trace the course of composition (derivation) down to prtanā. In some of the following, also, the monosyllabic stem of the priora in -a- (<m/n) has been preserved.—e. brahma-ṇyānt ‘praying’, prius brāhma (acc. sg.) ‘hymn, prayer’.—f. ukṣa-ṇyāntas (RV. 8. 27. 9) means ad-augendum (pass. sense) <nos> agentes and not “doing like oxen’; prius *ukṣa- quasi ‘increase’.—

1 In uda-pū- ‘im wasser sich reinigend’ and uda-prūt- ‘im wasser schwimmend’ the prius udn (≠ an before the accent, § 7 a) may be for the suffixless locative (cf. e. g. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2. § 185. 4).

2 It is curious that even udā-nvānt (with rāthas = water-bringing car) may contain a posteriorius -nvant- (type of Skr. pī-nvāti ‘fattens’), cf. nā- : pūyā, ēnnaus : pūyai. In garta-nvānt- (: garta- ‘ditch’) mānsa-nvānt ( = mānasa- ‘flesh’) and vāna-nvant ‘desirous’ the element -nvant ‘ducens, portans’ seems further to have been assimilated to the possessive suffix in -va<n> (TAPA, 44. 121).

3 Or n. *prta-an-, cf. Av. savan- ‘cry’ in § 14 n below.

4 To this might be added an accus. of the weapon.

5 Reduced to -nyu- in karma-ṇyu- ‘agilis’, sara-ṇyu- ‘celer’.
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g. 

**vyṣ-a-nyati** (RV. 9. 5. 6) is said of Soma (Bacchus) as bringer of the rain (drops) of soma (vinum); prius *vyṣ-ṇa- (vyṣu-) 'rain'. In 9. 19. 5, *kuvid vyṣ-a-nyantibhyah .. gārbham ādadhāt* (nonne vaccis liquorem-ferentibus fetum dedit?), Soma is declared to have put in calf the cloud-cows. The interpretation of \( f \) and \( g \) by 'bulling' (subans) came by "disease of language".1—h. Sundries (cf. c end). *kṛp-a-ṇyāti 'cupit' (kṛp-2: kṛp-ā 'compassion' :: loc. ālāk-i : ālākī 'strength'); kṛp-a-ṇanta, posterius after § 6 c; kṛpāṇam 'miseria' (post-verbal)—tur-a-ṇyāti 'festinat' (tūr 'festinans', *nom. ag.3 'festinatio').

turāṇa-s (postverbal).—dam-a-ṇyāti 'constrains, forces': *dam- = dama-m 'constraint, poena'; damana-s 'miseria' (post-verbal)—bhur-a-ṇyāti: 1) (factitive) 'in wallende bewegung versetzen', 2) (intrans.) 'se movere' (cf. § 5 c).—

ris-a-ṇyāti (intrans.) 'geht auf schaden aus' > 'defaults'; prius: riṣ- 'schaden' (also 'schädiger').

ruv-a-ṇyāti 'cries out', prius acc. to lexical ru- 'sonus'.

sar-a-ṇyāti 'speeds', prius from a root-noun *sar- (: sira' < 'wasser->lauf'; sar-a-nas 'laufend', postverbal).—huv-a-ṇyāti 'calls', prius hu<v>-a- (acc.) : (ā)-hū- ('an-)ruf' (cf. Lat. su-em : ēnv); or huv-n- : Av. zavan- 'call'.—i. In the Avesta the entire stock of anya-verbs is represented by (1) pārōs-a-ṇyeiti 'interrogat' (prius acc. pārōs-a-: n. sg. pārōsā :: ālāk-i : ālākī); (2) sar-a-ni-mnṃ ('irascentem'): Vedic hr-nīyā-māna-s (cf. ā-hrṇā-na-s, i. e. *a-hṛṇā-[m]nas), act. hr-nāyānta-m (accent like chāyāti § 6 d)—cf. prīt-a-nāyāntam (§ 14 d), hrṇāyyū- : prīt-a-nāyū— with hr- for hr-i- (§ 7 b), while sar-a- is from *g̣hṛṣ-ṛ-m (flexion type of Skr. acc. gīr-am).

15. Greek factitives in -αὐω. Besides the accus. prius in iāνο (§ 14 a) dat.-loc. priora in -ai (-a) are to be admitted. The -νεω future of these verbs may contain neyeti (§ 5 d). The capacity of a present to function as a future will not be challenged by knowers of English or colloquial Latin (elmu).—

1The other day C. H. F., aged 5, told me a story of the creation of tomatoes by some breaking up or dissection of tomato-bugs. A settee he explained as a place "to set tea".

2Original sense something like 'shout, outcry': Lat. crepitus; cf. lexical kṛpa-ṇya-s 'laudator'.

3There is a wide range of nouns that indifferently designate action or agent, so that in complexes we may expect either function, even though in isolation only one function survives.
a. *pāi-vei: defined by "brings to light" (Liddell and Scott) and "bringt ans licht" (Menge), prius IE. dat.-loc. bhai or bhāi, cf. Skr. bhā- 'light'; pā-vä (pāvepos, post-Homeric) may be analogical; pā-vās 'torch' may be from *bhām-nōs ('lucifer'); but pā-vā 'torch' has ā < om (reduced before the accent, §7 a), cf. Skr. khā- 'well': khā-m 'hole'; Hom. pāi-vei 'brings light', prius pāveš.—b. krāi-vo: krāi- from a noun *krā- 'factio'; the "distracted" form krā-al-vo (see also §21 c) contains either a dative *krā-y-śi (cf. Skr. absolutive upa-sthā-yaīm : infin. sthā-m; a stem *krā-y-ā would be made like Skr. māyā 'a magic making', chāyā 'umbra', jāyā 'wife', cf. Av. īyā- 'furtum', gāyā- 'pace, step') +śi etc., (§6 a, c); or an accusative (a<ś, or -ām) + nyēti (§6 g).—c. thērmaiwi 'makes hot (cf. §§12, 13), prius dat.-loc. to bēmē 'heat' (cf. ἐξθραί-wo : ἐξθρην).—d. litaiwei 'to smoothness brings'; prius dat.-loc. to leīn (not attested as abstract); or acc. (or dat.-loc.): IE. *lēwi-s 'smoothness' ( : λειος :: Lat. rāvis 'hoarseness': adj. rāvos; cf. fem. pronis [Varro ap. Non.]: pronus; Lith. i- abstracts and Latin neuters like pingue 'fat, fatness'), primate *lēwy-nyēti.—e. līmāi-vei-tai (middle, as Skr. nāyate often is) 'outrages'; prius : līmē 'outrage'.—f. līmāi-vei 'anoints'; cf. advb. līm-a (from a cognate acc. = an anointing), which preserves a monosyllable stem.—g. nīa-vei 'fattens'; prius, if contracted, : nīas (cf. Skr. nīyas-, krāoś: Skr. kravīs—), nīo; or IE. nī-śi (cf. on leia-vo).—h. maui-vei 'pollutes', prius from IE. mi- (cf. pada-vīyam acc. of pada'ī 'pedis-via' (via : -vī?) or mīyā (cf. Skr. bhīyās- 'pavor': Vbhēy): Vmēy (see Walde s. v. mīngō, end), cf. the Vedic ritual word go-māya-s 'cow-dung' (-māya : mīyā- :: Skr. bhāyā- : bhīyās-. On ma-βrōs see §30.

16. a. Not even the stalking horse ṣaṃvāi rōv is certainly from

The Vedic adjective pīva-s ( : pīvan-) recurs in pītrėtops pītrātros : pīwn. Lat. pīus 'good' is postverbal to the Italic sept "piare" 'to sacrifice' (cf. piaculum), originally == 'to offer fat', as in the Homeric sacrifices. Perhaps *pīyā- 'fat' is preserved in Skr. pī[ya]-yās- 'biestings'. (Cl. Qτ. 9, 105), but predominantly of the "cream" of the Soma offering; -yās- : Lat. īus. On Skr. pī 'to be fat' see the handbooks, noting Ṛi-melī 'soft fat'. In Latin, cognates of Skr. pāyate and śpāyate (if themselves different) would fall to-gether (cf. pīvāh-sphākū-s 'fat-swelling'). For the generalized sense of pīus cf. ṛiṣāpaōs 'oily': ṛiṣāpēs 'importunate in prayer, pious'.
*ovomyn-γό, but may rather be from ὄνομα + νῦς, cf. nuncipso, Germ. *namen führen. If we give to ὄνομα (? suffixless locative), as we must to Skr. nāma, the syntactical value of Lat. nōmine, Homeric ἄρα ὄνομαν (−νς<−av[ς]ς) will mean ‘nomine ducam’ (for ‘n. numerem’.1) Goth. nam-nyan, if of IE. provenance, is from an allegro nōm[ν]nyeti, while glit

mun[ν]jan ‘candere’ (intrans., § 5 c) is from a lento form in -ν-nyeti. So lauhmu[ν]ni ‘lightning’ comes, except. excip., from *lauhmyn+nī quasi ‘lumen-ducens’.—b. ἐλεκτρόν ‘drawing to pity, piteous’, postverbal to *ἐλεκτρον, contains a locative to ὅ ἔλεος, or, if from *ἐλεκτρον-νος, to *ἐλεκτρον (τὸ ἔλεος, NT.).—c. ἐρείπου ‘ask’ will be similarly built upon a noun *ἐρείπος: Vερεύω.—d. ἐρεύνα contains a locative prius *ἐρήν to a noun ἐρήν- (§ 19), of the same sept.

The “infix” nasal verbs: ἐφαί-νο. The prius is ἐφαῖ-

νῆ ‘web’, the whole = ‘draws to a web, weaves’. Skr. unābh-

to confine’—i. e. ‘obstringere, comp[e]scere’ (cf. AJPh. 25, 183), see also Grassmann PW1+2 Uhlenbeck—gives a clear insight into the origin of the so-called ne-infix.4 IE. (e)nebh-is certified by ἐφέλαξ ἐρεύνα ‘bird-net’ nebula ‘veil’ (AJPh. 25, 380) and with great clearness by ἅρνα-νάβης ‘wool-spinner’ (= spider, also called ἃντω-νάβης; fals. ap. Wackernagel ai. gr. 2, 11, “wool-navel”!); cf. ἄρνα-νάβης ‘spider’. A root ἄ-

to spin, weave’ also is found in Skr. u-tā-s ‘woven’ ἄτι-s ‘web’. The analysis of 3d sg. impf. uṇāp ‘he fettered’ as a complex of ā+nebh- is therefore scarcely to be questioned.

1 How long before etymologists realize that the ὄνομα- sept is not to be separated from the numerus-sept (AJPh. 31, 413); and learn from the folklore prejudice against definite names and numbers how to connect ὄνομα ‘I scold’ (from a briefer “root” than enem-) with ὄνομα. Think of the “naming” of the Speaker of the House of Commons. In the Tennessee mountains they “name it to you”.

2 See also AJPh. 25, 370 c; 26, 395 sq.; 32, 407; TAPA, 41, 36; Bull. § 84 sq.

3 On the blended stem in Skr. tr-nah- ‘to crush’ see AJPh. 25, 370.

4 It is needless to dwell on the absurdity of a floating ne, settling about almost at will, particularly in the ā=ι ā=ν bases. For the casual, i. e. infinitival, nature of ā=i see Bull. § 55; of ā=ν § 19, below.—The “infixes” of Basque and other incorporating tongues, with their precise semantic or syntactic values, are not to be compared. For the casual nature of infixed -n- see § 22 etc.; 29 below.

5 The metaphorical sense of ‘cloud’ is predominant.
17a. By rejecting the root *nēbʰ ( : IE. nē : webh: wē ‘weave’) anybody is competent, of course, to put in a cursory demurrer to the blended “root” unēbʰ and to deny, what I hold to be certain, that in the sept of véfos the sense of ‘cloud’ has derived from ‘veil’. The same demurrant should be competent also to deny that the roots snēy and sṃēw are parallel; cf. Lat. neo (<*nēyō) : pf. nēv-i (an excellent starting point, be it said in passing, for the Latin -vi perfects) : véfos: Lat. nābes. I would now formulate the development of the unabh type by a different syncretism, and my formulation, as I now see, has been already prepared for by Brugmann’s observations in the Grundriss (2, 3, 226). Skr. mrndti ‘crushes’ and Lat. li-nit ‘smears’ reveal an IE. present formation consisting of the reduced root + nē-. This entitles us to posit an Indo-Iranian *unāti ‘weaves’ ( : Skr. utā- ‘woven’) alongside of a root class middle *ubh-tē (assimilation disregarded). Further like pairs are *yunāti (lexical yunāti) ‘jungit’: Skr. yuk-tē; *tṛṇāti ‘bores’ (cf. ṛpūros ‘borer’): *tṛ-d-tē and again to *tṛ-ḍh-tē (> tṛḍhē); *chināti ‘cuts’ (Epic Impf. a-chinam): *chit-te; Skr. mṛṇāti ‘destroys’: *mr-k-tē ‘nocet’. By syncretism of *yunāti and yuktē came yunākti and so on. On the derivation of the weak forms chindānti, etc. see § 29 a.


19. a. Factitives in -vvo ( -vvyō is possible). Homer has ṣaṃrātōvēn bhaṇiṇēn bariṇēn eṝṇēn itiṇēn karṇiṃvēthai and bariṇēn, etc. ¹

¹ The cognates (derivatives) of (s)nēy- ‘nere’ frequently show a prothetic e-, e. g. eneḥ- (TAPA, 41, 31 sq.; IF. 33, 351), in Skr. amṣu-ka-m ‘vestis’: Hom. ἀντρα ‘trappings’ (AJPh. 34, 19). The sense ‘necare’ (TAPA, 41, 37) tended to obscure the sense ‘vincire’. For the ‘fetters’ of death observe not merely generalities like Lethaea vincula (Horace, C. 4. 7. 28), but specific ritual texts like AV. 8, 8, 10 sq. (mṛtyu-pācā = later kāla-pāca-). For the ritual see Caland, ai. Todten- u. Bestattungsgebräuche p. 14 (§ 7) ; p. 165 (§ 15) ; cf. p. 172, top ; 173, § 11). The fetters were a precaution against revenants, but the figure may also have applied to the binding on of the grave-clothes. The Vedic god of death, Yama-, was a ‘binder’ (Cl. Qt. 9, 109). On the Avesta ritual-binding of the corpse see IF. 11, 120–121 (translated).
"veu," all to u-adjectives. The prioria in u (futures in ū, if certified, will be analogy futures) are (1) identical with Skr. ā adverbs (ṛjū + kar Vedic; tanū + kar cf. § 12 e’); or (2) locatives in ū like Skr. camū tanū ( : nouns in -as, see Macdonnell, Ved. gr. § 385); or (3) neutrals in -ū (ṛvū from ṽvyō, cf. rō ḍraorū, ṽū ṽū ādū, Skr. vāsu ‘reichtum’, neut. of vāsu-s ‘bonus’), also āsū-s ‘life’, āyu ‘life’ ( : āyu-s ‘homo, genius vitæ’), Av. sānghu- ‘doctrina’, γηρv-s ‘vox’, Skr. āhū-s ‘anruf’.—b. But ṛopō-vei ‘stirs’ (<‘draws with a ladle, stirrer’) may have an instrum. prius from a primate t(o)ū-: Lat. tru-a ‘ladle’ ( ṛopō-vṝ postverbal).—c. Of the -ū ū locative in ēpev-vaω remark has been made above.—d. In ēλaū-vei ‘drives, prods’ etc. ēλaω- is a locative from an action noun *ẽlu-s ‘going’ (cf. ve-γυν-δ-, nom. ag.), with -av < ṇyu, a doublet of ū in Skr. camū.

20. Lithuanian verbs in -neti and -noti. a. OBulg. mi-nēti, Lettic mi-nēt, Lith. mi-nē-ti ( fut. mi-nēsiu [-nēsiu : Vnēy :: Skr. fut. dāsyātī : Vdā], aor. mi-nēyō) have a clear case of ē in the posterius; for the prius mn[ŋ]-[ŋ] or m[ŋ]-i see § 7 b. —b. Save by me in AJPh. 25, 386, the large group of Lithuanian verbs in -neti seems not to have been brought into connection with the nasal classes, to which, as mi-nēti shows, they clearly belong. They fall into two types: i. vēz-i-neti, prius = Skr. vāh-i- in vāh-i-śthas, see AJPh. 31, 410, §§ 19, 20; Lat. *rēg-s ‘ruling’: rēx ‘ruler’: Skr. rājān ‘ductio’: rājān- ‘dux’; posterius -neti ‘ducere’ (§ 6 a). In the more usual vāz-i-netī, vaz-i- (also in Skr. vā[h]-i-śthas, § 4 a) is like tōri-i in Greek. If the symphysis took place in Lithuanian times -i- may be from IE. i. The formation is certainly paralleled by (κτ-νεω and) ḍyτ-νεω (cf. p. 294, tōn ḍe... ḍyτνεσκον... αἰγας ἐτι=

Fraenkel, Gr. Denom. 30, lets all these start from thārośvōs ‘confidens’, which is mere algebra. thārosvos, quantity after πίνωs, is post-verbal. Nor is πίνωs credibly derived from πιθω, but it is for (ē)πι- svos (: σεβα, Skr. ṽcyus-), first meaning ‘having rushed to’, with sense generally similar to Eng. ‘appealing to’, ‘resorting to’, ‘rallying to’, ‘relying on’ (see Concise Oxī. Dict. s. v. rely), and markedly like Skr. praśī-s (lit. ‘aditus’-) ‘fretus, πινωs’ (cf. PW2, I, p. 200, col. 3, top). In OPersian, forms of ś(i)yaω (= Skr. cyu-) are defined by ‘übergehen zu, jemand’s partei ergreifen’ (Bartholomae, Wbch. 1714. 2). ṭṛaśū already meant ‘audax’ and suggested ‘confusus’ (Thucydidès, 7. 77), and belongs with Skr. ḍhar-š- ‘audere’, an extension of the root of frētus.

2 The present me-nū owes its e to menu ‘recorder, puto’.
eum <canem> agere solebant . . . in capreas). ii. akli-néti 'blind umher irren' (i. e. ziehen, § 5 c): akla-s 'blind' (cf. factitive aklinu 'caeco') svsviti-néti 'albescere, candere' (: Skr. cvitrá-s 'albus'): the priora are locatives in -i(< < ei), of the tolí-type (see Wiedemann, Lit. gr. § 76), cf. tolí-nu 'ziehe in die ferne, remove' with várg-i-nu 'in miseriadam duco' (: vařga-s 'miseria'), cf. Skr. duḥkha-m nayāmi (§ 12). The symphysis of these groups with locative priora (see on μενωνώ εν § 21) may not have taken place till the beginnings of Lithuanian.—c. The special sense of the -něti verbs is that, like ἄγινέω, they are frequentative (§ 5 d) and also diminutive. So in English takes to with action nouns in -ing (as in takes to jumping) means "begins, falls into the habit of, begins to busy oneself with" (Concise Oxf. Dict.), i. e. "incipit". This diminutive and frequentative sense also inheres in—d. Lith. lynóti 'to drizzle', where -nóti = 'incipit' (§ 6 e), and ly- is a locative in -i (§ 7 c; cf. on ἄγινέω) to the root in lé-ti 'to pour'.

21. MENOINΩ and Homeric Diek tas is. a. The most profitable remark hitherto made about μενωνώ is that it owes its -όνω to the synonym μαμώνο 'valde cupio'. The truth is precisely the contrary. Our verb is a symphysis, in Greek times, of loc. μενοι- (cf. Ἰοί [: ἴο] 'mane' and, for the o-vocalism, Lat. tergore tempore [Neue, Formenl. 2649]) + νώ (§ 6 e), but in μενοι-νόμαι we have -νω (§ 6 d). The sense was 'in mentem duco'; a verb of feeling as Lat. (in) animum induco is a verb of thought (cf. Skr. mánas 'voluntas', mévos 'ira, ardor'). We also have animo ducebam (rebarque futurum, Aeneid). With μενοι-νώ cf. Epic Skr. manasā yat pra-ṇītam = mente quod cupitum, manah-pra-ṇīta-s mente-cupitus, mano-ṇītas 'chosen' (cf. anu + ni 'precor', § 10).

1 In the first edition of the Grundriss (I, § 60 C) Brugmann connected the -no- of lynóti with -ημι, seeing (correctly, as I doubt not) in the lynóti type a possible starting point for the denominatives in -óti. But now the wide extension of -óti in denominatives seems to have blinked his earlier vision.

2 The forms of record are A μενοι-νώ (N 79); B (from *μενοινώ), 2d sg. μενοι νῆς (8°), 3d sg. μενοι νά (3°), but μενοι νά (T 164), ptc. μενοι νών (O 293), impf. 3d sg. μενοι νά (3°), 3d pl. μενοι-νον (e!, M 59), C. μενοινήσσει (O 82).

3 Is Lat. moneo from loc. mo[ni]+ -neō = 'in-mentem <alienam> duco'? Cf. § 20 (ροπ-ί).
The sense of μενοι-νως is given in Sanskrit by loc. manasi + kar or ni-धा; also note manas + kar (धा, यु-) 'animadvert'. Instr. manasa + gam (quasi 'mente ire') = 'to think of' etc.; m. + √ni would amount only to a causative of m. + √gam. — b. The posteriora -νως -τω -νω (-νως-νηως, §6 f) are all equally original, and were kept alive for their different rhythmic values in the epic. To interplay of μενοινως on μενοιναω we owe μαμώ: μαμάω and ηβωντες (cf. ζω: *ζω) for ηβαντες, δραντες1 for δραντες. In μενοइνεων e comes by §6 d, or is due to the ē of μενοινήσαν. After the ratio of μενοινων: *μενοινων we account for μενοινά: μενοινά.—c. Thus a sufficient number of patterns (ων η άα) for Homeric diek- tasis, the distinctive assimilation of vowels, is supplied by the μενοινων group. See further on κραάινω (§15 b), and other etymological patterns will appear below (§30). There was of course no real diektasis, no corrective metrical "distraction" (Wackernagel); and even the vowel assimilation of Leo Meyer and Hermann (l. s. c.) footed in these varying etymological patterns—a not improbable source of much that seems merely phonetic. e. In δεικα-νωντο (= in honorem du- cunt) the prius δεικ-α is an accusative; cf. Vedic instr. dāc-ā' 'honore'.

22. a. MENEAI-NΩ. The prius is a localis (Bartholomae's dative-locative, Gr. Ir. Phil. 1, §217; cf. Lat. temperī 'zur <rechten> zeit, χαµ-αι = humi [IF. 33, 359] 'to (or on) the ground'), from menesoi; the whole = quasi 'cordi ducere' (cf. animo ducebam), a transitive as it were to mihi cordi est, 'I have at heart'. The posterius -νει-ς (-νει) may = IE. nēisi (§6 a; AJPh. 25, 387). Analogy apart, the preterit, μενεινα- μεν may = instrum. menes-ει + impf. *e-nαmen. By combin-

1-οντ- for "open" -οντ- according to Hermann, KZ. 46, 2-49.

2 This ending (cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2. 194 ann.) can hardly be anything but IE. *δ | ὁ 'unmittelbar an, bei' (ib. p. 817), already glimpsed by Brugmann (Gr. 2. 2. §185. 3) as a locative ending. English by has developed the function of the agent and instrument. The old prejudice in favor of -a as the instrumental ending was due to πέδα (see Cl. Qt. 8, 50, 52′)=μετά, whose -α is a nominative ending, as in Lat. -cola (TAPA. 44. 119).—It is the -o | -e of this instrumental (sociative) that functions as a "connecting vowel" in compounds (survivals, not innovations) such as Goth. brōpr-a-lubō (with brother love) etc.; interpret δακρυ-ό-φι δακρυ-ό-εις by TAPA. 44, 107 sq. (§§ 1, 27). See also §28.
ing \( \mu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varphi\varepsilon\varphi\varepsilon\nu \) with aor. 1st sg. \( \mu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varphi\varepsilon\varphi\nu \) [analogy form after \( \iota\varphi\alpha/\iota\alpha\varphi \) (\( \dot{\alpha}\varphi \ <\alpha\varphi\nu-\))] we obtain a beautiful start for \( \ddot{a} \) as a quasi connecting vowel for the sigmatic aorist. Or is \( \dot{\eta}\varphi\alpha \ -\alpha\varphi\nu \) the proper compensative lengthening for \( -\alpha\nu-\sigma\alpha \ (\dot{\nu}\varphi\sigma\alpha: \ \dot{\nu}\nu\dot{e}y: \ \nu\ddot{d}e\nu: \ \nu\ddot{d}e\nu) \)? —b. Like \( \mu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varphi\varepsilon\varphi\varepsilon\nu\nu \) is \( \beta\lambda\varepsilon\mu\varepsilon\alpha\nu \), if \( = \) ‘superbit’ (\( <\nu\varepsilon \) in splendid dorium ducit), cf. es stem of \( \ddot{a}-\beta\lambda\varepsilon\mu\varepsilon\alpha\nu \). A root \( d(e)\varepsilon l\varepsilon m- \) (on \( \beta\lambda- <\dot{d}l- \), see TAPA, Spec. Sess. 1894, p. ix) ‘superbire’ may be justified to some degree by \( d(e)\varepsilon \) in Skr. \( \ddot{d}\varphi\nu\dot{a}t- \) ‘superbit’ (\( \ddot{p}: m \) as in Lat. \( \text{trepidus: t} \text{remit} \)). But if \( \beta\lambda\varepsilon\mu\varepsilon\alpha\nu\nu \) = ‘glaring’ (so Liddell and Scott) \( \beta\lambda\varepsilon\mu\varepsilon- \) belongs with \( \ddot{t} \) \( \beta\lambda\varepsilon\mu\varepsilon \).

C. On the -d/-dh root extensions.

22a. The Latin gerundials constitute a mere aspect of the composita found in the \( -\dot{d}o/-\dot{b}o \) extensions of shorter roots. Observe the pairs (\( \alpha p \))\( \text{standus} \): Germ. \( \text{standen} \); ciendus ‘movendus’: \( \mu\varepsilon\varepsilon\varphi\alpha-\kappa\dot{a}-\beta\omega \) ‘sequor’; \( -\text{bundus} \): OBulg. \( \text{bo}-\dot{d}o \) ‘ero, weorde’. The primate \( \text{sth}\text{m-}\ddot{d}h- \) contains an acc. infinitive = Skr. \( \text{sth}\text{m} \), and the complex = ‘to do a standing’ (‘do [to] stand’). In ciendus, etc., cien-: \( \kappa\dot{a}- = \text{IE. k}\dot{i}\text{m} \), acc. of \( \k\dot{i}- \) in \( \k\dot{i}\omega \k\dot{\nu}\nu\nu - \) (\( -\nu\rho\nu \) as in \( \ddot{a}\gamma\nu-\nu\rho\nu \), § 20), and the whole = ‘to do a moving’ (‘do move’). In \( -\text{bundus}: \text{bo}-\dot{d}o \) the prius is \( \text{IE. bh}\varepsilon\mu\nu\nu \) or \( \beta\ddot{h}\upmu\mu \), and the whole = ‘do become’.

23. Syntax of Lat. gerundive: \( \text{mihi eundum est} = \) ‘I have a going-do’, as Lane almost divined (Lat. Gr. 2, § 2243), and the necessitarian sense is contextual only, that is to say lies in theative. Words like secundus are formatively like Skr. \( \text{dhiyam-}\ddot{d}h\alpha- \) ‘precem faciens’. Note the comparative richness of the -om infinitives in the Italic dialects (von Planta, Gr., § 333). Sequendus is of the type of Skr. infin. \( \text{dhiy}\dot{a}-\text{dhy}\alpha\nu \), cf. \( \text{bhaos} \ <\text{dhiy\dot{i}m-dhiy}o-s \) (\( \text{th}\alpha\sigma\nu \cdot \chi\rho\varepsilon\nu\sigma\upsilon\alpha \), like Skr. \( \text{dhiy}\dot{a}dhy\alpha\nu \)), but Lacon. \( \sigma\alpha\delta\epsilon \) (\( \sigma \) in both <\( \text{m} \), as Prellwitz correctly saw, BB 22, 283) has \( d \) (§ 24).

24. The posterioria in the Italic gerundials may be subsumed, quantity apart, in the Vedic pair \( \text{n}\alpha\nu\alpha-\ddot{d}\dot{h}\alpha\nu \) ‘name-giving’: \( \ddot{a}\text{ma-}\ddot{d}\alpha\text{-} \) ‘soul-giving’, or in \( \text{rayi-}\ddot{d}\alpha\text{-} \) : ratna-\( \ddot{d}\text{h}\alpha \). In the dialects, Umbr. anferen 2 apart, only \( -\text{do} \) is attested,

1 a. amor (Plautus) = Love must be stood off (transitive, as \( \text{standen} \) is transitive).

2 As a matter of palaeography anferen <f>er is an easy correction; or the second \( \text{nf} \) might be reduced to \( \text{n} \) by teleheterosis.
cf. ἱδ in συάδες and φυγάδες (Prellwitz, l. c.), a type recognized as gerundial by Lebreton (Mém. Soc. Ling. 11, 145 sq.), otherwise, all the dialect examples are, or may be, irradiations from the “operandus” type, which may be purely Italic, as operandus comes from operam dare (rebus divinis, Cicero, Leg. 2. 26). For operam dare with accusative see Bennett, Syntax ii, § 260.

25. Statistic of “operandus”: ύπαννο- ‘operan-do-’ 7°; piano- (§ 15 g) ‘piando-’ 4°; sacranno- ‘sacando-’ 2°—13 instances of one and the same idea. ¹ Of other ritual verbs of the first conjugation, sense unknown, there remain pelsano- 5°; (v) eehiano- 2°. Lastly, Umbr. anferener occurs as follows: (<“sacra omnia”> popler anferener ² et ocrer pihaner = populi circumferendi et arci piandi.

26. Proof of dh:—Lat. standus: Germ. standen, ciendus: μετεκίαθε (i is either metric ὅ ὅ ὅ, or like i in Skr. pada-vyam, § 15 h). Proof of d: operandus; of dh/d θλασσος: συάδες. Lindsay’s explanation of the gerundials (II., p. 544, § 95) would have gone better had he used operandus-dus for his example, instead of *lausam-dus, etc.; and the choice of Skr. sthām instead of Av. ḍgm (for dan-dus) might have led him to see the formal identity, except. excip., between standus and Germ. standen.

27. Case-relations of the priora. In standus the prius is an infinitive of accusative form; in operandus the accusative of an action noun; in ciendus (µετεκίαθε)³ again an accusa-

¹ The sense of ύπαννο- was generalized from ‘operando-’ to ‘facciendo-’, along the easy transition afforded by the equality of the idea of faciendo- with the idea of sacrificando-.

² As IE. -ndh- alternated with -nd- we need not here raise the question whether -n(n)- came from -ndh-, but neither -nf-<-ndh- nor any analogon is certified by the dialects save in Osc. anafriss, where the conditions of Lat. inferi inferiae etc. (apparent recomposition) obtain (see TAPA. 29, 19).

³ Statistic of some Greek verbs in -άθειν (or -αθείν, see Veitch’s catalogue s. vv.): Hom. ἐφέργα-αθείν ‘twisted off, cut off; shut out’; in the dramatists: ελκαθείν ‘to yield’ (i. e. do a yielding), διωκαθείν ‘to pursue’; ἄμυναθείν ‘to defend’; and particularly ἅλκα-αθείν ‘to ward off’, with ἅλκα- (acc.) matching ἅλκα- (loc.): ἅλκη. Hesychius adds κατ-ε-κιάθεν· κατεκομήθη, in gradation with Skr. जय-ध्याद ‘to lay’, cf. Av. gen-ablv. inín. जयो ‘to destroy’, but जस (i) ‘perniciei’ ( : जस ‘pernicier’).
tive (cf. Skr. infin. *pra-mi-yam ‘to neglect’), as in Skr. dhiyā-dhiyā ‘to deposit’ (in which dhiyā was once an independent infinitive, like Av. dyā; see tmesis with dyāt in § 28). For the propriety of the accusative relation note Bartholomae’s renderings of Skr. bhāradhyāī ‘tragung zu machen’, sāhadhyāī ‘bewältigung zu machen’, gayādhyāī ‘liegen zu machen’, Av. vasadyāī ‘fahrt zu machen’ (cited in TAPA, 29, 13). I take Av. vərən-dyāī to contain n < m (acc. *vər-m, a more allegro form than the flexion type of Skr. giram: nom. gār); but ir-ā-dhyāī (in krānā i. = potentes adipiscendi) has a prius *rrm (like giram < giram) belonging with the root of āpnu-maī (cf. on āp-σtros, § 4 c’).

28. But the dative-locative relation is also attested and, in Avestan, with relative fulness: thāyōi-dyāī ‘protegere’ (thāyōī-: √trā(y)- : dāvōī: √dā(v)-); o-stem locative priora in srāvayeī-dyāī ‘to cause to hear’; āfyei-dyāī ‘curare’ (-fyei: Lat. pius, ? I v g); varazyeī-dyāī ‘zu wirken, zu thun’ (cf. the es stem varazyah- ‘wirken, thun’, which governs the accusative and corresponds, in its locative varaz-yah(i), to the Latin infinitives in -ier,¹ Bull., § 94; neut. varəz-ya-m ‘wirken, arbeit’). The genesis of these infinitive combinations in -dyāī (but Av. dyāi is also a simplex) is made clear-as-day² by the Gāthic combination varaz-ī (loc. infin.) nā dyāt = “zur wirksamkeit uns verhelfe”. So in Av. srui-dyāī ‘audire’ sūi-dyāī ‘zu nutzen’ we are quite justified in finding the locative priora srū- and sū- (cf. on camū, § 19); and continuants of IE. nēi and snāi (infinitives like parā-dāi, § 7 c) in the priora of vī-thēi ‘spins’, Av. snā-daitī ‘lavit’. In vəp-e-θovto vəp may be a suffixless locative (Bull., § 38), followed by augmented ē-θovto; unless vəp-e- (like ṭīλ-e; cf. ēpē: ēpē-) is a locative-instrumental in -e (§ 22, c’), of the type of O Bulg. kamen-e, etc. (Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2. § 185, 3 a). This -e/-o case, undifferentiated (and not mixed³) as between instrumental and locative, is found in Skr. div-ā-kṣas- = div-i-kṣit-

¹Latin fieri is from a dative of a verbal noun of the type of Skr. bhi-yās- ( = ābhēy).
²Be it said in passing that this locution (cf. Lat. sub divo) probably foots on Indo-European.
³Convergence by phonetic decay excluded, so far as cases can be called mixed it is in consequence of imitation of the more original lack of differentiation.
'in caelo habitans' (div-á- = advb. divá/divá); cf. κερα-ο-ζός "worker in horn" (graver on horn) and ἀσπιδ-ό-δουρος 'clupeo-crepitans'; ἀσπίδ-ό-φέρμων 'living-by-shield'. [Fick, Eigenn., p. 53, explains Ἄλκε- in Greek names as an instrumental.]

29. The flexional type of fundit· and -bundus. Algebraic analysis has satisfied itself in the past by deriving OBulg. bo-do ‘ero’ (Berneker, Wbch. s. v.) from bhā<n>- -d- or bhvo<n>-d-, calling n the infixed nasal (formant!) and d a formant (admittedly from the root dhē or dō); and has never come to a reckoning à outrance with this ubiquitous n (§ 172).

To define fundit as ‘pouring does’ ought, however, to be enough to satisfy anyone that fun- is IE. acc. *ģhw-omo ( :: Skr. ā-bhavo-m: √bhā), not *ģhā-m (type of Av. xínām ‘πλήρωμα, completio’, § 4. 3), because of f- <ģhw-. In pf. fū-dit (for *hū-dit) fā- (with f after the present—and this may be one source for the f/h variation in Latin) is a locative like srū- in srūi-dyāi (§ 28), and the whole = I did [to] pour. Similarly in Lat. fin-d-it ‘splits’ fin- is from *bhim (: OBulg. biṭi ‘caedere’1)1, fashioned like Av. xśim ‘perni-ciem’, +-d/-dh- ‘dare, facere’.2 The root being a long vowel root, in the perfect ft-dit ft will be a dative-locative <bhāi (cf. on λοί-οβος, § 4 b). The participles fū-sus fū-ssus (prius <bh-ī-, § 7 c) will contain in -(s)sos the correspondent of Skr. -ta-, ptc. to √dā.

[29a. I have but lately come to understand the flexional significance of OBulg. dajq ‘do’ (infin. dajati ‘dare’) and to realize that it entitles us to operate, in composition, with IE. dyēti ‘dat’ (cf. Skr. dyāti ‘διδοὺ’). In scin-dit, as in fin-dit, the prius is an accusative. In σχί-ζω (-ζω <dyō) the prius is a locative to a root noun skhē(y)-, and the complex meant something like ‘in scissuram do’, cf. Lat. in fugam dare ‘ fugare’ (causalis to fugere) and in conspectum dare, causalis to ‘conspicere’.]
The Greek aorist in -θη (ptc. -θεις, note accent). Exclusive of ἐ-γνῶ-σθης (-θθ- <sth, Bull, §81) and perhaps a few more like it, the -θη aorists are simply tenses belonging to the fu-n-dit flexion type, χῦ-θεις being equivalent, except excip., to fū-dit. In ἐ-κλῖνθη 'he did lean' (Γ360) κλιν- is accusative like Av. xšim 'perniciem'; in ἐ-κλιθ-θη ‘did turn’ (τ470), κλι- is a locative as in §7 c. From the analogy of ptc. κλιτός (Skr. γριτ-ά-s): κλι-θείς, pairs like χυτός: χυθείς were begotten, cf. ἀμφ-ε-χιθή (δ716) ‘did fall’ (= fundebatur). In A200 note δισε ρανθηνε' 'eyes did glow' (φαν <βηθυά-m 'splendor', formed like Skr. dayā-'misericordia' (also cf. ἀγίατ-δαγία-'), a feminine to the type of Skr. n. bhayā-m 'pavor' (masc.). See on κρα-νr, §15 b.

31. Other complexes with ḍhē-. In μαν-θάω the prius is from lento mn[i], as in §7 b; but in μαθέων from allegro mn[i]-. An Indo-Iranian ‘suffixless’ locative man-, (i. e. mn) is found in Skr. man-dhātār- and, in tmesi, in Av. mn. . . . dadē 'I have put in mind’ (for the form cf. Gāthic azēṃ = Skr. ahām ‘ego’). In Lithuanian, the causatives like ly-dinu ‘pluerē facio’ contain an infinitive prius ly-, etc. (§20 d) + -dinu = -θαυω (but in -dinu i may be the most reduced form of a case in -ārγ, §71; ə in -θαυω of -ār[y]). The syntax of the combination reminds of Lat. marcescere facit (Thes. LL. VI, 115, 6).

22a. Postscript.—The do- conjugation is found in Indo-Iranian. See exx. ap. Bartholomae, BB. 15,237 and Jackson’s renderings, Av. Gram. §724, 4, Av. -rīcyā is a loc. infin. rīc-i + ə as explained in §222.

University of Texas.

The root is certified as klēy by ἰ-forms like κλίμακι κλίνει; and Skr.  ngọt- is from klēye-. We have a dissyllabic kōley- in Lat. colīna ‘kitchen’ (i. e. in our parlance a ‘lean-to, shed’) : cāīa- (long-grade ə) ‘hut, stall’. Note the rhyming pair klē (in kētaiv ‘lies’) and lēy (§4 b) in Skr. pra-lāyana-m ‘lagerstätte’; nilāy- ‘lager’, ni-lāyana-m ‘das sich niederlassen auf’.

But forms like μαδνθησαν are perhaps from μα-νθ[θ]θησαν (νθ-θη- : Vθēy : στρ-θείς : Vθēθ; on ə see §31); at all events, in ἀμανττ γ[τ]ς suggests ‘ad-pollutionem ductus’ (cf. §15 h).